



DIMUN

Dr. İlhami Tankut Anatolian High School Model United Nations
Conference

The Dark Age: Future of Europe

Agenda Item:

Fate of Europe - 1198 AD

Under Secretary General: Melikhan Demirkıran

Under Secretary General: Metehan Yıldırım

Academic Assistant: Dağhan Aras Karanfilci

ADHOC: The Dark Age

Table of Contents

- 1. Letter from the Secretary General**
- 2. Letter from Co-Under Secretary Generals**
- 3. Letter from the Academic Assistant**
- 4. Procedure**
 - a. *What is a ADHOC Committee***
 - i. Directive*
 - ii. Updates*
 - iii. Crises*
 - b. *Directive Types and How to Write Them***
 - i. Personal Directive*
 - ii. Joint Directive*
 - iii. Committee Directive*
 - iv. Intelligence Directive*
 - v. Top Secret*
 - vi. Press Release (Declamation)*
 - c. *Procedure of the Committee***
 - i. Roll Call*
 - ii. Tour de Table*
 - iii. Semi-moderated Caucus*
 - iv. Unmoderated Caucus*
- 5. Historical overview of past years**
 - a. 1050-1100*
 - b. 1100-1150*
 - c. 1150-1200*
- 6. Religious Structure in Europe**
 - a. Early Church and Great Schism*
 - b. The Catholic Church and Popes*
 - c. Hierarchical Structure*
 - d. Scholastic System*
 - e. Political Influence of the Church*
 - f. Corruption of the Church*
- 7. Political Structure in Europe**
- 8. Sociological Structure in Europe**

9. Economical Structure in Europe

10. Battle and Warfare tactics

a. Field Warfare

b. Siege Warfare

c. Military Units

11. Further notes

12. Bibliography

1. LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY GENERAL

Greetings Esteemed Attendees,

As the secretary general of the conference. It is with great pleasure that I extend gracious hospitality and welcome you all, participants of DiMUN'25, which will be held in Antalya from June 27th to 29th.

As we gather for this Model United Nations conference, we look forward to thought-provoking debates, insightful dialogues, and meaningful opportunities for collaboration. The delegates of this conference may have enlightening discussions and foster their diplomatic skills. With committees exploring a wide array of historical topics, delegates are sure to be both challenged and inspired, cultivating their critical thinking and diplomacy throughout the experience.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the organizing team and academic team for their dedication and hard work in order to raise DIMUN'25 to the pinnacle!

Furthermore, it is important not to place undue pressure on yourself before or during the conference. All participants are here to enhance their personal and academic growth while engaging with new peers in that kind of conference, so please be reminded of that. Therefore, remember to enjoy the experience and make the most of your time. Stay tuned for an enriching and memorable event.

Sincerely,

Erdem Demirci

2. LETTER FROM CO-UNDER SECRETARY GENERALS

Dear Delegates,

It is my great pleasure to welcome you to the ADHOC: The Dark Age. In this study guide, my co-committee secretary, Melikhan Demirkıran, our Academic Assistant Dağhan Aras Karanfilci and I have prepared all the information you need to know before participating in the committee.

In ADHOC Committees, regardless of your previous conference experience or current level of procedural knowledge, you can succeed, learn, and most importantly, have fun and we will do our best to make this committee a unique experience for you!

Co-Under Secretary General: Metehan Yıldırım

metehanyildirim2007@gmail.com

Hi, it is Melikhan. I am one of the Under Secretary Generals of the committee: ADHOC THE DARK AGE. I would like to welcome you all to the DIMUN25'. I also can proudly say that you are in arguably the best committee in the conference! We have planned an amazing flow of the events for you. To be prepared, we want you to read the study guide AT LEAST ONCE. The study guide will be all you need thanks to Dağhan. He did a really amazing job. If you have any kind of questions about the committee you can reach me via WhatsApp. I am looking forward to seeing you in the committee. Have an amazing day!

Melikhan Demirkıran - 05443681943

3. LETTER FROM THE ACADEMIC ASSISTANT

Dear delegates,

Here is Dağhan. I am the academic assistant of ADHOC: The Dark Age committee. -as you already know- I would like to say that I am happy that you all participated in this valuable conference. At the same time, it is also a pride that you have joined this committee, which is undoubtedly the best committee of the conference. As my friends have mentioned, we have prepared an extraordinary committee and committee functioning for you. Do not doubt its flow and the rest about the committee. But of course, the only condition for experiencing these is to have fully internalized the guide. PLEASE READ THE GUIDE UNTIL THE END. Since we will be together throughout the entire guide, do not hesitate to contact me at any time if you have any questions about the guide or the committee. I hope I am not the only one who is dying with excitement for the committee! I wish you a wonderful day...

Best regards...

Dağhan Aras Karanfilci

05417281289 - daghanaras00@gmail.com

4. PROCEDURE

a. What is an ADHOC committee

The functioning of the committee: Unlike a CC, delegates within the committee will be divided into parties due to states and will fight each other outside of the crises of that period to achieve their own goals. The ones who will manage the committee will be Pope Innocent I and his assistant so that they can determine the course of the committee and support those who need help with issues such as directives. We will be able to start conflicts, trials (hanging, burning, beheading, etc.) and even wars within the scope of excessive or

insufficient speeches made by the delegates, well the same logic applies to crises resulting from directives. There will be no speaking sessions other than the Tour de Table and in irregular sessions where we will allow Cross Talking, states will write directives, press releases, and treaties among themselves. Each state will have its own characteristics (statuses).

When a state conquers / destroys another state, the 3 delegates in the destroyed state will come under the protection of the conquering state, and during the trial process, they will be executed, etc. If he is sentenced to a decision, he will start working on behalf of the state he entered under the protection of by taking a realloc after his execution or if his dynasty is still standing, he will be the most competent person from his dynasty. In this way, the most active and successful state will increase its influence within the committee and become a greater power.

Why ADHOC: Because it is the type of committee that provides the structure that can accommodate the procedure that will serve our purpose from every type of committee within MUN, where we can give place to the intrigues that will arise from crises, trials and discussions specific to the Middle Ages.

i) Directive:

Directives are the main materials of Joint Crisis Committees; they are what distinguish a JCC from the General Assembly. As the name implies, the term "directive" refers to an order or instruction. On the committee, any realistic and feasible action can be taken by writing directives. Consequently, it is guaranteed that the majority of the time spent on the committee will be devoted to writing directives (Triumphs are attained through concrete actions, rather than mere speeches or campaigns.) Unlike the GA procedure, it is unnecessary to encourage, suggest, or demonstrate any ideas to make it happen; only a decent directive is required. There are several types of directives depending on what one wants to do, and they will be discussed in the latter section.

To summarize, directives are written when one wishes to accomplish or do something. Writing a directive allows one to take any realistic action, therefore instead of long discussions and talking sessions to execute your ideas and progress in the committee, directives will be written.

ii) Updates:

1- Updates are the outcomes of directives, which are either granted or rejected based on how precisely one wrote and phrased the directive. The Crisis Team evaluates whether they are adequate or not; every conference with crisis committees includes a Crisis Team that reads and inspects directives.

2- Updates can also come as a result of a new occurrence in your cabinet. For example, if the other cabinet launches a successful attack on one of your cities and captures it, an update will come. If the directive only concerns your cabinet, such as building a new military base in your country, then the update will only come to your cabinet, but if it is a conflict that both sides participate in, then the update will come to both cabinets.

3- The update doesn't necessarily have to be the result of a directive; for instance, if you are in the Hundred Years' Wars committee during the 14th century, then the Crisis Team may bring a plague update that will infect the majority of soldiers. Hereupon, it can be understood that the update may also be a *crisis*.

iii) Crisis:

Crises emerge when one submits an insufficient directive, the other cabinet successfully affects you in a negative way, or temporal crises occur depending on the Crisis Teams' wishes. To clarify:

1- In order for a sufficient directive to be written, there are a few rules and necessities that must be followed; failing this, an inevitable crisis will occur based on what was wanted to be done in the directive.

2- If a cabinet were to create a virus and spread it to the other cabinet's people, the update would be a crisis that must be handled promptly. It does not necessarily have to be a virus or a plague; anything that affects one or one's cabinet negatively can be a crisis.

3- Finally, depending on how the committees' actions progress, a periodic crisis like a plague or a political disagreement may arise and affect a cabinet adversely.

b. Directive Types and How To Write Them

In an ADHOC committee, there are six types of papers that can be submitted. Each type has its own purpose, advantages, and disadvantages. Unless it is a top secret directive, directives should be given to the chair, who will then send them to the crisis team via admins.

i) Personal Directive:

Personal directives are written when an action is within your character's authority or is possible due to their abilities. Now take a look at how to write a Personal Directive: Firstly, there is a format for writing directives; thus, one has to write who is sending the directive and to whom (from, to). After that, which cabinet is sending the directive, then the real-world time and the current date of the committee. Lastly, the type of your directive and the headline of it. And that's it; this is all the format one needs to know to write a directive. The only thing left is the content of the directive, and the method by which one writes it is fairly straightforward; it is written by addressing the WH questions, which are what, why, when, who, where, and, most importantly, how. Write down the action you want to take by answering the WH questions, then detailing and explaining it as much as possible to ensure

that your plan is as comprehensive as possible. Also, the use of the future tense is critical, try to use it whenever possible. Here is how a directive looks on paper:

From: Menelaus 1192BC May 3	Personal Directive	Date:
To: Related Authorities (Spartan Cabinet)	Capturing Tiryns	Time: 12.34

What: I will capture Tiryns with my 5,000 agoge men stationed on the Tiryns frontline. My soldiers will kill and destroy any enemy forces they come across, as well as any enemy military bases. Women and children in the city will not be murdered unless they attack the soldiers.

Why: Tiryns plays a crucial role in the war, and it must be captured in order to cut the enemy's supply lines.

When: Soldiers will charge at 02.00 a.m. to catch the enemy off guard.

Who: I will be operating this attack, and if I fall during the war, my right-hand man, Analus, will take over. 5,000 agoge soldiers will assault the enemy under his command.

Where: 2,500 of my soldiers will charge from the southeast frontline, and the other 2,500 will charge from the west to capture Tiryns.

How*: To reduce noise, the 5,000 agoge soldiers will be divided into 50 groups, with 100 soldiers per group. Soldiers will check and control their weapons before charging. Each group will have a commander, and the commanders will be the best warriors among their groups. They will be well-armed with their hoplons, xiphos, and dorus (Spartan agoge soldiers' shields, spearheads, and small swords). Each group will apply the doctrine properly to face the fewest casualties. If needed, 3 soldiers from each group will bring supplies to their own group from the frontlines, and these 3 soldiers will be picked randomly from the commanders. They will take the safest route and avoid the enemy. Our men will take the safe paths suggested by our spies. They will pray, remember how brave they are, and then honour their nation and gods by demolishing the enemy. They will not disobey their commander's orders and apply the doctrine as they say. To avoid being affected by attrition, our soldiers will study their geographical situation as well as the enemy's to use it in their favour. They will not be wearing inappropriate armour and clothing, only those that will fit the current climate. Any careless mistakes shall not be forgiven and the commanders of the groups will eliminate the soldiers who made the mistake such as sleeping on a night's watch. If by any chance a soldier catches a disease that may spread he will be killed if there are no precautions that can be taken in order to heal him without letting it spread. If the siege and the road take unusually long to take and pass they will shave properly to prevent any lice growing, mating and distracting the soldiers. Soldiers will use an offensive phalanx formation when I order them to charge, and they will slaughter each enemy troop they face. They will use the offensive formation until they face a larger enemy force to quickly capture as many critical areas as possible. If they face a larger enemy force, to be exact, 1.5 times larger than them, they will quickly change to a defensive phalanx formation and wait for recruitment while defending themselves. Their priority will be killing the enemy rather than cutting supply lines. In mountain areas, they will use the highlands in their favour and quickly oppress the

enemy to finish them. Once they reach the city, their priority will be killing the cabinet members of Tiryns. If possible, they will defenestrate them to entertain themselves. Meaning of mercy will disappear from their minds and any offers made by the enemy will be rejected for they have disrespected our Nation. After the military bases and the city are captured, soldiers will go to the possible conflict areas to recruit other soldiers. Even though we've sent spies before, our soldiers will be vigilant for any kind of trap. Their main objective is to capture the city, and for that purpose, they will sacrifice themselves without hesitation.

Once one gets used to it, it is quite simple and straightforward to write. While it lacks details and additional information, the directive nicely illustrates its format. As one keeps writing and contributing to their cabinet's goals, in no time one will witness that the directives one has written have already surpassed that one above. And to write such a directive, here are a few tips and tricks:

- For every action that is written in the directive, it has to answer all the WH questions.
- The longer and more detailed, the better.
- Drawing your war doctrine, charging plan, or strategy may significantly increase the directive's preciseness and effectiveness. The success rate of the directive will grow in proportion to how clear your action and directive are.
- Do not use abbreviations such as "etc."; instead, detail the directive explicitly.
- WH questions are not necessarily broken into paragraphs (one can write the directive like a book), but if you are a beginner, doing so will dramatically improve the quality of your directive, hence, I strongly recommend it.
- In JCCs, one should not try to impose their ideas or policies on others but rather to achieve a specific goal, such as destroying the other cabinet; therefore, do not be hesitant to ask for help from other cabinet members or your chair, you are all in this together.
- If you are positive that there is no impostor in the cabinet, directives should be written separately because it will be much faster. If you need the authority of another cabinet member, simply ask that person to add their name to the "from:" section. That way, eight people will be working on eight different tasks, and it will save quite a lot of time.
- Precise information, like troop counts, is critical; do not forget to write them down.
- If needed, fake names can be used for strategic persons in the directives, like Coxus, the Naval Commander.

ii) Joint Directive:

Directives written by more than one individual are considered joint directives. Joint directives are written when one can only achieve the purpose of the directive by utilising the authority of other cabinet members. Consider the scenario where one is a commander responsible for capturing Warsaw. Recognising the insurmountable challenge of achieving this objective without air superiority, a collaborative effort can be initiated by writing a joint directive with the Air Force general. In this case, the "from" field of the directive would

include the commander's name alongside the name of the air force general, and instead of a personal directive, you write Joint Directive at the top of the directive. Everything else is the same.

iii) Committee Directive:

A committee directive is written when one wishes to use everyone's authority or when one is about to deliver their final directive (in most cases). Delegates frequently ask, "How are we meant to write a committee directive with the other cabinet?" However, this concern stems from a widespread misunderstanding. The committee directive is essentially formulated collaboratively within the confines of your cabinet, with the members of your cabinet. Although it is formally referred to as a "Committee Directive," its essence remains akin to that of a cabinet directive. So, simply writing Committee Directive in the "from:" part will do.

iv) Intelligence Directive:

Intelligence directives are written when one wants to acquire the necessary information about their country/cabinet/character. The format is exactly the same, except for the "WH Questions" part. For example:

From: Winston Churchill	Intelligence Directive	Date: 1942 May
3		
To: Crisis Team	Our Troop Counts	Time: 16.21
(The Great Britain Cabinet)		

How many troops does our country have? Do we possess any nuclear weapons? How many of our military factories are assigned to manufacture infantry weapons, and what kind of weapons are they producing?

When one wants to acquire a piece of information, one must write "To: Crisis Team" but when one wants to take action, one must write "To: Related Authorities". The reason behind this is that the crisis team is not the people who will cause the action to happen; hence, "Related Authorities" must be written.

v) Top Secret:

Top Secret directives are those that your chair is not allowed to read. Top secret directives are directly handed to the admin. They are written precisely the same, but one must fold the paper and write "TOP SECRET" on the back side of it. The major reason for writing a Top Secret Directive is treason, a diabolical strategy to crash one's own cabinet or switch sides. For instance, if a person secretly kills his cabinet members and becomes dictator, the winning condition changes and only that person wins, whereas the cabinet loses. But I do not recommend writing Top Secret Directives unless you're planning on writing a brilliant 10-page directive, because failing to do so will backfire much worse. If one fails to accomplish their nefarious plan and gets busted, one will earn their cabinet's distrust and may

die and be given an insignificant character. Additionally, updates to the Top Secret Directives are only sent to the person who sent them unless they directly affect other cabinet members.

vi) Press Release (Declamation):

Press Releases are written when one wants to make a declaration, a speech, or a notice. When one writes a press release, depending on the era of the committee, the other cabinet members may hear it or not. In our case, there are no printers, social media, or newspapers, so it is very unlikely to hear other cabinets' press releases. The format is once again exactly the same, except for the "WH Questions" part. For example:

From: Erwin Smith	Press Release	Date: 845 July 23
To: Related Authorities (Wall Maria Cabinet)	Hyping Up the Soldiers	Time: 18.17

Everything that you thought had meaning: every hope, dream, or moment of happiness. None of it matters as you lie bleeding out on the battlefield. None of it changes what a speeding rock does to a body, we all die. But does that mean our lives are meaningless? Does that mean that there was no point in our being born? Would you say that of our slain comrades? What about their lives? Were they meaningless?... They were not! Their memory serves as an example to us all! The courageous fallen! The anguished fallen! Their lives have meaning because we, the living, refuse to forget them! And as we ride to certain death, we trust our successors to do the same for us! Because my soldiers do not buckle or yield when faced with the cruelty of this world! My soldiers push forward! My soldiers scream out! My soldiers RAAAAAGE!

A Press Release like that might be written before a conflict to increase the motivation and morale of soldiers, or it could be written in any way one wishes, depending on their goal. Since one is addressing your people rather than the Crisis Team, the language can be informal. Plus, press releases can prevent crises, especially those related to the public; they can be used for propaganda, making promises, or spreading misinformation. This is a different form of press release that could be submitted:

From: Rollo	Declamation	Date: 802 August 28
To: Related Authorities (Frankish Kingdom Cabinet)	Standing our Ground	Time: 10.27

All of my life and all of your lives have come to this point. There is nowhere else to be but here. Nowhere else to live or die but here. To be here now is the **only** thing that matters. So, gather yourselves. Gather all of your strength, all of your sweetness into an iron ball. For

we will attack again and again until we reach and overcome their king or die in the attempt!
We will attack! Attack! Attack! Blow the horns! Beat the drums! And have courage! For
there will be no turning back. Only victory! Or death!

Based on one's creativity, press releases may vary just like directives and can be used for almost any purpose. And for this committee, we will allow you to write Declamation instead of Press Release because declamation is a more accurate term for the ninth century.

c. Procedure of the Committee

i) Roll call: When your character's name is called out during a roll call, you can respond with "I", "present", or simply by raising your placard.

ii) Tour de Table: Tour de Table is an introduction, similar to the opening speech. Following the roll call, it can be done at the beginning or end of the sessions, depending on the chair's initiative. Delegates are expected to briefly introduce themselves and voice their goals or vision for their cabinet.

iii) Semi-moderated Caucus: Unlike moderated caucuses, delegates in a semi-moderated caucus are allowed to speak without the chair's permission, as long as they do not interrupt other cabinet members and treat each other with respect.

iv) Unmoderated Caucus: In an unmoderated caucus, delegates are free to draft any kind of paper they want to achieve their goals, and support others. The majority of the cabinet's time should be spent on unmoderated caucuses rather than semi-moderated.

Unlike the General Assembly Committees, at an ADHOC Committee, the sessions proceed with Semi-Moderated caucuses and Unmoderated caucuses. The reason for that is to have a more smooth experience. Since the participants of a Joint Crisis Committee have already had a few experiences with how committees and MUN conferences proceed, semi and unmoderated caucuses are to advance the efficiency of debates, thus making crucial and quick decisions. It was mentioned earlier, but directives are the primary reason that a JCC's procedure is so unique. So later on with the sessions based on your chair's initiative you need not take one or two semi-moderated caucuses before an unmoderated caucus to write directives, directly voting for an unmoderated caucus before moderated will be allowed to continue writing directives.

On an ADHOC committee, after the roll call and Tour de Table, delegates take semi-moderated caucuses to discuss future actions, strategies and plans. After determining their move, delegates write down the designated act to put into practice. There isn't a General Speakers' List, resolution paper, or opening speech.

5. HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF PAST YEARS

a. 1050-1100

When the year 1050 showed many developments had already taken place. Feudal systems were established, and many states and empires were formed in Western and Central Europe. The Byzantine Empire and the Arabs were also among them. However, the developments that came on top of all these were not to be underestimated. Many of them were of a type that changed history. Religions were getting more and more heated day by day and were attracting many masses. When the calendars showed the year 1050, Islam reached Kanem-Bornu, a joint kingdom encompassing the eastern and western shores of Lake Chad. A Muslim dynasty is established at Kilwa, on the east African coast. And the developments were not only based on religion. Apart from these, cultural developments also emerged. For example, the heavier and more dense style of calligraphy, known as 'black letter', becomes the fashion in manuscripts written in northern Europe, and Polyphony brings new complexity of interweaving vocal lines, in the choral singing of an abbey or cathedral. Of course, the means of communication were not idle either. The rulers of Baghdad harnessed homing pigeons as postmen, for example. The Chinese civilization was also making new inventions in their region that would encompass the entire world. And the developments under which they signed, such as the concept of movable type for printing, were pioneered in China, using fired clay, but it proved impractical. The earliest surviving reference to the principle of the compass occurs in a Chinese manuscript, which is of a nature to prove this.

When the calendars hit the year 1054, the developments did not stop. Terrible developments took place in Europe. A Russian chronicle makes the first mention of the marauding Polovtsy, who persistently raided Russian cities from the steppes. Along with these, religious developments were also incessant. A papal delegate (from Leo IX) excommunicated Cerularius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and the delegate was excommunicated in retaliation, launching a lasting East-West Schism. However, the situation was not like this in Asia. Asian countries were trying to develop their countries and the world by focusing on their technologies. And they signed a study that was at an incredible level for its year. Astronomers in China and Japan observe the explosion of the supernova, which is still visible as the Crab Nebula. What a vision..

From this year until 1064, the world calmed down a bit. Yes, the developments could be considered minor compared to the rest. But their effects on the world were not like that at all. In 1055, someone named Tugrul Bey was officially dominating that region in Central Asia. How? Togrul Beg entered Baghdad and was granted by the caliph the title of sultan, which became hereditary in his Seljuk dynasty. In 1057, things were not going well in Europe. There was a very big regime change. -legally-. Duncan's son, Malcolm, killed Macbeth in battle at Lumphanan, and in the following year, he was crowned at Scone. When we came to 1062, the conditions for Europe were the same again. This time, a big threat was waiting for Spain. Berber tribesmen, the Almoravids, established a base at Marrakech from which they conquered northwest Africa and moved into Spain. God bless the Spanish... And in 1064, the Chinese were still the same. Their minds were too busy with technology and developing the world. And their fresh invention, this time a water wheel. Su Sung, a Buddhist monk, developed in China the principle of the escape in his tower clock worked by a water wheel. They are always the same...

With the arrival of the calendars in 1066, the world began to shake again. And England in particular was getting its share of this shake-up. The throne fights and wars brought about by their order never left them alone. And these were the kind that would even turn brothers against each other. Of course, the change of people in power came with these. Statesmen were constantly changing, and England was literally being dragged into an abyss. First, on his deathbed in Westminster, Edward the Confessor designates Harold, foremost among England's barons, as his successor. He closed his eyes to life immediately after this. Edward the Confessor is buried in his new abbey church at Westminster, consecrated only the previous week. And with this, on the day of Edward's burial, Harold is crowned king, almost certainly in the same abbey church at Westminster. On the other hand, they pioneered astronomical developments. Halley's comet, appearing in the Normans' annus mirabilis, is later depicted in the Bayeux tapestry. It could be said that Harold's military successes were almost instantaneous once he was crowned. Also in the same year, Harold defeats at Stamford Bridge the joint army of his brother Tostig and the Norwegian king, Harald Hardraade. Remember the comet? Here is a depiction of that star that resulted in the defeat of a king. The Normans, as seen in the Bayeux tapestry, invade England in Viking longships with fortified platforms for archers. What a threatening depiction...Harold thought so, of course. But the end is not very encouraging. Harold, hurrying south to confront the Normans after his victory at Stamford Bridge, is defeated and killed at Hastings. How sad... And as

expected, after Harold's death, a new leader had to take over. This was William, also known as William the Conqueror. William the Conqueror was crowned at Westminster on Christmas Day - this gave the new abbey church two coronations and a royal funeral in its first year. All this development in one country in one year must have exhausted the English.

The year 1071 was officially the year of the Turks. They finally captured the place they had wanted for years and thought was the best place for them. The campaigns of Alp Arslan, culminating in 1071, gave the Seljuk Turks a lasting presence in Anatolia. Of course, this brought war with it. Byzantium, who was the ruler of Anatolia at that time, did not want a threat like the Turks on its lands. That's why the Seljuk Turks and the Byzantines met in battle at Manzikert, with victory going to the Turks.

Until 1080, there was little progress compared to the previous years. The expected things happened. In 1075, the first steps towards the future domination of the church were taken. Pope Gregory VII declared that only the church may make ecclesiastical appointments, thus initiating the investiture controversy between the pope and the emperor. In 1077, another religious development took place. The Emperor Henry IV stood as a penitent outside the pope's castle at Canossa, to be released from excommunication. Thus, the church instilled the loyalty of the people towards the church. And a year later, in 1078, Anselm includes in his Proslogion his famous 'ontological proof' of the existence of God.

The calendar pages were exhausted by 1080. We return to the depiction of the comet in England in 1080. Again starting from this depiction, Work begins on the story of the Norman conquest, narrated in embroidery in the Bayeux tapestry. And within these works are the Norman earls given territories on the marches of Wales, with the specific task of raiding their neighbours.

Until the 1095s, there was no extraordinary event that would affect the whole world. In other words, the world was stagnant until these years. In 1082, Venice and Constantinople reached a trade agreement between them. And this agreement turned into an advantage in favor of Venice. Venice acquired valuable trading privileges from Constantinople, her merchants being excused of all dues and customs in the Byzantine empire. In 1084, we encountered a very important order. St Bruno and six companions retire to Chartreuse, in the French Alps, and establish the Carthusian order. In 1085, Toledo was captured from the Muslims by

Alfonso VI of Castile, who continued the city's traditions of religious tolerance. What can religion do...

When we come to 1087, we see some statesman changes in England. On the death of his father, William the Conqueror, William II became king of England. And it doesn't end there. The hostility between the Normans and the English is still ongoing. In the same year, the Domesday Book provides the Normans with an inventory of England.

In 1091 we began to hear the first voices from the Normans. They must have taken their anger out on the Muslims in England, as Roger I, the first Norman count of Sicily, completed the conquest of the island from the Muslims. And in 1093, Work began on a new cathedral in Durham, which will become an outstanding example of Norman (or Romanesque) architecture. In 1094 Rodrigo Diaz, known as El Cid, drove out the Muslims and won Valencia. Another victory for the Castilian Spaniard!

And here was the first step taken for those great events to begin... In 1095, Pope Urban II preached the First Crusade, urging the Christians of Europe to march east to recover Jerusalem from the Muslims. Everything that lasted for years began with this sermon. And with it in 1096, Peter the Hermit, an old monk on a donkey, leads the largest of the popular groups from Germany on the First Crusade. And this massacre-filled expedition begins with a massacre of Jews in many of the region's cities.

In 1098, some religious orders began to crack. The biggest example of this is the Benedictine monks. Benedictine monks, wishing to return to the early ideals of the order, formed a community at Cîteaux, which became the Cistercian order. And the crusades were still going on at this time. And with great success. After a siege of seven months, the city of Antioch fell to the knights of the First Crusade. They seem to be coming with a bang...

Their extraordinary success continued in 1099. Perhaps with their greatest development, the Crusaders captured the holy city of Jerusalem and massacred the Muslim and Jewish inhabitants. And with that, they proved that they were unstoppable. What is religion really capable of...

When the calendar pages of 1099 were exhausted and those of 1100 were spent, many fate-changing developments took place. The Assassins, a sect of Nizari Ismailis, which we

have not mentioned much so far, begin to acquire strongholds in Persia. This year did not end there. Some countries in Europe began to divide and take shape with different independence. The most obvious example is that Many of the towns of northern Italy acquire virtual independence as self-governing communes. Independently of these, Greek texts, translated by Arabic scholars in Baghdad, which could lead to unpredictable things in the future, gradually made their way through the Muslim world to Christian Europe. Speaking of Europe, the king changed again in England. On the death of his brother, William II, Henry I became king of England. And China... They are still dealing with technology and world technologies. This time, Chinese potters in the Song dynasty developed the wares known as celadons, with thick, transparent green glazes. They will never change...

b. 1100-1150

The calendar pages burned and turned into ashes. Years passed, and finally we came to the year 1115. There were no striking developments until 1115. Except for the great developments of the Crusaders. In 1109, the crusaders started to rule the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, the principality of Antioch, and the counties of Tripoli and Edessa. After all these developments, there were also the Knights of Jerusalem. In 1113, they experienced a development that would make them happy and protect their lives for a long time. The Knights

of St John of Jerusalem became an established order under papal protection. And our year is 1115. Here, a religious order like a ball of light was established this year. It was not an order to be underestimated. The Cistercian order. St Bernard establishes a new monastery at Clairvaux, from which he presides over the rapid expansion of the Cistercian order. Now, let's go exactly 5 years later. The year 1120. When the calendars show 1120, we witness a violent death. The heir to the throne, William, whom we mentioned before, closes his eyes to life. The White Ship strikes a rock off the Cherbourg peninsula, drowning William the Aetheling, heir to the English throne. And this year we witness the Knights Templar, who will have a great impact all over the world. The Knights Templar were founded to protect pilgrims from the Muslims on the journey to Jerusalem.

Until 1135, for a whole 15 years, the world was still at a standstill. But there were many poems and heroic stories that sounded very nice. A popular French poem, the *Chanson de Roland*, turns a minor disaster in one of Charlemagne's campaigns into a tale of epic heroism. What a great legend! At the same time, a very developed world was seen in construction. The full flowering of the Romanesque style is seen in the nave of the abbey church at Vézelay, in France. The French must have worked very hard on this. In 1132, construction began on a magnificent structure that has survived to this day. Although it was built for kings, it is the kind that everyone would want to enter. Work begins on the exquisite palace chapel in Palermo, built for the Norman kings of Sicily.

You may remember the English... they are in a constant state of throne change and fight. Guess what happened again? Yes, the king died, and the discussions and tricks for the throne began. The year is 1135. On the death of Henry I, his nephew Stephen moved quickly to keep Henry's daughter Matilda off the English throne. May God make things easy for Stephen. A year later, there were some throne developments in Scotland, which was very close to England. Walter FitzAlan takes a post as steward with the Scottish king, thus establishing the Stewart family and later dynasty. As you can see, the throne situation in Europe was a bit complicated during these 5 years. The Germans faced this in 1138. Conrad III, of the Hohenstaufen family, is elected German king - a title which remains in the family for more than a century, bringing with it that of Holy Roman emperor. There is nothing to say about the stability of this family, anyway. An extraordinary success... In the year 1139, a great disaster occurred. Disaster, destruction, apocalypse... Whatever you call it, the crossbow got its share of it. Pope Innocent III and the Second Lateran Council outlawed the crossbow as a

weapon, causing unacceptable devastation. A great weapon source of the countries was destroyed on this occasion. Again in the same year, Portugal won a great victory in its history. The first moment they gained their independence. They literally grew up in our hands... Victory over the Muslims at Ourique is seen as the moment of Portugal's independence from the Kingdom of Leon.

Nothing significant happened for 3 years. However, in 1142, such a structure was built that it is worth paragraphs. The great castle of Krak des Chevaliers was built in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem by the Knights of St John. And after this magnificent castle, developments began to follow one after another...

The Gothics began to emerge in 1142. Indeed. The new abbey church of St Denis is consecrated near Paris, introducing the style of architecture later known as Gothic. Meanwhile, the Crusaders, who were thought to be invincible until this year, suffered their first defeat and proved to be unstoppable. The city of Edessa is captured by Zangi, a Mameluke general, in the first setback for the crusaders in the Middle East. Of course, this caused the Crusaders to take new actions. And they did this right after the defeat. The fall of Edessa prompts the pope, Eugenius III, to call for a second crusade to defend the Latin kingdom. Exactly 1 year later, a strange situation occurred. The religious people went so far that they found a new way to be religious...

A new form of pious devotion is seen in Chartres, with people painfully dragging wagons of stone to enlarge the cathedral.

The calendar pages flew with the wind. Look at them soaring! The place where the wind stopped is 1147. This year, we see action from the Almohads. Rival Berber tribesmen, the Almohads, evict the Almoravids from Marrakech and soon conquer the whole North African coast. North Africa is theirs, it is up to us to wish them long years of dominance... Of course, the Crusaders are not stopping at this time. Alfonso I takes Lisbon from the Muslims, with the unexpected help of some passing English crusaders. The Muslims are slowly losing power against the Crusaders. With Portugal gaining its independence, diplomatic relations also came with it. Gilbert of Hastings, an English priest, becomes bishop of the recovered see of Lisbon - the first of many such links between England and Portugal. Could this be the beginning of a great alliance? And again the Crusaders... They had taken the first steps to

start the second expedition after the first one was very successful. And in your presence, the Second Crusade... The second crusade is led east by two kings, Louis VII of France and Conrad III of Germany. The Almohads are not standing still either. Seville falls to the Almohads, from North Africa, who make it their Spanish capital.

Now, two years later, in 1148, the Crusaders appear to have already lost more than half of their army. By the time Louis VII and Conrad III reached the Holy Land, they had lost more than half their joint armies to Muslim attacks. But that doesn't mean they weren't successful. After all, they were still able to inflict great damage on empires. Louis VII and Conrad III did grave harm to the Latin Kingdom by a feeble attack that merely alienated the previously friendly city of Damascus. The Crusaders' dead are enough for their living...

And we come to that great year. 1150. Religions in Europe began to change and become official. In feudal France and Germany, Charlemagne is now venerated as a saint. Of course, this year did not end there. The city of Angkor and the great temple of Angkor Wat were created by the Khmer dynasty in Cambodia. And the Aztecs, whom we have not mentioned before, are undergoing a radical change. The Aztecs begin to move south from their original home, which they call Aztlan, somewhere in northern Mexico. What they will gain is a mystery. Along with the Aztecs, deep-rooted dynasties in Europe are also undergoing similar radical changes at the same time. The Medici moved into Florence from their country home in the Mugello valley. 1150 can also be called the year of migration. In Asia, new entities and civilizations continue to be established at full speed. After centuries of raiding the northern part of Sri Lanka, the Tamils established a settled Hindu presence on the island. If you remember, I mentioned the Goths. In Europe, this art continues to stand out. However, it is also rapidly becoming the most famous style of the time. The biblical kings and queens in the west porch of Chartres Cathedral are a striking early example of Gothic sculpture. Let's go back to Asia. A new form of Buddhism has already begun to spread to countries. Zen Buddhism reaches Japan from China and appeals greatly to the new samurai class.

“未知の道に入ると、無限の秘密が明らかになるだろう” .(If you enter an unknown path, endless secrets will be revealed.)

-Bushido

In the same year, in Europe again, new trade searches began. The Germans were the pioneers of these. German merchants started trading along the coasts of Latvia and Estonia, a region to which they gave the name Livonia. They must have made much money... On the other hand, there was a merging of two civilizations. Catalonia and Aragon were united by a marriage. The merging of Catalonia with Aragon, by marriage, creates a power in northern Spain of comparable strength to Castile. God save Castile!

c. 1150-1200

While the calendar pages have 50 years of ink left, the calendar page with the ink in 1152 is in front of us. Time flies so fast, doesn't it? What is more ruthless and powerful than time? Frederick Barbarossa. As the calendars show, in the year 1152, Frederick Barbarossa became king of Germany and Holy Roman emperor, greatly extending the power of the empire during a long reign. Long live the king!

Two years after Frederick's incident, all eyes were already on the Middle East. In 1154, the inhabitants of Damascus surrendered their city to Nur ed-Din, helping him greatly in his campaign against the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. Of course, this year was not limited to the developments in the Middle East. The English king - not surprisingly - changed again. Henry II, coming to the throne of England, is king or feudal overlord of an unbroken swathe of territory from the Tweed to the Pyrenees. New kings, new hopes...

Of course, the changes of kings and other people in power in Europe were not all the changes. In 1156, Vienna was adopted by the Babenberg rulers as the capital city of Austria. Just one year later, in 1157, Russia changed its capital. A Russian prince, Andrei Bogolyubski, made his capital east of Moscow at Vladimir, where he built a cathedral and several churches. We can say that it was a period when city changes were popular. Because it did not stop with just these two. In 1159, Henry the Lion built a new town at Lübeck, well placed to develop as the center of the Hanseatic League.

When we come to the year 1160, we begin to understand the importance of the value given to art. Chrétien de Troyes and other French authors turn the stories of Arthur and his knights

into a romance of courtly love. And this will be a work that will be read as a cult work for years and passed on to the next generations. What a romance...

As we mentioned, the internal affairs of England have always been complicated and full of intrigue. Conspiracies, brothers' fights for the throne, and much more. We are faced with one of these again. Like the world, we have stopped being surprised. Thomas Becket, Lord Chancellor to Henry II, is forced by the king to accept the vacant post of archbishop of Canterbury. All we can do is wish him success and patience in his new position. But apparently, God rejected our wishes this time. Thomas Becket must not have been granted the patience he needed, because in 1164, Thomas Becket, having offended the king by his firm stand as archbishop of Canterbury, fled to a monastery near Paris. This time, it is our humble duty to wish him success and patience in his new life rather than his position...

Of course, while these were happening, it was not an unexpected result for Britain to be shaken. In 1169, the Irish also got their share of this shake-up and could not avoid being eaten by the Norman fish. The Normans made good use of the opportunity. The Normans landed in Ireland, seized Wexford, and in the following year captured Waterford and Dublin. This must be the burning of the wet next to the dry.

While the calendar pages were torn until 1170, despite all these upheavals, the English were standing tall. In fact, they were standing taller than expected. The English exchequer grew in importance under Henry II, taking its name from the table on which financial calculations are made. And with this, they were also taking many new measures and actions. One of these was directly related to their chief bishop. Henry II arranges for the archbishop of York to crown his son, the 'Young King', as a joint ruler. However, this situation must have bothered someone who used to hold this position. Thomas Becket... The attitude he took when he heard this is the biggest proof of this. Thomas Becket, in France, suspends the English bishops who have participated in the coronation of the 'Young King'. In fact, he could not control his anger and decided to return to England himself. After an apparent reconciliation with Henry II, Thomas Becket leaves France and returns to Canterbury. Of course, it was not expected that these actions would not anger the English king Henry II. Henry II did what was necessary and put Thomas Becket in his place in the same year. Four knights, acting on an unguarded hint from Henry II, murdered Thomas Becket on December 29 in his cathedral at Canterbury. Rest in peace, dear Thomas Becket... While all this was happening, what was

happening in France, where Thomas had fled? Of course, the love of art in the country continued to grow. Again in the same year, a play called Mystery of Adam was put forward in France. And this play was highly praised by all the masses. It can also be said that The first known mystery play, the Mystery of Adam, takes place outside a church somewhere in France. Who knows where? After all, as the name suggests, the Mystery of Adam...

After this eventful year, of course, neither the English nor the world could stop. The English king, Henry II, acknowledges Rhys ap Gruffydd as the lord of south Wales. Thus, he paved the way for his future plans. And he didn't stop there. He made the move that would bring the Normans to heel in this year, namely in 1171. Henry II, the king of England, summons the Irish and Norman lords to do homage to him in Dublin. It is not easy to be a king who can bring even the Normans to heel. Especially when your internal affairs are in such chaos. He was a great king, after all. Of course, just as the English were not calm, the war in the Middle East was also unceasing. And this determination to fight was gaining a lot of land for the rulers. Saladin deposes the Fatimid caliph and brings Egypt back to orthodoxy, acknowledging the rule of the Sunni caliph in Baghdad. The war in the Middle East never stops and never will.

Three years later, in 1175, another development that would shake Britain occurred. The Scottish king, William the Lion, is captured raiding into Northumberland and is taken south with his feet tied beneath his horse. God save the king. Meanwhile, the Gothic style continues to influence the world. The Gothic style is first seen in Britain in the new east end of Canterbury Cathedral. It will obviously make a big splash.

Of course, architectural and cultural changes were not limited to these. Exactly 1 year after this incident, a structure that made a worldwide impact emerged. In 1176, Construction began on London Bridge, the first stone bridge to be built across a tidal waterway. As time progresses, the development of culture never ever ends. Again in the same year, The first known eisteddfod was held during Christmas festivities at Rhys ap Gruffydd's court in Cardigan Castle. As I said, it should not be difficult to understand that time changes and develops cultures.

On the other hand, the wars and agreements brought about by religion were not going to remain idle. Three years later, in 1179, In a treaty signed at Cazorla, the kings of Castile and

Aragon agreed on a plan of cooperation against the Muslims. May God honor the Muslims with strength. Because it seems necessary.

Epics... Aren't they strange things? Knowing how they came about is limited only to their content. Its truth or falsity is uncertain. It is only possible to know when and by whom it was created -for most of them, at least- But we do know the details of our current epic. In 1180' The shared memories and legends of Nordic peoples were brought together in a great German epic, the Nibelungenlied. Alongside the developments in epics in Europe, Muslims also continued to develop in science and philosophy. In Cordoba, the Muslim philosopher Averroës writes commentaries on Aristotle that are influential throughout medieval Europe. Of course, Muslims are not the only ones making developments in this regard. Jews are not picking pears in Africa either. In Cairo, the Jewish philosopher Moses Maimonides writes, in Arabic, a much-translated text with the endearing title Guide to the Perplexed.

Unfortunately, not everything is as rosy as science and philosophy. Especially when the blood of many Catholics is being shed brutally in Europe. In 1182, the Resentment of Western merchants resulted in a massacre of Roman Catholics by fellow Christians in Constantinople. Rest in peace, dear Catholics.

The same brutality prevails in Japan. The internal conflict between the clans never subsides and thousands of people, both guilty and innocent, are slaughtered in the name of honor. The triumph of the Minamoto clan in Japan in 1185 led to an uneasy relationship between the brothers Yoritomo and Yoshitsune. As we can see, it can even turn brothers against each other.

And the world is once again beginning to be shaken by wars in 1187. And in such a sacred place that is even mentioned in the Bible. Saladin destroys the Christian army of the Latin kingdom in a battle below the Horns of Hattin. Of course, he doesn't stop there. Is a ruler who doesn't take the places he fought for, a ruler? Saladin captures various Crusader fortresses and walled cities, including Acre. And after this sacred battlefield, it's the turn of those lands that are considered sacred in every religion. Saladin takes Jerusalem and treats the Christian inhabitants with a consideration unusual for the time. What a naive ruler, isn't he?

There had been no sound from the English and their throne for a long time. Henry II continued his reign with great success. Until 1189. Here this year The English king Henry II is succeeded by his third son as Richard I. Knights, hail your new king!

And this king seems to have every ambition to honor his father. A year after succeeding to the throne of England, Richard I set off east as one of the leaders of the Third Crusade. May the new crusades be auspicious for the country and nation. But things apparently did not go as Richard I wanted. The Third Crusade suffered an early disaster when its first leader, the emperor Frederick Barbarossa, drowned crossing the Calycadnus River. Fortunately, tomorrow is the day that hopes love most...

And hopes really do not bring tomorrow to naught. Richard I may have taken a failed step when he ascended to the throne. But what is important is how to compensate for this failure. In 1191, the Muslim garrison of Acre surrendered to Richard I, who ordered the massacre of 2700 of its members. Long live the king! While all this development was taking place on this side, there were developments on the other side of the world, of course. Especially in Jerusalem. The Teutonic Knights are founded to run a hospital in Acre, in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem.

Meanwhile, the winner seems to be clear in Japan. In 1192, Yoritomo was given the title sei-i-tai-shogun, beginning centuries of rule by shoguns more powerful than the Japanese emperors. Samurai, respectfully greet your new emperor! While we were talking, rumors started to rise that someone was caught near Vienna. While everyone was trying to find out who he was, his identity was finally revealed: Richard I. Richard I, returning from the Holy Land in disguise, is recognized in an inn near Vienna and is imprisoned until England pays a massive ransom. No matter how hard the king tries, he is the best at somehow thwarting his efforts...

With things getting so heated in Europe, why shouldn't they get a little hotter? The year is 1197 and this time our address is Germany. And another throne debate. The three-year-old Frederick II has a claim to the thrones of both Sicily and Germany upon the death of his father, the emperor Henry VI. Yes, three-year-old.

As we approach the end of the calendar pages, you remember King Richard I, don't you? Richard I, who was captured years ago, remained captured and was killed. As a result, we are

left with a new throne change in 1199. On the death of his brother, Richard I, John becomes king of England. New king, green hopes.

And finally, we are at the last of the calendar pages. The year is 1200. The new year means new rumors, new conflicts, and clashes between religions. The new Christian doctrine of Transubstantiation prompts rumors that the Jews desecrate the consecrated Host. The Cathars also have their own religious conflicts. As far as religion goes, of course. The heresy of the Cathars (meaning 'pure' ones) is now so well established in southern France that they have bishops of their own. Of course, it is impossible for the new year not to bring new inventions. A new weapon was discovered in Britain and its homeland was discovered. The longbow, a weapon of great use to English armies, is probably the first developed in Wales. When we talk about discovery and invention somewhere, can we not mention China? The Chinese developed a feature of great significance in the history of seafaring - a sternpost rudder which is an integral part of the ship. Always, always the same... It is also not surprising that the new year brings new cultural and architectural developments. We do not have completely detailed sources, but at least we know this: Terracotta heads and figures are buried in graves in the region of Djenne in modern Mali. And it does not stop there. In the cathedral on Torcello, and in St Mark's, Venetian mosaics are a culmination in the west of the Byzantine tradition. Developments in Japan did not end either. The samurai provide military support for the shogun, in a system similar to feudalism at this same period in Europe. Similar works... They also do not hesitate to impose new codes. Introducing: The code of Bushido. Bushido, the code of the samurai, emphasizes the necessary qualities of respect, decorum, courage, and martial skill. A world left behind by war is also one of the hardest things to imagine. Especially in these years. However, the concept of war can change depending on what you define as war. For example, is a war for independence war? Flemish towns began to acquire municipal independence, as communes, following the earlier Italian trend. Of course, there are things that the whole world defines as war. The German pressure eastwards (the *Drang nach Osten*) steadily brought colonists into regions previously occupied by Slavs. After all, everyone reaps what they sow...

6. RELIGIOUS STRUCTURE IN EUROPE

a. Early Church and Great Schism

First, we will start with what the Church and the Schism are, because it is essential to know these concepts first in order to understand their details. The church is a formation that sees itself as single, holy, catholic and apostolic. Even Orthodox churches and similar smaller churches have a saying like this:

For, though the whole earth was filled with observance of the true faith by the preaching and doctrine of the apostles, yet the Orthodox Church of Christ, having been founded by apostolic institution and most firmly established by the faithful fathers, is further built up through the teaching of divine discourses...To it did all the most blessed apostles, endowed with an equal participation of dignity and authority, convert hosts of peoples. (Gregorius, 1893).

The Patristic consensus, something that pertains to the agreement of all of the saints of the Church, is that the Church was begun by Jesus Christ with the ordination of the Apostles to the title of Bishop, through Saint Peter. Though these Apostles had “equal...dignity and authority,” Church tradition teaches that Peter literally ordained the other Apostles to their Bishoprics. To quote John of Thessalonica’s apocryphal account of a conversation between Saint Peter and the other Apostles:

Peter picked up a palm branch and said to John, “You are the virgin [Apostle], it is your duty to sing hymns before the bier, holding this.” Then John said to him, “You are our father and bishop; it is your duty to be before the bier until we bring it to the place [of burial].”

In this way, every Bishopric is Petrine and ultimately sourced in Jesus Christ Himself.

We now have basic and sufficient information about the Church. One, holy, catholic, and apostolic. Now we need to get a sense of what schism is so we can move on.

In the early Church, it was understood that all Bishops succeeding from the Apostles were part of this Church provided they did not pack up their bags and leave. The Fathers, who are those saints from whom the Patristic consensus is derived, are unanimous when defining schism that it is the act of both cutting oneself off from communion and setting up a parallel jurisdiction/church where the Church already is. In Catholic theology, the theology that both sides of the Great Schism ascribe to, it is necessary to follow the consensus of the fathers and

uphold the “faith which has been believed everywhere, always, by all. For that is truly and in the strictest sense Catholic,” according to Saint Vincent de Lerins. In the words of Saint Pope Celestine, quoted by Vincent in support of the beforestated rule: “Let novelty cease to assail antiquity.” (Vincentius of Lerins, 2010) For the Catholic, one’s definition of schism *must* be how the fathers defined it, otherwise it is definitionally un-Catholic.

Local schisms, where there is a break between two individual churches, yet while these churches were often in communion with other churches who were not in schism with either side, was fairly common in the early Church. The Easter controversy, the Meletian Schism, and the Constantinople-Rome schism during the 11th century did not break communion categorically between all the churches. In the latter case, the Alexandrine communion with Rome persisted until the 13th century. The fathers never confused such local breaks in communion with what they considered as “schism.” This is because schism had a predictable historical pattern. All of the notorious schismatics the fathers were writing against, such as Novatian (a counter-Bishop of Rome) and Donatus (a counter-Bishop of Carthage) not only went into schism in their local cities, but they spread their schism by ordaining Bishops in parts of the Church that have not left the fold. For example, the Novatians ordained Bishops to replace those who did not recognize the legitimacy of his bishopric throughout the Roman Empire. The Donatists ordained parallel bishops throughout North Africa and even in Rome itself after a dispute broke out over Caecilian of Carthage’s ordination to the Bishopric. In the words of St Augustine the Donatists should have warned themselves:

The great scandal of schism within the Church...may arise and we may be found presuming to set up another altar, not against Caecilianus [of Carthage only], but against the universal Church, which...would still hold communion with him.

In the early second century, Saint Ignatius of Antioch wrote, “Wherever the bishop shall appear, there let the multitude also be; even as, wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church.” (Ignatius, 1885) Hence, to install a schismatic bishop where a bishop already “appears” was understood to be definitionally un-Catholic because it in effect cut one off from all the other Christian believers within the one “Body of Christ.”

To quote Saint Paul :

For as the body is one, and has many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ.

-What you read and what is said may seem very complicated. However, we need to have this information in order to understand the formation of the schism, how the church itself and how it affects and uses the schism. A little patience...-

In the fourth century, Saint Meletius, the Bishop of Antioch, was sent into exile during the Arian controversy. Lucifer Cagliari of Sardinia single-handedly ordained Paulinus II as Bishop of Antioch. This is considered “uncanonical” or “illegal” within ecclesiastical law, something that is documented to have existed since at least the third century. In any event, Alexandria and Rome recognized Paulinus in place of Meletius and so Meletius did not commemorate them. This is known today as the Meletian Schism. After the death of Meletius, Saint Flavian was ordained to replace him and was recognized by the Council of Constantinople I, the largest representative body of the Church’s views during its day. Saint Pope Damasus I (and then Saint Pope Siricius) and other Italian Bishops did not recognize Flavian, even though Saint Theophilus of Alexandria and even bishops in Illyricum (who were under Roman jurisdiction) later did. This vindicates Meletius and Flavian, who are recognized by both Roman Catholics and Orthodox as saints—and not Paulinus, Evagrius, and other Paulinian successors. Sometime in the late 390s, Rome finally re-entered into communion with the canonical Church of Antioch. The preceding episode illustrates how a schism began (Rome and Alexandria did not recognize Meletius) and how it was ultimately consummated (Rome and Alexandria entered communion with the parallel Bishopric in Antioch). The schism was only healed by re-entering into communion with the canonical Church of Antioch and ceasing recognition of the parallel jurisdiction. This historical example is especially important as the authority of an Ecumenical (or “Church-wide”) Council and the veneration of saints which both sides, Roman Catholic and Orthodox, accept delineates the correct and incorrect parties in this matter according to the standards applicable to each side.

And later on, the effects of schism grew bigger and bigger with claims of division. Every community had a different voice, every state had a different view, and this caused certain fights. And these fights never seemed to end.

In the early 11th century, the Roman church unilaterally changed the Creed—something the truce disallowed for. Then, they excommunicated Constantinople for allegedly “removing [the] filioque from the original Creed” amongst other things. This allegation is historically

inaccurate, and it demonstrates which side started a fight in violation of an earlier truce. At the same time, the Normans conquered Byzantine Italy and with the assent of Rome, replaced its Constantinopolitan bishops, introducing a parallel Latin bishopric alongside Greek bishops who served southern Italy's Greek population. They also imposed Latinization, including the imposition of the Filioque. This was both heretical and schismatic, as it propagated the Germanic, as opposed to the traditional Latin view of that doctrine. It can legitimately be argued that Italian Christians largely consented to their new episcopacy and so this muddies the waters as to this being the origin of the Great Schism. However, the Western side was decisive in exacerbating matters during the Crusades which followed soon thereafter. Western Christians, with Papal support, repeatedly installed parallel bishops and enforced liturgical changes including the Creed sometimes in locales they had not even conquered. This includes setting up parallel churches in:

- Jerusalem and Antioch (12th Century)
- The Aegeans and Constantinople (13th Century)
- Alexandria (13th Centuries)
- Baltic, Balkan, Russian, Ukrainian, and Greek Lands (13th to 17th centuries)

In effect, the Papacy through their ordinations and expounding of the Filioque created another church in places there were already Bishops who had belonged to the one, holy, Catholic (as St Vincent defined it), and apostolic Church. They likewise had different doctrines to that same Church. The Roman church had clearly consummated a schism, becoming a new, independent Christian body. They did so with the use of force.

And thus the Schism arose. The schism continued in the 13th century just as described. New parallel churches had just been established. We can say that this was perhaps the century when the discussions of division and schism were at their most heated. The new parallel churches began to give direction to religion and their sects day by day, people's minds were getting more and more confused and some even started to turn to schism. And as a result, the schism discussion was also included in all these sectarian discussions and the church was getting its fair share of this. And of course this caused a lot of problems. New things and views sometimes cause new problems, don't they?

b. The Catholic Church and Popes

First, let's start with the power of the Catholic Church and how it came about. The split in the church... Until the mid-11th century, the Christian church was united. However, the Pope was at the head of Western Europe, and the Patriarch of Constantinople was at the head of Byzantium. The Christian religion spread from Byzantium to Eastern Europe. However, the Pope wanted to control this area as well. -As might be expected- the Byzantine church opposed the Pope's interference in its internal affairs. Fierce disagreements began between the Pope and the Patriarch about who was superior in the Christian Church and how the revenues would be divided. In 1504, there was a split in the Christian Church. The Pope and the Patriarch cursed each other with the torments of hell. Since then, the Western Church has been called Catholic (meaning "universal"), while the Eastern Church has been called Orthodox (meaning "correct faith"). After the split, both churches became completely independent.

That's exactly how the Catholic Church came into being, and we have enough information to understand.

Now, it's time for the consolidation of the papacy... In Western Europe, which was divided into numerous feudal estates, the Catholic Church had great influence. The pope's treasury contained many valuables, and the pope owned magnificent palaces and castles. He also had a mercenary army and his own legates. Hundreds of thousands of clergy from different countries were at his command.

The popes' efforts to subjugate European rulers led to a bitter conflict between Pope Gregory VII and King Henry IV of Germany in the 11th century. Each declared the other incompetent. The Pope released Henry's subjects from their oath of fealty to the king. The great feudal lords (princes) of Germany rebelled against the king. Henry IV was forced to make peace with the pope. With a small retinue, he traveled to Italy, where the pope resided at Canossa in the north of the country. Three days later, Henry IV arrived at the castle, barefoot and

wearing only the long cassock of a penitent sinner. Finally, he was accepted by the pope and kneeled down and asked for forgiveness. His request was granted.

During the reign of Pope Innocent III, the papacy reached its peak of power in the early 13th century. Innocent III declared that the pope was God's vicar on earth and that the rulers of the countries should be his vassals. During official receptions, everyone had to kneel before the pope and kiss his shoe. No other European king was so obeyed. Innocent III intervened in the internal affairs of European countries and in their relations. The kings of England, Poland, Sweden and Denmark accepted to see themselves as vassals of the pope.

There was no crime too bad for the popes to commit in their struggle for power. Speaking of the papacy, a contemporary said that the papal throne was occupied not by men but by monsters in human form.

Oh, by the way, let's not forget to mention where the Catholic Church and the popes got all this income and wealth. The Catholic Church and the popes had 5 main sources of income. The sale of indulgences, payments for church rituals, tithes, the worship of sacred objects and of course the sale of church offices. This is exactly how all this income and wealth came into being.

Of course, with these incomes and the insistence on the throne and prestige, after a while the church became the biggest feudal lord. So, what was the church like as the biggest feudal lord?

In the Middle Ages, about a third of the arable land in Western Europe belonged to the Catholic Church. Bishoprics and monasteries owned hundreds or even thousands of serfs. Large herds of cattle grazed on the monastery pastures, church barns were overflowing with grain, and cellars were filled with the highest-quality wine.

Bishops and abbots differed little from other feudal lords. They fought wars, organized tournaments, and wore silk and velvet, despite the prohibitions imposed by the church. To pay for all this, they increased the peasants' obligations. On monastery lands, forced labor and rent in kind were particularly high.

So you see, in the Middle Ages, the Catholic Church was an important feudal lord and a ruthless tyrant who oppressed the working people.

Well, was this wealth enough for the popes and the church? Of course it wasn't enough. The church's wealth continues to increase...

The clergy collected a tithe tax from the entire population of Western Europe. Churchgoers also had to pay for weddings, the baptism of children, and other church ceremonies.

Valuables flowed from all over Western Europe into the pope's treasury in Rome. The papacy claimed the right to forgive the crimes and sins of the faithful for a certain sum; it sold special documents called indulgences (from the Latin for "kindness"). The monks took the indulgences to the cities and villages and sold them in the squares where the markets were held. Murderers, bandits and thieves could buy forgiveness not only for crimes they had already committed, but also for future crimes. The officials at the papal court had prepared a list showing how much each sin was "worth". The sale of indulgences was a very profitable business...

Of course, despite all this power, there were those who did not believe and did not agree with what they were doing. The church called these people "heretics." And for a very long time, there were great conflicts between the heretics and the church. So, as you can see, the Catholic Church fought against the heretics for a very long time.

So, what did the church teach the faithful that it could not win the faith of the heretics? The preservation and strengthening of the feudal system also served the interests of the church, which taught that God divided people into three groups: first, those who prayed for all (clergy), second, those who fought (feudal lords), and third, those who worked (peasants and artisans).

Christians believed that after death, depending on a person's behavior during life, the soul would either go to hell, where it would suffer eternally for its sins, or to heaven, the "kingdom of God." The clergy argued that only the church could protect people from God's wrath through prayer, acting as an intermediary between God and man.

The clergy brainwashed the faithful by preaching that to struggle against the established order was to go against God's will. Any opposition was seen as a sign of arrogance and pride, the

worst sins in the eyes of the church. Churchgoers were instructed to love their enemies, obey the authorities, fulfill their obligations, and pay their taxes.

So, you see, Christian morality was used to instill ideas of docility and patience in oppressed people and to suppress any idea of struggle against the feudal order.

So, what exactly were the people we refer to as heretics fighting against? Despite the power of the Catholic Church, more and more peasants and townspeople began to oppose it, and the clergy called such people heretics (the word derives from the Greek *hairetikós*, meaning "able to choose").

Heretics opposed lavish church ceremonies and said the church was corrupt. They wanted to stop collecting tithes and give up their wealth from clergy.

Many heretics arose to defend the peasants and the poor. They opposed feudal duties and taxes, criticized the clergy for their idleness, and urged them to earn their living by work. Some even advocated the abolition of private property and equality of property.

Heretics, who remained religious people, were generally obedient and preaching. They were more than willing to suffer for their beliefs... The struggle of the heretics reflected the protests of the masses against the oppression of the feudal nobility and the Catholic Church.

We understand what the heretics were fighting for and against. But how did the Church respond to these struggles? How did it fight against the heretics? In all countries the church pursued heretics and sentenced them to severe punishments. One of the worst punishments was excommunication. An excommunicated person could be robbed or even killed without threat of punishment; the faithful had no right to help or protect him. Sometimes the pope excommunicated an entire region or even a country. Churches were closed, weddings could not be held, babies could not be baptized, and the dead could not be buried in cemeteries.

The Church also launched military expeditions into areas known to harbor large numbers of heretics. In the early 13th century, Pope Innocent III called on feudal lords to launch an expedition against heretics in the wealthy southern regions of France. Knights from northern France were eager to join the expedition, hoping to gain rich booty. The Pope promised absolution to those who joined the expedition. Many prosperous French cities were burned, looted, and their inhabitants killed. In one of these cities, Catholic forces massacred 20,000 people.

And the most useful method for them to fight heretics: the Inquisition. To combat heretics, the pope established a church court known as the Inquisition. Using the services of spies and informers, the Inquisition tracked down heretics and heretics. Those accused were imprisoned and subjected to brutal torture in order to extract confessions. Their feet were burned and their noses were broken in a special vice. Many, unable to withstand the torture, confessed to things they had not done and accused innocent people. By handing over those condemned to death to the authorities for execution, the church hypocritically pleaded for mercy by asking for a "bloodless" death. This meant burning the person found guilty alive. The persecution of heretics greatly enriched the clergy, as the property of the convicted heretic was divided between the authorities, the church and the informer.

In Spain, where the Inquisition was particularly active and ruthless, the burning of heretics alive was known as "auto-da-fé" (act of faith). The execution was carried out as a solemn church ceremony in front of a crowd of people in the main square of the city. Often the nobles and the king himself were present at the ceremony.

The Church used the Inquisition to persecute scholars and writers who developed ideas that questioned its teachings, as well as those who participated in rebellions.

In summary, in the Middle Ages, the Catholic Church was one of the main pillars of the feudal system. It used different methods, from persuasion to violence, in its struggle against the enemies of the feudal system. [Agibalova-Donskoy. 2017]

God bless the Catholics!

c. Hierarchical Structure

The Catholic Church wielded immense power in medieval Europe, with a hierarchical structure led by the Pope. From cardinals to monks, each role played a part in shaping society. The Church's influence extended beyond spiritual matters, impacting politics, economics, and culture. Church-state relations were complex, balancing cooperation and conflict. The Two Swords concept (Two Swords theory is based on a biblical passage interpreted to represent spiritual and temporal power. Pope Gelasius I (5th century) articulated the doctrine of the Two Swords, stating that the Church wields the spiritual sword while the state wields the temporal sword, with the spiritual sword considered superior. Balance of power between Church and state fluctuated throughout the Middle Ages, with Popes and monarchs often vying for supremacy, leading to conflicts and power struggles (Crusades, Avignon Papacy). Relative strength of the Church and state varied depending on the personalities and circumstances of individual leaders (Pope Innocent III, Emperor Frederick Barbarossa)) attempted to define the roles of spiritual and temporal power, but the struggle for supremacy between Popes and monarchs continued throughout the Middle Ages. When we came to Hierarchical Structure of Church:,

- Pope serves as the head of the Catholic Church and is considered the successor of Saint Peter, claiming spiritual authority over all Christians.
- Cardinals are high-ranking clergy who advise the Pope and elect new Popes (College of Cardinals).
- Bishops oversee dioceses, which are geographical units of church administration, and are appointed by the Pope to supervise local clergy and church affairs.
- Priests serve individual parishes within dioceses, administering sacraments (Eucharist, baptism) and providing spiritual guidance to laypeople.
- Monks and nuns live in monasteries and convents, dedicating their lives to prayer, study, and service, often following specific religious orders (Benedictines, Franciscans).

The hierarchical order of the church was exactly that, in order of authority. And below the church, as one might expect, were the local people. Among the people, the hierarchical status according to the church was divided into three:

- Firstly, those who pray for everyone (i.e. Clergy)
- Secondly, those who died on the battlefield, those who fought (Feudal Lords)

- And finally those who work to earn their living and support their household (Peasants and Artisans)

d. Scholastic System

Derived literally from *methodus* (μέθοδος, manner or way) and *scholastica* (pertaining to the schools), the common method of teaching and learning in the schools of the Middle Ages after 1200). From this method is derived the term scholasticism, which is sometimes mistaken for a definite body of doctrines or a unique harmony of faith and reason. The scholastic method was essentially a rational investigation of every relevant problem in liberal arts, philosophy, theology, medicine, and law, examined from opposing points of view, in order to reach an intelligent, scientific solution that would be consistent with accepted authorities, known facts, human reason, and Christian faith. Its ultimate goal was science (*scientia*), although frequently schoolmen had to be content with probable opinions and dialectical solutions. Its highest form, developed in the 13th century, was a positive contribution to education and research. In the 16th century the medieval method assumed the form of theses, proofs, and answers to objections to meet catechetical and apologetic exigencies. This modern scholastic method reached new prominence with the revival of thomism in the 19th century.

Convinced that the best way to learn established truths was to duplicate the original process of discovery, schoolmen of the 12th and 13th century taught that the method of teaching (*modus docendi*) ought to follow the pattern of discovery (*modus inveniendi*). Therefore the order of instruction (*ordo doctrinae*) followed as closely as possible the order of discovery

(*ordo inventionis*). This pedagogical conviction existed in early scholasticism prior to the introduction of the "new Aristotle" into the Latin West. From its earliest, obscure beginnings there were two essential features of scholastic method: exposition (*lectio*) and disputation (*disputatio*). Disputation was undoubtedly the more original and characteristic feature, but exposition was its foundation: *Lectio autem est quasi fundamentum et substratorium sequentium*. Both features employed three essential methods of scientific knowledge (*modi sciendi*): definition, division, and reasoning. Gerbert, later Pope Sylvester II, had already emphasized the importance of definition and classification in his *De rationali et de ratione uti*. Employing Latin grammarians and Aristotelian logic preserved by Boethius, and inspired by dialecticians of an earlier period, 12th-century masters in cathedral schools, such as Laon, Chartres, and Paris, gradually developed the basic elements of the scholastic method.

The basis of all medieval teaching was the master's lecture (*lectio*), or commentary on the text accepted as an *auctoritas*. For theology the Bible alone was the official text to be expounded by the "master of the sacred page." In the liberal arts leading to theology and other advanced studies, Cicero was the "authority" in rhetoric; Priscian and Donatus, in grammar; and Aristotle, in logic; in the 13th century Aristotle's philosophical works were recognized texts in the "three philosophies." Collections of ecclesiastical law were the official text for the study of Canon Law. The schoolmen were convinced that students should learn from the great books of antiquity, difficult as they were to understand. The master's exposition was not simply an exegesis, but an intellectual grappling with real problems examined by the author. To understand a particular problem, words, ideas, and realities had to be clearly defined, distinguished, and examined from all sides. Recognition of a problem meant appreciation of all arguments *sic et non*, i.e., for and against, a specific question. Such questions could arise from the text, conflicting interpretations, doubtful solutions, or new insights; these gave rise to the disputation.

The scholastic *quaestio disputata* seems to have arisen at Laon in the early 12th century from conflicting patristic interpretations of Scripture. Authorities *pro* and *contra* were disputed, noted in the margin of the text, and a tentative solution proposed. By the middle of the 12th century these occasional digressions became extremely numerous and elaborate. Collections of *sic* and *non* authorities were made not only in theology, but also in law, grammar, and logic. Doctors of canon and civil law collected conflicting legislation and interpretations of law for the purpose of establishing general principles and consistent solutions to problems.

The well-known collection of *Sic et non* attributed to Abelard and his school is merely one example of a growing interest in *quaestiones disputatae* in the schools.

With the evolution of the *quaestio* the disputation became a special feature in scholastic method, conducted at a distinct time of the academic day. Generally, the lecture on a text was given in the morning, and the disputation on some significant point was held in the afternoon as a kind of seminar. The question was posed by the master; a senior student, later called a bachelor, was appointed to respond to closely argued objections (*videtur quod non*) proposed by other students. In conclusion the master summarized the state of the question, methodically presented his own solution called a *determinatio*, and resolved major objections, usually reshaping the response of his bachelor.

The protocol of disputations in every discipline was formalized to ensure proper conduct; logic was the universal instrument of debate, but each discipline had its own principles, sources, and method. Originally the order of questions proposed followed the order of the text. The Bible, however, offered no order that could be called systematic. By the middle of the 12th century, theological questions were organized to conform with articles of the creed. From this arose the sentences and summae of theology.

During the 13th century two types of disputation emerged, at least in the faculty of theology: the ordinary *quaestio disputata* and the *quodlibet*. Ordinary disputations, already highly systematic, sophisticated and subtle, were on a specific subject, such as *De potentia Dei*, *De veritate*, and *De virtutibus*, chosen by the master and divided into logically distinct points, with each point (*quaestio*) subdivided into a logically ordered series of scientific problems (*articuli*). Quodlibetal disputations, on the other hand, were conducted only by outstanding masters in theology during Advent and Lent on any question proposed by anyone present (*de quolibet ad voluntatem cuiuslibet*).

Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics*, dealing with scientific method, exercised an important and valuable influence on the scholastic method, once it was understood. Although it was translated from Arabic and Greek around the middle of the 12th century, its nuances and significance could not be appreciated until scholastics saw how Aristotle applied his scientific method in the real sciences. Basically this method consists in raising the right question at the right time and in the logical way of finding an answer. Scientific questions fall into four

categories: does it exist (*an sit*), what is it (*quid sit*), does it have a given characteristic (*quia sit*), and why (*propter quid*). One of the first scholastics to appreciate fully the scientific method of Aristotle was Albert the Great. Saint Thomas Aquinas applied this method in all of its subtlety in his *quaestiones disputatae*. Undoubtedly the most outstanding example of medieval scholastic method is the *Summa theologiae* of Aquinas.

Now that we have sufficient, even too much detailed information about the scholastic method, now let's go over the existing system again for better understanding, briefly.

Scholasticism was a medieval school of philosophy that employed a critical method of philosophical analysis to reconcile Christian theology with classical and late antiquity philosophy, especially that of Aristotle.

The origins of Scholasticism can be traced back to the late 11th century, with the rise of cathedral schools and the increasing interest in applying reason to matters of faith.

Key early figures in the development of Scholasticism include Anselm of Canterbury, Peter Abelard, and Peter Lombard, who laid the foundations for the Scholastic method.

The translation of Aristotle's works from Greek and Arabic into Latin in the 12th and 13th centuries had a profound impact on the development of Scholasticism, providing a new set of philosophical tools and concepts (logic, metaphysics, ethics).

The University of Paris, founded in the early 13th century, became a major center of Scholastic thought, attracting scholars from across Europe.

The 13th century saw the high point of Scholasticism, with the work of thinkers such as Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus, who systematized and refined the Scholastic method.

Other important centers of Scholastic thought included the universities of Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca, which helped spread Scholastic ideas throughout Europe.

The key debates of the Scholastic System were Reason and Faith debate, and Metaphysical and Theological debate.

And lastly, the impacts of Scholasticism were:

Scholasticism had a profound impact on the development of Christian theology, providing a systematic and rational framework for understanding and defending the truths of faith. The Scholastic method, with its emphasis on logical argument and the reconciliation of apparent contradictions, became the dominant mode of theological discourse in the Middle Ages. Scholasticism also had a significant influence on the development of medieval universities, which were modeled on the cathedral schools where the Scholastic method originated. The Scholastic curriculum, based on the study of the liberal arts (trivium and quadrivium) and the works of Aristotle, became the standard for higher education in Europe, shaping the intellectual formation of generations of scholars and clerics. In theology and education, of course.

And in intellectual and social fields, they were:

Scholasticism contributed to the growth of a vibrant intellectual culture in the Middle Ages, with universities serving as centers of learning and debate. The Scholastic emphasis on reason and argument also had a broader impact on medieval society, influencing the development of law, politics, and social thought. However, the increasing complexity and abstraction of Scholastic thought in the late Middle Ages also led to criticisms of its relevance and a desire for a more practical and experiential approach to knowledge.

Now that we have passed our summary, it is time to get to know the scholastic thinkers superficially. And here are the early scholastic thinkers:

- Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109) is considered a founder of Scholasticism, known for his ontological argument for the existence of God and his motto "faith seeking understanding".
- Peter Abelard (1079-1142) was a key figure in the development of the Scholastic method, known for his work on logic, ethics, and the problem of universals.
- Peter Lombard (c. 1096-1160) was an Italian theologian whose Sentences became a standard textbook of theology in the Middle Ages, helping to systematize Scholastic thought

Since they are also mentioned in what I have told you, getting to know these people is of great importance in understanding their actions and thoughts.

And now, it's time to get to know the high scholastic thinkers:

- Albertus Magnus (c. 1200-1280) was a German Dominican friar who played a crucial role in the reception of Aristotelian philosophy in the Latin West, writing extensive commentaries on Aristotle's works.
- Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) was the most influential Scholastic thinker, known for his synthesis of Aristotelian philosophy and Christian theology in works such as the *Summa Theologica*.
 - Aquinas developed the theory of natural law, argued for the compatibility of faith and reason, and made important contributions to metaphysics, ethics, and political thought.
- Duns Scotus (c. 1266-1308) was a Scottish Franciscan friar known for his complex and subtle arguments on a wide range of philosophical and theological issues, including the problem of individuation and the nature of free will.

Of course, as you can imagine, there are more. However, it would be best for us to list the most important and useful ones. And finally, there are the late scholastic thinkers:

- William of Ockham (c. 1285-1347) was an English Franciscan friar who challenged many of the assumptions of earlier Scholastic thought, arguing for a more nominalist and empiricist approach to knowledge.
 - Ockham is known for his principle of parsimony, or "Ockham's razor," which holds that the simplest explanation is often the best.
- Jean Buridan (c. 1300-1358) was a French philosopher who made important contributions to logic and natural philosophy, including the concept of impetus, which anticipated later theories of inertia.

I know, this information may seem a bit complicated and actually unnecessary. But we have to know how the education system works in the age we live in. As they say, the pen is mightier than the sword...

e. Political Influence of the Church

One of the most significant organizations in medieval Europe was the Catholic Church, which had a profound impact on political power and governance in addition to influencing people's spiritual lives. The Church was a major force in the political, social, and economic systems of the Middle Ages, and its influence went well beyond religious doctrine. As the head of the Church, the Pope frequently exercised authority on par with that of secular rulers, influencing choices on both a national and worldwide scale. The Church's role in establishing monarchs, its control over legal frameworks, and its notable impact on occasions like the Crusades and the Investiture Controversy all demonstrate its involvement in medieval politics. Furthermore, the papacy's power to excommunicate leaders or validate their rule was crucial in determining how the Church and European kings interacted.

And these complex relationships were not insignificant. As a result of all this, the church had become a political authority and was exerting its influence throughout the world, especially Europe. With enormous landholdings and substantial social and economic sway, the Catholic Church was, in many respects, the most powerful organization in medieval Europe. Bishops and abbots, who possessed both temporal (secular) and spiritual authority, were frequently used by its hierarchy, which was led by the Pope, to directly control regions. Legitimacy and Coronations The coronation of kings and emperors was one of the most important ways the Church exercised its political power. Being crowned by the pope was regarded as a sign of divine approval, establishing the ruler as both a political figure and a person selected by God. This strengthened the Church's control over the legitimacy of rulers, so a monarch losing the favor of the pope could have disastrous political repercussions. . Charlemagne was the most well-known example of this; his coronation by Pope Leo III in 800 signified the unification of the papacy and the Frankish empire, establishing both political and religious authority. Another political weapon in the Church's toolbox was the authority to excommunicate monarchs or impose interdict on entire regions. A monarch who is excommunicated may no longer be protected by the Church, leaving him open to uprising and eventual overthrow. Because of the Pope's authority over spiritual matters, the Church was able to get involved in politics with serious repercussions.

Of course, while this was happening, the relationship between the church and the secular rulers was getting increasingly strained. As the relationship between them got more strained, things got more heated and discussions were flaring up in Europe. The Catholic Church's

relationship with secular rulers was frequently tense despite its enormous influence, particularly as monarchs attempted to strengthen their hold on power within their own realms. There were several ways in which the conflict between papal and royal authority manifested itself. One of the most notable instances of this conflict is the Investiture Controversy, which took place in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The question was whether the Pope or secular rulers had the authority to name bishops. This conflict between Emperor Henry IV and Pope Gregory VII brought to light the political nature of Church power. It resulted in Henry IV's excommunication and penance at Canossa in 1077, where the emperor asked the Pope for forgiveness. This incident illustrated the boundaries of papal power as well as the Pope's control over non-religious leaders. The Church and the English Monarchy This tension is further highlighted by the dispute between Thomas Becket, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and King Henry II of England. Becket's defense of Church authority resulted in Becket's murder as a result of Henry's attempt to control Church appointments and legal matters. This incident demonstrated the Church's capacity to oppose secular authority and its impact on politics.

As if this were not enough, the church was not afraid to take part in wars. The Church's influence extended beyond politics and diplomacy; especially during the Crusades, it was crucial in defending wars and guiding military operations. In addition to being a religious exhortation, the Pope's call to arms during the First Crusade in 1095 served as a political catalyst for the unification of European kingdoms under papal rule. Due to the wealth and lands they brought under their control, the Crusades increased the Church's religious and political clout. Furthermore, the Pope frequently served as both a political commander and a spiritual leader during the Crusades, which were a way to spread Christendom. The doctrine of Just War, which provided a religious rationale for war, was also developed by the Church. Medieval views on politics and warfare were influenced by Augustine and Thomas Aquinas' teachings on the morality of war, and the Church frequently stepped in to settle disagreements over whether a war was justified. Many rulers who fought in the Crusades or other wars with religious motivations benefited from these teachings in terms of their political legitimacy. As might be expected, this dominance of the church in politics also affected the social order. Medieval social hierarchies were defined in large part by the Catholic Church. It shaped the moral and social order of the era in addition to political issues. The Church upheld the notion that kings had the right to rule because God had predetermined their position of power. The established social hierarchy and the power of kings were both supported by this religious

framework. The Church frequently portrayed itself as the go-between for God and the populace, arguing that both the king and the priesthood were used to carry out God's will. Medieval social structures were strengthened by the Church's teachings on morality, marriage, and social behavior. In order to maintain social order and stability, the Church frequently got involved in issues of inheritance, divorce, and moral behavior. Canon law also governed interpersonal relationships and social behavior. The administration of the Church's property and riches depended heavily on monastic orders like the Benedictines and the Cistercians. These monastic communities frequently held important positions in education, charity, and local government. They occasionally served as arbitrators in regional political conflicts.

With all this power, the church began to face many problems. The church's power gradually declined and the power dynamics began to change. As they say, with great power comes great responsibility. Despite its enormous influence, the Catholic Church's power started to wane in the later Middle Ages, particularly as nation-states and secular rulers gained more clout. The Church's independence and reputation were severely harmed by the French crown's influence in moving the papacy to Avignon. The papacy's moral authority was undermined by many who saw it as a political tool of France. Due to political instability and the erosion of papal authority brought about by rival popes in Rome and Avignon, this caused rifts within the Church and, eventually, the Great Schism (1378–1417). The emergence of the Renaissance and the spread of secularism throughout Europe by the late Middle Ages reduced the Church's intellectual and political clout. The Church of England was established as a result of monarchs like Henry VIII of England claiming autonomy from papal authority. The Church's political role in Europe was gradually eroding as a result of its incapacity to withstand the growing tide of nation-state formation. The Catholic Church played a significant and complex role in medieval politics. Depending on the situation, it frequently cooperated or competed with secular rulers as a political entity. By controlling the legal and judicial systems, legitimizing kings, directly participating in war, and exerting a strong hold on social and cultural norms, the Church played a significant role in forming the political landscape. However, as kings attempted to establish their control over both spiritual and temporal issues, the Church's political influence was also called into question. The Church's political role started to decline as European political structures changed, particularly with the emergence of strong nation-states. This marked the beginning of a new political era that would eventually result in the Reformation and the eventual separation of Church and state in modern Europe.

Now, let's summarize everything again for easier understanding. A major institution in medieval Europe, the Catholic Church had a big say in political, social, and legal issues in addition to religious ones. Because it actively participated in medieval society's politics, diplomacy, war, and even day-to-day operations, its influence went well beyond the spiritual sphere. The Church was a political force that influenced medieval history in addition to being a religious organization. The Church played a crucial role in establishing the legitimacy of political power during the Middle Ages. The idea that rulers were subject to God's will was strengthened when the Pope crowned kings and emperors, offering them divine approval. At the same time, the Church had significant power over secular rulers thanks to its ability to excommunicate or put monarchs under interdict. This allowed the Church to get involved in political conflicts and keep some degree of control over European kingdoms. The influence of the Church extended beyond politics and was instrumental in establishing the social order. The Church upheld the status quo, moral principles, and social hierarchies through its teachings, canon law, and authority over establishments like monasteries and schools. It frequently served as the final arbiter in disputes and dominated legal systems, especially in areas like marriage and inheritance. Nonetheless, there was some conflict in the relationship between the Church and secular authorities. The struggle for control over the appointment of church officials was exemplified by conflicts like the Investiture Controversy, and the Church's political dominance was increasingly threatened by the emergence of strong monarchies. The papacy's authority was undermined and its weaknesses were revealed by the Avignon Papacy and the Great Schism that followed, especially in light of the rise of secular power and national identities. The emergence of nation-states and growing secularization in the later medieval era progressively reduced the political influence of the Church. Henry VIII's split from Rome was one example of how kings and monarchs attempted to demonstrate their independence from papal authority. The eventual separation of church and state in contemporary Europe was made possible by these developments. In summary, the Catholic Church was a strong political force that influenced the development of European history during the Middle Ages. Because it affected monarchies, legal systems, and the fundamental framework of medieval society, its influence was not only religious but also political. Even though growing secularism caused the Church's power to wane, its influence on medieval politics cannot be denied. The history of Europe and the larger evolution of Western political philosophy are still reverberated with the Church's political influence. Because it affected monarchies, legal systems, and the fundamental framework of medieval society, its influence was not only religious but also political. Even though growing

secularism caused the Church's power to wane, its influence on medieval politics cannot be denied. The history of Europe and the larger evolution of Western political philosophy are still reverberated with the Church's political influence. When one thinks of the church, the first thing that comes to mind is that with great power comes great responsibility.

f. Corruption of the Church

In fact, we cannot speak of a great corruption in our active time. It can even be mentioned as the prime time of the church. However, of course, that does not mean that it will not happen... right? Therefore, let's consider this title for general information purposes, not specifically for the 13th century. The Roman Catholic Church suffered from grievous corruptions, tainting the purity of its sacred mission. By the close of the fifteenth century, she had become embroiled in a variety of corrupt practices that drew widespread concern and criticism. Men of cloth, once revered as custodians of divine truth, turned instead to earthly pursuits. Greed, avarice, and opulence pervaded the clergy, as gold and silver adorned their vestments more lavishly than the humility of Christ Himself. It was a time of great darkness and apostasy. The Church, which ought to have been a light unto the world, was in many parts darkened by sin and worldly excess. Among these corruptions, the following were most grievous. Accountability begins with headship. For this reason, calling corruption in the church into account in both its causes and liabilities begins with headship. As the head, so goes the body. Firstly, the Papacy. The papacy refers to the office and authority of the Pope, who serves as the head of the Roman Catholic Church. Its place and prominence evolved over centuries, with the Bishop of Rome gradually asserting primacy over other church leaders. The papacy's history includes periods of significant power and influence. Its self-asserted power, centralized in Rome, had estranged many of the local churches throughout Europe. The papacy was secularized, and changed into a selfish tyranny whose yoke became more and more unbearable. The scandal of the papal schism had indeed been removed, but papal morals, after a temporary improvement, became worse and worse... The papacy, consumed by political machinations, was often seen as a secular power rather than a spiritual one. It was entangled in dynastic feuds and preoccupied in the governance of Papal States. Several popes, particularly those of the Renaissance era, were notorious for their lavish lifestyles and political ambitions, most egregiously exemplified by figures such as Pope Alexander VI whose papacy was marked by corruption, nepotism, and scandal.

Secondly, Simony, the article which is coming after from the papacy as the importance degree in corruption topics, Simony was one of the most fundamental corruptions prevalent in the medieval church. Simony refers to the buying or selling of ecclesiastical privileges, powers, functions, rites, or church offices. The term derives from the name Simon Magus, who sought to purchase apostolic powers from the apostle Peter (Acts 8:18-24). Peter's rebuke is sufficient to denounce this concept from its inception, "May your silver perish with you, because you thought you could obtain the gift of God with money!" (Acts 8:20). Simony was a crime under canon law. Yet, Church leaders circumvented this by requiring a fee for assuming office once selected. This fee could be set to exclude poorer candidates or auctioned to the highest bidder. Frequently positions of authority and influence were obtained through bribes rather than through spiritual qualification or contribution. Many bishops were merely political appointees from influential families. The holy offices of the Church were bought and sold like merchandise. Simony polluted the leadership of the Church at all levels. Priests, bishops, and even the highest seats of authority were often given not to those who were qualified spiritually, but to the highest bidder. Greed and avarice multiplied in the highest ranks of the Church with clerics growing richer in material wealth and poorer in spirit. The leaders of the Church were more concerned with the treasures of the world than the treasures of heaven. Dishonesty, neglect of pastoral care, hunger for power, and all sorts of worldly ambition permeated the ranks of leadership as a result of simony.

Thirdly, Pluralism, related to simony, was the practice of holding multiple offices at the same time, such as several bishoprics. This was illegal but could be permitted through special dispensations for those with enough financial or political influence. This was a common corruption in the church. Many bishops and cardinals held multiple dioceses, neglecting the duties that were attached to each. A single bishop might oversee several dioceses, though he would seldom set foot in any of them. But it was a lucrative arrangement. Each diocese came with income. Bishops and cardinals sought the financial gain of overseeing many local churches yet gave no care to the souls within them. They did not even live in the districts they supposedly served. Living outside their dioceses they happily collected their compounded income. They pursued honor but neglected those committed to their charge, living in ease and idleness while the people spiritually perished for lack of true shepherds. This corruption was a gross demonstration of self-interest, practical and spiritual neglect, wicked stewardship, and even social irresponsibility towards their churches.

As the fourth, we can mention Nepotism. The corruption of nepotism in the church refers to the practice of leaders favoring relatives or friends, particularly by giving them positions of authority, power, and influence. Nepotism reigned supreme in church, with papal appointments favoring family ties over spiritual qualification and devotion. As a result, the Church, which ought to have been governed by those most fit in godliness and wisdom, was instead ruled by kinship and blood. Sons, brothers, nephews, and cousins of popes and cardinals were placed in high offices, regardless of their character, qualification, and suitability for office. The sacred trust of the Church became dynastic. The term derives from the Italian word “*nepotismo*,” which is rooted in “*nipote*” meaning nephew. It was initially associated with popes granting exorbitant favors and positions to family members, often referred to as “nephews” but sometimes actually their illegitimate sons. Nepotism in the Church began prominently with Pope Nicholas III in the late 13th century and reached its peak under Pope Sixtus IV in the 15th century, causing significant scandal. Efforts to curb this practice within the Church intensified in the 16th and 17th centuries, culminating in Pope Innocent XII's 1692 bull requiring cardinals to swear an oath against nepotism. The popes of the 15th century were more concerned with temporal power and the building of empires than the care of souls. They engaged in wars, made alliances with princes, and sought the enlargement of the Papal States, forgetting that Christ's kingdom is not of this world. Their hearts were set on pomp and grandeur, even as the Church languished in spiritual decay. The clergy indulged in lavish lifestyles, with opulent buildings, fine clothes, and sumptuous feasts. They forgot their sacred vows of poverty and simplicity, and became indistinguishable from the princes of the world. Those at the helm of the Church had lost their direction, and with it the Church's mission. These corruptions, coupled with the growing intellectual and spiritual ferment of the Renaissance, made the Church ripe for reform. We can call it Worldly Ambition...

One of the most important reason of the corruption is Scriptural Ignorance. Many priests lacked even the most basic knowledge of Scripture and theology. Priests were typically ordained without ever reading the Bible. Some were even illiterate. They often lacked education in general, struggling even to comprehend the Latin Mass they recited daily. There were early attempts to alleviate the problem of illiteracy and ignorance in church leadership, however the problem persisted. Leadership was perfunctory, devoid of the mind and soul. The sacred office designated for spiritual oversight, leading in the likeness of Christ's heart and mind, was tragically reduced to an office of ritual operators. This corruption grew in part

because the Roman Catholic Church holds that sacraments operate *ex opere operato*. This means that the services of a priest are valid solely through the work of Christ and are not contingent on the worthiness or knowledge of the priest himself. Consequently, the Church did not concern itself much with the education of the clergy. This tended to mysticism. Most parishioners did not understand Latin and perceived the priest's actions in somewhat mystical terms. The sacred Scriptures were supplanted by mystical rituals. The way of true spiritual devotion in the disciplines of grace was forgotten, for the lamp and light of Scripture had been darkened. Instead, superstition and experientialism were confusedly counted as spirituality. In England, as late as the 16th century, there were reports of clergy unable to recite basic religious tenets. Some folktales criticize clergy for their lack of knowledge about religious rituals and holy days. It was clearly this corruption that colored the background of William Tyndale's famous retort, when threatened by a pair of visiting clerics, "If God spare my life, ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plough to know more of the Scripture, than does the Pope." These issues of clerical ignorance and illiteracy were detrimental to the Church's ability to effectively feed, lead, and serve her members. Such facilitated the blind following the blind, and the growth of abuses and corruptions within the Church. This corruption also paved the way for gross and defiling immoralities. Now, we come to the item that comes to mind when we read it. Immorality... If we are ready, here is the Immorality. Absence of grace will be seen in absence of godliness. No true gospel, no true godliness. Ignorance of Scripture meant ignorance of the gospel, which in turn will always accommodate immorality. One of the most plain and obvious corruptions of the medieval Church was the varied and pervasive immorality of her leaders. Priests, bishops, cardinals, and even popes lived lives of open immorality and debauchery. They readily brought shame and scandal on the Church. Drunk with self-interest and self-indulgence, many carelessly drove the faithful away from the truth by their gross hypocrisy. The sanctity of marriage was defiled as clerics, bound by sacred vows, flouted their chastity shamelessly. One example is seen in concubinage, which was prevalent. Roman Catholic canon law mandated celibacy for priests, yet many openly lived scandalously with women in unofficial common-law relationships. They kept mistresses and fathered children, all while preaching holiness to their flocks. This practice was not only tolerated but sometimes encouraged by bishops, for the sake of sordid gain. Some bishops even incentivized priests to take concubines, allowing them to impose an annual fee for this arrangement, thereby strengthening their income. Often, parishioners also expressed their support of priests having concubines. They thought that such arrangements kept the priests from pursuing their own

wives and daughters. So widespread was this corruption in medieval times that jokes circulated widely about immoral monks. Not only this, but according to Italian Renaissance writer Giovanni Boccaccio, there were convents in Rome rumored to double as brothels. Martin Luther went further, alleging that certain cardinals in the church were revered as saints merely because they confined their sexual activities to adult women. Luther, speaking of the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church in his day, comments in a letter, “look at those whom He allows to give free rein to their lusts smugly, with impunity, and without any trial. They slip from one crime into another, into lusts, murders, adulteries, hatreds, and horribly monstrous misdeeds, as is evident today in the Roman Curia. What else are the colleges of the canons and the cardinals than brothels and houses of ill repute? And Rome is a cesspool of unspeakable crimes and exceedingly wicked men.” Such immoralities, glaringly at odds with Scripture and the Church’s teachings, eroded public confidence in the leadership of the Church.

Another major corruption of the medieval Church is seen in her suppression of the truth and its rebuke. When brave souls did arise to call for reform and renewal, they faced persecution, imprisonment, and even death at the hands of the corrupt Church hierarchy. The Church suppressed and stifled the Spirit of God, and resisted the necessary corrections that would have restored her purity and power. Now, it is time for the doctrines that played a very, very big role in the corruption. These doctrines were given to the servants at one time and were later refuted by that man. Who is that man? Martin Luther... He refuted indulgences -the main doctrine which played the biggest role in corruption- first. The corruption of indulgences presented the spark that officially ignited the controversy of the Reformation. It was in direct response to the corruption of indulgences and related abuses of the clerics that Martin Luther drafted and posted his Ninety-Five Theses. Indulgences are a Roman Catholic Church doctrine that derives from the Sacrament of Penance (see more). This was a very important sacrament in the medieval Church, forming the plank by which baptism was restored. Indulgences could be obtained for oneself or for deceased persons, but not for other living individuals. The Church claimed that when a baptized parishioner in good standing obtained an indulgence, they were granted remission of temporal punishment for sins already forgiven. Obtaining an indulgence exempted a man from paying the satisfaction element of penance. Originally, indulgences could be obtained by pilgrimages, devotional practices, and charitable acts. But to add insult to injury, wealth had become the favored means of obtaining an indulgence by

the 16th century. The Church effectively commercialized its spirituality. This corruption was wrongly based on the previous corruption of the papacy. The Church claimed the authority to grant indulgences based on the power of the keys to the kingdom given by Jesus to Peter. Indulgences were sold like trinkets in a marketplace, promising salvation for coin. Forgiveness was peddled, selling remission of sins to the highest bidder. This created a mockery of Christ's atonement and reduced the Church to a mere marketplace of salvation. The poor were deceived, believing that their souls could be redeemed with coin, while the rich bought their way into false assurance. Popes and clergy alike sanctioned the widespread sale of indulgences. This mercenary distortion of salvation was met with increasing distaste, particularly as the funds were often used to finance lavish building projects in Rome, most notably the reconstruction of St. Peter's Basilica. Martin Luther wrote forcefully against indulgences in his "Ninety-Five Theses Or: Disputation on the Power And Efficacy of Indulgences." For example:

32. Those who believe that they can be certain of their salvation because they have indulgence letters will be eternally damned, together with their teachers.

34. For the graces of indulgences are concerned only with the penalties of sacramental satisfaction established by man.

36. Any truly repentant Christian has a right to full remission of penalty and guilt, even without indulgence letters

37. Any true Christian, whether living or dead, participates in all the blessings of Christ and the church; and this is granted him by God, even without indulgence letters.

39. It is very difficult, even for the most learned theologians, at one and the same time to commend to the people the bounty of indulgences and the need of true contrition.

43. Christians are to be taught that he who gives to the poor or lends to the needy does a better deed than he who buys indulgences.

50. Christians are to be taught that if the pope knew the exactions of the indulgence preachers, he would rather that the basilica of St. Peter were burned to ashes than built up with the skin, flesh, and bones of his sheep.

51. Christians are to be taught that the pope would and should wish to give of his own money, even though he had to sell the basilica of St. Peter, to many of those from whom certain hawkers of indulgences cajole money.

52. It is vain to trust in salvation by indulgence letters, even though the indulgence commissary, or even the pope, were to offer his soul as security.

53. They are enemies of Christ and the pope who forbid altogether the preaching of the Word of God in some churches in order that indulgences may be preached in others.

54. Injury is done the Word of God when, in the same sermon, an equal or larger amount of time is devoted to indulgences than to the Word.

And lastly, Transubstantiation. The Roman Catholic Church claims that the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper become the actual body and blood of Christ upon the invocation of a priest in the mass. This doctrine, known as Transubstantiation, was not officially recorded into canon law until 1215. It is a corruption of the plain meaning of Scripture. John Wycliffe strongly rejected it, asserting that the elements remain bread and wine and are meant for remembrance, not literal transformation. Jan Hus, influenced by Wycliffe, likewise condemned it as a deceptive practice that obscured true faith. Martin Luther, though he held to Christ's real presence in the Eucharist, refused the idea of a physical change. Ulrich Zwingli went further, emphasizing that the Lord's Supper is symbolic, not an act of corporeal consumption. John Calvin, building on these critiques, taught that Christ is present in the sacrament spiritually, received through faith rather than through the mouth.

The Church, once the bride of Christ, became corrupted with the leaven of sin. But the Lord, in His mercy, raised up voices to call her to repentance. These reformers, captive to the

written Word of God, called her to return to her Lord and Savior, to His revealed word and will. They spent themselves that she might be purged and restored to her former purity and remain faithful to the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

7. POLITICAL STRUCTURE IN EUROPE

In the 13th century, feudalism dominated Europe. Almost every country had a feudal administration and this feudal structure was developing day by day. So what is this feudalism? Between the 7th and 10th centuries, free members of peasant communities became increasingly poor and many lost what they had. The destitute peasants were called "*pauper*." On the other hand, groups of rich people emerged within these communities. In years of famine, the "powerful" bought the lands of impoverished peasants for next to nothing. They even raided villages to seize land. The state helped the big landowners to keep the peasants in subjection. Emperors forced peasants to pay taxes for their neighbors who had lost their holdings or had to flee. The poor, in order to escape the tyranny of the officials, settled on the lands of the "powerful" peasants and in time became dependents. Thus, feudal estates began to appear in Europe and classes of feudal lords and dependent peasants were formed. Now let's go a little deeper and into the details of these events, what feudalism is and how it was established. The deeper the better, right? Too much information is not enough. First of all, we can start with how the large estates developed and the enslavement of the peasants, because these are actually the beginning of all events. Of course, this began with the nobility seizing the lands of freemen. Let's explain a little. In fact, feudalism first emerged in history thanks to the Franks and they are its source. When Gaul was conquered, the Franks were free members of the communities. But a few centuries later, a large part of the peasants found themselves in bondage. This is exactly what happened: starting in the late 6th century, family lands became the private property of the community members. This ended the process of transfer from family communities to neighboring communities. The peasants were now free to use their lands as they wished. This made it even easier for the Frankish nobility to seize peasant lands. The Frankish nobles, imitating the king, formed armed retinues and distributed

land to their warriors in return for their services. In order to seize more land to distribute to the warriors, the nobles appropriated the lands of free peasants in various ways. This was made even easier by the fact that family lands became the private property of the peasants in the late 6th century. Many old documents found in the archives show how the Frankish peasants were dispossessed. Frequently, Frankish nobles and warriors attacked villages and forcibly seized the peasants' land.

The nobility had many other means of increasing their holdings. As a contemporary document shows, they were always looking for an excuse to persuade or force a peasant to go to war, and they continued to do so until the peasant who had lost everything was forced to sell his property or give it to them. Peasants who were oppressed by powerful neighbors - counts and warriors - had to resort to one of these "for protection." But such "protection" was costly to the peasant, and his land was transferred to his "patron." Some peasants in the communities managed to increase their wealth, but the majority became increasingly poor and eventually lost everything. Frequent bad harvests and wars made their situation worse. Almost every year they were forced from their work in the fields to serve in the army, paying for it at their own expense. The enemies who attacked them often burned their villages, trampled their crops, and carried off their cattle. Rich peasants used the hardships faced by other community members to their advantage. A poor peasant was forced to borrow cattle, seeds, or food from a rich peasant and then pay off the debt by working on his field. If the poor peasant could not pay the debt on time, he had to transfer the title deed of his land to his rich neighbor. In this way, a handful of peasants became large landowners. Next, as can be easily predicted, was the peasants' loss of freedom. The peasants who lost their land became dependent on the rich landowners. As a rule, the peasant continued to cultivate his former land, but in order to use it, he had to give a part of the produce to his master or to work on his field. Not all dependent peasants were in the same position. Some lost their land but retained their personal freedom and were therefore only in servitude to the land. Others lost not only their land but also their personal freedom, which meant both servitude to the land and personal servitude. They were forbidden to leave their villages. They were obliged to serve the land, as it were, and were therefore called serfs. Their children and grandchildren were also bound to the landowner by personal servitude. The Frankish kings helped the nobility to turn free peasants into serfs. One of the royal decrees stated that every free man had to choose a master for himself. The peasants fiercely resisted

enslavement. They had lived in communities for a long time and were used to solving all problems together. It was easier for them to reach agreements than for slaves, and they were more united in their struggles than slaves. They often refused to work for their masters and set fire to their masters' houses and barns. Individual peasants or entire villages fled their homelands and settled in unoccupied lands. The bravest gathered in the forests to defend their lands and freedoms with arms. But the nobility was stronger. The great landowners had well-armed troops and were supported by the king and the church. Oh, by the way, speaking of the church, let's also open a parenthesis about the church. Because, as I mentioned before, they were also quite dominant in politics and their property was expanding. And as with everything else, they had managed to become parsley. This was a time of unrest. Many who had lost their families or their property sought solace in religion. Some who had renounced worldly life and devoted themselves to prayer were called monks. As a rule, monks lived in groups separate from other people. Their settlements—monasteries—were surrounded by high walls. Behind these were buildings, refectories, churches, and storehouses. Upon entering the monastery, a monk took an oath that he would not have a family, would live in poverty, and would obey his superior, the abbot, without question. The Christian Church was a very powerful organization. There was a priest in almost every village. In large areas, the administration of church affairs was carried out by bishops or archbishops. In Western Europe, the head of the entire Christian Church was the Pope, who resided in Rome. All those in the service of the Church formed a separate section of the population called the clergy. At that time, people believed that through the prayers of the clergy they could be saved from disease or from bad harvests. Thousands of simple peasants and artisans gave the church their last penny or their last property. A document from that period states that the clergy increased their wealth by attracting the faithful with the bliss of the Kingdom of Heaven or by frightening them with the eternal torments of Hell, and took away the property of the ignorant and the foolish. They feared the wrath of God, which had brought so many people to ruin, and hoped that the priests' prayers would grant them pardon. The king and the nobility gave away large tracts of uncultivated land to bishops or monasteries. By force and fraud the clergy turned the peasants into serfs. Often an abbot would suggest to a peasant who had too little land to cultivate that he should cultivate a plot of land which had been left lying fallow. However, when the peasant received this additional field, he had to give his own fields to the monastery. Because in order to be able to cultivate this additional field along with his own, the peasant had to work for the monastery. Over time, the entire village would

become dependent on the monastery. In summary, two classes emerged in European states between the 6th and 9th centuries: large landowners and dependent peasants...

Of course, these polarizations and the sides that were formed continued with certain developments of the side that was superior to the others. As the Feudal Lords emerged, the places where they lived and their lifestyles also began to take shape. Now we will talk about Feudal Manors. Let's start with the Lord's Demesne and Peasant Lands. In the Middle Ages, most people were engaged in agriculture, ploughing the land and raising animals. So land was the most important property at that time. By the 9th and 10th centuries, all the land in Western Europe had passed into the hands of large landowners. Fields, forests, wastelands and even rivers were their property. There was a rule that there was no land without an owner. The old communities still existed, but they were now dependent on the landowners. A piece of land acquired by military service and inhabited by peasants was called a fief, and the lord of this land was called a feudal lord. The feudal lord inherited his fief from his eldest son. Occasionally, a feudal lord from among the nobility could own an entire region with dozens or even hundreds of villages. Usually, his holdings were scattered all over the country. A warrior who acquired land in return for military service was often given a village. Feudal Estates, that is, plots of land worked by dependent peasants, arose on lands formerly belonging to free communities. At the center of a manor was the lord's farm, surrounded by a fence. The farm contained the houses of the feudal lord and his steward, granaries for storing grain and other produce, stables for horses and cattle, and a chicken coop. The feudal lord often had a fruit and vegetable garden. Around the lord's farm, in the fields, were villages where the peasants lived. All arable land on the manor was divided into two: the lord's demesne (field) and the peasant's strips. The harvest from the lord's field belonged to the lord. The dependent peasants cultivated the strips assigned to them. Forests, pastures, and water were the lord's property, but the peasant communities were allowed to use them. Outside the strip, each peasant family had a country house and a vegetable garden. Unlike slaves, dependent peasants had their own tools of labor, draught animals, and a place to live. The peasant could feed himself and his family by working on his own strip and in his own house. He cultivated both his lord's land and his own strip of land, using his oxen, plough and oxen. What were the obligations of these dependent peasants? In return for using the land, peasants were forced to fulfill certain obligations or tasks imposed on them by the feudal lords. The peasant had to plow and sow the lord's field, then reap the harvest, and only then could he

tend to his own strip. Often, while he was working on his lord's field, wind and rain would destroy his own harvest. The peasant had to do other work for his lord without receiving any payment: building and repairing his house, barns and bridges, cleaning his ponds and catching fish. The peasant's wives and daughters spun cloth for the lord, and their children gathered forest fruits and mushrooms for him in the forest. The butler and servants made sure that the peasants did not shirk their work. The peasants' work on the lord's estate was called forced labor (*corvée*). Peasants were obliged to give the feudal lord a portion of what they produced in their fields, gardens and houses: grain, small and large cattle, poultry, eggs, butter, honey, flax, wool and leather. The payments made by the peasants to the lord in the form of products were called rent in kind. The forced labor and rent in kind were the basic obligations of the dependent peasants. But the feudal lords continued to invent new duties. The peasants were forced to grind their grain in the brain mill, bake their bread in the brain oven, press their grapes in the brain press, and pay for all of these. The lords also collected tolls from the peasants who used the bridges, roads, and rivers on their estates. The peasants also had to fulfill heavy obligations to the church, such as giving a tenth of their harvest and calves. This was called church tithes. Thus the lords exploited the dependent peasants through numerous duties and taxes.

So, how could the lords live off the labor of dependent peasants? Could a peasant refuse to perform his duties? The feudal lords used force to make the peasants work for them. If the rent in kind was late or if the lord thought that a peasant was not working hard enough to fulfill the forced labor, the peasant was brought before the lord's court. The cruel lord would bring charges, hear the case and pass the sentence. He had the right to punish the peasant with a beating, a whip, chains or imprisonment. The situation of the serfs, who were personally dependent on the lord, was even worse. Although the lord could not kill the serfs, he had the right to sell, buy or exchange them, together with the land on which they lived, without a court order. If the peasant escaped from the manor, was caught and brought back to his master, a cruel punishment awaited him. The owners of the manor often went hunting with their guests and retinue. If the hunted animal escaped into a peasant's field, the dogs and mounted men could follow it and trample the crops mercilessly, destroying the harvest, which was very valuable to the peasant. Towards the end of summer, the peasants' fields were often ravaged by flocks of birds, and wild rabbits plundered their vegetables. But the peasants were forbidden to kill animals that destroyed their crops. The lord was the lord of the serf and of

his property. For example, when an old peasant died, before he was buried, the lord's steward could come to his house and take his cattle. The inheritance tax consisted of the peasant's best cattle. If a peasant's daughter wanted to marry a serf from another estate, her parents had to pay the lord a large sum for the loss of a pair of working hands. In short, in the 9th and 11th centuries, a system was established in Western European countries in which all the land and power belonged to the feudal landowners who exploited the peasants who were dependent on them.

Okay, we've talked enough about how much the peasants suffered, in a very pathetic way. So, aren't we going to talk about how the feudal lords lived while these peasants were living in such misery? Of course we will. Let's start with their magnificent castles. On a hill or a high rock, there was a castle dominating the surrounding lands. This was both the lord's residence and his fortification. He would hide here from rebellious peasants and other feudal lords. Initially made of wood, the castles were later made of stone. Thick walls with crenelated towers provided reliable protection. The castle was surrounded by a wide moat full of water that could be crossed by a movable bridge; at night and when an enemy approached, the bridge was pulled with the help of a capstan. When the alarm was given, the warriors serving the feudal lord would rush to take up positions on the walls and castles. In order to infiltrate the castle, the enemy had to fill the moat and break the heavy oak entrance gate with iron edges. The defenders of the castle would throw stones and logs at their heads from the walls, pour boiling water and hot tar, and rain spears and arrows on them. But even if the attackers forced their way through the gate, they could not always capture the castle: they would have to overcome another, higher wall. Above the castle buildings rose the main tower. There the feudal lord, together with his warriors and servants, could withstand a long siege. Inside the tower were a series of rooms where the lord and his family lived. The basement contained a well with drinking water and provisions. The basement also served as a dungeon: prisoners chained to the wall and wayward peasants were kept in dark, damp cells. A staircase was built into the wall of the main tower, which spiraled down to an underground passage that could be used to escape to the forest or the river. For the peasants, the castle was a constant reminder of the lord's terrible power. Its high towers and formidable walls aroused their hatred.

Alas...

It seems that it is time to talk about the cruel weapons of the knights, stained with the blood of the peasants... It was not easy for the unarmed peasants to defeat even a single nobleman. An armed warrior - the knight - was armed with a heavy straight sword and a long spear. His shield was wide enough to protect him from head to toe. His body was protected by a ring or scale armor, which would later give way to steel armor. The knight wore a helmet and could protect his face with a visor made of a metal plate with slits that allowed him to see. Knights rode strong, durable horses, also protected by armor. The knight had heavy weapons weighing up to 50 kilograms. Therefore, the knight was not very mobile. If he was knocked off his horse, he could not get up without help. It took a long training to participate in battle on horseback and in heavy armor, and the sons of the nobles were trained for military service from childhood. Iron weapons were very expensive; The cost of a war horse and a full suit of armor was equal to 45 head of cattle, the price of an entire herd. Only a large landowner whose land was worked by peasants could afford it. This was why, for many years, warfare was the exclusive domain of the feudal nobility. Well, have you ever thought about it? What do these feudal nobles do in their daily lives? Let me answer right away. Feudal lords spent their time fighting, feasting, and entertaining themselves. Their favorite pastimes, hunting and tournaments, were related to the art of war. A tournament was a military competition of strength and agility between knights. The armoured and armed participants of the tournament would take up positions at opposite ends of the arena. At the signal of the herald, they would charge each other. Each would try to unhorse his opponent with a blunt tournament spear. It was not uncommon for the contest to end in serious injury or even death for one of the participants. As a rule, the winner would receive his opponent's horse and armour as a prize. The tournaments attracted large numbers of spectators. The nobles would fill the seats, while the common people would crowd around the arena. The feudal lords placed greater importance on physical strength than on intelligence and education. They spent most of their time practicing fencing, riding, wrestling and javelin throwing. They were rude and ignorant, many of them could not read or write and could not even sign their names, instead drawing a cross. During the banquets held in their castles, the wine flowed like water and the tables would groan under the weight of whole roasted game. Jesters, an indispensable part of every feudal lord's household, would entertain their masters and guests with vulgar tricks. If you recall, feudal lords were described as rude and ignorant. Of course, it is necessary to explain this rude and ignorant expression a little more. So let's talk a little about their morals and customs. The wild and arrogant feudal lords considered themselves "nobles" who were

above the common people. They boasted about their lineage and the number of their noble ancestors. Each feudal lord had his own coat of arms, a symbol of his family's military prowess, and a motto, usually a short phrase explaining the meaning of the coat of arms. In those days, it was believed that all nobles were born brave and noble-spirited. Feudal lords looked down on those who were thrifty and hoarded their money. In order to gain the respect of other feudal lords, a knight had to show generosity. Income from peasants and spoils from war were often given away as gifts or spent on feasts, hunting parties, expensive ornaments, and the feeding of numerous servants and warriors. In later times, the feudal nobility developed a code of chivalry: to distinguish themselves, a knight had to go on adventures, fight against the enemies of Christianity, and protect the weak and the oppressed. The code of honor was only valid in relations among the feudal nobility; but even there it was constantly violated. In everyday life, many feudal lords were rude, cruel, and arrogant. We have talked enough -a little too much- about what feudalism was. Now, finally, we will talk about how it developed and how it spread throughout Europe after the Franks. And as a footnote: Charlemagne founded an empire. And this empire was an empire that lived feudalism to the core, even bringing the emperor and the great landowners together in a single council and discussing orders. Its name was the Carolingian Empire. The Carolingian Empire was an early feudal state. This state helped the newly emerging feudal landowner class in the conquered lands to seize the lands and turn free people into dependent peasants. The spread of feudalism to Western Europe was the result of a feudal fragmentation. There was an empire that collapsed. The Charlemagne's Empire: Carolingian Empire. The Carolingian Empire was not very powerful and did not last long. The tribes and peoples conquered by the Franks continued to live as usual and spoke different languages. They were brought together by force of arms and only temporarily. After Charlemagne's death, his heirs fought endless wars. In 843, after one of these wars, Charlemagne's three grandsons met in the town of Verdun to agree on the division of the empire. Three great kingdoms then emerged from these lands: France, Germany and Italy. But even within these states there was no unity. Each was divided into large feudal estates, which in turn were fragmented into many smaller estates. This was the period of feudal fragmentation in Western Europe. The nobles supported Charlemagne as long as he helped them seize new lands and turn peasants into serfs. But towards the end of his reign, news came more and more frequently from different parts of his empire that the great landowners were refusing to obey the emperor's orders. Frankish nobles who acquired large amounts of land were often able to build their own military forces and control their own villages. They no longer needed a strong emperor and

saw no reason to support him. Under a subsistence economy, strong ties between the regions of a country were not possible. People living on manors were isolated from their neighbors and had little contact with them. To control the work of the peasants and to compel them to serve him, the feudal lord needed his own army. Since peasant uprisings took place in relatively small areas, the feudal lords were powerful enough to suppress them without the help of the king. In short, the consolidation of land ownership by the feudal lords against the basis of a subsistence economy led to the disintegration of the states of Western Europe. In the 9th and 11th centuries, royal authority was extremely weak. (Footnote: Subsistence economy will be discussed under the subheading on economy.) And thus the royal authority was weakened and the era of independence of the feudal lords began. The kings were forced to recognize the independence of the feudal lords and to cede some of their rights to them. The estates of the great feudal lords gradually developed into almost independent states. The feudal lord had his own armed force, collected taxes from the population, and was free to judge and punish his subjects. He could even declare war on other feudal lords or make peace with them. The great feudal lords - dukes and counts - perpetuated the rule that the king was only "first among equals". In Germany the monarchy was initially stronger than in France. The kings waged wars of conquest. The German king, who conquered part of Italy, including Rome, declared himself Emperor of Rome in 962. This state would later become known as the Holy Roman Empire. The great feudal lords in Germany gradually gained their independence from the king. The people of Italy never stopped fighting against the invaders. Each successive German king had to organize a new expedition beyond the Alps to reconquer Italy. These brought about devastating wars (really devastating), of course. During the period of fragmentation, feudal lords constantly fought among themselves. These wars were called devastating. The reason for these wars can be explained as follows: feudal lords tried to seize neighboring lands together with the peasants living on them. Since peasants had to fulfill their arshi obligations to feudal lords, the more peasants a lord had, the richer he became. It was not uncommon for the aim of the war to be to destroy a neighbor's castle or to seize the lands of another lord. In order to weaken the power of an opponent, a feudal lord would lead his peasants to destruction: he would burn villages, steal animals and ruin crops. The devastating wars did the greatest harm to the peasants: at least the feudal lords could hide behind the walls surrounding their castles.

Of course, we can't talk about all this and not mention the overlords and vassals. In order to maintain his armed force, each great feudal lord would give part of his land, together with its peasants, to lesser feudal lords in return for military service. In the case of the latter, the owner of the land was the lord, and those to whom the land was given were his vassals or military servants.

Finally, it would be sufficient to mention the feudal ladder. The king was the head of all feudal lords in his realm. For dukes and counts, he was a liege lord. Dukes and counts owned vast lands, including hundreds of villages, and had large military forces. After dukes and counts in importance came their vassals, the barons. As a rule, barons owned two or three dozen villages and could equip a military force. Barons were liege lords of knights, who were minor feudal lords and had no vassals of their own. Thus, the same feudal lord was the liege lord of a lower lord and a vassal of a more important one. Vassals had to obey only their liege lord. If they were not the king's vassal, they were not obliged to obey his orders. This system was based on the rule that "my vassal's vassal is not my vassal." The relations between feudal lords resembled a ladder, with the most important feudal lord at the top and the least important at the bottom. These relations were called the feudal ladder. Peasants were not part of the feudal ladder. Both lords and vassals were feudal lords. All, from the poorest knight to the king, lived off the labor of dependent peasants. The vassal was obliged to go on military expeditions with a force of armed warriors at the command of his lord. In addition, he was obliged to advise his liege lord and to pay ransom for him if he was captured. The liege lord also protected his vassals from attacks by other feudal lords and rebellious peasants. If a knight in his village rebelled, he would send a messenger to his liege lord, and the liege lord would come to his aid, bringing his warriors with him. When war broke out with another state, the entire feudal ladder was set into motion. The king would call the dukes and counts, who would return to their barons, who would bring their knights with them. Thus, a feudal army was formed. But most of the time, the vassals did not obey their lords, and in such cases, obedience was only achieved by force. As you can understand, during the period of fragmentation, the feudal classes were organized in the feudal ladder. It helped the feudal lords wage wars and enabled them to unite their forces to subdue the peasants. What a mess!

8. SOCIOLOGICAL STRUCTURE IN EUROPE

We actually touched on this subject in the political structure subheading. Therefore, it would be the most logical thing to go over it a little more and pass superficially. This time, let's examine it in items so that we can understand it more easily. Let's remember the feudal ladder again. In order of importance: king, dukes and counts, barons, knights and feudal lords. And of course, the peasants who have no place in the feudal ladder... That's all we've talked about. But there's actually a lot more to the overall social classes. That was just the feudal ladder in the feudal empires. Now let's consider society as a whole. Medieval society was divided into three main classes: nobility, clergy, and peasantry. Each group had distinct roles, rights, and obligations within the feudal system. This hierarchy shaped every aspect of life, from access to resources to legal rights. Social mobility was limited, with birth and lineage being the primary determinants of status. However, factors like wealth, education, and military service could sometimes lead to advancement. The rigid class structure reinforced power inequalities and shaped daily life for centuries. The nobility was the ruling class, consisting of kings, lords, and knights who held land and political power (so, the part which mentioned before)

- Made up a small percentage of the population
- Further divided into hierarchical subclasses based on titles and wealth (dukes, counts, barons)

The clergy was the religious class, including monks, nuns, priests, and bishops

- Held significant influence due to their spiritual authority and education
- Played important roles as advisors, administrators, and scholars

The peasantry made up the vast majority of the population and included serfs, freemen, and townspeople

- Serfs were bound to the land and had limited freedoms
- Freemen had more autonomy but still owed obligations to their lords
- Townspeople engaged in trades and had more opportunities than rural peasants

Now let's talk a little about the hierarchical division within these classes. Within each main class, there were further hierarchical divisions and subclasses based on wealth, occupation, and social status

- Among the nobility, there were distinctions between higher and lower nobility
 - Higher nobility included kings, dukes, and counts who held larger territories and more power
 - Lower nobility consisted of knights, barons, and landed gentry with smaller holdings
- The clergy had its own hierarchy, with the Pope at the top, followed by bishops, priests, and monks/nuns
 - Higher clergy often came from noble families and held significant political influence
 - Lower clergy, such as parish priests, interacted more closely with the common people
- Peasants were divided into subclasses based on their relationship to the land and their lords
 - Serfs were the lowest class, bound to the land and subject to their lord's will
 - Freeman had more personal freedoms but still owed rents and services to their lords
 - Townspeople, such as merchants and artisans, had more autonomy and opportunities for social mobility

The most important thing that a person has and that makes him the freest is his rights. Let's examine the rights of the classes in items:

Nobility

- The nobility had the right to own land, govern their domains, and collect taxes and rents from the lower classes
 - Land ownership was the basis of wealth and power in the feudal system

- Nobles exercised judicial authority over their subjects and could impose fines and punishments
- Nobles were obligated to provide military service to their lords and maintain order in their territories
 - Knights were expected to fight for their lords and defend their lands
 - Nobles had to provide troops and resources for their lord's military campaigns
- Nobles enjoyed privileges such as the right to hunt, hold tournaments, and bear arms
 - Hunting was a popular leisure activity and a symbol of noble status
 - Tournaments allowed knights to display their combat skills and gain prestige

Clergy

- The clergy enjoyed privileges such as exemption from taxes and the right to collect tithes (a portion of agricultural produce)
 - The Church's lands and properties were often exempt from secular taxation
 - Tithes provided a significant source of income for the Church and its institutions
- Clergy were responsible for providing spiritual guidance, education, and charity to the community
 - Monasteries and churches served as centers of learning and preserved knowledge
 - The clergy administered sacraments, performed religious ceremonies, and offered pastoral care
 - The Church was expected to provide assistance to the poor and needy
- Higher clergy had significant political influence and often served as advisors to kings and nobles
 - Bishops and abbots were involved in governance and diplomacy
 - The Pope, as the head of the Church, wielded immense spiritual and political power

Peasantry

- Peasants had limited rights and were obligated to work the land and pay rents, taxes, and fees to their lords

- Serfs were required to work a certain number of days on their lord's land (corvée labor)
- Peasants paid a portion of their crops as rent (champart) and other fees for using mills, ovens, and other facilities
- Serfs were bound to the land and had fewer freedoms than freemen
 - Serfs could not leave their lord's manor without permission and could be bought and sold along with the land
 - Freemen had more personal liberties but still owed obligations and services to their lords
- Townspeople, such as merchants and artisans, had more rights and opportunities than rural peasants
 - Towns had their own charters and legal systems, providing more freedoms and protections
 - Guilds regulated trade and production, offering support and training to their members
- Different legal rights and punishments applied to different social classes under the feudal system
 - Nobles were often subject to different laws and courts than commoners
 - Punishments for crimes varied based on social status, with nobles receiving more lenient treatment

Those years were quite socially active. And they brought their benefits and factors with them. As expected, social classes were not equal due to differences in social status. Let's examine it this way:

Birth and Lineage

- Social mobility, or the ability to move between social classes, was limited in medieval society due to the rigid hierarchical structure
- Birth and family lineage were the primary determinants of social status
 - Individuals typically remained in the social class they were born into
 - Noble titles and lands were inherited through bloodlines
- Aristocratic families sought to maintain their status through strategic marriages and alliances

- Marriages were often arranged to consolidate power, wealth, and territories
- Dowries and inheritances played a crucial role in maintaining noble status

Wealth and Land Ownership

- Wealth and land ownership could provide opportunities for upward mobility, particularly for merchants and successful artisans in towns
 - Merchants who accumulated significant wealth could purchase land and titles, entering the lower nobility
 - Successful artisans could become master craftsmen and gain social prestige within their guilds
- Land grants from lords or the crown could elevate individuals to higher social status
 - Kings and lords could reward loyal servants with land and titles, creating new noble lineages
 - Military service and valor in battle could lead to land grants and improved social standing

Education and Clergy

- Education and positions in the clergy offered some avenues for social advancement, as the Church provided schooling and leadership roles
 - Monasteries and cathedral schools provided education to both nobles and commoners
 - Talented individuals from lower classes could rise through the ranks of the clergy based on merit and ability
- Higher positions in the Church, such as bishops and abbots, were often reserved for those from noble families
 - Younger sons of noble families often entered the clergy as a means of preserving family influence and wealth
 - Nepotism and political connections played a role in appointments to high-ranking clerical positions

Military Service and Loyalty

- Military service and loyalty to a powerful lord could also lead to improved social standing and rewards

- Knights who demonstrated valor and loyalty could receive land grants, titles, or marriage into noble families
- Mercenaries and professional soldiers could gain wealth and status through their military prowess
- Participation in successful military campaigns and crusades could bring glory, wealth, and social advancement
 - Successful military leaders could be rewarded with titles, land, and political influence
 - Capturing enemy nobles or acquiring wealth through conquest could elevate social status

Limitations and Rarity of Mobility

- Despite these factors, significant social mobility was rare, and the vast majority of people remained in the social class they were born into throughout their lives
- The rigid social hierarchy and the importance of birth and lineage made it difficult for individuals to move between classes
- Upward mobility often required a combination of factors, such as wealth, education, military success, and political connections
- Downward mobility was more common, as noble families could lose their lands and titles through war, political upheaval, or financial mismanagement
- The social and economic structures of medieval society were designed to maintain the status quo and preserve the power of the ruling classes

All of these paved the way for social stratification over time, and social stratification occurred. Of course, this had its effects. In fact, it was quite extensive:

Access to Resources and Opportunities

- Social class determined access to resources, education, and political power, greatly impacting daily life and opportunities
- Nobles enjoyed luxuries, leisure activities, and political influence
 - Access to fine food, clothing, and entertainment
 - Participation in hunting, tournaments, and courtly events
 - Involvement in governance, diplomacy, and military leadership

- Peasants faced hard labor, poverty, and limited social and geographic mobility
 - Long hours of work in fields and on manors
 - Limited access to education and opportunities for advancement
 - Restricted movement and freedoms, especially for serfs
- The clergy had access to education and held important roles as advisors, administrators, and scholars
 - Monasteries and churches served as centers of learning and knowledge preservation
 - Clergy played crucial roles in governance, diplomacy, and religious life
 - Higher clergy enjoyed significant influence and privileges

Legal Rights and Obligations

- Social class affected legal rights, taxation, and obligations to lords and the Church, creating disparities in personal freedoms and living conditions
- Nobles had more legal protections and privileges than commoners
 - Trial by combat or ordeal was often reserved for nobles
 - Nobles were subject to different laws and courts than peasants
- Peasants had limited legal rights and were subject to their lord's justice
 - Serfs could not leave their lord's land without permission
 - Peasants were required to pay taxes, rents, and fees to their lords and the Church
- Townspeople had more legal protections and freedoms than rural peasants
 - Towns had their own charters and legal systems
 - Guilds provided legal support and regulations for their members

Marriage and Occupational Choices

- Marriage and occupational choices were often limited by social class, with endogamy (marrying within one's class) being the norm
- Nobles typically married within their own class to maintain social status and consolidate power
 - Strategic marriages were used to form alliances and increase landholdings
 - Dowries and inheritances were important factors in noble marriages

- Peasants and serfs had limited choice in marriage partners and were often subject to their lord's approval
 - Marriages were often arranged to ensure the continuity of labor on the land
 - Serfs could not marry outside their lord's manor without permission
- Occupational choices were largely determined by family and social class
 - Peasants were tied to agricultural work and had limited opportunities for other occupations
 - Artisans and merchants in towns had more occupational choices but were still subject to guild regulations

Power Structures and Inequalities

- Social stratification reinforced power structures and inequalities, with limited opportunities for the lower classes to challenge the status quo
- The nobility and higher clergy held the majority of political and economic power
 - Nobles controlled land, resources, and political decision-making
 - Higher clergy had significant influence over religious and intellectual life
- Peasants and lower classes had little power to challenge the existing social order
 - Lack of education and resources made it difficult to organize and advocate for change
 - Fear of punishment and retribution from lords and the Church deterred rebellion
- The rigid social hierarchy contributed to social tensions and occasional uprisings
 - Peasant revolts, such as the English Peasants' Revolt of 1381, challenged the feudal system
 - Urban conflicts between guilds and merchants reflected tensions within the social hierarchy
- Despite these challenges, the social stratification of medieval society remained largely intact until the gradual decline of feudalism and the rise of new economic and political systems in the late Middle Ages and early modern period...

After all, there is a new version of everything, right?

9. ECONOMICAL STRUCTURE IN EUROPE

In the years in question, there was an economy that was mostly based on labor. This was called the subsistence economy. The subsistence economy was a form of economy based on peasant life and labor. In a medieval village, a cluster of ramshackle houses would be found. The small wooden huts were covered with straw. There were no chimneys in these houses; when a fire was lit in the hearth, a thick, suffocating smoke would fill the whole room. The walls were always black with soot. The narrow, glassless windows let in very little light; in cold weather they were filled with rags or straw. Cattle and poultry spent the winter months in the same room as the people to protect them from the cold. The peasants' huts were narrow and dark. The furniture consisted of a roughly hewn table, a few benches along the wall, and a tin containing flour. Clay pots, bowls, and jugs stood on shelves. The whole family slept either on a single bed, which consisted of a large mattress, or on straw, which was usually spread on the ground. During the long winter nights, the men of the family, by the light of a torch, prepared the necessary food with the help of primitive tools. While he made tools and equipment, his wife spun cloth and wool and sewed clothes for the whole family. The peasants wore coarse homespun clothes and heavy woolen slippers. The meals were simple and always the same: soup, fish, and vegetables. Meat was only on the table on holidays. Even the flour did not always last until spring. Caught in the web of taxes and obligations owed to the lord, the peasants lived in deep misery. Despite all the misery that the peasants experienced, and even the fact that they had directly become misery themselves, the economy still ran on their labor. The peasants cultivated their land with implements not unlike those of their fathers and grandfathers. They used light ploughs that only made furrows and did not disturb the layers of the soil. Those who did not have a plough did their work with a spade and a hoe. Many peasants did not even have a taper, so a log was used, which was pulled across the field. The crops were reaped with sickles. Threshing was done with sticks or flails, and the grain was thrown into the air with shovels for winnowing. There was almost no manure. The peasants raised mostly sheep, goats and pigs. Horses and cattle were rare, because they required more feed. Since they spent so much time working for the lord, the peasants had little chance of cultivating their own fields properly. Their harvests were very small, only two or three times as much grain as they had sown. Even a light frost or drought could ruin a crop. Then came months or even

years of famine. At first, people ate all the animals they had, and later, they had to eat grass, herbs, and edible wild plants to survive. Infectious diseases killed thousands of people who were weakened by starvation. As you can see, the ruthless exploitation of the peasants by the feudal lords prevented the development of agriculture and the economy. This exploitation and development obstruction actually caused the spontaneous emergence of the subsistence economy. The peasants produced food and other goods for themselves, their lords, their lords' families and servants. What the peasants could not produce was produced by craftsmen, who were also serfs. Inside their large estates were workshops producing weapons, harness, cloth, etc. Since the harvests were small, the peasants could barely produce a surplus. When they did produce, most of it was taken from them by the feudal lord. Most of the produce obtained from the peasants was consumed by the lord's household and his numerous servants and guests. The rest was put away in barns to be stored. The peasants had so little food and other goods that they could barely eat and had nothing to sell. Everything that the peasants and the feudal lords needed had to be produced within the estate. Neither the lord nor the peasants bought much. Only salt and iron had to be exchanged for food in the places where they were produced. Occasionally, a merchant would drop by, accompanied by servants carrying bundles and chests. He would offer the owner of the manor valuable ornaments, bright silks, and expensive weapons brought from the Far East. To purchase these luxuries, the feudal lords had to sell the surplus; but this was not easy, since all the estates produced much the same things. Consequently, even feudal lords rarely had money to spend. In other words, a Subsistence Economy was an economy in which everything necessary for life was produced on the estate, and the purpose of producing food and goods was not to be sold, but to be consumed.

Of course, over the years, the economy and types of livelihoods have changed and developed. It can be said that the economic developments in the 11th century laid the foundation for this. By the 11th century, there had been a considerable reduction in the forest area in Western Europe. In the dense forests, peasants cut down trees and uprooted the remaining roots to clear land for crops. In many areas, marshes were drained. Previously unused land was now being cultivated. Peasants worked hard on their farms to get better harvests. They now had more iron tools. In addition to the light plough, heavier wheeled ploughs were also used. Peasants ploughed the soil more deeply, then they raked it with iron-tine harrows. The two-field system gave way to the three-field system. Arable land was instead divided into three parts: the first for winter crops, the second for spring crops, and the third for fallow. The

unproductive part of the field was now one-third, not half. To prepare the soil for winter crops, peasants ploughed it two or even three times, and then fertilised it. Market-oriented market gardening, horticulture and viticulture developed rapidly. Agricultural products were now more plentiful and varied: in England, for example, the harvest was four or even five times greater than the seed sown. The increase in arable land and harvest was accompanied by an increase in the amount of feed. The number of horses and cattle on peasant farms increased. Horses were now used not only in the army, but also for carrying loads and for harnessing the plough. This accelerated and facilitated the ploughing of the land. A large amount of metal was needed to make iron tools. Iron ore production increased in Europe, the smelting process improved, and blacksmithing was highly developed. People were no longer happy to wear linen. Woolen fabrics appeared; people said that sheep had conquered linen. Fabrics were woven on large horizontal looms. In short, with the establishment of the feudal system, important changes took place in the economy: Along with craftsmen, both agriculture and animal husbandry were developing rapidly. After all these developments, the expected happened and the craft was separated from agriculture. In the early Middle Ages, peasants produced their own equipment. There was no distinction between crafts and agriculture. But to produce an iron-tipped plough or woolen cloth required special knowledge and skill, as well as special equipment. It became increasingly difficult for peasants to be both farmers and craftsmen at the same time. Among peasants, craftsmen with certain skills and who knew a certain job began to stand out from the rest. As a rule, they came from families where work experience had been accumulated over generations. Village blacksmiths, carpet makers, potters and other craftsmen began to spend less and less time ploughing the land. Crafts became their main occupation. Thanks to better harvests, peasants sometimes had surplus products that they could exchange for goods produced by craftsmen. As a result, economic development gradually led to the separation of crafts from agriculture. Crafts became the full-time work of a large group of the population called craftsmen. As a result of the development of the craftsmen in this short period, many new craftsmen's workshops were opened. New workers were hired for the workshops and this provided new job opportunities and new contributions to the economy. New craftsmen's guilds were opened immediately afterwards and in a short time they gained a big place in the city life. In fact, new competitions arose between the craftsmen in the city and these competitions that would continue for years began. Finally, struggles against the rulers began. During this time, the biggest development after the craftsmen was commercial developments. Commercial relations became increasingly widespread in Europe. Craftsmen produced

ever-increasing quantities of goods. They needed raw materials and bread and other food to make new goods. As agriculture developed, peasants produced more and more surplus. They sold these in the cities and used the money they earned to buy goods made by craftsmen. Feudal lords, attracted by the goods produced by urban craftsmen, also began to take the goods from their estates to the city markets. Cities became the trading centers of their localities. But these commercial relations were not enough for the city dwellers. Cities began to trade with distant lands and even with other countries. In the Middle Ages, trade was a profitable but difficult and dangerous occupation. On land, merchants were robbed by "noble brigands", or knights, and at sea by pirates. Merchants had to pay tolls to cross a lord's lands and use bridges and river crossings. Feudal lords, who wanted to increase their income, built bridges even on dry land and demanded compensation for the dust raised by the merchants' carts. The roads were narrow and bare; in spring and autumn they became impassable because of the mud. Carts often broke down and goods that fell to the ground were considered the property of the landowner. If a ship wrecked and washed up on the shore, the goods it carried were confiscated by the feudal lord who owned the shore. Merchants who wanted to protect themselves from robbers organized themselves into associations called merchant guilds. They hired guards and traveled in large groups. Occasionally merchants also engaged in banditry or piracy.

This development of trade naturally led to the opening of the eastern gates. Since ancient times, Europeans had been in contact with the eastern countries. They traveled to the Mediterranean to reach the ports of Syria and Egypt, where Arab and Persian merchants brought valuable eastern goods. European merchants would buy luxury goods from them and resell them at high profits to the wealthy in their own countries. The most profitable trade was spices; black pepper, cinnamon, and other seasonings for the rather bland European food. Spices were weighed on apothecary scales, sold in small quantities, and worth their weight in gold. There was a reason why very rich people in the Middle Ages were derisively called "bags of pepper." The profitable trade routes to the east were dominated by the Italian city-states of Venice and Genoa. These cities competed and fought with each other, as well as with Byzantium. Fierce conflicts broke out between them repeatedly over the centuries. Venice and Genoa were autonomous city-states, where power was in the hands of wealthy merchants. The wealthy owned fleets, dozens of houses, factories, and shops. Eastern trade helped Mediterranean ports, especially those in Italy, grow and prosper. Of course, these trade relations were not limited to the East. These developments also

benefited Northern Europe, one of the largest trade markets. Another important trade route was along the Baltic and North Seas. Here merchants bought and sold salt, wool, woolen cloth, wax, timber, iron and many other goods necessary for the economy. This trade was carried out by merchants from cities and countries in Northern Europe, from Novgorod in Russia to London in England. The center of the trade was the city of Bruges. In the 14th century, merchants from German cities formed the Hanseatic League, which included 70 cities, in order to be included in the trade carried out in Northern Europe. The center of the league was the German city of Lübeck. Hanseatic merchants tried to exclude their competitors from the trade carried out in the North and Baltic Seas. They had fortified trading areas in Novgorod, Bruges, London and other cities. They made good profits by selling their goods and buying local products. The Hanseatic had a large fleet and often resorted to arms to obtain advantageous trade agreements with neighboring countries. They fought twice with Denmark and forced the Danish king to accept the Hanseatic's special privileges. All these commercial developments gave birth to new areas of trade, the most well-known of which were fairs and money changers. The liveliest trade in Europe took place at the annual fairs, which attracted merchants from different cities and countries. Merchants brought goods in demand to the fairs and sold them wholesale to small traders and artisans. The most important fairs in the 13th century were those held in the Champagne region of northeastern France, which lasted almost all year round. The Champagne fairs sold both luxury goods from the East and Northern European goods. The fairs were always crowded and noisy. The money changers' tables were located between the rows of merchants' stalls. The merchants needed their services greatly, because each country used different weights and types of money. Money was minted not only by kings, but also by the great feudal lords and the big cities. France alone had at least 80 different coins. -Thanks to the Lydians- Money changers would provide merchants with the coins accepted at the fair in exchange for the money the merchants had in their possession, in return for a fixed fee. In time, money changers became very wealthy and began to lend money. The amount borrowed had to be repaid at an agreed time, with a certain amount of interest. Thus, money changers became moneylenders. The interest rate was usually high, and the debtor had to repay twice the amount of the loan. With the development of trade, great fortunes were accumulated in the hands of merchants, money changers, and moneylenders. The division of labor between cities and villages stimulated the development of both agriculture and craftsmen. An urban craftsman who specialized in this craft would achieve a high level of mastery in his work and would improve his working tools and methods. Peasants had more time to cultivate their fields and raise their cattle. They

could buy quality tools and equipment from the cities. Farming methods also improved. In short, the separation of craftsmen from agriculture made people's labor much more productive.

From misery to commercial dominance...

10. BATTLE AND WARFARE TACTICS

a) Field Warfare

First, we can start with the *devastating cavalry charges*, which are one of the most used. The cavalry charge – in which soldiers on horseback gallop straight towards the enemy – is a potent military strategy that's synonymous with the Middle Ages. While these kinds of attacks had long been employed in warfare across the world, developments in saddles and stirrups, and the emerging technique of couching the lance under the arm (thus utilising the momentum of the galloping horse to drive the tip of the lance into the enemy) made the cavalry charge a core tactic of the medieval era. The Templar Knights were particularly famed and feared for their cavalry charges. It earned them the reputation of being the shock troops of the Crusades, with the knights launching formidable cavalry charges in confrontations like the Battle of Montgisard, which was fought between Saladin's forces and the Kingdom of Jerusalem in 1177. As an eyewitness account put it, the Templar charge 'incessantly knocked down, scattered, struck and crushed' Saladin's foot soldiers, so much so that the great Ayyubid leader himself was 'smitten with admiration'. However, soldiers on foot – the infantry – developed weapons that could take on the knights and men-at-arms on horseback. This would become particularly obvious during the Hundred Years' War which spanned the 14th and 15th centuries.

You know what else is as effective as cavalry? Lethal infantry attacks. As warfare evolved in the Middle Ages, infantry troops were able to take on cavalries in several ways. They would often create physical obstacles for the charging horses – for example, at the Battle of Bannockburn in 1314, the Scots dug pits in front of their position to entrap or break up cavalry troops coming their way. At the Battle of Nicopolis in 1396, Ottoman troops set up sharpened stakes that would gash the stomachs of the Crusaders' horses. Of course, this cannot be done unless we support them with sharp and devastating arrows. Archery was also used to deadly effect against cavalries and enemy infantry during the

Middle Ages. The English, for example, became known for their use of the longbow during the Hundred Years' War. Think of the Battle of Agincourt in 1415, when the French troops found themselves rained on by thousands upon thousands of arrows. The English also stuck sharpened stakes in the soil to keep the French cavalry at bay. There is one thing more piercing than swords, and too important to forget. Yes, your voice may be heard too much. Pikes. The pike, a long pole with a lethally pointed end, was another invaluable weapon for medieval infantry troops. During the Wars of Scottish Independence in the 13th and 14th centuries, Scottish forces were known for their use of schiltrons: tight groups of soldiers pointing their pikes outwards at different angles. At the Battle of Falkirk in 1298, William Wallace arranged some of his troops into circular schiltrons, with archers carefully positioned between these giant hedgehogs of pike-wielding men. The tactic did significant damage to the English cavalry, even though Wallace eventually lost the battle. One of the most well-known battle tactics is the flanking tactic. There are also civilizations that call this tactic the Turan tactic. Flank flanking is a basic military maneuver used in almost every conflict. It is one of the most basic applications of military tactics used in close, face-to-face combat between units. The movement consists of ensuring that the enemy forces gather in the center with a simultaneous attack launched from the wings immediately after the opposing side attacks from the center, and continuing the pincer movement, encircling the enemy by moving behind them. During this movement, a second pincer movement applied from the extreme wings also prevents possible support from reaching the surrounded unit. Most infantry combats are generally based on this military tactic and are also widely used in air combat. This maneuver is also roughly mentioned in Sun Tzu's *The Art of War*. However, Sun Tzu argues that leaving an escape route for the enemy is the best method. According to him, an army that is completely surrounded will fight more resiliently due to the fear of being trapped. In this maneuver, which is basically applied, there are different completion styles such as destroying the surrounded enemy force without leaving an escape route if its strength is less or equal, or allowing the rearguard forces to clean up the fleeing enemy if the enemy force is stronger. In addition, while the fighting is continuing on the wings and in the center, it is also achieved by withdrawing the forces in the center in a way that gives the impression of retreat. We can give The Battle of Hastings which took place on 14th October 1066 as an example of a field warfare. The Battle of Hastings fought by the English and the Normans took place on the 14th of October, 1066. The English were led by King Harold and the Normans were led by William the Conqueror. The battle took place just north of Hastings on the south coast of England. Edward the Confessor became King of England in 1042. When he

died on January 4th 1066 he did not have a son or daughter to become the new King or Queen of England. There were three claimants to the throne of England. They were: Harold, the Earl of Wessex, Harald Hardrada, the King of Norway and William, the Duke of Normandy, the Conqueror. Harold, the Earl of Wessex became king after the death of Edward the Confessor and had to go north to deal with an invasion from Harald Hardrada. At about the same time that King Harold was dealing with the invasion in the north, William was preparing for his invasion in Normandy. William first gathered his fleet to ships and army on the banks of the River Dives in northern Normandy. Once all preparations were in place he moved them up the coast to wait for suitable weather conditions to cross the channel. William's fleet landed in the area around Pevensey on the south coast of England on or around September 27th, 1066. The coastline around Pevensey and Hastings has changed dramatically since medieval times due to the silting up of estuaries in the area. The town of Rye used to be on an island before the sea retreated. The Normans found a ruined Roman fort at Pevensey and they used it as an initial base camp. There is evidence in the Bayeux Tapestry that the Normans brought with them wooden prefabricated castles that they could assemble wherever they were needed. They could have built one of these temporary castles within the ruins of Pevensey Castle. From here William moved his troops to Hastings where again the Normans built temporary defences. Hastings at the time was situated on a peninsula with estuaries on two sides. To the north was Telham Hill where William placed lookouts to warn of the English approach. On October 1st, 1066, King Harold heard news of William's arrival and immediately began the long journey south with his army. By October 6th Harold had reached London where his army rested. On October 11th Harold and his army left London to fight William. On the 13th of October Harold had reached Caldbec Hill near the road from Hastings to London. It was from Telham Hill that the English were sighted by the Normans on the 12th or 13th of October.

b) Siege Warfare

The proliferation of castles in the medieval era meant that siege warfare – long, physically gruelling, psychologically exhausting – was a fact of life for warriors of the time. Attackers would often blockade, camp, and otherwise maintain a presence around the target fortress for weeks, months and even years on end. Sieges would also often take place around whole cities – a notable example being the 53-day standoff at Constantinople in 1453, which culminated in the fall of the city and of the Byzantine Empire itself. A degree of diplomacy would often be required, at least during the early phase of a siege. The attackers would generally be keen to negotiate the surrender of the people inside the target, to avoid a drawn-out and costly deadlock. If an agreement was not reached, the attackers would hope to seal off the target to starve the occupants into submission. Or, they could use siege engines to bring a violent end to proceedings. A prominent type was the trebuchet, a huge catapult that threw heavy projectiles using a long arm. When Edward I's English forces laid siege to Stirling Castle in 1304, they assembled a fearsome array of siege engines, including what's thought to be the largest trebuchet ever made. Dubbed the Warwolf, it was frankly terrifying to behold, leading the Scots to send out some men to negotiate a surrender. Edward was so confident in his strategy that he curtly replied, 'You do not deserve any grace, but must surrender to my will'. The Warwolf was then used to tear a hole in the castle's curtain wall, absolutely assuring Edward's victory. As well as trying to attack the target directly, besieging forces might also choose to tunnel underneath the fortifications in an attempt to weaken them, and cause them to collapse. This was known as mining, and an infamous example of this tactic came during King John's siege of Rochester Castle during a period of civil war in 1215. Having mined beneath part of the castle, the king's forces called for the delivery of '40 of the fattest pigs, the sort least good for eating'. The fat from these pigs was then used to burn the support beams of the attackers' tunnels. This caused them to collapse, bringing down part of the

castle with them. Real Medieval Siege techniques appeared only when formal sieges by trained troops began to form a special feature in warfare. Until then, the castle inmates had chiefly to fear surprise, fire, and perhaps treachery. Against a formal siege, the Norman castle could hold its own. The passive strength of the massive keep, whether rectangular or cylindrical, was almost ideal. And with its ramifying passages and puzzling staircases it afforded some protection against treachery within. In 1135 Baldwin Redvers held Exeter Castle for five months against King Stephen. However, the days of King Stephen, whose history is a long story of changing fortunes of the castles, are also the days when the weak points in the existing system of fortification became manifest. In order to take advantage of this weakness, a more methodical approach was needed when conducting the siege. From now on, the Medieval Siege methods will develop into the very art of siege-craft, as it was understood on the continent. When it was introduced into England, the attack was conducted formally and systematically by artillery, engineering and blockade. Under the head of artillery are included (in addition to the Crossbow, by which skilled marksmen picked off the defenders if they ventured to show themselves at the battlements), certain weapons of heavier caliber known as Petraria. Failing assault, there remained the other component of a Medieval Siege, the blockade. Theoretically, the advantage here was with the attackers. Failing relief, starvation must sooner or later end the defense. In practice, however, blockade was very often, perhaps usually, unsuccessful. Castles were, as a rule, provisioned for at least six months, and it was impossible to keep a medieval army in the field for so long. Until standing armies of mercenaries were employed, the system of service stood in the way. And the besieging force melted away long before the pressure of starvation was felt within the walls. Further, blockades were seldom effective. Most contemporary accounts describing a Medieval Siege show how easily communication was maintained between the beleaguered garrison and their friends outside. To prevent this, and to make the defenders physically worn down, the malvoisin was employed. The malvoisin, as the name implies (from French, "ill neighbor"), was a permanent structure, sometimes of stone, but more frequently an earthen mound, placed as near as possible to the castle in such a manner as to command its gate, and to keep up a fire of missiles into its wards. As early as William II, Bamborough Castle was unsuccessfully threatened by one of these "ill neighbors", and some traces remain of that thrown by Stephen at Wallingford during the long siege of its castle. A contemporary description speaks of two hastily erected "castles" which appear to have been mounds with defenses of timber. Now we may look at a Medieval Siege from the defenders perspective. The first and always the chief of the means at their disposal was the passive strength of the

masonry. This was supplemented by artillery similar to that of the besiegers. On one hand, the defenders' artillery had the advantage of being positioned at a higher altitude. On the other hand, was the drawback of lack of space where to use the larger engines. It is rather curious that the roof of the rectangular keep was apparently never used as a platform for heavy weapons, for which purpose such a roof would be perfectly adapted. When, however, the besiegers were able to bring their engines close under the walls, artillery in the earlier castles became useless, and the next resource was to attempt to destroy these engines by dropping heavy stones and combustibles upon them. When this had to be done from the rampart of a straight wall under a heavy fire, it became almost impossible, so that the next development was the provision of shelter by the construction of bretasches or brattices, and hourdes. These were galleries of timber, temporary or permanent, clinging to the summit of the walls, supported by struts or barks of timber, protected by wooden hoarding often covered with hides. In France, these type of construction reached a high state of development, but in England it was never more than a makeshift. This engineering work marked an essential contribution the Medieval Siege had to the development of fortifications, as from the brattice was developed the system known as machicolation. This was a stone modification in which boldly projecting corbels carried a parapet two feet in advance of the wall, leaving openings, machicoulis, between the corbels, through which missiles might be dropped. Against the attack of the ram, bags of wool or sand were let down from above to act as buffers, or the ram itself was caught and held in the cleft of a forked beam, while attempts were made to pick up individuals of the attacking party by means of hooks, occasionally with some success. When Stephen was besieging Ludlow, Prince Henry of Scotland was caught up in this way, and only rescued in mid-air by the great personal strength of the King himself. The Medieval Siege became an increasingly dangerous business, both for the besieged and the besiegers. Starting with the 13th Century the whole system of military architecture was revolutionized, and the increased efficacy of the attack had to overcome a truly scientific form of fortification. Not being a straightforward affair anymore, the outcome of a Medieval Siege will be decided also by other factors, like the ability of the attacker to keep his manpower in the field for a longer period if necessary, and the tactics employees. As you can understand, during the Middle Ages, armies used a variety of siege equipment when laying siege: ladders; battering rams; siege towers and various catapults (mangonel, onager, ballista and trebuchet). Siege techniques also included the use of sewage. The Ottomans were the best at this. Now let's examine them one by one. A *battering ram* is a weapon that is usually carried by several people and used to break down doors, open a gap or

demolish walls by hitting them. In the past, variations of it were also used, which were hung inside wooden shelters resembling huts to protect against enemy fire. The word *ballista* derives from the Greek word "ballistra" meaning "to throw". It was used by Dionysius I (400 BC), the Tyrant of Sicily and the Western Greek Colonies. It was used as a siege machine by the Greeks. When the cities in the region were taken over by the Romans (146 BC), the ballista was developed and used by the Romans. It was used as a kind of primitive missile by placing small fireballs on the spears thrown by the Romans that would burn the place where it fell. It provided military advantages to the Romans with its high range on the battlefield. It was a war tool used in Europe and the Middle East throughout the Middle Ages. In the Middle Ages, it was generally placed on top of a tower, and its firepower was high due to the advantage provided by its height. The catapult is a simple war tool used to throw a projectile far away. It was used as a basic siege tool especially in the Early and Middle Ages. There are different types of *catapults*; such as Trebuchet, Mangonel, Catapult and Ballista. Stone, solid iron, solid lead, burning grass, hot pitch or lava can be placed in its fire. Greek fire was also thrown with a catapult. Greek fire, which does not go out even in water, was also used by the Byzantines in the Conquest of Istanbul. The Byzantines caused great damage to the Ottomans by throwing Greek fire with their catapults. Another version is the mangonel; this weapon consisted of a long arm moving with a shaft from the center. At one end of the arm was a sling used for throwing stones. The other end was attached to the towing ropes. During the throw, several people would pull the ropes quickly and lift the arm and throw the stone at the other end. A *siege tower* is a siege weapon used to protect attackers and their ladders from approaching the walls of a castle. Siege towers are usually four-wheeled, rectangular in shape, and are as high as the castle wall, sometimes even higher so that archers can stand on top of the tower and shoot arrows into the castle. During sieges, siege towers close in on the castle walls, reducing the time it takes for attackers to breach the castle's defenses. In addition, one of the tactics for the attacking side during a siege is *sewage*. In its simplest sense, sapping is a technique used in sieges to bypass any type of fortification (trenchments, castle walls or ramparts). In this technique, sappers reach the fortification by digging tunnels that lead to it and in most cases attempt to breach it using explosives. Sometimes these tunnels are used to transfer troops of varying sizes to the front or back of the fortification. Techniques for the defending side vary. Apart from the fighting infantry and knights, digging a moat around the castle and pouring liquids such as boiling water and hot oil over the walls are just a few of the tactics used by the defending side during a siege.

Of course, you should not forget that the best strategy is always your own.

c) Military Units

The troops raised by commanders in this period consisted of infantry, missilemen (archers and crossbowmen) and the mounted, armoured warriors known to history as 'knights'. The image of the knight has in many ways come symbolically to represent the Middle Ages as a whole. Now let's examine all these units in item form:

- **Infantries**

They are minor knights who are usually on the front lines in battle. They usually have a sword and armor. The Medieval infantry armor was somehow intended to mimic that of the Medieval knights. But how complete was the actual infantry man armor depended exclusively upon the means of the soldiers. They could wear what they could afford. The Bayeux tapestry is showing that in Duke William's army only the nobles had their legs protected by chain mail armor. The common soldiers wore linen or leather swathings, sometimes studded with metal. It is known that in 1181, Henry II raised a permanent infantry force. Every member, the burgess or the freeman, was compelled to wear an armor composed of an iron helmet, and either a chain mail hauberk, or if he could not afford it, at least a gambeson. During the times of Richard I, the infantry armor consisted of a helmet, coat of mail, and quilted defenses made of many folds of linen which were hard to penetrate. The infantry man also had a shield, usually held in the left hand. The foot soldiers generally used the round shield. For quite a long time during the Middle Ages, the infantry and light troops were left to arm themselves as best as they could, depending on their financial means. As most of the time these were scarce, any opportunity to improve an infantry man armor for cheap was welcome. The main source of supplying the armor for the Medieval infantry were the changes in warfare fashion. Every time new models of Medieval armor appeared, the knights were the first to adopt them. The old equipment was quickly considered obsolete, and it was relegated to be used as infantry armor.

As a result, the Medieval foot soldiers were generally equipped with various hauberks of mail, old brigandines and gambesons, bits of plate, or "jakkes" of linen.

- Archers

Employing one of the most efficient weapons of the Middle Ages, the Medieval Archers were for centuries that corps of an army capable to decide the outcome of the battle. The right deployment in the field, combined with the rapid "fire" capability could ensure the victory even when their army was in numeric inferiority. Crécy, Poitiers, and Agincourt (Azincourt) are classical examples. The role the Medieval Archers could play in battle was quickly understood, and as early as the years following the Norman Conquest, the practice of archery was much encouraged and the Medieval Archers were granted special privileges. Among the enactments of Henry I of England, it was provided that if anyone practicing with arrows or with darts should by accident slay another, it was not to be visited against him as a crime. From 1066 until the end of the 12th Century, the longbow was of the most simple construction. It appears frequently in the Bayeux tapestry. The arrows were usually barbed. Among the Medieval Archers, the English archer is the most prominent character. In the 14th Century, he was equally efficient in siege and in the field. The defender of town or castle could not peep beyond the parapet, but an English arrow could nail his cap to his head. In the field, provided the archers were, by marsh, wood, or mountain, secured from a flank attack, they would bid defiance to any number of mounted men-at-arms. The foot-archers were in far greater proportion than the mounted ones. The bows were of two kinds: painted and plain (white). Archers were generally units in the rear of the battlefield, defeating the enemy from a distance with their good vision. These archers would usually have a bow, a quiver to carry their arrows, and armor. The foot archers at Agincourt were left to pick up any kind of helmet, bascinet, or cap, whether of leather or iron, and any side arms, simply because they were mostly without armor, except a simple pourpointerie (fabric studded with metal). For them to go to war, only the bows, arrows, and stakes were mandatory. As victors, it was the time to equip themselves to a higher standard .

- Crossbowmen

It is a more advanced weaponized version of archers. Their armor and quivers are the same, but they use crossbows instead of bows. Again, it is a soldier unit generally located in the rear lines. There was a clear difference between the Continent and England as far as the Medieval Archers are concerned. While the longbow was preferred in England, the crossbow-man was

an essential component of a Continental army during all this period. The crossbow-men were either mounted or on foot. One of the popular type of crossbow arrows was the four-sided or pyramidal head. On the continent, the missile weapon employed to oppose the English longbow was still the arbalest (crossbow). The troops who used it were chiefly Genoese and Spanish infantry mercenaries. Mounted crossbow-men were also engaged, but in much smaller numbers. How inefficient the crossbow was when opposed to the English archery appears in every page of the histories of the 14th Century. The element of success was simply the more rapid “fire” of the English archers using the longbow. Although the 15th Century saw the first hand-gunners, the Medieval Archers were still in favor. The crossbow-men continue to have an important place in the Continental armies of the day. There were also important changes in organizing the Medieval Archers. Learning from the lessons of Crécy and Agincourt, Charles VII of France instituted the French-Archers, equipped partly with the longbow and partly with the crossbow.

- Knights

They are military units that are at the forefront, wearing heavy armor, armed with sharp and blood-stained swords, and equipped with large protective shields, and sometimes mounted and sometimes unmounted. It is also known as the most important and iconic military unit. The history of the Knights in Middle Ages is not simply the history of individuals who held political and social power, but is an important part of the general Medieval history. So far as the chivalry upheld religion, honor, and courtesy, it elevated society. Until a greater degree of centralized power was achieved, the feudal lord and his military power shaped the history. The influential role the knights held during the Middle Ages was not achieved by chance, but by education, faith, and by strictly following the rules of chivalry. Education played an important role in the formation of the knights. In Middle Ages it began at an early age. It appears from authorities of the 14th Century that boys of noble birth were commonly left under the charge of their mothers till the age of seven. After that age it was the custom to send them to the care of some nobleman or churchman to receive knightly breeding among the squires and pages who served him, thus rendering what is called “personal service”. Personal service was the custom of chivalry, and lay at the foundation of all medieval institutions. It was no derogation to the dignity of a Prince Elector to bear the cup or wait at the stirrup of the Emperor; the Emperor himself held the bridle of the Pope’s horse. The household of a feudal seigneur and the religious houses were organized in the same

manner as the court of a sovereign prince. Hence, the Abbot or the Prior was served by the knights and gentlemen who held lands of him by feudal tenure, or were maintained in his service as mercenaries. The Abbot of Saint Denis never moved from his Abbey without a Chamberlain and a Marshal, whose offices were held as fiefs, and could be transferred and transmitted like any other property. Personal service was also symbolical of the obligation to serve in war, which was the main occupation of the knights.

In Middle Ages it was also the principal characteristic of feudal land tenure: the vassal was bound to serve his lord in the field, he might also be called upon to serve at home. In return for domestic service, the lord gave his dependant board and lodging and the advantage of sharing in his opportunities of military distinction and royal and princely favor. The attendants of the lord were entitled to their share of the lord's plunder in public or private war. During his apprenticeship service with the nobleman or churchman, the future knight was known as a page or henchman, and was under the orders of a squire called the Master of the henchmen. The apprenticeship lasted seven years, during which time he was learning the business of a squire in the stable, the armory, the kennels and the hall. At the age of 14, the boy was old enough to be entitled squire. Bishops and abbots were served by noble youths sent to them by their parents. In England, one of Cardinal Morton's pages was Sir Thomas Moore. In France, the chevalier Bayard was page to his uncle the Bishop of Grenoble, and served as his cupbearer when he dined with the Duke of Savoy. Besides the schools attached to cathedrals, religious houses and the palaces of bishops and abbots, literature was not neglected by the lords who received boys into their houses. To read and write, to play the harp and sing were part of a knight's accomplishment. The ladies of the castle also taught them letters, the games of chess and tables, the rules of good manners, and the rudiments of gallantry. However, the principal part of the education was carried out outdoors. All kinds of exercises and games were practiced, such as wrestling, boxing, running, riding, tilting at the ring and the quintain (an object mounted on a post or attached to a movable crossbar mounted on a post, used as a target in the medieval sport of tilting). Once a knight, the young noble's main duty was the military service. And the best way to acquire the highest level of combat skills was competing in tournaments, the favorite pastime of the knights. In Middle Ages, the tournament bore a principal part in the lives of all knights, and the laws of the tournament were inseparable from the love of ladies. Together with religion, these were the main rules of service for every knight. Among the gentler features of chivalry may be reckoned the beautiful institution of brotherhood in arms, by which two knights vowed faith to each other.

The brothers in arms wore the same arms and clothes, mingled their blood in one vessel, and received the Sacrament together. They engaged to support each other in battle and in all quarrels, and to have the same friends and enemies. The brotherhood in arms was one of the most powerful institutions in the life of knights. In Middle Ages, it over-rode all duties, even to ladies, except the duties owed to the King. When Henry Bolingbroke Duke of Hereford deposed Richard II, Louis Duke of Orleans annulled the treaty of brotherhood which he made with Bolingbroke some years before, and challenged him to combat at any place in France with 100 knights and squires on either side. Du Guesclin was brother in arms of Olivier de Clisson. They agreed to support each other against all the world, except the King of Rome and his brothers, the Viscount of Rohan and their several liege lords, they will share all ransoms of prisoners and lands, will acquaint each other of any mischief intended, and will guard each other as brothers.

We are familiar enough with the military units. Now it's time for their equipment...

- Swords

The Medieval Swords were the knights' weapons par excellence. During the history of mankind, no other weapon carried so many symbols as the sword, and, in this context, the Medieval swords are a special case. The swords are indissolubly related to the most solemn ceremony of Chivalry, the Consecration of the Knight. The two essential parts of the Medieval swords are the blade and the hilt. The prolongation of the blade which fits into the handle is the tang; the upper portion near the hilt is the ricasso. The essential portions of the hilt are the quillons, which cross at right angles between the blade and the handle to protect the hand; the grip, which is self-explanatory, and the pommel, the expanded piece at the end of the grip.

- Armors

The Medieval armor is starting to show a more rapid evolution only towards the end of the first millenium. Under the reign of Charlemagne, the protection of warrior's body was still a mixture of Roman and Northern elements.

Firstly Medieval Norman Armor, In the early Norman times, the Medieval armor was mainly the chain mail armor, quilted-work, jazerant, scale, and a small proportion of plate used as an additional protection to the breast. The scale was a type of armor made of small metallic

scales overlapping, and fastened upon leather or cloth, while the jazerant was a body defense made of small plates of metal sewn upon linen. The materials were iron, leather, and horn, with wool, tow, or cotton for quilting defenses. The Bayeux Tapestry is one of the most valuable sources in establishing what was the standard Medieval armor of the period. The components of the body armor worn by the knight were the tunic, the gambeson and the hauberk. The gambeson was a defensive garment made of stuffed and quilted cloth. The surcoat, though found in some rare instances at the close of the 12th century, does not become a characteristic part of the knight armor till the 13th century. The hauberk was the chief part of the Medieval suit of armor of the period. It reached to the knees. The skirt sometimes opened in front, sometimes at the sides. The sleeves usually terminated at the elbow, but occasionally extended to the wrist. The hauberk could reach as high as the neck only, but more generally it was continued so as to form a coif, leaving only the face of the knight exposed. The above picture depicts a hauberk with lateral openings. It is remarkable also for the way the sword is carried partially beneath the hauberk. The defense is continued over the head as a coif. This feature of the suit of armor of the period is also known as the "continuous coif" and is surmounted by the usual conical nasal helmet. At the beginning of the 13th century, the hauberk of chain mail was made with continuous coif and gloves. The coif was flattened at the top of the head, and the gloves were not divided into fingers. The hauberk descended nearly to the knees. To protect the face of the knight on the battlefield, the opening left little more than the eyes and nose in view. In the same period, some armor models had the hood of mail made separately from the hauberk. In the second half of the century, the round topped coif became more usual. The sleeve of the hauberk was sometimes secured at the wrist by a lace or strap. In order to liberate the hands occasionally from their fingerless gloves, an aperture was left in the centre of the palm.

Secondly, Transitional Armor, The medieval knights soon became dissatisfied with their old panoply of chain mail armor, and searched for substitutes. In the end they opted for a combination of the newer elements of plate with the old chain mail. As a result, in the 14th century the knights' armor offers the most brilliant and striking combinations encountered during the Middle Ages. The armor, a mixture of chain mail, glittering plate, embossed leather, and rich heralding decorations, was an ample field for the display of color, and variety of form. The Medieval suit of armor had as the main part the breast plate, continued under the waist with chain-mail, or metal strips covered with cloth or velvet. It is the time when the surcoat changed considerably. The long, old-fashioned surcoat proved to be a

serious impediment on the battlefield, when the knights descended from their horses to fight on foot. To alleviate the problem, the garment underwent a clipping in front, still in this case the evil was but half remedied. As the full skirt was a necessity of long dress, now it had no purpose and could be abandoned, the result being the short, tight surcoat. In the early years of this period, the legs armor consisted of the chain-mail chausses. As an occasional occurrence, we find them until the middle of the century. The legs defense, like the arms defense, made a steady progress to the complete equipment of plate. Generally, the Medieval horse armor, named also "barding" followed the same patterns as its human counterpart. In the second half of the 14th century, a new fashion emerged, the so-called camail armor. The camail was attached to the helmet and did not join the hauberk as before.

And lastly, Plate Armor, During the 15th Century, the Medieval armor was entirely made of plate. It had shoulder and elbow guards, and gauntlets formed of broad overlapping plates. The breast plate of the Medieval armor evolved from one piece to the two parts construction, lower overlapping the upper, and contrived, by means of straps or sliding rivet, to offer more flexibility. Due to the metal friction, the knight could not wear ordinary clothes under the armor, no matter how skilled the armourer was. A very strong fabric was required. This material is mentioned in contemporary records as "Fustian". It is hard to say if it resembled the more modern fabric with the same name, but we can approximate and say that a material as either the "Fustian" or the corduroy will conveniently prevent the friction of the Medieval armor metal.

- Helmets

We have 5 different types of helmets. These are divided into norman helmet, cylindrical helmet, classic helmet, bascinet and 15th century helmets.

Firstly, Norman Helmet, From the Norman Conquest to the end of the 12th century, the Medieval Helmets were mainly of the type known as the "nasal helmet", a casque with an extension protecting the nose, hence the name. It was also known as the "Casque Normand", and it was surmounting the continuous coif. The characteristic Norman Helmet is conical, usually made of four triangular pieces of metal plate riveted in a ring and meeting at the apex. The nasal was broad enough to conceal the face to such an extent that sometimes the knight had to take his helmet off in order to be recognized. As a main piece of defense, the continuous coif, named this way because it was continuing the hauberk, is seen constantly in

the Bayeux tapestry. It is shown also in many seals of the 12th century, and in vellum paintings of this time. The hood of mail will eventually be separated from the hauberk in the 13th century. The helmets without nasals were chiefly conical, round and flat-topped.

Secondly, Cylindrical Helmet, Among the most characteristic helmets of the Middle Ages was the cylindrical or flat-topped helmet, which came into fashion towards the end of the 12th century. In the 13th century it became very common. In its earliest examples, the casque was of one piece, having two horizontal clefts for vision, and being strengthened by bands crossing each other over the face and on the top. The term cylindrical must not always be understood literally. In some cases, the cylinder swells, taking the barrel form. The helmet had a grated-ventail by which a better supply of air could always be obtained. A still more abundant provision occasionally was acquired by opening the ventaglia, constructed with hinges at the sides. At the beginning of the 13th century, the continuous coif is still part of the hauberk of chain-mail. The shape was flattened at the top of the head. In the second half of the century, the round topped coif was more usual.

Thirdly, classification and classification of helmets, An important change in Medieval armor construction is marked by the development of the great Medieval helm, the casque enclosing the whole head of the knight. The great casque came into use towards the end of the 12th century. From now on, the Middle Ages helmets can be classified in two categories: helms and helmets. The term helm will be used to designate the new type of headpiece, while the helmet will designate a piece of diminished completeness, the non-closed casque. There were two leading kinds of this head armor: the helm was either one piece, or the front was provided with a moveable ventail. The flat-topped helm with movable ventail appears about the middle of the century. The successive changes of fashion supply a further division of the helms: the flat topped, the round topped, and the sugar-leaf form. Around 1270, the round-topped helm came into vogue. The helm was worn over the coif of chain-mail. The helmets may be classed as the hemispherical, the cylindrical, the conical, and the nasal. The bascinet was in use at this time, but do not appear to have been anything more than the round-topped skull-cap. In the 14th century, the head protection may be considered under the same two classes of helms and helmets. Helms provided freedom of breathing by means of perforations in the lower part. Some had holes made on the right side, in order that the lance of the antagonist, who, if in a tilt passed on that side, might glide off freely. Helms were made

mainly of iron or steel, and were occasionally gilded. For war, the great helm was placed over the bascinet.

And the most fashionable one, Bascinet, The Middle Ages helmets became more sophisticated, and the movable visor was introduced. The helmets of the 14th century are composed chiefly of a mixture of iron plate and chain mail. Among them, the visored bascinet with camail was much in vogue. It was made of three parts: the skull-piece, the visor, and the camail. The visor, which turned on side pivots, could be removed, so it allows the helm to be added to the knight defenses by placing it over the bascinet. However, this was not a rule, as the visored bascinet itself was sometimes used for war, instead of the helm. It is in this century that the beaked bascinet was also introduced. The bascinet did not necessarily exhibit the plain surface of steel, and was often covered with leather. The rich knights and Kings could wear helmets with decorations ranging from velvet to gold and precious stones.

And lastly, the 15th century helmets, The Medieval helmets of this period exhibit crests of every variety of fanciful design. Though a particular crest was no doubt generally worn by each knight, it was not unusual for a champion to appear with the crest of some remote ancestor. Sometimes, no more than a plume of feathers was worn in lieu of any definite cognizance. The beaked bascinet was widely used, as illustrated in the illuminations of the beginning of the century, and the Medieval helmets were further diversified with the introduction of the bascinet with globose (rounded) visor.

- Shields

When it comes to shields, we have 3 types of shields and their designs. As civilizations in the Middle Ages cared about the aesthetics of everything, they did not ignore shields, of course. In England, the Medieval shields construction was heavily influenced by the Norman conquest.

Firstly, Kite Shield, the so-called kite shield had mainly a flat design, as depicted in the Bayeux tapestry. The soldiers are shown using their shields as trays on which to set the cups and dishes. Sometimes, the shield was bowed, and might also have a projecting spike, as in the Great Seal of King Stephen. Generally, this was the favorite form until the end of the 12th century.

Secondly, Triangular Shields, The design of the Medieval shields will be diversified about the middle of the 12th Century, when the triangular shield was introduced. The new form was obtained by reducing the arched top of the kite to an almost straight line. This variety of Medieval shields was also bowed or flat. And, though the earliest examples were as tall as the kite shields, the triangular design soon adopted a much reduced height. The kite and triangular shields were provided with straps for attachment to the arm and for suspension round the neck. Once we enter the 13th Century, the majority of the designs in use were based on the triangular Medieval shield. Notably, the dimensions of the triangular shield of this period are decreasing as the century advanced. The triangular design could be of two shapes: bowed or flat. The round shield is of more rare appearance. It appears that it was more frequently by the foot troops. Other formats of the period were using slightly modified old designs like the kite shaped, or more advanced ones: the heart-shaped, the round, and the quadrangular. The boss is still retained in some of the shields models. The materials used for shields' construction were wood, leather, and paint for identification.

And lastly, we are going to mention about Medieval Shields Ornamentation, The 14th Century is the period of the most sophisticated examples of shields, offering diversity of form, material and ornament. The principal designs of the period are the triangular, the kite shaped, heart-shaped, the circular, and the notched. The triangular shield can be flat or bowed. The usual materials were wood, steel, and leather, the latter frequently embossed, and exhibiting the heralding bearings of the knight. The previously popular kite shield and the heart-shaped shields are of rare occurrence. The curved shield appears in the second half of the century, sometimes notched, sometimes plain. The round Medieval shield was designed to be born on the arm, or to be held at arm's length. The enarmes, or straps by which the shield was attached to the arm, were placed either horizontally or vertically. The shield was suspended round the neck by a strap. The surface of the shield is variously embellished, usually displaying the coat-of-arms of the knight's house. The new "quartered" shields appeared, and, in England, the first instance might be considered that of the third great seal of Edward III. The armorial shield was occasionally enriched by diapering or filigree-work. The little shield fixed on the lance shaft to protect the hand first appears during this period. In the 15th Century, the triangular shield, richly decorated with the knight's coat-of-arms, is a familiar presence. The round shields of this period are of two kinds: the buckler, borne in the hand, and the larger one, born on the arm. A novelty among the Medieval shields designs is represented by the three-planes shield, mainly a piece of the equipment of the foot troops.

The three-planes shield borne by the man-at-arms in the centre of the "mêlée" illustrated on the right is characteristic of this period.

- Bardings (Horse Armors)

Barding, or the horse armor, must be mentioned in any history of the knights' armor, given the huge importance the war horse had in a knight's life. Whether equipped with the chain mail armor, or completely clad in plate, the knight was entirely dependent on his horse, both in real warfare and in tournaments. The war horse, named Destrier, had to be protected as much as possible, the same as his master. The Bayeux tapestry does not mention any armor being used for the Normans' horses. In his chronicle "Roman de Rou", Wace is mentioning Duke William's horse as being defended by armor, "covert de fer." However, he wrote in the second half of the 12th century, and, as with all Medieval chroniclers, he portrayed his characters in the dress of his time. Chain mail armor for horses was known as early as the Roman times, as shown on the Column of Trajan, but in the Middle Ages it does not seem to have been in common use before the 13th century. Barding developed along similar lines with the knights armor. Paintings executed about the year 1237 are showing a quite inconvenient trapper of chain mail. It is doubtful that that particular model was in general use, as the horse could barely walk, let alone to trot or to gallop. A much lighter textile trapper was used more for display and ornament, however these garments were designed for the same purpose as the knight's surcoat: to protect the armour from wet. When their owner died, the rich trappings were donated to churches, where they were used as altar hangings. The relation worked both ways, meaning that if, for some reason, the trappings were required, the churches were asked to provide them. As the man was in some cases defended by quilted garments, so the horse could wear a quilted trapper. Matthew Paris, when describing the Battle of Nova Croce in 1237, writes that Milan raised an army which was using iron-clad horses. And an ordinance of Philip the Fair, dated 1303, required that owners of certain estates should provide at least a man-at-arms mounted on a horse wearing armor or quilted defences. The caparisons first appeared on Royal seals under Edward I. There are also mentions of a rigid horse armor in the Windsor Roll. We learn that the head piece was made probably of cuirbouilli, as suggested also by the image presented here. The breast plate could be of cuirbouilli as well. The back of the horse was protected by the crupper, made of several pieces riveted or hinged together. The root of the tail was protected by a tubular plate called

the gardequeue. To prevent chafing, the plates were lined with leather or wadded with cotton. In the 15th century, the horse was protected with plate armor, the same as the knight. Barding was very close to the human armor even in decorations, delicate lines being embossed in the metal surface in the same way that the knight's armor was treated.

11. FURTHER NOTES

It is finally over. Isn't it? It's a little longer than usual, it won't be hard for you to notice. Let's say my hand slipped. And let's think optimistically. At least you won't need another document. You don't need to do research from any other source for the committee. All of these will be more than enough for you in the committee. Of course, as a priority, we expect you to read the guide very carefully and internalize it, get into the role and this mood. If this happens, we are sure that the rest will come as easily as pulling a hair out of butter.

And most importantly, you have to take it seriously. Yes, of course we will have fun, such places will come, but your discipline and being ready to do the rank given to you as it deserves is the most essential part for us. Your priority should be to find solutions to the given updates and act accordingly. Well, it wouldn't be bad if you acted a little more according to your own mind and did your own thing, of course... At the same time, taking the actions required by the age is also one of your responsibilities. Because your country, your nation and the swords of your army are completely up to you. It is your decision with

whose blood they will be stained. You have to make these decisions wisely. Be worthy of your crown.

Also, cosplay or something similar will contribute to your mood and role. It will be allowed to bring or wear any clothes, accessories, swords, etc. related to the Middle Ages to the committee. You can bring and wear them with peace of mind without worrying about the dress code. Of course, without misusing this permission inappropriately and exaggerating too much... Swords in the air!

12. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agibalova, Y. and Donskoy, G. (2017) *Ortaçağ Tarihi*. Trans. Sümer, Ç. İstanbul: Yordam Kitabevi.

Apostolic Canons (c. 380) *Apostolic Canons*.

Bible (n.d.) *Holy Bible: New International Version*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Black, J. (2020) *İngiltere Tarihi*. Trans. Yıldız, A. Ankara: Doğubati.

Council of Antioch (341) *Canons of the Council of Antioch*.

Council of Carthage (397) *Canons of the Council of Carthage*.

Eusebius (c. 325) *Ecclesiastical History*, Book 2.

Ignatius of Antioch (c. 110) *Epistle to the Smyrnaeans*.

John of Thessalonica (c. 700) *Dormition Homily*.

Maalouf, A. (2006) *Arapların Gözünden Haçlı Seferleri*. Trans. Berktaş, A. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Optatus (c. 370) *Against the Donatists*, Book 1.

Vincent of Lérins (434) *Commonitorium*.