

er of his writings might be mentioned, written about 1267, *de Terrae Sanctae* <sup>44</sup> where he emphasizes in the preface the stance of the apostles of Christ being acquainted with usages and customs of each nation. Of Raymond Lull reference was made in regard to his intense missionary zeal and enthusiasm. It is necessary to go through all his writings in order to characterize their value and importance.

Without doubt, in the thirteenth century enthusiastic and energetic men laid the foundation for a great epoch. It was the beginning of a new mission era and of a new literary missionary renaissance, beginning in St. Thomas a high standard of missionary thought. There was constant energetic zeal and action flowing from the home field to the missionary field and again a wholesome influence on the home country; it was the lively and fruitful relation between home work and theology, the preparation at home and its application in the missions, and again a harvesting in the non-Christian countries that was to enrich knowledge and to broaden and deepen Christian philosophical and religious thought. The hopes and expectations of these men in the thirteenth century indeed heralded a missionary epoch, a most promising beginning for the modern missions, had it not been stopped. Christians were losing ground in the Near East and the invasions of the Turks ended practically all missionary effort in these countries and cut also the connecting link with the Far East. Real deadly destruction of all missionary enterprise was the devastation brought on by the Black Death, when no missionaries were available to go forth to preach the word of God. But these men who revived and reorganized the missionary work in the thirteenth century have also fully the right to be mentioned and to be respected with those who made this century the greatest century of the Middle Ages.

MATHIAS BRAUN.

Polubovich, *Bibliotheca bio-bibliografica della Terra Sancta e dell' Oriente* (Quaracchi, 1906), I, 268.

## Outsiders by Birth and Blood: Racist Ideologies and Realities around the Periphery of Medieval European Culture

*Richard C. Hoffmann*

English representatives at the Council of Constance argued their claim to equal national status

whether a nation be understood as a race, relationship, and habit of unity, separate from others, or as a difference of language, which by divine and human law is the greatest and most authentic mark of a nation and the essence of it. . . or whether it be understood, as it should be, as an equality of territory with, for instance, the Gallic nation.<sup>2</sup>

Of the criteria there asserted, race, culture, and land, the English seemed at Constance to prefer the latter two for determination of group identity and membership—and, conversely, of non-membership. But when Englishmen met other peoples not in the middle of the medieval European world but at its periphery in Ireland, they used the first criterion, a genetic, ethnic, even racist yardstick. In this they answered in kind the Irish; so both applied a framework of genetic classification which was, despite the official English stance at Constance, common—though not ubiquitous nor invariant—around the fringes of the expanding and expanded Europe of the middle ages.

This essay examines racist or genetic ideas used to interpret social realities in three widely distant peripheries of medieval Europe, the Celtic northwest, the Iberian peninsula, and east-central Europe, exploring the development and application of these in relation to their evolving objective context. When medieval writers and men of action chose words and images like "birth," "blood," "inheritance," and "lineage" to refer to large social groups, they exhibited a fundamentally biological explanation of how the groups came to be. In modern biology

the term "race" correctly denotes an endogamous gene pool, a population separate from others of the same species and persisting over time in that genetic isolation. Hence racist or genetic thinking classifies groups and their attributes in terms of such distinctive descent up to the extreme of a fully differentiated species. Such idea structures offer a means to make sense of observed phenomena and, when they are applied to human societies, a framework apt for legitimizing inclusion or exclusion of individuals and groups. Of course, medieval Europeans knew from their creation myth of Adam and Eve that all humans shared a common ancestry; so few medieval writers seriously argued for the wholly distinct origin of any human groups with which they were familiar. While in the cultural heartlands of medieval Europe racist thinking always had an insubstantial quality,<sup>3</sup> on Europe's cultural frontiers this was not so. Though outright deviations from the Genesis account seem absent there, too, specialists in the histories of various regions are familiar with intellectual constructs and even important socio-political actions which rested upon the assumption and assertion of genetic distinction between interacting human groups. Yet the cases here examined have not always been conceived in the terms or explored in the detail here essayed, for they have hitherto been treated quite separately as unrelated incidents in distinct narratives of independent national pasts.<sup>4</sup> To bring them here into meaningful conjunction is at least to assert a taxonomic or typological connection among them, but the comparative perspective as well illuminates both the individual cases, and the more general issues of medieval backgrounds to subsequent European nationalist and racist behaviour and of medieval frameworks for understanding human societies. A fundamental problem is to confront relationships between mythic modes of mental analysis and practical human action.<sup>5</sup> The roughly similar kinds of ideas about human groups, and group-attributes, articulated in medieval Ireland, Poland, Scotland, Spain, and Hungary, associated differently with the situations in which they appeared.

The genetic criteria with which men distinguished groups in medieval Ireland had an ancient history and a straight-forward correspondence to ethno-cultural realities. Early medieval Irish historical myth describes the then dominant "Gaels" as descendants of the "Sons of Milesius," immigrants who in a misty past came from Spain to conquer Ireland from its previous inhabitants.<sup>6</sup> To modern scholars the Milesian legend reflects the move of Goidelic speakers from the continent to Ireland where they defeated and absorbed earlier users

Brythonic Celtic tongue. In a subsequent proto historical period roughly corresponding to the third to fifth century AD, further legends placed the emergence of what would be the principal ruling groups of early medieval Ireland, conceptualizing these again as interrelated descent groups whose ancestry stemmed from eponymous heroes. The Connachta of the northwest belonged to the *Dal Cuinne*, the "race of Conn," after Conn Cédathach ("of the Hundred Battles"), as did the younger Uí Néill of the centre and north, whose direct ancestor, Niall Noigiallach ("of the Nine Hostages"), provided the general name for lineage segments traced individually to his various sons, for instance the *Cenél Conaill* from Conall and the *Cenél nEógain* from Eogan. An unrelated Eógan, called *Mug Nuadat*, similarly engendered the dominant Eóganachta of the southwest, rulers over what the historiographers labelled "Mug's Half" as opposed to "Conn's Half."<sup>7</sup>

When a millenium or more of virtually self-contained Irish historical development since the coming of the Gaels was next interrupted by the Norse who entered the island in the ninth century, their distinctive qualities were easily perceived by the Irish; not *Gael*, they were *Gall* or "foreigners." And that distinction remained even when Norse settlers rapidly integrated into the Irish tribal political order and society. Where, as in the ninth century Hebrides, elements of the two peoples merged, the result was a distinctly-named population of *Gall-Ghaedhil*, literally "foreign-Irish," and where, as in the hinterland of Norse-founded Dublin, the tenth-century immigration was dense, the territory became *Fingal*, "land of foreigners." Even in the early twelfth century, propagandists for the politically upstart O'Brien lineage thought it useful to glorify their founder, Brian Boru (d. 1014), by making of his struggles with internal rivals and the occasional Norse allies of these an ethnic conflict of Gaels against aliens. Their epic *Cogadh Gaedhel re Gallaibh* ("War of the Gael and Gall") thus spoke not only of *gaill* (foreigners) but even of *gentib* ("gentiles").<sup>8</sup>

With the Anglo-Norman intervention which began in 1167 and the ensuing incomplete conquest that produced a late medieval Ireland confusingly contested among English, Anglo-Irish, and Irish, in the words of James Lydon, "racialism and a cultural war became permanent features of the Irish scene."<sup>9</sup> Groups identified themselves and others by letting ethnic origin stand for or override cultural attributes and then discriminating among persons in precisely these terms.

For the native Irish a prime distinction remained that between *Gael* and *Gaill*. During an early thirteenth century dispute over the

primatial see of Armagh between English and Irish aspirants, the latter, Eugenius, is described by the *Annals of Loch Cé* as going to King John "to lay complaint against the foreigners."<sup>10</sup> Some hundred years later, Highland and Hebridean Scots mercenaries, who in the words of their own king, Robert Bruce, shared with the Irish "the same natural ancestry" and who provided to the Irish the military power for a major Gaelic political revival, were still labelled *gall-o-glach*, "foreign soldiers." To the *Annals of Loch Cé* the Scottish intervention of 1315-18 aimed "to expel the Foreigners from Ireland," while a less enthusiastic contemporary Gaelic writer condemned the O'Neill for therein supporting "foreigners less noble than these our own foreigners." And throughout the middle ages, no matter how much of Gaelic culture many deeply-rooted Anglo-Irish families absorbed, they remained to native authors still distinct *Gaill*.<sup>11</sup>

Among the sharpest and most developed Irish discussions of group identity and distinction during the later medieval period was the so-called "Remonstrance of the Irish Princes," a petition directed in 1317 to Pope John XXII by Donald O'Neill, self-styled King of Ulster, and others who supported Edward Bruce as King of Ireland. They aimed to impugn the legitimacy of English rule there.<sup>12</sup> O'Neill's anonymous writer first adjusted the old Milesian legend to fit current canonical doctrines of legitimate lordship, by replacing a Gaelic conquest with unopposed settlement in a previously empty Ireland. Then he emphasized the uninterrupted succession to the Milesians of 136 kings "sine admixtione sanguinis alieni" to Legarius, "a quo ego Donaldus praedictus in linea recta carnalem traxi originem." In King Legarius' day St. Patrick converted the Irish to Christianity and thereafter sixty-one kings "de eodem sanguine, sine interposicione sanguinis alieni" had ruled up to 1170. As the petition continues to detail English maltreatment of the Irish since that time, both peoples are labelled with the simple collective nouns *Anglici* and *Hibernici* and both are generally called *nationes*. Now the souls of the native Irish clergy and people stood in danger from the continual wars required to preserve their "innatam libertatem" and to regain their stolen "hereditate paterna." Individualized, the threatened victim is the "hominem Hibernicum" whom to kill an English Franciscan has purportedly said is no sin at all.

To the Irish people and their innocence the Remonstrance opposed the English by birth and nation, especially those "qui se vocant mediae nationis," the immigrant Anglo-Irish and their descendants

Richard C. Hoffman

and from other nations that with the greatest propriety they may be called a nation not of middle, but of the utmost, perfidy.

And as in way of life and speech they are more different from us and in their actions from many other nations than can be described by us in writing or in words, there is no hope whatever of our having peace with them.

For we have a natural hostility to each other. . . .<sup>13</sup>

The Remonstrance thus catalogues what the Irish saw as the crimes of one coterminous ethno-cultural group against another, but a slightly later Irish contemporary, the Minorite John Clyn, perhaps phrased the equation best. Conflict among his brethren in the order's Irish province during the 1320s arose from "quidam eorum nacionis sue et sanguinis et lingue partem tenentes et foventes ac promoventes."<sup>14</sup>

English writers and administrators, secular and clerical alike, reciprocated in full measure the Irish sense of ethnocultural antipathy, having by the time of the Remonstrance already for a century used like terms to favor the "English by nation" over the "puros Hibernicos, homines siquidem bestiales et indoctos."<sup>15</sup> The famously discriminatory 1366 Statutes of Kilkenny thus merely codified a policy long pursued in separate detail.<sup>16</sup> One was English, if of English descent, whether born in England or in Ireland, whether following proper English customs or degenerated to those of the Irish. These, in turn, were by birth "Irrois del nacion de Irrois." Between the two genetic communities the statutes would allow no congress. They prohibit sexual or other alliance, presentation of Irishmen to benefices, patronizing Irish entertainers, use of the Irish language or costume, and giving land to Irish for pasture. As James Lydon puts it for a slightly later period, "To be *merus hibernicus* ('pure Irish') meant that one could never be the equal of an Englishman, whether one born in England or in Ireland." Henry VI, however, encapsulated the distinction in more pithy terms, describing an Irish Minorite as "our enemy born and of Irish blood, name and nation. . . ."<sup>17</sup> The English king stood more than a century apart in time from the Franciscan, John Clyn, and they consciously stood on opposite sides of a great ideological gulf. Yet could they have met, they would have agreed on what it was that separated them. The words of one echo the other; English or Irish, race was culture was group identity in late medieval Ireland.

Genetic terminology of greater or lesser accuracy expressed observable culture attributes in places other than Ireland as well. In brief, the restored unity of post-1320 Poland lost one of its conceptual

## STUDIES IN MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE HISTORY

bonds with the end in 1370 of rule by the ancient royal Piast dynasty. Contests among foreign claimants and internal factions threatened the country's hard-won identity as in another way did the simultaneous evolution of the *Corona regni Poloniae* into a multinational state. One response, clear and common by the fifteenth century, was to equate Polish ethnicity and Polish culture as hallmarks of both unity and identity. The *gens et natio Poloniae* defined all those who spoke the Polish language.<sup>18</sup> This well represented ethno-cultural realities in what then comprised the *regnum Poloniae* and, though certainly not intentionally, also those in the old Polish province of Silesia, which had since the thirteenth century undergone major German immigration and considerable cultural Germanization and had since the mid-fourteenth century been not a part of the Polish, but of the Bohemian crown.

\* \* \*

To return to the Celtic periphery, racialist ideas could also identify cultural groups in late medieval Scotland. However here they conceptualized neither unity nor the difference between indigenes and recent immigrants, but an emerging internal distinction between Highlands and Lowlands. Contrary to romantic nineteenth-century dogma, the schism of Scotland into two district societies along the "Highland Line" has no immemorial antiquity. At the eve of the wars of independence, the country contained a regionally and ethnically mixed population with Norse, Norman, and Anglian additions variously and acceptably grafted on a basic Celto-Pictish stock. Language, social structures, economy, and internal politics each followed different subdivisions.<sup>19</sup> Fission along the Highland line began in the later middle ages from the divergent attraction of the Lowlands into a broadly European cultural sphere centered on the North Sea, and of the Highlands into the consciously archaizing and insular world of resurgent Gaelic Ireland.<sup>20</sup> Thus learned Lowland historians like John of Fordun in 1387 and John Major in 1521 began to differentiate between the "Irish"-speaking, strangely-costumed "ferina gens" of "wild Scots" (*Scoti silvestri*) and a properly-clad "domestica gens. . . , civilis atque pacifica," who spoke proper Scots.<sup>21</sup> Late fourteenth and early fifteenth century Lowland literature pictured the Highlander as an outlandish character, at once a figure of fun and of menace.<sup>22</sup> After all, Fordun and Major agreed, Highlanders hated and persecuted English-speaking Lowlanders no less than they did the real English.

*Richard C. Hoffman*

9

The cultural distinction so perceived received at once a genetic component: Fordun saw two *gentes*; Major referred to the "birth" of the Highlanders. Fordun and others also touched up an older tradition of the Scots' Egyptian origin to provide a historical explanation for his recognition that the community comprised two different ethnic groups. Irish migration myth as recorded in the eleventh-century Irish version of Nennius and related contemporary works told how the ancestors of the Gaels had been Greeks who went from Scythia to Egypt where their leader married Scota, daughter of Pharaoh, and then to Spain after Pharaoh drowned in the Red Sea. The mythic etymology derived *Scoti* from Scota and *Gael* from her son, Gaedel Glas.<sup>23</sup> The story was amplified and proliferated, often with considerable inconsistencies among its versions, in the twelfth century *Lebor gabala Erenn* and left traces in tenth through twelfth century Scottish chronicles and royal genealogies.<sup>24</sup> The myth of an Egyptian origin for the Scots then surfaced during the wars of independence as an element of political propaganda to counteract the Trojan legend of British supremacy retailed by Edward I. Confronted with what had thus become a commonly accepted tale and with its many conflicting variants (not all of which may survive), John of Fordun compiled a composite mythic prehistory for the Scots, giving them for the first time a clearly dual origin: "natio Scotorum a Graecis et Egyptiorum relinquit. . . primum ceperat exordium,"<sup>25</sup> under Scota and her husband, an exiled Greek prince named Gaythelos (perhaps Fordun's own invention). With vocabulary that foreshadows his subsequent description of two *gentes Scociae*, Fordun concluded and interpreted the origin myth:

Afterwards in truth since this mixed people took its origin from Greeks and Egyptians, lest the memory of their early princes should in the drawn-out course of time fully perish from men, they adopted as their own names the names of these. The Greeks, to be sure, from the name of their Prince Geythelos called themselves *Gaythelenses* and similarly the Egyptians continuously called themselves from Scota, *Scoti*, which name alone afterwards and today both *gentes* are pleased to enjoy in common. From this: The Scots from Scota, from the Scots all Scotland has its name, barred the increase of Duke Geythelos<sup>26</sup>

Though rejected by Major as palpable fiction,<sup>27</sup> Fordun's hints at a genetic explanation for the Scots' dual culture were taken over by Major's influential contemporary, the principal of Aberdeen University,

## STUDIES IN MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE HISTORY

ector Boece, in his *Scotorum historiae a primo gentis origine* (Paris, 1526),<sup>28</sup> to become a common element in a learned understanding of past and present.

Ranald Nicholson rightly doubts if ordinary Lowlanders knew or believed these learned genetic fantasies, or even if they saw Highlanders as other than uncouth, though true Scots none the less. He argues, however, that genuine "pseudo-racial animosity" did exist on the other side. Gaelic learning created a mythical King Albanactus to engender the Celtic inhabitants of *Albanach* and in the great compilation of Gaelic poetry done in the early sixteenth century by James MacGregor and his poet brother Duncan for Highland chieftains' courts (the *Book of the Dean of Lismore*), the *Gael* are twice described as Greeks. Highlanders spoke of themselves as *Gael* and collectively as *Gaidhealtachd* ("speakers of Gaelic"); their Scots-speaking compatriots were *Sassunnach* ("speakers of Saxon") and thus *Gall*. As Nicholson puts it, "when racial issues are evoked, fiction is often more important than fact."<sup>29</sup> As in Ireland and Poland, in Scotland culture was race—even if that equation here distorted ethnic realities to explain a cultural change and did so by denying that change had occurred.

\* \* \*

The Iberian peninsula had known in early and high medieval times as great and as recognized a cultural pluralism as ever existed in post-twelfth century Ireland or late medieval Scotland. Initially cast in cultural terms, the residue of pluralism came in the fifteenth century to be understood as a matter of descent, thus giving rise to the infamous Castilian preoccupation with *limpieza de sangre*, a Christian's "purity of blood" from the pollution of Muslim or especially Jewish ancestry.

During the long centuries of Christian reconquest of the peninsula and well into the fourteenth century Spaniards conceived of their country as a land of three "laws," i.e. religions: Christian, Muslim, and Jewish. In the contest for political hegemony one religious group opposed another, but none was deemed an *ethnic* entity and no conflicts obscured a fundamental assumption that Hispanic society involved a regular interaction among members of all three, what subsequent Spanish historians have labelled *convivencia* ("living-together-ness").<sup>30</sup> *Convivencia* in practice implied Jewish and Muslim deference to Christian rule, true, but Christian poets, chroniclers, and legislators customarily depicted their whole society by listing the triad, "Christians and

Richard C. Hoffman

11

Moors and Jews." Spaniards of the thirteenth century took seriously and worked hard for the Christian dream of converting by persuasion Muslims and Jews alike<sup>31</sup>—not the act of a society which assumed that blood alone told.

Nor did this way of thinking about human groups disappear when the myth and reality of *convivencia* became tattered during the fourteenth century. Socio-political conflict, economic distress, and the trauma of the Black Death were accompanied by ugly outbreaks of Christian violence against minority religious communities. Hostility to *mudejars* (Muslims under Christian rule) was muted by that group's own socio-cultural decapitation; Muslim élites had emigrated from Christian Spain to leave an innocuous population of peasants and artisans. That to Jews, however, was exacerbated by their very cultural sophistication, financial success, and apparent political influence. Anti-Jewish riots and pogroms rose to a crescendo in the great wave of violence that swept the peninsula in 1391-1415.<sup>32</sup> Yet in this extremity the hatred lacked racialist quality. Many Jews perished horribly for their faith, others fled into exile, but thousands of high and low socio-economic standing submitted to forced baptism and saved themselves. Conversion changed group membership in 1391.<sup>33</sup> A cultural transformation made from one-time Jews "New Christians," *conversos*. Their surviving or returning co-religionists finally faced the ultimate in religious discrimination a century later, the expulsion of 1492. Muslims in freshly-conquered Granada received the same choice, conversion or exile, ten years thereafter. The myth of *convivencia* was gone, replaced by one of cultural uniformity.<sup>34</sup>

The whole issue of *limpieza de sangre*, of a genetic criterion for social or other discrimination, arose from the results of 1391. Removal of religious barriers opened the way for rapid assimilation and ascent of *conversos* into the highest strata of Hispanic society. One-time rabbis became prelates; royal financiers needed no special privileges to continue their trade; the wealthy and prestigious merged with their counterparts in a form not unprecedented but on a scale that certainly was. King Fernando "the Catholic" himself acknowledged a *conversa* great-grandmother who had married into the house of the Admiral of Castile.<sup>35</sup> Her experience had innumerable parallels at all social levels in early fifteenth century Castile. But popular resentment against the beneficiaries of such rapid mobility was envenomed by some evidence of individual false converts, by the anti-Jewish polemic of other zealous converts, and by a too vivid memory of the New Christians' origins.<sup>36</sup> By

mid-century, the effaced cultural ideology of discrimination was revived in a racialist form by an anti-*converso* movement.

That the anti-*converso* movement conceived of its victims in genetic terms appeared in its first manifestation at Toledo in 1449. Rising in rebellion against war taxes imposed by the royal favourite, Constable de Luna, the Old Christian majority turned its anger first against the purported fiscal mastermind, the *converso* merchant Alonso Cota, and then against that group in general. In public assembly the rebels' chief, Pedro Sarmiento, articulated the popular programme. He asserted first the claimed regularity with which the Jews had historically betrayed Christian Spain in general and Toledo in particular and, second, the continuity of erroneous belief and practices which *ipso facto* made of the *conversos* the same old enemy. Then, as a magistrate, Sarmiento proclaimed his *Sentencia-Estatuto*, expelling from office thirteen municipal councillors, notaries, and judges as "conversos del linaje de los judios" (since few if any had personally once been Jews) and declaring unworthy to occupy any public or private position in Toledo any from these "perverse lineages."<sup>37</sup>

That Toledo's act of rebellion drew royal anger, papal repudiation, and elaborate rebuttal from intellectuals and churchmen of New Christian stock had little effect. Anti-*converso* riots and legislation spread in the later fifteenth century almost in proportion as the actual converts receded into genealogical memory: laws for church offices in Toledo in 1467, municipal prohibitions at Ciudad Real in 1468, violence in Andalusian towns in 1473, and so on.<sup>38</sup> Because such actions gained ostensible legitimacy from accusations that some *conversos* were crypto-Jews, prominent New Christians supported establishment of the Inquisition—to free most from guilt by association through revealing and punishing the few—and expulsion of the Jews—to remove temptation and opportunity for backsliding.<sup>39</sup> Such hopes were vain. A "statutum contra hebraeos" of San Antonio de Sigüenza, passed in 1497, could have had only New Christians for a target. In 1525 the Spanish province of the Franciscans joined other leading reformist orders when it gained papal permission to remove from its offices all descendants of Jews or of those found guilty by the Inquisition and to forbid further entry of such persons to its membership.<sup>40</sup> University colleges, cathedral chapters, and others seemingly contested with vigour the priority of their exclusion policies. The college of San Bartolomé at Salamanca claimed papal approval for a requirement "ex puro sanguine" dating back to 1414. The phrase if authentic, and some doubt remains, does not refer to Jewish

ancestry according to modern scholars. But this may have been a *locus classicus* for what became in the early sixteenth century the dominant expression of the grounds for discrimination: *limpieza de sangre*. By 1530 a new member of the cathedral church of Cordoba, after proving his personal freedom from Jewish or Muslim descent, swore publicly to support and observe its ordinances and statutes ". . .especialmente. . .el estatuto de limpieza desta yglesia."<sup>41</sup>

In fact the legal enactments of whatever source simply articulated in formal language the broad genetic perception of social groupings which was shared by late fifteenth and early sixteenth century Spaniards, Old and New Christians alike. They thought increasingly in terms of lineage, of breed, of, to use the contemporary Hispanic term popularized by Portuguese explorers to describe groups in the very different society they encountered in India, *casta*, each a common genetic line frozen in time by the biological identity of endogamy. That the supposed endogamy contradicted the reality of interpenetration which itself gave rise to a concern for *limpieza* was not, it seems, perceived. The country priest and chronicler of the Catholic monarchs, Andrés Bernaldez, saw the misfortunes of captured Granadan Malaga as punishment for the sins of the inhabitants' ancestors. Of one *converso* he wrote "all the lineage (*linaje*) was defamed and stained with this disease [Judaism]."<sup>42</sup> *Conversos* themselves felt a tortured ambivalence. One wrote in 1518 of his "accursed lineage. . .so dirty that all Jordan could not wash it off even with the help of the Holy Ghost."<sup>43</sup> Yet a *converso* bookseller baited his Old Christian guard in the prison of the Inquisition, "dijese que mas valia un christiano nuevo que uno viejo ya que ellas, los nuevos venian del linaje de Cristo y los viejos de los gentiles." And at another level the court chronicler Juan de Lucena argued openly and formally the superiority of Hebrew descent over that from Romans or Visigoths or Franks.<sup>44</sup> *Limpieza*, with two other increasingly genetic qualities, nobility and honor, became a key to the self-identity and social place of Spaniards. But in Stephen Gilman's words, "Since cleanliness of blood, unlike hereditary nobility, was fundamentally unreal—a social myth which was invented to justify and camouflage a hidden revolution—proof [of *limpieza*] itself became more and more meaningless."<sup>45</sup> Mere allegation of impure descent blocked and repulsed those who violated what were now seen as anciently right relationships among groups. Thus racist ideology defeated reality in late medieval Spain, denying cultural change by enforcing a view of society as comprising genetic units immune to time and human action.

## STUDIES IN MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE HISTORY

\* \* \*

etic social myth served to camouflage and legitimize a revolution in medieval Hungary, too, one which attained its climax almost concurrently with that in Spain, but one with older intellectual roots and carried out from the top. If Castilians used racialism to resuscitate a cultural conflict, Hungarian nobles found it a weapon in a class conflict. Ethnic and genetic myth first explained socio-political stratification among the Hungarian people and eventually helped to justify and conceptualize increased dominance and exploitation of the peasants by the elite. The development moved from historiographic myth to public policy to a baneful union of the two. The process requires close analysis.

An articulated genetic understanding of society in Hungary seems to have been initiated in a major rewriting of early Hungarian history by a well-educated and much-travelled cleric, Master Simon of Kézai (Simon Kézai), who moved in court circles and composed his *Gesta Hungarorum* in 1282/85.<sup>46</sup> Earlier authors had focussed their attention on legends concerning the Magyars' late ninth-century entry into Pannonia and subsequent entry by baptism into the cultural community of Latin Christendom. Simon, perhaps following the lead of a predecessor some decade before, Master Ákos, whose works do not survive separately, thrust the origins of his people more deeply into the past. He instructed from originally western misconceptions about eastern peoples, a new myth of identity between the Huns of Attila and the later Hungarians. In the best thirteenth-century antiquarian mode he postulated eponymous brothers, Magor and Hunor, as descendants of Magog, son of Japhet, and progenitors of the race in both its historic avatars.<sup>47</sup> Thus a mythologized Hunnish history became for Simon both a Hungarian pre-history and a source of models for socio-political ideals in the present. Three of these have special interest here.

Simon changed the definitive concept of the people whom he had previously discussed from one based on political allegiance to one keyed to ethnicity and culture. Whereas for his predecessors the Hungarians had been defined by the *gens regis* or *populus regni Hungariae*, now they comprised a *natio* linked through kinship and a common language. This group included, however, both "pure Hungarians" and others. "Pura Hungaria" were the descendants of Simon's 108 ancient Magyar clans "absque omnibus missitalia;" all others traced their descent to captives or immigrants. For Simon this formulation, though incipiently racist, lacks clear discriminatory purpose. He nowhere explicitly denigrates Hungarians

Richard C. Hoffman

15

mixed ancestry and easily acknowledges all ethnic groups, pure Hungarians included, as containing both nobles and non-nobles.<sup>49</sup> But in narrating Hunnish "history" he implicitly devalues those of impure descent. Foreigners' treachery is made the cause of the collapse of Hunnish power and departure from Pannonia after the death of Attila.<sup>50</sup> Csaba, the son of Attila who becomes Simon's hero as the political link between the Huns who were, and the Hungarians who would be, has to overcome the impediment of his mixed ancestry and connections: born legitimately to Attila by the daughter of the Byzantine emperor and himself married to a woman from another steppe tribe, Csaba was spurned by the Hunnish nobility as "non verum. . . alumnum regni Scitiae, sed quasi missitalium externae nationis. . ." <sup>51</sup> The mere hint of prejudice in Simon's work itself departs from the explicit praise given to persons of mixed descent by his immediate predecessor, Master Ákos.<sup>52</sup>

Since Simon so conceived of his nation in hereditary terms as containing both pure Hungarians and miscegenates, he confronted the fact that some "pure Hungarians" of his own day were of unfree status. (The unfreedom of others did not bother him.) He dealt with this anomaly in the course of two linked narratives set in the Hunnish past to explain the political and social structure of his people (for the complete text, see Appendix A). The second of these told how, up to the time of the Hungarian conversion to Christianity, it was the national custom for heralds to summon the whole people to reach and hear communal decisions. Those who inexcusably failed to attend were, by law, split in two with a coultter, banished, or condemned to common servitude ("detrudi in communium servititem").

And thus his own evil deeds and excess separated one Hungarian from the other. For how else, since one father and one mother procreated all Hungarians, could one of them be called noble, another ignoble, unless he were held to be guilty of such a crime.

Thus ancestral crime and not just descent from a conquered people marked the servile population of Hungary.<sup>53</sup>

Simon had, moreover, in the immediately preceding passage of the same chapter (Appendix A) just given constitutional shape to these genetic perceptions of Hungarian society. The beginnings of a political *communitas* he ascribed to the original powers of the Hunnish people to make law, name rulers, and depose them. It was the still inchoate but seminal articulation of a claim to authority independent of the king.<sup>54</sup>

Hence the loss of status by miscreants and their descendants left the nobility alone as not only those Hungarians possessing both pure blood and honorable ancestry but also the sole legitimate members of the ancient political nation.

Master Simon's genetic conception of his nation's identity and internal subdivisions became common intellectual currency in late medieval Hungary. The whole Hunnish pre-history myth with all the elements and most of the very words mentioned above was fully incorporated in fourteenth-century reworkings of the Hungarian chronicle tradition that produced, among other versions, the *Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle* of 1358, done in the court of Louis the Great (*v* Appendix B).<sup>55</sup> Royal circles remained the center of Hungarian historical writing. Activity peaked there under the native King Mathias when a notary from the central court, János Thuróczy, published his *Chronica Hungarorum* in 1488. The work won immediate success, being treated as the definitive statement of the national past well into the 1530s and 40s and again ascendant as historical truth during the eighteenth century.<sup>56</sup> Thuróczy's writing reflected the strong emphasis on national identity which prevailed in Mathias' court: the king he portrayed as a "second Attila" and the Hun-Hungarian equation he stressed and elaborated.<sup>57</sup>

Thuróczy drew from a broad array of sources and expatiated freely upon them, but the core narrative and interpretive elements for his treatment of the Huns came straight from the tradition established by Simon of Kéza and transmitted by the fourteenth century chronicles. From the mating of Hunor and Magor with the Alan princesses "tandem omnes Hunni, sive Hungari originem sumpsisse perhibentur."<sup>58</sup> Their descendants formed the 108 tribes and functioned as a sovereign political community. After the death of Attila, their treacherous German subjects incited civil war and thus caused the retreat from Pannonia.<sup>59</sup> When Csaba rejoined his people in exile, they rejected him for his mixed blood and exogamous marriage.<sup>60</sup> As well as heightening a sense of ethnic identity and stressing unity and equality within the politically significant groups as barriers against the rise of a lesser noble order, Thuróczy modified the received report of the origins of servitude to highlight still more the antiquity and perpetual hereditary character of socio-political inequality. As in his sources, the narrative (Appendix C) begins in the self-governing community of Huns, where the sending of a blood-stained sword through their camps announced the heralds' call to the general national assembly. The custom was observed among Huns or Hungarians right up to the time of Duke Géza (971-997) and "multos

generatione de hac, perpetuam redegit in rusticitatem," for the unexcused absentee was, as in Simon of Kéza, split with a coulter, exiled, or enserfed ("vel communem immisericorditer redigerentur in servitutem"), thus causing some of the Huns themselves to be of unfree status ("plebejæ conditionis"). Thuróczy echoes Master Simon to the end:

For since they were of one and the same birth and came equally from Hunor and Magor, how else could it be that one could be made a lord, another a serf or peasant?

Thus János Thuróczy expanded on his model and moved what had been in earlier writers a more ambiguous reference to datable past practice so that, coming after the heralds' call, it explicitly gave to serfdom this ancient authority. He ended with a more blunt perpetual distinction, too: where others had spoken of nobles and non-nobles, he referred to lords and serfs. Thus at a crucial time in Hungary's history, the educated had before them an authoritative treatment of the country's past which handled important socio-political issues in terms of a genetic myth.

It is time to turn from myths to the realities of late fifteenth and early sixteenth century Hungary. Especially after the death in 1490 of the strong and ambitious King Mathias, the peasants' rights and economic autonomy suffered piecemeal but accelerating erosion by their noble lords.<sup>61</sup> At the same time the nobility as a whole seized political power in the state while the lesser nobles effectively reined in the former superiority of the great magnates. The elected Jagiellonian monarch was practically impotent. Peasant resentment at growing oppression flashed into fierce rebellion when commoner volunteers gained arms for an abortive crusade against the Turks in spring, 1514—itself the product of the vain ambitions of the peasant-born Hungarian primate, Thomas Bakócz. After some months of mutual brutality, forces of the lower nobility crushed the revolt and then exacted a ferocious revenge. Thousands of peasants died in agony. Their leader, Gyorgy Dózsa, the victorious nobles roasted alive on an iron throne with a red-hot iron crown on his head and then served his flesh to his carefully starved subordinates.<sup>62</sup> The punitive physical atrocities were carefully planned. So, too, were punitive legislative ones. The noble Diet assembled in autumn, 1514, to subject the peasants fully in law.

The statutes of servitude passed by the Diet and given royal assent on 19 November 1514 demonstrate a genetic conception of the Hungarian peasantry which was held by the nobility and which was to



define for all time the objects of noble vengeance and rule.<sup>63</sup> At first glance this is not obvious. No mythical Huns appear, nor do historical antiquities legitimize past, present, or future inequalities. All is cruelly practical as dues are raised, reparations exacted, mobility forbidden, and "mera et perpetua rusticitate" imposed against people called interchangeably *rustici*, *coloni*, and from the Magyar, *iobagiones*.<sup>64</sup> But whenever the subjugated class is described more fully and especially when the modalities of a future perpetuity demand operational precision, the punishment is directed against a group defined by birth. For instance, the prohibition against movement covered adult males and female heads of household, but not young girls or widows without their own land, who were free to marry and move. If the latter had marriageable sons ("filios nubiles"), however, these could not accompany their mothers and if a young male child were on account of his age taken away, he had to return to his original home upon reaching maturity.<sup>65</sup> In choosing servants and promoting clerics the king received firm instructions to avoid those "qui ex rusticis parentibus nati sunt" and to favour "dominorum et nobilium filii."<sup>66</sup> Archbishop Bakócz got a sharp rap across the knuckles, too. No more would the church offer an avenue for a peasant's son to rise above his betters.

Further that for the sake of perpetual memory of the aforementioned peasant treason, no one else born of peasant ancestry shall be promoted to bishop or archbishop by the royal majesty. And if any should be so promoted, no one ought to pay tithes to them.<sup>67</sup>

But the clearest statement of a genetic perception occurs with reference to those special peasants who suffered gruesome deaths for leading the revolt. That all posterity may know their evil and quake at the consequences,

...and also the descendants of these, that is sons and daughters and blood brothers are to be punished in this way: never from any of their descendants is any judge or town official or village head man ever to be chosen nor is any to hold a servant's position in the household of a prince or lord or noble nor is any of them to be raised to any position of honour, but they should lament without end the penalty of those guilty as a family subject to the yoke of perpetual servitude and rusticity. If in truth the unmarried are found not to have fathered such nonetheless the fathers of these and all their progeny are to be condemned to the aforesaid infamy.<sup>68</sup>

As Jewish ancestry stained future generations of New Christian Castilians and conviction of heresy ground in the dirt, so would in Hungary rebellion indelibly darken the inborn hue of any peasant descent forever.

And at the same time the real discrimination by birth of the nobles' legislative vendetta was joined to the ideology of historical genetic myth by a sophisticated and articulate noble lawyer, Istvan Werböczy. In more than a decade's experience as an adviser to high officials and notary to the Diet Werböczy had built a reputation for close legal reasoning and clear constitutional rhetoric in the interests of his class. He had drafted the decree on the succession in which the Diet of 1505 asserted the rights to self-government of the noble *natio* of the "gentis Scythice" over against the failures of foreign-born kings.<sup>69</sup> Late in 1514 Werböczy completed a larger commission from the Diet, his *Tripartitum*, the first codification of Hungarian customary law. Accepted by committee and given royal assent, this extensive work met magnate opposition such that it was never formally transmitted to the county courts nor proclaimed by the king. Still it was printed in 1517 and quickly treated in practice as the definitive statement of Hungarian law and of a constitution in which the lower nobility possessed legitimate and total political supremacy.<sup>70</sup>

To explicate the kingdom's socio-political structure Werböczy turned to the Hunnish myth created by Simon of Kéza, reusing the very words of his immediate source, Thuróczy, to describe the criminal origin and hereditary transmission of unfreedom among the descendants of Hunor and Magor (*v* Appendix D and compare Appendix C).<sup>71</sup> Even his rare emendations are telling. Werböczy identified Duke Géza as the father of Saint Stephan, which lent the aura of the holy apostle to this passage, too. He made explicit the application of the ancient servile law to both Huns and Hungarians but omitted banishment as an alternative to death or perpetual unfreedom. Could that have been to avoid suggesting flight from servitude? And the rhetorical ending first composed by Simon of Kéza is heightened by still more repetition:

For since one and another came equally from the same birth, namely that of Hunor and Magor, how else could it be that this has been made a lord, that a serf, this noble, that ignoble and a peasant?

Werböczy had well absorbed his history lesson. Hungarians were either servile peasants stained with ancient crime or they were noble lords.

To the nobility, too, Werböczy gave more precise contemporary legal definition in hereditary terms.<sup>72</sup> And the *notulus Hungaro-*

*rum*, which in his constitutional view and in his political reality possessed legislative authority as an equal member of the "Holy Crown" with the king whom they elected, was strictly equated with that nobility:

Moreover, by the name and term *populus* is to be understood at this point only the lords prelates, barons, and other magnates and all nobles, but not the ignoble.<sup>73</sup>

Membership in the political nation with all the rights appurtenant thereto had become a matter of genetics, ancient and modern.

At the end of his work Werböczy turned to the "misera contribuens plebs," the "villanis quos jobagyönes nuncupamus." Whereas Huns and Hungarians alone had framed his earlier discussion of nobility, peasants he traced to widely variant ethnic origins, some Hungarians, others Saxons and Germans, Czechs, Slavs, Vlachs, Ruthenians, Serbs, Bulgars, Greeks, Pechenegs, and Cumans. Most of these had once been free to change their residence, but no more, for they had now lost it in perpetual punishment for the late insurrection. The reference becomes an echo of the statute itself: "Dominisque ipsorum terrestribus, mera et perpetua iam rustici tate subjecti sunt."<sup>74</sup> Particulars of the lords' jurisdiction over and the nobles' judicial privileges against the peasants he develops in subsequent titles. Among others, the rustic lacks forever any right to land; all property pertains to the lord.<sup>75</sup>

Istvan Werböczy thus took over as Hungarian constitutional principles both the ethno-genetic understanding of a social order transmitted by the historians and the practicalities of the class victory gained in that very year. The reality was legitimized from a historic sense of the nobles' birthright, enforced in a contemporary sense of the peasants' shameful birth, and projected on to an endless future in precisely those same terms. Werböczy thus functioned as the educated and eloquent spokesman for his triumphant class, winners in the internal struggles of a state which, whether they cared or not, teetered on the lip of disaster. That came at Mohács a dozen years later. Medieval Hungary was destroyed and soon dismembered, leaving Werböczy's concept of that state immune from the need to confront an evolving political reality. In the chaos his theory of a social order remained to lend historical validity to the real genetic bar between nobility and servitude. His concept of the nation remained, too, as an ideal for the resuscitation of rule by Hungarian nobles of pure birth and spotless descent. These were the future significances of the *Tripartitum*. But in its own time the genetic myth

there summarized had transmuted past realities to justify a genuine change imposed on the political economy of late medieval Hungary.

\* \* \*

It remains to make tacit comparisons explicit and then to suggest some tentative and partial explanations for what has been observed. Consider first how the five idea structures here explored related to more objective situations surrounding those who propagated them. None of these genetic ideologies failed to correspond to a contemporary reality, though that reality was not necessarily itself genetic. Some were. In Ireland and Poland, where the *natio* or *gens* had, for the most part, genuine ethnic identity, ideas fairly represented this, if thereby perhaps eliding or even distorting other kinds of social attributes. But elsewhere racialist distinctions stood instead for different real discriminatory criteria, cultural and behavioral in Scotland and Spain, socio-political in Hungary. Still, even in these cases the genetic myths accurately located, though they inaccurately described, fissures in a social order.

Secondly, the racialist ideologies differ some in their relations to social change over time. Again, the first two cases are the simplest, for Irish and Polish notions of identity between genetic and cultural groupings varied little in the periods examined. But in Scotland Fordun's modification of the *Scota* myth constituted a clear effort to bring older ideas into more satisfactory accord with what he and his successors understood as a contemporary (and now can be recognized as an evolving) social reality. With this adjustment of the idea structure, racialist thought in Scotland still maintained its consistent place as mirror of reality. More complex and interesting were, however, the mutual interactions among ideas and realities in late medieval Spain and Hungary. In the former, Christian cultural preconceptions and the fact of occupational differences between medieval Christians and Jews together shaped a consistent ideology of Jewish-Christian relations in the age of *convivencia* right up to 1391. But thereafter, when the changed cultural reality of the *conversos* negated a part of the older idea structure but not other of its components, a different set of actions obtained legitimacy as a result of the ideological innovation which postulated a genetic equation of the new group with the old. In Hungary Simon of Kéza formulated his genetic myth much as would Fordun a century later—to explain the realities of his own time. But when Simon's myth became a statement of fundamental truths, it offered to later men like Werböczy a

mental framework to legitimize and define their own subsequent transformation of reality. Thus the Spanish idea of blood and the Hungarian of birth entwined with their realities in sequential and mutual development far more significantly than did the analogous concepts articulated elsewhere.

Racialist ideologies thus sustained a connection to socio-cultural realities closer than may otherwise have been the norm among medieval social theories. Whether changing or not, these ideas had distinct purpose in situations of real or potentially real fear and conflict among groups. They defined the group and/or its opponents in a way which lent meaning to the others' behavior and justification to one's own. For an Englishman the Irish were *bestiales*, for an Old Christian the *conversos* were traitors, for a Hungarian noble the peasants were inherently criminal because they had to be so. They were what they were and one excluded or exploited appropriately in response.

They were what they were because they always had been. Racist ideologies are necessarily historical in that the constituent units exist in time and through time. With equal necessity, however, the units are ahistorical. They do not, they can not, change through time. They freeze. Momentary personal representatives simply stand for a permanent biological identity. *Gaels* or Castilians knew that from the start, for they possessed traditional mythic histories and scriptures to trace the genetic link from the past to the present. Others had to invent their own myths, whether in passing like John of Fordun with his *Scota* and *Gaythelos* or as a basic interpretive structure like Simon of Kéza with his *Huns*. For all, though, the birth of a person, the blood flowing in his or her veins, placed that one unalterably in a sempiternal unit of race and lineage, a structure with characteristics fixed for all time by that birth and blood.

But the explanatory question remains. Why stress or even use racist or genetic ways of understanding when others seem, at least to the modern eye, to have been equally or more obvious and fundamental in these situations? Useful hypotheses are few. Modern sociology of race and ethnicity seem unwilling to distinguish among or to explain the particular forms of prejudice which may arise in conditions of conflict.<sup>76</sup> Léon Póliakov puts forward a psychoanalytic theory of racism wherein collective myths of origin serve a universal function of distinguishing self from other and thus "make explicit those obscure emotional forces which determine the hostilities between clans and tribes."<sup>77</sup> That is for the historian at once too much and too little. These universals occur only in certain cases, sometimes to divide, sometimes to unite, and the

hostilities were often only made to appear as tribal. Why did *this* schema serve as it did in *these* cases? Two speculative but mutually compatible proposals may be advanced by way of conclusion, one with greater reference to the choice of genetic criteria *per se*, the other to the fixing of human groups which use of these criteria entailed.

First and most assuredly, all five societies here discussed placed antecedent emphasis on lineage and kinship bonds within them, an emphasis stronger, it seems, than that normal elsewhere even in medieval society. Each Irish tribe claimed a blood link as, more immediately, did its ruling lineage segment. Highland clans echoed this structure and so, more faintly, did the Lowland "name." For Polish and Hungarian nobles analogous clans and lineages remained key solidarity groups into and beyond the thirteenth century, while in Spain pride in ancestry gave honor and *hidalguia* among Christians and Jews alike. These structures offered an evident model for conceptualizing larger groups as well, less, perhaps for those trained in learned culture than for people like ordinary Scots or Irish, Old Christian rioters, or vengeful participants in the Diet of 1514. But many of the protagonists mentioned above had some claim to high intellectual culture. Had they therefore any mental equipment with which to supplant popular conceptions? What models were available to understand socio-cultural differences and change? To judge from what has been seen so far, not much. The author of the Remonstrance, Simon of Kéza, and John of Fordun displayed their learning in this regard only by trotting out more elegant antiquarian myths, not by seeking interpretive structures to handle change in human groups. Speaking more broadly, only one kind of exception seems to test this ruling inability to conceive non-genetic explanations of large-scale cultural phenomena, and that is a change explicitly mentioned in passing in three of the cases though present in more, conversion to Christianity. But for virtually everyone here mentioned conversion of the ethnic group was a transcendent event, not an ordinary historical process at all. God intervened directly. And at the risk of displaying gross ignorance, in the one other instance I know of where a medieval writer clearly perceived a major change in the identity of a socio-cultural group and understood it not as degeneration or as sin but as change, he not only avoided racist ideas of necessity, he ascribed it explicitly to God's design. Fulcher of Chartres wrote in 1123 of the Christian society he had seen created in the Levant.

Consider, I pray, and reflect how in our time God has transformed the Occident into the Orient. For we who were Occidentals have now

## STUDIES IN MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE HISTORY

become Orientals. . . . We have already forgotten the places of our birth. . . mutual faith unites those who are ignorant of their descent. . . . He who was born a stranger is now as one born here; he who was born an alien has become as a native. . . . You see therefore that this is a great miracle and one which the whole world ought to admire. Who has heard anything like it?<sup>78</sup>

On the one periphery of medieval Europe that was the sacred center of the Christian universe God did intervene to erase the constraints of birth and make possible a wholly new human group. Elsewhere He did not, and the biological identity of lineage and race bound human beings past, present, and future into unchanging mental structures.

Appendices: *Texts describing the origin of servitude among Hungarians.*

a. Simon of Kéza, *Gesta Hungarorum* (1282/85), ch. 7. Ed. A. Domanovszky in E. Szentpétery, ed., *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*, I (Budapest, 1937), pp. 147-148.

igitur in aetate sexta saeculi multiplicati Huni in Scitia habitando ut terna, anno Domini septingentesimo in unum congregati, capitaneos inter se, scilicet duces vel principes praefecerunt, quorum unus Wela fuit, Chele filius ex genere Zemem oriundus, cuius fratres Cuwe et Aducha ambo capitanei. Quarti vero ducis nomen Ethela fuit, Benzuz filius, cuius fratres Reuwa et Buda uterque duces extiterunt de genere d'oriundi, ut simul uno corde occidentales occuparent regiones. Conventerunt quoque inter se rectorem unum nomine Kadar de genere Turda oriundum, qui communem exercitum iudicaret, dissidentium inter se sopiret, castigaret malefactores, fures ac latrones. Ita quidem, ut si rector idem immoderatam sententiam definiret, communitas in irritum converteret, errantem capitaneum et rectorem deponeret quando vellet. Consuetudo etenim ista legitima inter Hunos sive Hungaros usque ad tempora ducis Geyche filii Tocsun inviolabiliter extitit observata. Itaque quomodo ergo baptizati fuissent Hungari et effecti Christiani, sub tali rege praecones in castris ad exercitum Hungaros adunabant: "Vox Dei in populi Hungarici, quod die tali unusquisque armatus in tali loco precise debeat comparere communitatis consilium praeeptumque audire." Quicumque ergo edictum contempsisset praetendere non

Richard C. Hoffman

25

valens rationem, lex Scitica per medium cultro huius detruncabat, vel exponi in causas desperatas, aut detruendi in communium servitutem. Vitia itaque et excessus huius unum Hungarum ab alio separavit, alias cum unus pater et una mater omnes Hungaros procreaverit, quorum unus nobilis, alter innobilis diceretur, nisi victus per tales casus criminis haberetur.

B. *The Hungarian Illuminated Chronicle* or Vienna Codex (1358), chapter 7. Ed. D. Dercsényi (New York, 1970), facsimile fol. 4r-v; ed. A. Domanovszky in E. Szentpétery, ed., *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*, I (Budapest, 1937), pp. 255-257.

Anno ab incarnatione Domini CCC-o LXX-o III-o, tempore Valentis imperatoris et Celestini primi, pape Romane ecclesie, in sexta etate saeculi multiplicati Huni in Scythia habitando, congregati in unum, inter se capitaneis constitutis Wele, filio Chele de genere Zemein oriundo, Keue et Kadicha eiusdem Ethele, Kewe et Buda, filiis Bendekus de genere Eadar, ad occidentales regiones invadere decreverunt. De centum enim et octo tribus decies centena milia, scilicet de uno quoque genere decem milia armatorum virorum eligentes, derelictis aliis Hunis in Syethia, qui ipsorum sedes regnumque ab hoste custodirent. Constituentes inter se rectorem unum nomine Kadar de genere Turda, qui lites sopiret dissidentium, fures et latrones ac malefactores castigaret, ita tamen, ut si rector idem immoderatam sententiam diffiniret, in irritum posset communitas revocare errantem rectorem et capitaneos deponeret quando vellent. Consuetudo itaque ista legitima inter Hunos sive Hungaros usque ad tempora ducis Geyche filii Toxun, extitit observata. Ante enim baptismum Hungarorum in castris vox preconia clamando taliter Hunos congregabat ad exercitum: "Vox Dei et communitatis universe, quod unusquisque in tali loco armatus vel sicuti esse, debeat precise comparere communitatis preceptum ac consilium auditurus." Quicumque ergo edictum contempsisset non valens pretendere rationem, culto divino [sic]<sup>77</sup> per medium lex Scitica sanctiebat, aut ire in desperatas causas, vel in communium servitium in misericorditer tradebatur. Vitia itaque et huiusmodi excessus unum Hunum ab aliis fecerunt seperari. Alias autem, cum unus pater et una mater Hunos omnes generans procreavit, quomodo unus nobilis et alter ignobilis esse diceretur, nisi victus per hos casus criminis haberetur?

This edition copyright © 2008 by Ashgate Publishing Limited, and Introduction by James Muldoon and Felipe Fernández-Armesto. For copyright of individual articles refer to the Acknowledgements.

Published in **The Expansion of Latin Europe, 1000-1500 Series** by

Ashgate Publishing Limited  
100 Brookfield Drive  
Suite 200  
Burlington, VT 05401-4405  
USA

Ashgate Publishing Company  
Suite 420  
101 Cherry Street  
Burlington, VT 05401-4405  
USA

ISBN 978-0-7546-5973-0

Ashgate website: <http://www.ashgate.com>

#### British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

The medieval frontiers of Latin Christendom : expansion, contraction, community. - (The expansion of Latin Europe, 1000-1500)

1. Colonization - History - To 1500 2. Civilization, Medieval 3. Colonization - Religious aspects 4. Middle Ages 5. Europe - History - 476-1492

I. Muldoon, James II. Fernandez-Armesto, Felipe 909'.07

Library of Congress Control Number: 2008924312

This book is printed on acid free paper.



Printed and bound in Great Britain by  
TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

THE EXPANSION OF LATIN EUROPE, 1000-1500 – VOL 1

## Contents

Acknowledgements

General Editor's Preface

Introduction

### PART ONE – EXPANSION

- 1 The Expansion of Europe I  
*William R. Shepherd*
- 2 The American Frontier – Frontier of What?  
*Carlton J. H. Hayes*
- 3 European Colonial Experience: A Plea for Comparative Studies  
*Merril Jensen and Robert L. Reynolds*
- 4 The Significance of the Frontier in the Middle Ages  
*Robert I. Burns*
- 5 Medieval Real Estate Developments and Freedom  
*Bryce Lyon*
- 6 Colonization Activities in the Latin Kingdom  
*Joshua Praver*
- 7 Missionary Problems in the Thirteenth Century: A Study in Missionary Preparation  
*Mathias Braun*
- 8 Outsiders by Birth and Blood: Racist Ideologies and Realities around the Periphery of Medieval European Culture  
*Richard C. Hoffmann*

### PART TWO – CONTRACTION AND REDIRECTION IN THE LATE MIDDLE AGES

- 9 The Closing of the Medieval Frontier, 1250–1350  
*Archibald R. Lewis*