

4 Vassalage

In societies in which the state's role in regulating human relationships is minimal, law and order are maintained through custom and contract. This condition prevailed in the Early Middle Ages, particularly among the Germanic peoples. Laws were based on the community's assumptions about what was right and wrong, enforced by public opinion and community-approved use of force. To enforce law and to protect oneself and one's family, a person formed contractual ties with others and sought security and justice in mutual aid. A principal form of such a contract was called vassalage. By its terms, two free men of different means bound themselves to assistance and loyal support. The socially and economically superior man was called the lord; the man of inferior social status was called the vassal. The vassal pledged to be loyal and fight on behalf of his lord when called upon, in return for the lord's loyalty and protection when they were needed. The contract was lifelong and had deep emotional meaning in addition to the obvious self-interest of both parties.

Vassalage was a dynamic relationship, ever changing in content and meaning according to time, place, and circumstances. In the Carolingian Empire, vassalage was practiced by all members of the free class wealthy enough to afford weapons. Charlemagne and his successors tried to use vassalage as a means of controlling their warlike subjects and organizing them to serve more effectively for the defense of their realms. Eventually, the kings' vassals used their military skills, their own landed wealth, and political power to diminish royal power. The royal vassals then became the true center of authority within medieval society.

An important part of the lord-vassal relationship was the lord's grant of a fief to his vassal. The fief might be any object of value that reflected the vassal's social status and the lord's respect for his services. A fief could be a war horse, sword, and suit of armor, a public office, a right to collect a tax or toll or authority to hold a court of justice in a specified district. The most sought-after fief was a land grant—one or more manors from which to draw income. Fiefs were held for the duration of the bond of vassalage. If the bond was broken by death or disloyalty, the fief was forfeited to its grantor. By the late ninth century, however, fiefs had become hereditary, as had the right to be a vassal to a specific lord.

Galbert of Bruges COMMENDATION AND THE OATH OF FEALTY

This reading contains an eyewitness account of the ceremony of commendation or investiture in which vassals swore an oath of fealty (loyalty) to their new

lord, William Clito, the count of Flanders, in 1127, and were then invested with their fiefs. The account comes from an early twelfth-century chronicle written by a Flemish notary, Galbert of Bruges (a major medieval commercial city in Flanders, now part of Belgium).

Through the whole remaining part of the day those who had been previously enfeoffed [given fiefs] by the most pious count Charles,¹ did homage to the count, taking up now again their fiefs and offices and whatever they had before rightfully and legitimately obtained. On Thursday the seventh of April, homages were again made to the count being completed in the following order of faith and security.

First they did their homage thus. The count asked if he was willing to become completely

his man, and the other replied, "I am willing;" and with clasped hands, surrounded by the hands of the count, they were bound together by a kiss. Secondly, he who had done homage gave his fealty to the representative of the count in these words, "I promise on my faith that I will in future be faithful to count William, and will observe my homage to him completely against all persons in good faith and without deceit," and thirdly, he took his oath to this upon the relics of the saints. Afterward, with a little rod which the count held in his hand, he gave investitures to all who by this agreement had given their security and homage and accompanying oath.

¹Charles, count of Flanders, was murdered on March 2, 1127.

Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres

OBLIGATIONS OF LORDS AND VASSALS

In a letter written in 1020 to William, Duke of Aquitaine, Bishop Fulbert (c. 920–1028) of Chartres summarizes the obligations of the lord and the vassal.

To William most glorious duke of the Aquitanians,¹ bishop Fulbert [asks] the favor of his prayers.

Asked to write something concerning the form of fealty, I have noted briefly for you on the authority of the books the things which follow. He who swears fealty to his lord ought always to have these six things in memory; what is harmless, safe, honorable, useful, easy, practicable. Harmless, that is to say that he should not be injurious to his lord in his body; safe, that he should not be injurious to him in

his secrets or in the defences through which he is able to be secure; honorable, that he should not be injurious to him in his justice or in other matters that pertain to his honor; useful, that he should not be injurious to him in his possessions; easy or practicable, that that good which his lord is able to do easily, he make not difficult, nor that which is practicable he make impossible to him.

However, that the faithful vassal should avoid these injuries is proper, but not for this does he deserve his holding; for it is not sufficient to abstain from evil, unless what is good is done also. It remains, therefore, that in the same six things mentioned above he should faithfully

¹The Aquitanians inhabited the kingdom of Aquitaine in southwestern France—later a province of France.

counsel and aid his lord, if he wishes to be looked upon as worthy of his benefice and to be safe concerning the fealty which he has sworn.

The lord also ought to act toward his faithful vassal reciprocally in all these things. And

if he does not do this he will be justly considered guilty of bad faith, just as the former, if he should be detected in the avoidance of or the doing of or the consenting to them, would be perfidious and perjured.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. In the Middle Ages, contracts were symbolized and publicly noted by the use of various ritual acts or gestures. Explain how the contract of vassalage was signified by specific rituals or actions.
2. What were some of the ethical and emotive dimensions of vassalage?
3. Describe the mutual obligations of lords and vassals.

5 ❖ The Feudal Lord as Warrior

Feudal lords did not engage in productive labor as did serfs, merchants, and craftsmen. Manual labor and commerce were considered degrading for men of their rank and skills. Lords were professional warriors; combat was what they relished, trained for, and eagerly sought. They used their wealth to obtain armor and weapons, and even their sports, hunting and tournaments, prepared them for battle.

Bertran de Born IN PRAISE OF COMBAT

The spirit of the feudal warrior is captured in the following poem by Bertran de Born (c. 1140–c. 1215), a French nobleman from the bishopric of Périgord in southern France. He is acknowledged to have been a superior poet of his day, a good warrior, and a clever intriguer who stirred up troubles between the kings of France and England. His poetry captures the excitement and pageantry of medieval warfare.

I love the springtide of the year
When leaves and blossoms do abound,
And well it pleases me to hear
The birds that make the woods resound
With their exulting voices.
And very well it pleases me
Tents and pavilions pitched to see,
And oh, my heart rejoices

To see armed knights in panoply [full armor]
Of war on meadow and on lea [pasture].

I like to see men put to flight
By scouts throughout the countryside,
I like to see, armed for the fight,
A host of men together ride;
And my delight's unbounded

When castles strong I see assailed,
 And outworks smashed, whose strength has
 failed,
 And near the walls, surrounded
 By moats, and by strong stakes enrailed,
 The host that has the ramparts scaled.

And well I like a noble lord
 When boldly the attack he leads,
 For he, whene'er he wields his sword,
 Inspires his men by his brave deeds,
 Their hearts with courage filling.
 When tide of battle's at the flood,
 Each soldier then, in fighting mood,
 To follow should be willing,
 For no man is accounted good
 Till blows he's given and withstood.

Axes and swords and spears and darts,
 Shields battered in with many a blow,
 We'll see when first the battle starts,
 And clash of arms as foe meets foe;

The steeds of dead and dying
 Wildly will rush throughout the field,
 And all who wish to be revealed
 As brave will e'er be trying
 How best their axes they may wield,
 For they would rather die than yield.

Not so much joy in sleep have I,
 Eating and drinking please me less
 Than hearing on all sides the cry
 "At them!" and horses riderless
 Among the woodlands neighing.
 And well I like to hear the call
 Of "Help!" and see the wounded fall,
 Loudly for mercy praying,
 And see the dead, both great and small,
 Pierced by sharp spearheads one and all.

Barons, without delaying,
 Pawn every city, castle, hall,
 And never cease to fight and brawl.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What personal qualities were expected from a medieval leader in combat?
2. What challenge did the Germanic warrior spirit present to the leaders of the Christian Church?

6 The Burdens of Serfdom

The feudal lord's way of life was made possible by the toil of the serfs who worked on the manors. Serfs, who were not free persons, had some rights but many burdensome obligations. Unlike slaves, they could not be sold off the land or dispossessed from their landholdings. Their tenure on their farms was hereditary, but they owed heavy rent to the landlord in the form of labor and a share of their crops and livestock. There were many restrictions on their personal freedom: they needed the landlord's permission to leave the estate, to marry, or to pass on personal property to their heirs. In return, they received security; they were defended by the landlords against outside aggressors or fellow serfs.

The labor services usually took up half the work week of the serf. He was required to plant, plow, and harvest the lord's fields, repair roads, fix fences, clear ditches, and cart goods to barns and markets. Although specific obliga-

tions varied from time to time and manor to manor, they were sufficiently onerous to encourage the serfs to seek freedom; in later centuries, when the opportunity presented itself, a serf might flee to a nearby town or to newly developed lands, or might purchase certain freedoms from the manorial lord. The serfs' struggle to rid themselves of the burdens of serfdom took centuries. It was largely successful in western Europe by the fifteenth century. But in eastern Europe, serfdom was imposed on the formerly free peasantry in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Remnants of serfdom in western Europe survived until the French Revolution. Serfdom was abolished in central and eastern Europe in the mid-nineteenth century.

THE CUSTOMS OF THE MANOR OF DARNHALL

The first reading from the customs of the manor of Darnhall (variously spelled in the original manuscripts) in Cheshire, a rural county in northwestern England, details the general burdens of serfs. The manor of Darnhall belonged to an order of monks. In the year 1326, the abbot of the monastery drew up this custumal, a document reaffirming his rights over the serfs.

Here begin the customs of the bond-tenants¹ of the manor of Darnale [Darnhall].

One is that they ought to [appear in] court at the will of the lord, or of his bailiff,² upon being summoned only, even during the night, and they ought all to come the next day.

And whereas some of them have been accustomed to give part of their land to their sons, so that it came about that after their death their sons have by the carelessness of the bailiffs of the place been received as holding those same lands without doing to the lord anything for their seisin³ in their father's time; those sons who hold land ought to do suit of court [to sue], or obtain the lord's grace to redeem the suit at the will of the lord, on account of the great loss which has by this means been suffered by the lord.

Also they all [must use] the mill under pain of forfeiture of their grain, if they at any time withdraw suit; and every year they owe pannage⁴ for their pigs.

Also they ought to make redemption of their daughters, if they wish to marry out of the manor, at the will of the lord.

They will also give *leyrwithe*⁵ for their daughters, if they fall into carnal sin.

Also, when any one of them dieth, the lord shall have all the pigs of the deceased, all his goats, all his mares at grass, and his horse also, if he had one for his personal use, all his bees, all his bacon-pigs, all his cloth of wool and flax, and whatsoever can be found of gold and silver. The lord also shall have all his brass pots or pot, if he have one (but who of these bond-tenants will have a brass pot for cooking his food in?), because at their death the lord ought to have all things of metal. . . .

¹*Bond-tenants* was another name for serfs; they were also known as bondmen.

²The bailiff was an agent appointed by the landlord (that is, the lord of the manor) to manage the manor, collect rents, and levy fines for breaches of the lord's rules (custom).

³*Seisin* is a legal term meaning possession of property.

⁴Pannage was the right to pasture swine in the lord's forest.

⁵*Leyrwithe* (also *leyrwite*) was the name given to the fine levied by the lord on a female serf found guilty of fornication.

Also the lord shall have the best ox for a "hereghett,"⁶ and holy Church another. After this the rest of the animals ought to be divided thus, if the deceased has children, to wit, into three parts—one for the lord, one for the wife, one for the children; and if he leaves no children, they shall be divided into two parts—one for the lord and one for the wife of the deceased, equally. Also if they have corn, in grange [barn] or in field, then the wife of the deceased ought to choose her part, to wit, half the corn in the grange or the field, as she chooses. And if she choose her part in the field, then all the corn in the grange shall remain wholly to the lord; and if she choose her part in the grange, then all the corn in the fields shall remain wholly to the lord, together with his moiety [half] and share in the granges; always provided that, wheresoever the wife shall choose her part, whether in grange or in field, the lord shall have his moiety and part, with her and against her; and all the other corn, in the place where the woman does not choose, shall remain to the lord; and if he has children, or a child, the division shall be made in the same way into three parts, to wit, among the lord, the wife of the deceased and his children; also if there are many children [their share shall be divided] among them.

Also it is not lawful for the bond-tenant to make a will, or bequeath anything, without licence of the lord of the manor.

And as to the sheep, let them be divided like all the other goods of the deceased which ought to be divided. But this is inserted in this place by itself, because, when the convent first came to Darnhale, the bond-tenants said that no division ought to be made of the sheep, but

that all the sheep ought to remain wholly to the wife of the deceased. Which is quite false, because they always used to divide them without gainsaying it at all, until Warin le Gran-tuenour was bailiff of Darnhale; and while he was bailiff he was corrupted with presents, and did not exact the lord's share of all things in his time; and afterwards the bond tenants endeavoured to make this a precedent and custom, which they by no means ought to do, because they have been accustomed so to do according to the customs of this manor in the times of former lords.

Moreover, the whole land of the deceased shall be in the hands of the lord, until he who is next, that is to say, he who ought to succeed the deceased—whom, according to the custom of the neighbourhood, they call the heir—shall make such a fine with the lord as shall correspond with the value of the land and the will of the lord. . . .

. . . Also, if the lord wishes to buy corn or oats, or anything else, and they have such things to sell, it shall not be lawful to them to sell anything elsewhere, except with the lord's licence [permission], if the lord is willing to pay them a reasonable price.

Also it is to be known that it is the custom of the manor to pay assize⁷ rents equally at the four terms of the year, to wit, at Christmas, the Annunciation of the Blessed Mary [March 25], at the feasts of St. John the Baptist [June 24] and St. Michael [September 29].

Amercements [fines] of courts ought always to be levied within a fortnight after the holding of the court, or sooner, if the lord will; . . . and the lord's mercy [fine] is according to his will or the will of his bailiff, so that they can take according to the amount of the trespass and measure of the offence.

⁶*Hereghett*, usually spelled *heriot* or *heregeld*, was any property that had been lent by a lord to a now-deceased serf, plus a fine levied on his property and paid to the lord after his death. It often consisted of the lord's choice of the serf's best livestock.

⁷The rent of assize was a fixed rent paid by the freeholder to the lord. "Assize" refers to fixing any measure.

MANORIAL COURTS

Serfs were subject to the judicial power of their landlords for any infraction of manorial rules of management. The next reading, from the records of a thirteenth-century English manorial court, lists cases heard by the court, the jurors' decisions, and the penalties fixed.

John Sperling complains that Richard of Newmere on the Sunday next before S. Bartholomew's day [August 24] last past with his cattle, horses, and pigs wrongfully destroyed the corn on his (John's) land to his damage to the extent of one thrave [a measure] of wheat, and to his dishonour to the extent of two shillings; and of this he produces suit. And Richard comes and defends all of it. Therefore let him go to the law six handed.* His pledges,¹ Simon Combe and Hugh Frith.

Hugh Free in mercy [fined] for his beast caught in the lord's garden. Pledges, Walter Hill and William Slipper. Fine 6d [sixpence].

(The) twelve jurors say that Hugh Cross has right in the bank and hedge about which there was a dispute between him and William White. Therefore let him hold in peace and let William be distrained² for his many trespasses. (Afterwards he made fine for 12d.) . . .

From the whole township of Little Ogbourne, except seven, for not coming to wash the lord's sheep, 6s. [shillings] 8d.

Gilbert Richard's son gives 5s. for licence to marry a wife. Pledge, Seaman. Term (for payment), the Purification [February 2].

*I.e., he must appear with six companions who will swear to his innocence.

¹Pledges were persons, like today's bail bondsmen, who stood surety for someone who was ordered to appear later in court or to pay a fine.

²To distrain means to force a person to comply with a court order by seizing and holding his movable property.

William Jordan in mercy for bad ploughing on the lord's land. Pledge, Arthur. Fine, 6d.

The parson of the Church is in mercy for his cow caught in the lord's meadow. Pledges, Thomas Ymer and William Coke.

From Martin Shepherd 6d. for the wound that he gave Pekin.

Ragenhilda of Béc gives 2s. for having married without licence. Pledge, William of Primer.

The Court presented that William Noah's son is the born bondman of the lord and a fugitive and dwells at Dodford. Therefore he must be sought. They say also that William Askil, John Parsons and Godfrey Green have furtively carried off four geese from the vill of Horepoll.

It was presented that Robert Carter's son by night invaded the house of Peter Burgess and in felony threw stones at his door so that the said Peter raised the hue [alarm]. Therefore let the said Robert be committed to prison. Afterwards he made fine with 2s.

All the ploughmen of Great Ogbourne are convicted by the oath of twelve men . . . because by reason of their default (the land) of the lord was ill-ploughed whereby the lord is damaged to the amount of 9s. . . . And Walter Reaper is in mercy for concealing (i.e. not giving information as to) the said bad ploughing. Afterwards he made fine with the lord with 1 mark [13 shillings, fourpence].

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Why did the manorial lord regulate the marital and sexual practices of his serfs?
2. What restraints were placed on the property rights of the serfs at Darnhall?

3. What restrictions were placed on the serfs' rights to buy or sell their goods and services where they pleased? Why?
4. Discuss the judicial procedures of the manorial courts and their similarity to modern practices.

7 Germanic Kingship and Law

The Germanic peoples' traditions of government and law differed from those of the Romans. The Germans gave loyalty to a tribal chief, whereas the Romans belonged to an impersonal state that ruled citizens of many nationalities. Roman law was written and applied to all citizens throughout the Empire, regardless of nationality. At the time of the invasions, Germanic law consisted of unwritten tribal customs that applied only to people of a particular tribe and permitted blood feuds and trial by ordeal.

The duties of the Germanic kings varied from nation to nation; all were expected to be effective warriors, but few seem to have been law-givers like the Roman emperors. The powers of Germanic kings were limited by tribal custom and by their need to win the consent of the assembled leaders of the people for any new policy affecting people's lives or property. The kings were subject to the customary law, and their role in law enforcement was quite limited compared to the police powers exercised by Roman emperors. The right of people to settle disputes among themselves by blood feud was generally recognized.

Germanic ideas of kingship and law underwent slow modification under the influence of the Christian church and Roman imperial traditions. The church promoted a new model of kingship, that of the biblical Hebrew King David. In the eighth century, to Christianize the traditional religious character of Germanic kingship, the church began to anoint and inaugurate the Germanic kings in liturgical ceremonies similar to those used to consecrate bishops and priests. In time, the secular Germanic practice of selecting kings was combined with new liturgical ceremonies, through which the chosen king was given sacral dignity. According to church theory, the king was chosen for royal office by God; he was called upon to uphold divine law, to defend Christianity, to protect the weak, and to rule justly.

Widukind of Corvey THE CORONATION OF OTTO I

In this passage from the chronicle *Rerum Gestarum Saxonicarum* (*On the Deeds of the Saxons*), a German historian, Widukind of Corvey (d. c. 1004), describes the coronation of the Saxon Otto I (the Great, 936–973), as monarch of the Germans. (The last of the Carolingian kings had died in 911.) The account shows the mingling of the traditional Germanic practice of designation of a chosen heir by the previous king, the successor's subsequent election by the leading

nobles and acclamation by the people, and the church ceremony of anointing and crowning the new king.

After the death of Henry (936), the father of his country and greatest and best of all kings, the Franks and Saxons¹ chose as their prince his son Otto, who had already been designated king by his father. They ordered the coronation to be held at the palace in Aachen, the place of universal election. . . .

And when they had arrived, the dukes and the great lords with a force of the chief vassals gathered in the portico of the basilica of Charlemagne. They placed the new ruler on the throne that had been constructed there, giving him their hands and offering fealty; promising their help against all his enemies, they made him king according to their custom.

While this part of the ceremony was being carried out by the dukes and other magistrates, Archbishop Hildibert of Mainz awaited the procession of the new king with all the priestly order and the commoners in the basilica. The archbishop awaited the procession of the king, holding the crozier² in his right hand and wearing the alb, the pallium, and the chasuble.³ When the king came forward, he advanced to meet him, touching the king's right hand with his left. Then he led the king to the middle of the sanctuary and turned to the people standing about them (ambulatories⁴ had been constructed above and below in that round basilica so that all the people might have a good view).

"Lo," Hildibert said, "I bring before you Lord Otto elected by God, formerly designated

by Henry, now made king by all the princes. If this election pleases you, signify by raising your right hand to heaven." To this all the people raising their right hands on high loudly called down prosperity on the new ruler.

The king, dressed in a close-fitting tunic according to the Frankish custom, was escorted behind the altar, on which lay the royal insignia—sword with sword-belt, cloak with bracelets, staff with sceptre and diadem. . . .

When the question of who should crown the king arose, two bishops besides Hildibert were considered eligible: the bishop of Trier because his city was the most ancient and had been founded by St Peter, and the bishop of Cologne because the place of coronation—Aachen—was in his diocese. But both of these men who would have enjoyed the honour deferred to the pre-eminence of Archbishop Hildibert.

Going to the altar and taking from it the sword with sword-belt and turning to the king, he said: "Accept this sword, with which you may chase out all the adversaries of Christ, barbarians, and bad Christians, by the divine authority handed down to you and by the power of all the empire of the Franks for the most lasting peace of all Christians."

Then taking the bracelets and cloak, he clothed him saying, "These points (of the cloak) falling to the ground will remind you with what zeal of faith you should burn and how you ought to endure in preserving peace to the end."

Then taking the sceptre and staff, he said: "With these symbols you may be reminded that you should reproach your subjects with paternal castigation, but first of all you should extend the hand of mercy to ministers of God, widows, and orphans. And never let the oil of compassion be absent from your head in order that you may be crowned with eternal reward in the present and in the future."

¹The Saxons were members of a Germanic tribe that lived in northwestern Germany between the Elbe and Rhine rivers.

²A crozier is a staff shaped like a shepherd's crook. It is carried during liturgical services by bishops and abbots as a symbol of their pastoral office.

³The alb, pallium, and chasuble are liturgical vestments worn by Christian clergy.

⁴An ambulatory consists of aisled spaces around the sides and the east end of the central chamber of a church, usually separated from the central portion by columns.

After having been sprinkled with holy oil and crowned with a golden diadem by the bishops Hildibert and Wikfried (of Cologne) and all legal consecration having been completed, the king was led to the throne, to

which he ascended by means of a spiral staircase. The throne of marvellous beauty had been constructed between two marble pillars, and from there the king could see and be seen by all.

Alfred the Great BLOOD FEUDS

In Germanic law, there was usually no public prosecution for crimes. Victims or their surviving kinsmen were expected to prosecute the alleged criminal. They might arrange to get help from others in the community, and they had the right of conducting a vendetta, or blood feud, against the alleged criminal and possibly his kinsmen. The effort to bring the blood feud under control for the good of the community was encouraged by the church and frequently by the kings.

In this reading, Anglo-Saxon (English) King Alfred the Great (871–900) established with his councilors' consent a law whereby the pursuit of blood feud was permitted only if certain procedures were followed that would offer time and occasion for peaceful mediation and adjudication of the dispute. Because blood feuds made life insecure, Alfred sought to limit their legality.

Also we enjoin, that a man who knows his adversary to be residing at home, shall not have recourse to violence before demanding justice of him.

1. If he has power enough to surround his adversary and besiege him in his house, he shall keep him therein seven days, but he shall not fight against him if he (his adversary) will consent to remain inside (his residence). And if, after seven days, he will submit and hand over his weapons, he shall keep him unscathed for thirty days, and send formal notice of his position to his kinsmen and friends.

2. If, however, he flees to a church, the privileges of the church shall be respected, as we have declared above.

3. If, however, he has not power enough to besiege him in his house, he shall ride to the *ealdorman*¹ and ask him for help. If he will not help him, he shall ride to the king before having recourse to violence.

4. And further, if anyone chances on his enemy, not having known him to be at home, and if he will give up his weapons, he shall be detained for thirty days, and his friends shall be informed (of his position). If he is not willing to give up his weapons, then violence may be used against him. If he is willing to surrender and hand over his weapons, and anyone after that uses violence against him (the pursued), he shall pay any sum which he incurs, whether *wergeld*² or compensation for wounds, as well as a fine, and his kinsman shall forfeit his claim to protection as a result of his action.

5. We further declare that a man may fight on behalf of his lord, if his lord is attacked,

¹The *ealdorman* (from which the modern term *alderman* derives) was the chief royal officer of an English shire or county.

²*Wergeld* was money paid in recompense for an injury or death; it was paid to the victim or his surviving relatives. The amount varied according to the victim's legal status or political office.

without becoming liable to vendetta [family vengeance, feuds]. Under similar conditions a lord may fight on behalf of his man.

6. In the same way a man may fight on behalf of one who is related to him by blood, if he is attacked unjustly, except it be against his lord. This we do not permit.

7. A man may fight, without becoming liable to vendetta, if he finds another (man) with his wedded wife, within closed doors or under the same blanket; or (if he finds another man) with his legitimate daughter (or sister); or with his mother, if she has been given in lawful wedlock to his father.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Who participated in the making of a Germanic king?
2. What ideals did the church promote through its ceremony of royal anointing and coronation?
3. What limitations on the king's power were implicit in the coronation ceremony?
4. In what ways might blood feuds have been destructive to medieval society?