



**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY
WEST POINT, NEW YORK 10996**

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

6 JAN 2020

MADN-HIST

MEMORANDUM FOR Cadets Enrolled in HI 370

SUBJECT: Syllabus for HI 370, Ancient and Medieval Warfare, Second Term, AY19-20

1. Introduction.

HI370 is devoted to the military history-- broadly conceived--- of the ancient and medieval periods in Europe (and, secondarily, the Middle East), from the dawn of recorded history to the mid-fifteenth century AD. It is not, however, merely an extension backwards in time of HI 301/302. Although it deals with the history of the military art over that period (i.e. with developments in strategy, tactics, weaponry, etc.), it is equally concerned with "war and society" issues: how various military systems have affected and been affected by the societies of which they are a part. In addition, this course is intended as a workshop in historical methodology, in which you will have the opportunity to work with a wide variety of primary sources and compare what you get out of them with what professional historians have taken from the same materials. Even if you do not plan to be a historian, this will provide you with an excellent opportunity to hone your critical thinking skills.

2. Course Questions, Goals and Objectives.

Two course questions will guide our class all semester:

I. Taking into account (a) the individual warrior: his motivations, equipment, and place in society; (b) the prevailing methods of waging war, at the tactical, operational, and strategic levels; and (c) societies' motives (and justifications) for waging war, how much continuity is there both within and between the ancient and medieval periods?

II. How can we squeeze the greatest possible amount of understanding from the primary and secondary sources we read?

The following goals and objectives indicate what this course is intended to help you achieve.

Goals:

Knowledge:

1. To give cadets a foundation of knowledge concerning ancient and medieval (through the fourteenth century) military history.
2. To enable cadets to develop an understanding of the continuities underlying the conduct of pre-modern warfare, particularly in strategy, but also in tactics and in the practices of siege warfare.
3. To enhance cadets' understanding of the historical linkages between military systems and political structures, particularly relationships between military and political "enfranchisement," and between armies and states.

4. To give cadets a broader base of historical examples with which to evaluate proposed principles, rules, or patterns in military history (broadly conceived).

Development as Historians:

5. To accustom cadets to the study of primary sources for ancient and medieval military history, including some of the “Great Books” of military history, such as Thucydides’ *Peloponnesian War* and Caesar’s war commentaries, thus encouraging them to develop as life-long learners.

6. To develop cadets’ ability to weigh the evidence of primary sources in order to sort out conflicting historiographical interpretations.

7. To develop cadets’ abilities to develop and analyze historical narratives, based on primary source evidence, and to identify and refine their own historical questions to ask of those primary sources.

General Education:

8. To develop the wisdom and the military judgment of the cadets taking the course, including their ability to understand why people act as they do, how this relates to the justifications for their actions they offer, and the ways by which they can be influenced to work together to achieve a common purpose.

9. To improve cadets’ ability to read and think critically.

10. To improve cadets’ ability to construct well organized, well supported, and logically rigorous historical arguments.

11. To improve cadets’ ability to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing.

Objectives

1. Cadets should be able to demonstrate knowledge of continuities and developments in ancient and medieval military history, through the medium of a well organized, clearly written, logically rigorous essay.

2. Cadets should be able to demonstrate the ability to weigh the evidence of primary sources in order to sort out conflicting historiographical interpretations, through the medium of a well organized, logically rigorous essay, composed of precisely chosen words, correct sentences, and concise, coherent paragraphs.

3. Cadets should be able to read a body of primary source material, sort out the events described, and identify questionable elements which require further research or analysis, or patterns which can be highlighted and discussed.

4. Cadets should demonstrate the ability to analyze historical questions and make oral arguments, supported by sound factual knowledge of material related to the questions, in class.

3. Scope and Methodology.

a. The course covers European military history (with emphasis on Western Europe, but also with some coverage of the Middle East) from Biblical times into the fifteenth century. Because this is a very broad scope, many topics of interest will not be covered, or will be covered only briefly. Other selected topics, however, will be covered in much greater detail, since depth of study is as important as breadth of coverage.

b. Lessons are divided into two blocks of instruction: ancient warfare (down to the fourth century AD), and Late Antique and medieval warfare.

c. The majority of the readings for this class will be from sources roughly contemporary with the events they describe, from the Bible and Julius Caesar’s *Gallic Wars* to Jean le Bel’s chronicle of the Hundred Years War. As you read these sources, bear in mind for each of them the following questions:

1. What can we discern about the equipment, tactics, and strategic methods of the combatants? How are the latter two affected by the first?
2. What does the author of the source see as the proper role of the warrior in society (or of the society at large in the conduct of war)?
3. What does the source have to say about the reasons for going to war?

4. What does the source indicate about attitudes towards what is and is not legitimate in the conduct of war?
5. To what extent does the source seem trustworthy? Does it contradict itself, or other primary or secondary sources you have also read?
6. What generalizations suitable for the thesis of a paper can be drawn from the information in the source?

d. A substantial proportion of the reading assignments for this class are secondary sources. Most of these are paired with primary source selections covering the same or related material. As you read these historians' analyses, consider the following questions:

1. Is this a good piece of historical work? Is it well organized, well supported, and logically convincing?
2. What question is the author trying to answer? What is the thesis of the piece?
3. Are there conflicts between the assertions of this secondary source and the corresponding primary sources also assigned?
4. What details in the primary sources also assigned offer additional support to the generalizations of this secondary source?
5. Is the historical question which the author explores one which could profitably be addressed to a different body of primary source material assigned earlier in the course?

e. I will expect that, when you come to class, you will have already read and thought about the assigned reading for that day's lesson. Class time will generally be spent on discussion, not lecture. My job is to help you think about and understand the knowledge you acquire by reading, not to transfer knowledge to you.

4. Writing Requirements.

You will write at least two papers for this course, each of 750-1,250 words (c. 3-5 pages). One will deal with the motivations for Caesar's Gallic wars (due Isn. 17). One will deal with the battle of the Granicus (due Isn. 12), or Hastings (due Isn. 26), or Poitiers (1356), or with the Poitiers campaign (due Isn. 37). Papers are due at the start of class. More detail on the paper assignments will be provided in a separate memorandum early in the semester.

You may write as many additional papers as you wish for this class. Only the top two paper grades will be counted towards your final course grade. This reflects my belief that your final grade should represent your ultimate success in reaching the course goals and objectives. If you improve your mastery of the goals and objectives by reflecting on my feedback from the first two papers you submit, and then demonstrate that improved mastery by writing a better third paper, that demonstrated improvement should be represented by a correspondingly improved grade. Topics for additional papers will be chosen by you, with my approval (though you do not need advance approval to write an additional paper on one of the standard topics). Additional papers will be submitted on the day of the most closely related class, by prior agreement with me.

Kate Turabian's *Manual of Style*, as supplemented by the Dean's *Documentation of Academic Work* are the standards for format for elective courses in the Department of History.

6. Oral Presentation

Each cadet will give one oral presentation over the course of the semester. I will provide a list of topics and base readings early in the semester, and each cadet will sign up for one. More information on the presentation will be given in a separate memorandum.

7. Lesson Schedule. See enclosure 1.

8. Grading System.

- a. Points for the various graded components of the course will be allocated as follows:

	Points
Instructor Points (mainly writs)	200
Class Participation	200
Presentation	100
First Paper	250
Second Paper	250
WPR	400
<u>Term End Exam</u>	<u>600</u>
Total:	2000

b. The History Department has defined the letter equivalent of the various ranges of average marks as follows:

<u>Letter Grade</u>	<u>Average (Percent)</u>	
A+	97.0 - 100	
A	93.0 - 96.9	Excellent
A-	90.0 - 92.9	
B+	87.0 - 89.9	
B	83.0 - 86.9	Good
B-	80.0 - 82.9	
C+	77.0 - 79.9	
C	73.0 - 76.9	Satisfactory
C-	70.0 - 72.9	
D	67.0 - 69.9	Marginal
F	Less than 66.9	Unsatisfactory

5 Required Textbooks.

You must have the following texts for this class.

- a. [Ferrill] Ferrill, Arther. *The Origins of War, from the Stone Age to Alexander the Great*. Boulder: Westview, 1997. (Note: you may use any edition, but if you do not have the Westview edition, compare it with someone who does to ensure the page numbers match up.)
- b. [Hackett] Hackett, John, ed. *Warfare in the Ancient World*. New York: Facts on File, 1989.
- c. [Keen] Keen, Maurice, ed. *Medieval Warfare: A History*. Oxford: Oxford U.P., 1999 or 2001.
- d. [SR] Rogers, Clifford, ed. *Selected Readings for HI370: Ancient and Medieval Warfare, Spring Term, AY20*. West Point, NY: Department of History, 2019. (Electronic Reader) *Note: I will distribute a PDF e-book with the public domain Selected Readings and ones I have authors' permission to distribute. For items that cannot be distributed in that way, you will access them through electronic reserve on Blackboard. Some will be part in the print reader and part on Blackboard. The schedule of lessons lists Blackboard readings as (BB).*
- e. [Strickland] Strickland, Matthew, ed. *Anglo-Norman Warfare*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1991.
- f. [Thucydides] Thucydides. *The Landmark Thucydides* Ed. Robert B. Strassler. New York: Free Press, 1996.

g. *Atlas for Ancient and Medieval Warfare* [In-class issue.]

10. Instructor Assistance. I encourage you to contact your instructor whenever you need assistance or have questions. Students in my sections may call me at my office or at home. My office is located in Room 147 Thayer Hall. My office phone number is x5936; my home phone is (914) 736-9798 (please do not call after 21:00).

[SIGNED]

Clifford J. Rogers
Professor of History
Course Director, HI370

Encl.:

1. Schedule of Lessons

Enclosure 1: Schedule of Lessons, HI370.

Lsn	Date	Title
-----	------	-------

1.	1/8	Ancient Near Eastern War and Society. Readings: Ferrill, 33-62 ¼; Hackett, 30-34; Kadesh Inscriptions and Reliefs [SR#1 (BB)].
----	-----	---

Study Questions: 1. Summarize the changes in Egyptian warfare from Old to Middle to New Kingdom. 2. Answer questions in syllabus, paras. 2 and 3. *3. Can all the details of the battle of Kadesh as described by Ferrill be supported or deduced from the Kadesh Inscriptions and Reliefs?

2.	1/10	Assyrian and Hebrew Warfare, or: Terrorism and Counterinsurgency in Iraq and Palestine. Readings: Ferrill 62-79; Hackett, 46-7, 51.8-52.7; <i>Annals of Sennacherib and Assurbanipal</i> [SR#2 (BB)]; Atlas Map 1; <i>The Bible</i> , Selections. [SR#3]
----	------	---

Study Questions. 1. Can you discern a “grand strategy” at work in the sources on Assyrian warfare? 2. How, if at all, is the Hebrew way of war different from the Assyrians’? *3. Do you see any flaws in Ferrill’s analysis of the Assyrians’ way of war?

3.	1/15	From Homeric Warfare to the Hoplite Phalanx. Readings: 1. Ferrill, 91-99; 2. <i>The Iliad</i> , selections [SR#4]; 3. Tyrtaios, “Spartan Soldier” (Read at: https://web.archive.org/web/20100312173238/http://www.spartan-world.de/tyrtaeus2_text.html); 4. Victor Davis Hanson, abstracted by John Tarkov, “The Hoplite in Battle,” [SR#5 (BB)]
----	------	---

Study questions: See handout.

4.	1/17	The Persian Wars Readings: Ferrill, 80-89; Strauss and Ober, “Xerxes of Persia and the Greek Wars: Why the Big Battalions Lost.” [SR#6 (BB)] Optional: Read Ferrill, 107-119 before Strauss and Ober if you would like a more linear narrative to aid your understanding of the argument in Strauss & Ober.
----	------	--

Study Question. 1. Why did the Persians fail to conquer Greece?

5.	1/23	Hoplite Warfare at Plataea, or: Military Transformation from the “Army of One.” Readings: Ferrill, 99-107 + Herodotus [SR#7]; Atlas Map 2
----	------	--

Study Questions. 1. How would you use Herodotus’ account of Plataea to support or to modify Ferrill’s generalizations on hoplite warfare? 2. Why didn’t the Persians win?

6.	1/27	Thucydides I: The Outbreak of War, or: The Doctrine of Preemptive War. Readings: Intro to lsn. 6, in <u>SR</u> ; Thucydides, 1.18-19, 1.22-91; 1.118-125, 1.139-141, 1.143-6, plus marginal notations for chapters omitted from this sequence. Note: For Thucydides (as for most ancient authors), citations are by “chapter” [comparable to a modern paragraph] rather than by page. This is done for a variety of reasons, the two most important of which are precision and the fact that there are many different editions and translations of many of these ancient texts; so long as the standard chapters are used, a citation can be followed up in any one of them (or very easily on the Perseus Project web page, at www.perseus.org). In the <u>Landmark Thucydides</u> , the chapter numbers are in the margins, above the year of the action described.
----	------	---

Study Questions: 1. Was Athens wise to assist Corcyra? 2. What was the most fundamental cause of the war? Who were responsible for its outbreak-- the Athenians or the Spartans?

7. 1/29 Thucydides II. Strategy and the First Years of the War.
 Readings: Required: Thucydides, 2.1-2.14; 2.16-33, 2.47, 2.52-2.65.6, 2.66-2.79, plus marginal notations for chapters skipped in this sequence. Recommended: Just read straight through from 2.1-2.79 (about 40 pages of text after deducting maps & illustrations.)

Study Question: 1. For centuries Greek poleis had consistently “played by the rules” of hoplite warfare. How and why did Athens step outside of those rules? Why was Athens able to do so when others never had? 2. At the start of the war, which side had better prospects for ultimate victory? 3. At the end of the second year of the war, which side was winning?

8. 1/31 Thucydides III Empire & Morality [Mytilene and Melos].
 Readings: Introduction to Lsn. 8, in SR. Thucydides, 3.1-68; 5.84-116.

Study Question: 1. Can you tell which policy Thucydides favors – Cleon’s or Diodotus’—or whether he is neutral? If he does favor one side, why does he do such a good job of presenting the other? 2. Why do the Athenians act differently towards Melos than they had towards Mytilene?

9. 2/3 Thucydides IV Sicily and Overview: Imperial Overstretch?
 Readings: Ferrill, 127.3-143.2; Thucydides, 6.1, 6.9-6.11, 6.18-6.19.1, 6.31, 6.33, 7.2-7.6, 7.8, 7.11; 2.65.5-13

Study Questions: 1. Was the Athenian failure in Sicily inevitable, or was it due to bad execution? 2. Given the disaster in Sicily, was Athenian defeat in the Peloponnesian War inevitable?

10. 2/5 The “Military Revolution” of the Fourth Century BC.
 Readings: Hackett, 118-19; Ferrill, 143-152.5; map p. 53; 156-162.7, 166.3-186.

Study Questions: What is Ferrill’s thesis, and does he prove it?

11. 2/7 Alexander I
 Readings: Ferrill, 187-194.8; Plutarch, *Life of Alexander*, [SR#8]; Ferrill, 211-215.2; Atlas Map 3.

Study Question: 1. How well does Ferrill’s view of Alexander match Plutarch’s? 2. Which was most important to Alexander’s success: good luck, the mistakes of his enemies, or his own genius?

12. 2/11 Alexander II: Granicus Colloquium. **[First battle paper option.]**
 Readings: Ferrill, 194-198; Sources on the Granicus campaign [SR#9]; Atlas Map 4

Study Question: What about Arrian’s account is hard to credit? What about Diodorus’ account is hard to credit? What *did* happen at the battle of the Granicus?

13. 2/13 How to Conquer the World: An Overview of the Roman Military Machine.
 Readings:

1. Intro. To Lsn. 13 (BB)
2. Connolly, “The Early Roman Army,” in Hackett, 136-142; Atlas Map 5
3. Polybius, “Military Institutions of the Romans” [SR#10] and “The Battle of Cynoscephalae; The Phalanx and the Legion Compared” [SR #11]; Atlas Maps 6-10
4. Hackett, 169-173.6
5. Josephus, Excursus on Roman Military Institutions [SR #12]

Study Questions: 1. What adjectives would you pick to best describe the Roman military system? 2. If you were fighting a war against Rome, how would you do it?

14. 2/18 Hannibal vs. Fabius.
 Readings: 1. Barry S. Strauss and Josiah Ober, *The Anatomy of Error*, 133-147 [SR #13 (BB)]; Atlas Maps 11-12

2. Plutarch, “Life of Fabius” [SR #14]

Study Question: Was Fabius a better general than Hannibal?

15. 2/20 Roman Republican Imperialism I.

Readings: Atlas Maps 13-15; “Roman Expansion and Imperialism, 400-190 BC” [SR#15]. “Selected Primary Sources on Roman Imperialism: The Second Macedonian War.” [SR#16]

Study Questions: 1. Donald Kagan, following Thucydides, has argued that the main motivations for war (or other state actions) are fear, honor [i.e. maintenance or building of reputation; keeping obligations], and interest [acquisition of territory or other benefits aside from safety and honor]. Which of those three was the main reason for the Romans’ decision to go to war with Philip V in the Second Macedonian War? 2. Is that answer the exception or the rule in Rome’s wars of the 2nd century BC?

16. 2/24 Roman Republican Imperialism II. The Jugurthine War.

Readings: Atlas Maps 16-19; Synopsis: History of Rome, 146BC- 113 BC and Sallust, *Jugurthine War* [SR #17].

Study Questions: 1. How well does the case of the Jugurthine War fit with the conclusions we reached in our discussion last class concerning Roman imperialism? 2. Relying only on internal evidence, how reliable do you think Sallust is? Consider two questions: what was he in a position actually to know, and is he biased in favor of some individuals or groups over others? 3. What were the responsibilities of a general in the late second century BC? How good were Metellus and Jugurtha as generals?

17. 2/28 Roman Republican Imperialism III. Caesar’s Gallic Wars. **[Paper Due]**

Readings: Introduction to Caesar (BB); Atlas Maps 20-23; Caesar, *Gallic War*, Bks. 1 & 2 plus First British Expedition [SR #18 (BB)]

Study Question: 1. Donald Kagan, following Thucydides, has argued that the main motivations for war (or other state actions) are fear, honor [i.e. maintenance or building of reputation; keeping obligations], and interest [acquisition of territory or other benefits aside from safety and honor]. Which of those three are most important in motivating Caesar’s campaigns against the Gauls? 2. How important is Caesar himself in achieving the conquest of the Gauls (vs. Caesar’s army?)

18. 3/2 The Gallic Wars, continued.

Readings: Intro to Isn. 18 (BB); Atlas Maps 24-32; Caesar, *Gallic War*, Bk. 7 [SR#19 (BB)];

Study Questions: What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Roman army, as revealed in this text? Of Caesar himself? Of the Gauls? Why didn’t the Gallic revolt succeed?

19. 3/4 Caesar’s Civil War.

Readings: Atlas Maps 33-44; *Civil Wars*, Bk III (to p. 296) [SR #20 (BB)]

Study Question: 1. What were the characteristics of Caesar’s generalship that enabled him to defeat Pompey - or was it something other than his generalship that was decisive? 2. Historian A. K. Goldsworthy has argued that “the tactics of Roman infantry were fundamentally aggressive, emphasizing the offensive above all else.” Does today’s reading bear that claim out?

20. 3/6 **WPR IN CLASS**

21. 3/16 The Roman Empire

Readings: Intro. to Isn 21 (BB); Dobson, “The Empire,” in Hackett; Arther Ferrill, “The Grand Strategy of the Roman Empire” [SR #21 (BB)]

Study Questions: 1. What is Ferrill’s thesis? 2. Reverse-engineer Ferrill’s essay to produce an outline of its basic structure. 3. Does Ferrill persuasively support his thesis?

22. 3/20 Late Roman Warfare.

Readings: Tomlin, “The Late-Roman Empire” in Hackett; Vegetius, *De Re Militari*, selections [SR #22]

Study Questions: 1. Pick the three of Vegetius’ general maxims [at the end of the Vegetius reading] that you think best encapsulate his strategic advice. 2. How would Vegetius have rated Fabius vs. Hannibal? How would he have explained Caesar’s success? 3. List the most important differences between the Roman military system in the first century AD and in the fourth century. For each major change, is it a change that would make Vegetius’ strategic advice easier to implement? More effective?

23. 3/23 The Barbarian Kingdoms

Readings: 1. “Introduction to Early Medieval Warfare” (BB) [SR#23]; “Sources on Early Medieval Warfare” (BB) [SR#24]

24. 3/25 Carolingian and Ottonian Warfare.

1. Reuter in Keen, 13-35. 2. DeVries, *Medieval Military Technology*, 97.5-98.8, 108-110. [SR#25, BB] 3. *Royal Frankish Annals*, AD 782-785, and extracts from the *Annals of Fulda* [SR#26, BB]

Study Questions: 1. What areas of continuity, if any, do you see between Roman and Carolingian military systems and methods? 2. Do you see any contradictions between Reuter’s conclusions and either his evidence or your common sense, or the other assigned readings? 3. What are the topics Reuter flags as open for debate?

25. 3/27 Vikings and Anglo-Saxons.

Readings: Tacitus, *Germania*, selections [SR#27]; Clarke in Keen, 36-58; Anglo-Saxon Battle Poems [SR#28].

Study Questions: 1. Compare and contrast the Vikings and Anglo-Saxons with the first-century Germans described by Tacitus.

26. 3/31 Hastings Colloquium I. **[Second Battle Paper Option Due]**

Readings: Beeler, *Warfare in England*, [SR#29 (BB)]; Brown, “Battle of Hastings,” in Strickland, 161-178.5 + last three sentences p. 181.

Study Question. 1. Identify **ALL** of the disagreements between Brown and Beeler. (Make a written list.) 2. Which disagreements are most significant? 3. How would Beeler answer the question “Why did the Normans win at Hastings”? Would Brown’s answer be significantly different?

27. 4/2 Norman Conquest/ Hastings II.

Readings: Primary Sources for 1066 [SR#30 (BB)] Note: bring the Lsn. 26 readings to class as well as today’s assignment. Cadets writing Hastings papers should also read *The Chronicle of Battle Abbey*, pp. 1-10, at <https://books.google.com/books?id=zGjSAAAAMAAJ>.

Study Question. 1. How does the evidence provided by the primary sources help resolve some of the important differences (of omission or commission) between Beeler and Brown? 2. Do the primary sources suggest that the reason for the outcome of Hastings may have been *neither* William’s superior generalship nor the superior Norman military system?

28. 4/6 Norman Expansion.

Readings: Gillingham in Keen, 59-88; Gillingham, “William the Bastard at War,” in Strickland.

Note: translations of Latin quotations in the latter: p. 150 (*caput*): “most worthy city, the capital and defense of the land.” 156: (*princeps*) “foremost knights”; (*famis*) “the bitterness of hunger, crueler and more pressing than the

sword.” 155: (*cum*) “with a small force of men.” 156: (*stipendarios*) “paid men and mercenary knights.” 157 (*per*): “through vast/empty, hungry, unknown regions.”

Study Questions: 1. Gillingham writes that “demographic growth and economic expansion” underlay the Norman expansion of the eleventh century. What more strictly military factors would you emphasize as other contributors to that phenomenon? 2. What adjectives best summarize William’s generalship, as described in “William the Bastard at War”?

29. 4/9 Robert the Wily at War.

Readings: 1. Geoffrey Malaterra, *The Deeds of Count Roger of Calabria and Sicily and of Duke Robert Guiscard his Brother* and William of Apulia, *The Deeds of Robert Guiscard* (Selections). [SR#31 (BB).] Atlas Maps 45-46.

Study Questions: 1. Approach the sources for the d’Hautevilles (Robert and Roger) the same way Gillingham approached the sources for William the Bastard. What would you say in a paper on “Robert the Tricky Bastard at War?” 2. To what extent and how is Geoffrey of Malaterra biased?

30. 4/13 Anglo-Norman Warfare I.

Readings: Bradbury, “Battles in England and Normandy” in Strickland, 182-93; Gillingham, “Richard I and the Science of Warfare” in Strickland, 194-207.

Study Questions. 1. What “historical questions” structure Bradbury’s article? 2. What is Gillingham’s thesis?

31. 4/15 Anglo-Norman Warfare II.

Reading: Atlas Maps 47-51; *Fantosme’s Chronicle* [SR #32];

Study Questions: 1. Consider John Gillingham’s model of medieval warfare, as described in the articles you read for lessons 28 and 30. How well does it fit with Fantosme’s Chronicle? 2. What are some historical questions you could ask of this chronicle? Or (almost but not quite the same question), using it as your “data pool,” what topics might you address in an article or a history senior thesis?

32. 4/17 [Modified Schedule Day] Medieval Siege Warfare

Reading: Rogers, “Sieges (Abridged).” [SR#33 (BB)]. [Bring SR#32 to class also.]

Study Questions. 1. How important was generalship in determining whether a siege succeeded or failed? 2. How typical were the sieges described in Fantosme [SR#32]?

33. 4/20 Crusading Warfare

Reading: First Class Cadets: Read Edbury in Keen, 89-112, and Kastanias “Christian Victory in the First Crusade: An Issue of Unity,” 22-28. [SR#34] (BB). Other Cadets: Read Edbury in Keen, 89-93, and Kastanias, “Christian Victory in the First Crusade: An Issue of Unity.” [SR#34] (BB)

Study Questions: What does Edbury’s chapter tell us about the role, effectiveness, and use of fortifications, devastation, and battle in the Latin East? How does this differ from the West?

34. 4/23 Warfare and Chivalry, 1200-1320.

Readings: 1. Housley in Keen, 113-135. 2. Gillingham, “War and Chivalry in William the Marshal” in Strickland. 3. Excerpts from the *Scalacronica* and the poetry of Bertran de Born [SR#36]

Study Questions. 1. What are the three most important points made by Housley? 2. How does the medieval idea of chivalry differ from what you expected? 3. Did the chivalric ethos work to the benefit or the detriment of society as a whole? 4. What is the purpose of Gillingham’s discussion of the historiography of his topic? What is Gillingham’s historical question? What is his thesis?

35. 4/27 Mediterranean Mercenaries: The Catalan Company.

Readings: 1. Atlas Maps 52-53; Selections from *Muntaner's Chronicle* [SR#37].

Study Questions: 1. Are the members of the Catalan Company “chivalric” (defining that term based on your readings for lsn 34)? 2. Compare and contrast the warfare described in Muntaner’s chronicle with the warfare described in Fantome’s chronicle (lsn. 31). 3. Compare and contrast the warfare described in Muntaner’s chronicle with the wars of Republican Rome.

36. 4/29 The Face of Battle

Readings: Rogers, “Battle (Abridged).” [SR #38]

Study Questions: 1. Pick three passages from the reading you think are most interesting, surprising, or worthy of discussion. Bring a written list to class. 2. Can this reading be used to support the proposition that cavalry was the decisive tactical arm in medieval battle? 3. The generalities of medieval battle are a mix of characteristics of *all* battle, characteristics of *pre-modern* battle, and elements that are distinctively *medieval*. What aspects of medieval battle are unique to the medieval period?

37. 5/1 Poitiers Colloquium I (Secondary sources - Campaign)

[Third Battle Paper Option Due]

Readings: 1. Intro to Lsn. 37 (BB). 2. *War Cruel and Sharp*, ch. 15 pp. 1-9, [SR#39 (BB)]; *Black Prince's Expedition*, pp. 100-112. [SR#40 (BB)].

Study Questions: 1. What are the main points of disagreement between the two secondary sources? 2. On each major point of disagreement, is the dispute a matter of fact, inference, or opinion?

38. 5/4 Poitiers Colloquium II (Primary sources - campaign)

Readings: *Poitiers Sources* [SR #41A-J (41C on BB)]. In each document, read only up to the start of the battle. We will read the narratives of the actual battle next class.

Study Question: Review the points of contention concerning the 1356 campaign discussed last class, and the conclusions we reached for each of them. What specific passages in the primary sources can you use to support or reverse those conclusions?

39. 5/6 Poitiers Colloquium III (Primary and secondary sources - battle)

Readings: “Eager for Battle,” pp. 9-12 [SR#42]; *Black Prince's Expedition*, 112-134 [SR#43 (BB)]. *Poitiers Sources*, [SR#41A –J, portions covering battle itself (41C on BB)]; Atlas Maps 54-55.

Study Question: First read the secondary sources on the battle, study the maps, and based on them try to figure out what actually happened during the battle. Then read the primary sources and see if they change your mind. Try to match the terrain to the descriptions, and draw a sketch of the action in the battle.

40. 5/8 Late Medieval Warfare.

Readings: Rogers in Keen, 136-160.

Study Questions: 1. Bring to class, in writing, a good subcourse essay question for the TEE, and a good coursewide essay question. 2. T/F: War in the late middle ages was radically different from what it had been before 1300, as the result of revolutionary change, not evolutionary progression.