

**THE
HANOVER
HISTORICAL
REVIEW**



Volume 15

2020

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPTS

The *HHR* Editorial Board welcomes submissions of essays, document transcriptions and translations, and book reviews of a historical nature from any discipline.

Manuscripts must be prepared in conformity with *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 17th edition, in 12-point Times Roman font, double-spaced (including footnotes) and with pages numbered.

Submissions should be submitted by email attachment as a Microsoft Word document to Professor Michael Raley (raleym@hanover.edu). Because all submitted manuscripts will be evaluated anonymously, the author's name should appear only on the title page. There should be no identifying markers (including headers and hidden texts) within the body of the paper.

Articles should not exceed 3,000 words without the prior approval of the *HHR* editors. Please note that submissions accepted for publication may be edited to conform to the *HHR*'s style. The *HHR* editors remain the final arbiters of length, grammar, and usage. However, they will endeavor to consult with authors with regard to any changes made in the interest of clarity and economy of expression.

The *HHR* disclaims responsibility for any statements, either as fact or opinion, made by contributors.

THE HANOVER HISTORICAL REVIEW

Volume 15

Summer 2020

Senior Editors

Meghan Lanter and Nicholas Vaughn

Junior Editors

Abigail Estes, Emma Kate McMurtry, and Eric Woodruff

Editorial Board

Abigail Estes

Bradley Hancock

Addie Harris

Jordan Kennedy

Meghan Lanter

Eliza Malott

Emma Kate McMurtry

James Moll

Katarina Rexing

Lauren Rippy

Maddy Shelton

Nicholas Vaughn

Eric Woodruff

Faculty Advisor

J. Michael Raley, Associate Professor of History

Managing Editors

Daniel P. Murphy, Professor of History

J. Michael Raley, Associate Professor of History

Financial Support

Department of History and Hanover College

Printing

Carol Persinger, Mailroom Services

The *HANOVER HISTORICAL REVIEW* is dedicated to the promotion of excellence in undergraduate scholarship and writing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	v
----------------	---

Daniel P. Murphy and J. Michael Raley, Managing Editors

Outstanding Freshman History Essay

The Consequences of the Christian Conversion of Constantine: Favoritism, Conflict, and Heresy.	3
Cleo R. Mills	

Student Essays

<i>La Reconquista</i> : The First, the Last, and the Most Successful Constellation of Crusades	13
Meghan Lanter	
Pagan Ritual, Witchcraft, and Heresy: Transformation from the Early to High Middle Ages: ca. 500-ca. 1300 A.D.	25
Katarina M. Rexing	
Dr. Denis Mukwege: Addressing the Nightmare of Sexual Violence against Congolese Women	37
Malkia A. Wakuika	

Outstanding Senior History Thesis

Preparing for Greatness: Abraham Lincoln's Failed Term in Congress	47
Nicholas Vaughn	

FOREWORD

In the fall of 1992, supported by colleagues and enthusiastic students, Professor Frank Luttmner proposed a journal that would publish student papers and documents related to the field of history written, transcribed, and/or translated by students from any department of Hanover College. An editorial board of students was selected to determine which papers and documents would be chosen for the journal, and also to edit them for uniformity of style in preparing the journal for publication. Professor Luttmner provided support to the editors in the early stages of preparing the journal, while Professor Daniel Murphy helped oversee the final copyediting for the printer.

The inaugural issue of *The Hanover Historical Review* appeared in Spring 1993 and enjoyed great success. The *HHR* flourished for the rest of the decade, but was published only sporadically after Professor Luttmner's illness and untimely death. At the outset of the 2016-17 academic year, the Hanover College History Department decided to resume publication of the *Hanover History Review*, provided that we could find sufficient support for this project among our students. Twelve of our students immediately volunteered to serve on the *HHR*'s editorial board. Working with this group of eager and diligent students, and now with their successors in 2019-2020, has turned out to be a great joy for us as faculty mentors. The result of their diligent efforts may be found within the covers of this latest volume of the *HHR*.

Throughout the 2019 fall semester, the *HHR* Editorial Board met every other week on Tuesday evenings at 8 p.m. to discuss the 2020 *HHR* Call for Papers and Submission Guidelines, as well as to conduct training sessions for new *HHR* Editorial Board members and also provide grammar, formatting, and editorial training and review for all current *HHR* Board members. The 2020 *HHR* contains, first and foremost, essays on historical themes written and submitted by Hanover College students. Some of these were written by freshmen, while others were authored by upper-class men and women. An abridgement of an outstanding senior thesis is also published here.

The historical essays included in this year's *HHR* have all been written for classes at Hanover College. All submissions must conform to *The Chicago Manual of Style*. Only Professor Raley knew the identity of the authors until the essays had been twice reviewed by the *HHR* Board of Editors. This anonymity the Board regarded as especially important at a small liberal arts college such as Hanover College, where everyone knows everyone else; beyond this, however, a few of the board members wished to submit their own essays for consideration, and to ensure impartiality here Professor Raley distributed these, minus their authors' names, to other members of the board for anonymous peer review.

Seven specific criteria guide the Editorial Board's review of submissions:

1. Does the essay's introduction effectively set up and present a clear, original thesis?
2. Is the thesis supported with an ample supply of primary and secondary sources, critically interpreted for the reader?

3. Has the author brought forward a fresh interpretation of the evidence that advances current scholarship?
4. Is the thesis restated clearly in the conclusion to the essay? Does the author also add further implications of his/her findings?
5. Are the footnotes/endnotes and works cited page(s) formatted correctly in Chicago Style?
6. Is the writing style clear, fluid, and logical? Does the essay employ strong transition sentences along with connecting phrases and clauses?
7. What specific revisions or additions does the author need to make to improve the article pending its acceptance for publication?

Following the review process, the authors of the submissions were provided with summaries of the board members' comments. The review process, the board decided, would yield one of three ratings: (1) accept for publication as is (or with only minor editing required); (2) revise and resubmit (typically requiring more research and substantive revisions and/or additions as well as reediting the prose and reference notes/works cited pages); or (3) reject for publication. Some authors, of course, chose not to revise and resubmit their work. Those who did revise and resubmit their essays were expected to pay close attention to the comments and suggestions for substantive revisions as well as for the editing of the text and formatting of the notes that had been provided by the Board members in their reviews. The Junior and Senior Editors of the *HHR* took over from here, reading all essays still under consideration again and suggesting editorial grammatical and format changes for consistency and clarity. Professors Murphy and Raley oversaw the final editing of the journal, which initially is being published digitally, but hopefully, will be printed on campus early this fall by Carol Persinger.

The reason for the delayed printing stems from the outbreak of the COVID-19 virus this spring, which resulted in the temporary closing of the Hanover College campus and the completion of the winter 2020 semester online. Included here was also the closing of the Duggan Library, so any final additions of research material had to be digitally available. The abrupt transition to online and virtual classes created a considerable amount of stress and a greatly increased workload for both the students and the professors. All of this helps explain why only five student essays have been chosen for inclusion in this year's *Hanover Historical Review*.

Despite the difficulties of the past few months, what we as faculty members have found refreshing has been the seriousness and dedication with which these student editors and also the authors of the articles appearing in this volume have approached their tasks. In the midst of the burdens of daily college assignments, athletic commitments, club and student senate responsibilities, rehearsals for campus musical organizations, community volunteer work, part-time employment, and, finally, digital assignments while working online at home, each gave willingly and freely of his or her time to make this project come to fruition. In the process, these students not only performed a worthy public service, but no doubt also learned a great deal in the process.

For all of these reasons and many more personal ones, we have once again thoroughly enjoyed working with these fine students. We hope that you will share our enthusiasm as you read the articles and documents published within this .pdf file if you are reading the digital version or within these covers if you have the pleasure of reading a hard printed copy.

Daniel P. Murphy and J. Michael Raley
Managing Editors, June 2020

Outstanding Freshman History Essay

The Consequences of the Christian Conversion of Constantine: Favoritism, Conflict, and Heresy

Cleo R. Mills

Religion is one of the most powerful forces in all of history. It has been the catalyst behind numerous wars and has led to the suffering of countless people. Whether one considers the persecution of the Protestants under “Bloody Mary” Tudor in the 1550s, the persecution of Christians under the Roman Emperor Nero around 64 A.D., or the continued persecution of Jewish people throughout history, religion can drive people to do horrible things. However, religion can be a positive, unifying force as well.

By the Third Century A.D., the Roman Empire no longer retained its same strength and might. Much of its power that came from its centralization was now being dispersed and the capital city was moved around Italy to try and ward off the German barbarians. The massive extent of the Roman Empire did not make its plight any easier. In fact, it eventually became so much of a problem that the Empire was divided by Emperor Diocletian. Rome was now split between the East and the West, and it was on the western side of the Empire that Constantine rose to power. Diocletian ruled as emperor from 284-305 A.D. and is known well for his reunification of the Roman Empire, while his successor, Constantine, who ruled from 306-337 A.D., is known for his support for the recently persecuted Christian Church. Although Constantine’s own baptism did not occur until he was on his deathbed, his sympathy toward Christianity while he ruled facilitated the preservation and helped arrest the decline of the Roman Empire.

In regard to Constantine’s Christian sympathies, it is important to note at what point they originated. Eusebius is the chronicler who recorded the event that is credited to be the catalyst of Constantine’s turn to Christianity, the Battle of the Milvian Bridge. Eusebius gives a clear description of Constantine’s vision before the battle, which took place in 312 A.D. Regarding the vision, Eusebius states, “He said that about noon, when the day was already beginning to decline, he saw with his own eyes the trophy of a cross of light in the heavens, above the sun, and bearing the inscription, CONQUER BY THIS.”¹ Eusebius and Constantine interpreted this as divine intervention from the Christian God. Subsequently, both Eusebius and Constantine credited the aid of God for the victory against his rival emperor, Maxentius. Constantine decided to go against the tradition of Roman leaders looking for divine intervention from their pantheon of gods. Eusebius explains his reasoning as follows, “[M]any emperors who had preceded him, those who had rested their hopes in a multitude of gods, . . . at last had met with an unhappy end.”² This suggests that, under paganism, Rome and its emperors were facing a decline in

¹ Eusebius, *The Conversion of Constantine*, *Internet Ancient History Sourcebook*, Fordham University, <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/conv-const.asp> (accessed November 13, 2019).

² Eusebius, *The Conversion of Constantine*.

prestige and power, leading leaders like Constantine to look for change that could rebuild and strengthen the Empire. Constantine effectively proved that he did not believe the pagan traditions of Rome could facilitate that change and, instead, looked towards the monotheistic traditions of Christianity for guidance. This decision created considerable tension, especially since Rome was built on respecting its traditions.

Predating Constantine's rise to power, the Roman Empire had suffered from a number of domestic issues. Following the Severan dynasty that ended with the assassination of Alexander Severus in 235 A.D., the Roman Empire witnessed a period of chaos and decline known as the Crisis of the Third Century.³ Although Rome had recently expanded its territory, and hypothetically was gaining more might and wealth, the Empire was poisoned by internal conflicts. These problems included frequent civil war between military leaders, problems with succession that often led to these wars, high taxes, and economic instability that arose from the devaluation of Roman currency.⁴ These problems and the inability of emperors to solve them set the stage for Constantine's rise to power and rule that would largely stabilize the Empire. After defeating Maxentius in a civil war, Constantine was sole emperor of the Western Roman Empire, ready to restore the Roman Empire to a period of stability and power. By 324 A.D., after further civil wars, Constantine had united the entire empire under his rule.

Eventually, it became apparent that Constantine's new empire needed a new capital, and that pagan Rome would not be satisfactory. This is partly due to its geographical location and the fact that it was an aging city; however, it was also filled with pagan religion. The decline of Rome as the center of Italy, and of the Roman Empire, was evident even before Constantine rose to power. Indeed, the Emperor Diocletian had already moved the capital to Ravenna. Needing to establish a new center of power, Constantine built Constantinople and intentionally designed it to be a new, Christian capital for his empire. The desire for this new capital to be predominantly Christian was made abundantly clear in the way in which the new city was financed. The Emperor required that Roman citizens who had not converted to Christianity finance the building of the new city.⁵ This was a quite obvious way of asserting Christian dominance within the city and sending the message to pagans that their days of religious dominance within the Empire were numbered. Additionally, Constantine commissioned the building of Christian churches throughout the city, such as Hagia Irene.⁶ While many new Christian elements were present in Constantinople, the city, in many ways, still showed reverence to the traditions of Rome. It

³ Joshua J. Mark, "Roman Empire," *Ancient History Encyclopedia*, https://www.ancient.eu/Roman_Empire/ (accessed February 27, 2020).

⁴ Mark, "Roman Empire."

⁵ Constantine Bourlakis, "The Emperor's New Mind: On Constantine I's Decision to Legalize Christianity," *International Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 5, no. 1 (2016): 47-59.

⁶ Donald L. Wasson, "Constantinople," *Ancient History Encyclopedia*, <https://www.ancient.eu/Constantinople/> (accessed November 13, 2019).

contained aqueducts, an enlarged hippodrome, and even some small pagan temples.⁷ Even though Constantine was trying to set Constantinople apart as a new Roman capital for his new Roman Empire, he still understood the importance of including traditional Roman elements, and the long-term preservation of the Roman Empire. However, the movement of the capital to the Christian Constantinople, the aging of pagan religion in the Empire, and the subsequent rise of monotheistic religions around the world (such as Islam, Judaism and Christianity) spurred the Roman Empire's transition from a pagan, polytheistic Empire to a monotheistic, Christian Empire.

To preserve an institution as expansive as the Roman Empire, one of Constantine's major challenges was bringing the entirety of the Empire under one religion, ideologically and in practice, especially since the monotheistic nature of Christianity is quite a stark contrast to the polytheistic practices of paganism. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that there were tensions between the pro-Christianity governance of Constantine and the pagan traditions of Rome. As the two religions are quite different, their coexistence without conflict was unlikely. However, in the early years after Constantine's conversion, it looked as though it might actually have been possible. This glimpse of hope came under the Edict of Milan (313 A.D.), in which Christianity was made legal after the horrific persecution Christians had experienced under previous emperors such as Nero and, most recently, Diocletian. Not only was Christianity made legal to practice, but the edict seemed to grant a great deal of religious freedom, as it states, "We have also conceded to other religions the right of open and free observance of their worship for the sake of the peace of our times, that each one may have the free opportunity to worship as he pleases; this regulation is made that we may not seem to detract from any dignity or any religion."⁸ In theory, this seemed to create a Roman Empire in which the traditional pagan religion and Christianity could coexist peacefully. However, this was not always the case. Since the concept of separation of church and state was not really in practice yet, the emperor had a great deal of influence over religion. Constantine's Christian sympathies led to instances in which Constantine favored Christianity over other religions. An example of this favor may be found in an imperial letter included in Eusebius's *The Church History*. It was sent to Anulinus, a prominent church leader in northern Africa. The letter from Constantine included a decree that stated, "So I desire that those in your province in the catholic church . . . who devote their services to this sacred worship . . . should once and for all be kept entirely free from all public duties."⁹ This exemption of clergymen from taxes and state labor shows obvious favor to the

⁷ Wasson, "Constantinople."

⁸ "Galerius and Constantine: Edicts of Toleration 311/313," *Internet Ancient History Sourcebook*, Fordham University, sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/edict-milan.asp (accessed November 14, 2019).

⁹ Eusebius, *The Church History*, trans. Paul L. Maier (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Kregel Publications, 2007), 327.

Christians since the same favor was not shown to pagan priests. In fact, many pagans faced persecution rather than favor under Constantine. Constantine appointed mainly Christians to be provincial governors and forbade pagan governors the long-established custom of preceding official business with a sacrifice.¹⁰ Not only were Christians being granted obvious favors, but pagans were being actively persecuted against legally. In addition to this, Constantine laid out stricter anti-pagan legislation. Constantine issued laws that stripped pagans of their practice of idolatry, thus barring their ability to perform many of the basic practices of their religion such as sacrifice, consulting oracles, and the building of statues.¹¹ Thus, this further exemplifies the lack of favor given to pagans under the Christianized rule of Constantine. Constantine actively sought to strip pagans of their religious power and freedom, during his reign; meanwhile, he was actively facilitating the rise of Christianity. Another decree to the Bishop of Carthage granted extra funds to Christian churches. In the imperial letter Constantine states, “Since it has been our pleasure that in all provinces . . . the holy catholic religion should receive some contribution for expenses, I have sent a letter to Ursus . . . directing that he pay three thousand *folles* [a double denarius] to Your Constancy.”¹² Money from the government being given directly to build Christian churches demonstrates imperial favoritism towards Christianity. This is another clear example of Constantine showing favor to Christians, and thus further dividing the pagans and Christians. However, Constantine believed that he needed to take action to bring all of Rome under one religion, even if it was forcibly.

As is expected, unifying an entire religion under one ruler will inevitably lead to differences in ideology. Christianity under Constantine was surely no exception. As both the leader of the Roman Empire and the Catholic Church, Constantine’s own personal opinions regarding Christianity were quite powerful and held a lot of weight. This is shown clearly through the councils at Nicaea and at Constantinople. It was around 325 A.D. when a debate came up regarding the nature of Christ. The main dispute came from Arius, a priest from Alexandria. He argued that since Christ was the son of God and was effectively created from nothing, he was not equal to God.¹³ This idea gained traction with many Christians and led Constantine to call for the Council of Nicaea to address the problem, a council about which he felt so strongly that he oversaw it personally. At this council, the Nicene Creed was adopted as the definitive answer regarding the nature of Christ. In the Creed, Christ is said to be of the “same essence” of the Father, and it is said that, “And we believe in the Holy Spirit the Lord, the

¹⁰ T. D. Barnes, “Constantine’s Prohibition of Pagan Sacrifice,” *The American Journal of Philology*, vol. 105, no. 1 (Spring, 1984): 69-72 at 7.

¹¹ Barnes, “Constantine’s Prohibition of Pagan Sacrifice,” 70.

¹² Eusebius/Maier, *The Church History*, 326.

¹³ Donald F. Logan, *A History of the Church in the Middle Ages* (New York City: Routledge, 2013), 10.

giver of life. He proceeds from the Father and the Son.”¹⁴ This is the basis of one of the most famous, transcendent principles of Christianity, that of the Trinity, which shows the influence Constantine and his empire had on Christianity in ancient and modern times as well. By taking a role as both the imperial and religious head of Rome, Constantine was able to unite the Empire in ways it had not been before.

Although Constantine sought to unite the Roman Empire under Christianity, his own devotion to the Christian faith has been questioned. An obstruction that eclipses the light of Constantine’s completely Christian empire is speculation into his own discipleship and faith in Christianity. The main source on Constantine, Eusebius, was not only a close friend of Constantine, but a Christian as well. These two facts alone poison his writings with a strong amount of potential bias; additionally, a majority of his works regarding Constantine were written after the emperor’s death. Eusebius may have been writing and interpreting from a more Christian perspective, ignoring the parts of paganism that were still present in Constantine’s rule. For example, the Arch of Constantine, a great architectural marvel near the Coliseum in Rome, shows the victory over Maxentius as attributed to the sun god, as the emperor stands alongside a chariot of the sun god.¹⁵ This puts doubt into the mind, that Constantine was a solely Christian emperor. In addition to the sun god, the monument is riddled with many other pagan deities such as Victory, Hercules, Apollo, and Diana.¹⁶ The overwhelming amount of paganism shown through the Arch’s sculptures and the apparent absence here of Christian symbols seem to present the idea that Constantine may not have always been the loyal Christian Eusebius presented him to be. In addition to this, symbols of paganism appear on the coinage of Constantine’s reign. Pagan symbols of both Sol, Invictus, and Mars are found on his coins.¹⁷ However, his direct persecution of paganism and work defining some of the key principles of modern Christianity, such as the Trinity, suggest that he still was a devout Christian. Regardless of his own practice of Christianity, his devotion to its spread across the Roman Empire, even at the expense of other religions, made an important impact on the longevity of the Roman Empire. Although there are indications of Constantine’s supposed support of paganism, it does not diminish the role he played in the resurgence of the Empire back into power, in early Christianity, and in the rise of Christianity in general.

¹⁴ *Nicene Creed*, *Internet Ancient History Sourcebook*, Fordham University, sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/nicenecreed.asp (accessed November 14, 2019).

¹⁵ Charles Freeman, *A New History of Early Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 227.

¹⁶ Mark Cartwright, “The Arch of Constantine, Rome,” *Ancient History Encyclopedia*, <https://www.ancient.eu/article/497/the-arch-of-constantine-rome/> (accessed December 7, 2019).

¹⁷ Donald L. Wasson, “Constantine I,” *Ancient History Encyclopedia*, https://www.ancient.eu/Constantine_I/ (accessed December 7, 2019).

The Consequences of the Christian Conversion of Constantine

As always, the historical significance of Constantine and his sympathy and eventual assimilation to Christianity is still quite pertinent today and exerted a lasting impact on not only the longevity of the Roman Empire beyond the Imperial Crisis, but Christianity as a whole. Without Constantine's combination of toleration and restriction, the Empire could not have slowed the internal forces leading to its end. Leaders today have much to learn from the triumphs and failures of Constantine. As toleration and understanding of religious beliefs becomes more imperative than ever, it is important for humanity to look back at the successes and failures of history and learn – that in itself is the beauty of history. Whether or not the modern world listens to the wailing warnings of the past or learns from years and years of mistakes is yet to be seen. The history of Constantine, along with the rest of history, demonstrates the great power of unity and destruction that religion yields. Only time will tell if humanity wields it well.

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCES

Eusebius. *The Church History*. Translated by Paul L. Maier. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Kregel Publications, 2007.

Eusebius. "The Conversion of Constantine." *Internet Ancient History Sourcebook*, sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/conv-const.asp (accessed November 13, 2019).

"Galerius and Constantine: Edicts of Toleration 311/313." *Internet Ancient History Sourcebook*, sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/edict-milan.asp (accessed November 14, 2019).

Nicene Creed. *Internet Ancient History Sourcebook*, Fordham University, sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/nicenecreed.asp (accessed November 14, 2019).

SECONDARY SOURCES

Articles

Barnes, T. D. "Constantine's Prohibition of Pagan Sacrifice." *The American Journal of Philology*. Vol. 105, no. 1 (1984): 69–72.

Bourlakis, Constantine. "The Emperor's New Mind: On Constantine I's Decision to Legalize Christianity." *International Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 5, no. 1 (2016): 47–59.

Cartwright, Mark. "The Arch of Constantine, Rome." *Ancient History Encyclopedia*, <https://www.ancient.eu/article/497/the-arch-of-constantine-rome/> (accessed December 7, 2019).

Mark, Joshua A. "Roman Empire." *Ancient History Encyclopedia*, https://www.ancient.eu/Roman_Empire/ (accessed February 27, 2020).

Wasson, Donald L. "Constantinople." *Ancient History Encyclopedia*, www.ancient.eu/Constantinople/ (accessed November 13, 2019).

Wasson, Donald L. "Constantine I." *Ancient History Encyclopedia*, https://www.ancient.eu/Constantine_I/ (accessed December 7, 2019).

Books

Freeman, Charles. *A New History of Early Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Logan, F. Donald. *A History of the Church in the Middle Ages*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Student Essays

La Reconquista:
The First, the Last, and the Most Successful Constellation of Crusades

Meghan Lanter

Thirty years and three popes prior to Pope Urban II's call for the "First" Crusade at the Council of Clermont in 1095, Pope Alexander II sanctioned the true first crusade on the Iberian Peninsula. A vicious fight between Catholics and Muslims in the city of Barbastro, situated in northeastern Spain, the Crusade of Barbastro raged in August of 1064. Although sometimes referred to as the Siege of Barbastro or the War of Barbastro by historians who do not see it as a true crusade, the Crusade of Barbastro was the first holy war between the Muslims and the Catholics sanctioned by the papacy. However, this was by no means the first war between Catholics and Muslims. Starting in 711, the Muslim Umayyad Caliphate expanded over the majority of the Iberian Peninsula, including Catholic Spain, controlling all but a small section in the northernmost region of the peninsula by 718.¹ Over the next 781 years, the Catholics who had retreated to the Basque region slowly began to work on reconquering their lost peninsula, pushing back the Muslims little by little, through a series of crusades. Although this "*Reconquista*", or Reconquest, lasted for nearly eight hundred years, it thus was neither a single crusade, nor was it always able to be characterized as such. Rather, it was a series of wars and battles and crusades all characterized by the same goal: the Catholic reconquest of Spain from the Muslims. The first three hundred-fifty years of the *Reconquista* were not given special notice by a pope, but in the twelfth century Pope Alexander II had taken interest in the "heroic" Catholic fighters and issued a proclamation applauding their efforts and granting them the same type of indulgences and protections that would later be given to the crusaders heading to the Holy Land.² Following the success of the first crusade at Barbastro, a series of other crusades were fought with papal backing on the Iberian Peninsula until the conquest of Granada in 1492, which brought an end to Muslim rule in Spain, making the *Reconquista* a series of crusades rather than a singular one. This succession of crusades during the *Reconquista* not only include the first and last of all crusades, but they also have the exceptional quality of being the most successful crusades, actually achieving their goal of reconquering the Iberian Peninsula and managing to keep it under their rule even now, five-hundred years later.

As with most things in pre-modern history, and often in modern history, there is little to no universal agreement on any main part of the crusades. It is almost expected, therefore, for there to be a large debate on what actually deserves to be given the title of "crusade" and when

¹ Ibn Abd-el-Haken, *The Islamic Conquest of Spain* (ca. 850 AD), *Internet Medieval History Sourcebook*, <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/conqspain.asp> (accessed October 31, 2019).

² Joseph F O'Callaghan, *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 25.

the first and last ones even took place. Although a great deal of variety exists when speaking on these topics, most historians fall into one of three schools of thought: traditionalists, generalists³, or pluralists.⁴ The “traditionalists” stress that the only military endeavors that are worthy of the title “crusade” followed the Council of Clermont and Urban II’s call to the First Crusade; they must be sanctioned by the pope, be a campaign in the Holy Land (or at least with the goal of going to the Holy Land), be against the Muslims, and include the crusader states. Within these confines, there would have been at most eight crusades ranging from 1096 until the loss of the last crusader state, Acre, in 1291.⁵ In more recent decades, however, historians have begun to acknowledge that crusades took on different forms. Crusade historians known as “generalists” define “crusade” more broadly without discriminating amongst those people who are being fought against. They also do not require papal sanctioning for a Christian holy war to be considered a crusade. They include crusades against the Cathars, pagans, and heretics, although the majority of crusades by any definition were against various groups of Muslims.⁶ A third group of crusade historians falls in-between the two extremes of the generalists and the traditionalists. The “pluralists”, who agree with both the traditionalists and the generalists on some points, do not place a limit on the area in which the crusade must have taken place, but rather they see any war that has received Papal sanctioning along with the rights and protections normally given to crusaders and has active recruitment as worthy of the title “crusade.”⁷ Both the generalists and the pluralists allow historians to expand from the Middle East and move into the Iberian peninsula to examine any possible crusading movements that may or may not have taken place there. While the traditionalists would dismiss any claim to crusades on the Peninsula, given that they did not take place in the Holy Land, the pluralists and generalists are willing to look anywhere on a map for a crusade. The generalist group extends too far away from the crusades of the Holy Land and includes numerous wars, so long as the Christians fighting did so in the name of the Catholic Church, making it the murkiest of the three most common schools of thought. The pluralist finds itself as the best group for speaking about the crusades on the Iberian Peninsula, as they received papal sanctioning and support even though they were outside of the Holy Land.

³ Jaroslav Folda, *Crusader Art in the Holy Land: From the Third Crusade to the Fall of Acre* (Cambridge University Press, 2005), 513.

⁴ Thomas F. Madden, *The Concise History of the Crusades* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2013), 8.

⁵ Madden, *The Concise History of the Crusades*, 8.

⁶ Folda, *Crusader Art in the Holy Land*, 513.

⁷ Norman Housely, *The Later Crusades: From Lyons to Alcazar 1274-1580* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 2.

Even within the pluralist school of thought, however, the entirety of the *Reconquista* cannot be classified as a crusade. The first three hundred fifty years of the *Reconquista* did not feature a united Christian front against a Muslim enemy hated by all, and received no official sanctioning or privileges granted by the popes. Rather, the separate Christian kingdoms that had previously ruled over sections of the Iberian Peninsula hated each other as much, if not more, than the Muslim Caliphate. This is not surprising, however, since the idea of the *Reconquista* as a single, unified movement did not develop until, at the earliest, towards the end of the movement. This is reminiscent of how the crusades were not described as such until historians began speaking about them years after their conclusions. Even though the Popes may have been in favor of the fights against the Muslim inhabitants, the first few centuries of holy wars on the Iberian Peninsula lacked the crusading vows, indulgences, and other necessary characteristics of the crusades. Three hundred-fifty years prior to the Crusade of Barbastro, the Battle of Covadonga had been the real starting point of the *Reconquista* movement, but it had absolutely nothing to do with crusading. Having taken place sometime between 718 and 722, this battle marked the first battle between the Muslims who had just conquered the Peninsula and the Christian resistance which, over the next seven hundred and fifty years, would reconquer modern Spain and Portugal.⁸ It was a decisive Christian victory, and, much like the importance of the victory of the Second Siege of Antioch in the First Crusade, it is possible that, without this victory, the rest of the *Reconquista* may not have happened as it became a shining guide and example for the fight against Islam.⁹

The Christian kingdoms slowly formed and gained a foothold on the Peninsula through a series of battles and sieges until four sizable states, León, Navarre, Aragón, and Catalonia, controlled most of the upper fourth of the peninsula. As was previously mentioned, there was no love lost between these groups, and they were as much enemies of each other as they were of the Muslim kings.¹⁰ Without a unified force of all the Christian kingdoms working in cooperation, any hope of driving out the Muslim forces would take a painfully long amount of time, some seven hundred and fifty years. The unification of these kingdoms could only come about from an outside source that they were reliant upon, which, of course, would be the Catholic Church. While the Church has the privilege of claiming the primary responsibility for the transformation of the *Reconquista* from a series of often ill-planned holy wars into thought-out crusades, the influx of the French in the later part of the eleventh century helped a great deal.¹¹ Prior to the movement of the French across their border with Iberia, the Christians on the Iberian Peninsula had been relatively isolated from the rest of Europe, in part because of their geographical

⁸ O'Callaghan, *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain*, 5-6.

⁹ O'Callaghan, *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain*, 5.

¹⁰ O'Callaghan, *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain*, 23.

¹¹ O'Callaghan, *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain*, 24.

location and also due to the near-constant fighting of the *Reconquista*. This also allowed for the creation of a more targeted, yet inclusive, form of church-sanctioned warfare.

The true first crusade was preached by Pope Alexander II in 1063, when he penned and sent a bull to the *Clero Vulturicensi* (perhaps referring to the clergy at the Castle of Volturmo) in southern Italy that called for their knights to confess their sins prior to setting out for Spain. Within this bull sent to the knights he also gave what would become the basis upon which crusading indulgences and privileges would be built: “we, by the authority of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, relieve them of penance and grant them remission of sins.”¹² One sees in this the two main papal indulgences, although not yet given that label, needed to characterize a war as a crusade. The relief of penance and remission of sins would become standards on which to base a crusade, especially after Pope Urban II restated them thirty years later. Unfortunately for those crusade historians who fall into the pluralist view of thought, the writings of Alexander II were not as well documented as the speech made by Urban II at the Council of Clermont, which those who are traditionalists or simply oppose the idea of naming any part of the *Reconquista* a “crusade” are quick to point out. Or, as is the case with the *Epistolae pontificum romanorum inedita*, they simply are not widely available in English.¹³ Pope Urban II’s Sermon at the Council of Clermont calling for the First Crusade in the Holy Lands was chronicled by four separate individuals, two of whom are thought to have physically been in attendance, and the wording of his sermon was similar to Alexander II’s letter proclaiming the true first crusade. Pope Urban II’s call detailed the supposed reasons the crusade was needed as well as the protections the crusaders would receive should they answer the call. Fulcher of Chartres and Robert the Monk, the two chroniclers thought to have been present at the Council of Clermont, recorded their recollections years after the event had occurred. While they differ slightly in the details, both show Urban much as Alexander had been, promising those who took up the cross remission of sins while also condemning the Muslims for having killed Christian pilgrims to the Holy Land.¹⁴ Following his speech at Clermont, Urban II sent a letter of Instruction to the Crusaders in which he reiterated, as Alexander had done, the atrocities allegedly done unto Christians by the

¹² Alexander II, *Bull to Clero Vulturicensi*, in *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain*, ed. Joseph F. O’Callaghan (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 24.

¹³ Alexander II, *Writings of Alexander II*, in *Epistolae pontificum romanorum ineditae*, ed. Loewenfeld, Samuel (United States: Wentworth Press, 2019).

¹⁴ Fulcher of Chartres, “Urban II: Speech at the Council of Clermont, 1095 (ca. 1100),” *Internet Medieval History Sourcebook*, <http://legacy.fordham.edu/Halsall/source/urban2-5vers.asp> (accessed September 10, 2019); Robert the Monk, “Urban II: Speech at the Council of Clermont, 1095 (ca. 1107),” *Internet Medieval History Sourcebook*, <http://legacy.fordham.edu/Halsall/source/urban2-5vers.asp> (accessed September 10, 2019).

Muslims showing it was the duty of the Christians to stop them.¹⁵ As only two other papacies had passed following the death of Alexander prior to the accession of Urban to the job, it is not a stretch to assume Urban was most likely influenced by the writings and actions of Alexander prior to his decision to call for his own crusade. The crusades in the Holy Land, perhaps because their intended targets played so importantly into the history and birth of Christianity, tended to have more support as well as a greater number of Chronicles written about them. While historians have the letter sent by Alexander II to the knights in Italy, it is still unknown to what extent he preached the crusade and called for other Europeans to go to the Peninsula to assist them, which may also partially be the reason it is often ignored by historians who prefer to jump ahead to the “First Crusade.”

In a letter he sent to the bishops of Spain, Alexander justifies his call for a crusade, saying, “one may justly fight against those [the Saracens] who persecute Christians and drive them from their towns and their own homes.”¹⁶ Although killing directly goes against the teaching of Christ in the New Testament, the pontiff defends his call for bloodshed by asserting that the Muslims are persecuting the innocent, peaceful Christians by running them out of their homes, and that it is the duty of those knights who are able to do so to go and defend the innocent Christians living on the Iberian Peninsula. With Pope Alexander II’s call, especially including the crusader rights offered by him, the true First Crusade was able to take place in Barbastro in 1064, a full thirty-five years prior to the so called “First Crusade.” The crusade resulted in a temporary win for the Christian forces, which were comprised of troops from all over Europe, and a devastating loss for the Muslims who were treated less than kindly by the Christian conquering forces. They were not able to hold Barbastro long, however, and it was retaken by the Muslim kingdom of Zaragoza the following year, although it would permanently fall back into Christian hands thirty-five years later.¹⁷ Despite the fact that the city was retaken by the Muslims less than a year after it was conquered, the Crusade of Barbastro was a resounding success. Nonetheless, unlike the First Crusade in the Holy Land, it would not be the most important of the crusades during the *Reconquista*, nor would it be the last one.

Papal support continued to be given to the Christians focused on freeing the Iberian Peninsula from the influence of the Muslim Caliphates following the success of the first Iberian Crusade. Alexander’s two immediate successors, Gregory VII and Victor III, had been focused on the Investiture Controversy sweeping the Church at the time, but they did not completely neglect the plight of the Christian Crusaders in Spain. Gregory VII showed a great deal of

¹⁵ Urban II, “Letter of Instruction (December 1095),” *Internet Medieval History Sourcebook*, <http://legacy.fordham.edu/Halsall/source/urban2-5vers.asp> (accessed September 10, 2019).

¹⁶ Alexander II, “Letter to the bishops of Spain and the province of Narbonne,” in *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain*, ed. Joseph F O’Callaghan (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), at 25.

¹⁷ O’Callaghan, *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain*, 26-27.

concern with the situation in Spain and even began drafting plans for a second official Iberian Crusade, but his mind was often occupied with Holy Roman Emperor, Henry IV, later in his reign. He saw Spain as belonging to the Roman Church due to a series of ancient contracts, and now the Muslims had stolen from the Church what Christians believed to be rightfully theirs.¹⁸ While his intentions had, perhaps, been pure, little work was done during his reign thanks to other matters that pulled his attention elsewhere. Gregory's successor, Victor III, lived for a little over a year after being declared Pope, but truly did little within that time other than deal with the Investiture Controversy. The next Pope in line was, of course, Urban II, who spent most of his papacy dealing in Crusades. Even though his speech at Clermont and subsequent letter may lead one to believe so, Urban was not solely focused on the potential for crusades in the East. He had, after all, come into the papal authority seven years prior to his decisions to announce another crusade and did not use that time idly. Paul Chevedden, a professor at the University of Texas, argues in his journal article, "The View of the Crusades from Rome and Damascus," that Urban had had every intention of using the momentum of the First Crusade to help liberate the Peninsula and free the Church of God from its oppressors.¹⁹ He had planned to turn it into a two-pronged military attack between the Holy Land and the Mediterranean to continue on with the crusades the prior popes had started. Without an expansion of Crusade ideals away from the Holy Land, it would be difficult to think of any such war outside the East as comparable to the crusades. Unfortunately, it was impossible to turn the crusaders' minds away from the seductive notion of reconquering the holy city of Jerusalem, and any future crusades in Spain would have to wait until the conclusion of the "First Crusade" if the Pope wanted assistance from other European leaders. But this was not the downfall of the crusading movement on the Iberian Peninsula, but rather it was just the beginning.

While the Crusade of Barbastro definitively qualified as a crusade, the rest of the four hundred years of the *Reconquista* cannot all be characterized as such. The *Reconquista* was not a single war relentlessly waged by Catholic monarchs against the Muslim occupants of the Iberian Peninsula, but rather a series of papally-sanctioned crusades mixed with battles that were completely separate from the Church and lacked any unity between the Christian kingdoms.²⁰ While generalists do not make a distinction between those being persecuted in the crusades, pluralists view it more as a grey area. For the sake of this argument, only crusades against Muslims will be considered a true crusade, without any discrimination being made based upon

¹⁸ H. E. J. Cowdery, *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 468.

¹⁹ Paul E. Chevedden, "The View of the Crusades from Rome and Damascus: The Geo-Strategic and Historical Perspectives of Pope Urban II and 'Alī Ibn Ṭāhir Al-Sulamī," *Oriens* vol. 39, no. 2 (2011): 257-329, at 270.

²⁰ Lyle N. McAlister, *Spain and Portugal in the New World, 1492-1700* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 4.

the location of said crusade. But with regards to the different battles on the Iberian Peninsula during this time, one that would not be considered as a crusade involves the massacre of over three hundred Jews living in Aragon in 1320.²¹ While terrible, the massacre of the Jewish population highlights the difference between the crusades on the Iberian Peninsula at this time and the battles and killings unassociated with the papacy. Another, specific, Spanish crusade was the result of the proclamation of the so-called Second Crusade by Pope Eugenius III in 1145, following the 1144 loss of the Crusader State of Edessa, with the papal bull *Quantum praedecessores*, which looked back on the glorious successes of the First Crusade and appealed to European Christians to take up the Cross as their fathers and grandfathers had. Just as Urban had done before him, Eugenius offered the crusaders the same remission of sins, protection of property, and guaranteed entrance into heaven should they die fighting for God.²² Two years later he issued the bull *Divina dispensation*, which formally equated the holy wars on the Iberian Peninsula with those being fought in the Holy Land.²³ Christian leaders in Spain were able to focus and unite their aggressions towards the Muslims and, with the help of the crusaders who landed on the Spanish coast prior to continuing on to the Holy Lands, to conquer Lisbon. This was one of the most successful aspects of the Second Crusade, and most likely the longest lasting.

Pope Eugenius III was in no way the last pope to issue a call to the European Christians to march to the southmost tip of Europe, the Iberian Peninsula, and fight to retake the lands still held by the Muslim Caliphates. In fact, in 1123, twenty years prior to Eugenius's decision to call for the Second Crusade in both the Holy Lands and Spain, Pope Callixtus II, famous for his role in the end of the Investiture Controversy, had already reissued what had originally been called for by Pope Alexander II. Acting as the spokesperson for the entire Holy See of the Roman Church, he declared that, "we concede to all fighting firmly in this expedition the same remission of sins which we have given to the defenders of the Eastern Church,"²⁴ giving the same rights to the Spanish Crusaders while also acknowledging them as equal in importance. Again in 1326, Pope John XXII reiterated the proclamation of Callixtus, saying, "we have thought it worthy to concede those indulgences which in similar cases were accustomed to be given by the Holy See

²¹ David Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence: Persecution of the Minorities in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 72.

²² Eugenius III, *Quantum praedecessores* (ca. 1145), *Internet Medieval History Sourcebook*, <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/eugene3-2cde.asp> (accessed December 10, 2019).

²³ Eugenius III, *Divina dispensation* (1147), in *Crusade and Christendom: Annotated Documents in Translation from Innocent III to the Fall of Acre, 1187-1291*, ed. Jessalynn Bird, Edward Peters, and James M. Powell (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 85-86.

²⁴ Callixtus II, *Pope Callixtus II: Concerning Spain* (ca. 1123), in *What Were the Crusades*, by Johnathan Riley-Smith, 4th ed. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2002).

to those going to the aid of the Holy Land”²⁵. With both these and other popes placing such great emphasis on the efforts to regain the lands lost to the Muslims on the Iberian Peninsula, it is clear that the Holy See saw them as similar, if not equal, to those Crusades in the Holy Land. The proclamation of John XXII had even come after the end of the crusades in the Holy Land, showing the acknowledgement by the Roman Church that they had not yet ended and, it seems, would not be over until the entirety of the Iberian Peninsula was liberated from Muslim rule.

As for the question of whether any so called “crusades” came after the end of the *Reconquista* in 1492, since traditionalists end their crusade studies in 1291 with the loss of the last Christian holding in the Holy Land following the devastating Siege of Acre, there is no argument on their side that a crusade occurred following the end of the *Reconquista*.²⁶ For those who fall into the pluralist school of thought, however, the loss of Acre in no way marked the end of the crusading era. As was said earlier in this paper, no agreed upon date among pluralists marks the end of the crusades, and some extremists on both the Muslim side and the Christian side argue that crusades are a modern occurrence as well. At the end of the *Reconquista*, the previous proclamations by Popes still gave their blessing over the crusades to remove the Muslim invaders.²⁷ That being said, however, the Capture of Granada, led by the Catholic Monarchs, Ferdinand and Isabella, not only ended the Iberian Crusades and the *Reconquista*, but also finalized the unification of Spain as well.

Urban II has been recognized by history as the father of the Crusades, the first pope to turn from thoughts and plans to action. But when looking at the crusades through a pluralist view, a historian can easily deduce that this is merely a myth. The first pope to truly turn to action was Pope Alexander II, although he did so on the Iberian Peninsula rather than in the Holy Land. He granted the Spanish crusaders papal dispensations, forgiveness of sins, and time off in purgatory so they would be better motivated to do, as he saw it, God’s work here on earth. Urban II followed in his path and, over thirty years later, granted the same to those he called to take back the Holy Land. While the First Crusade, as it is traditionally known, did succeed in its goal of reconquering the Holy Land, the crusaders’ conquests there were lost once again two centuries later. Meanwhile, although it took them hundreds of years to do so, the crusaders of the Iberian Crusades managed to completely reconquer the Peninsula and hold onto it. While the First Crusade in the Holy Land succeeded in its goal of “reclaiming” the Holy Land from the Muslims and instituting crusader states in Edessa, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Tripoli, it failed to establish a lasting rule over these places by neglecting to put a well-established political structure in place. Nearly all of the crusaders began their long trek home to Europe shortly after the successful, but extremely bloody, siege of Jerusalem, leaving behind an inadequate number of soldiers to protect

²⁵ John XXII, *Pope John XII: Concerning Spain* (ca. 1326), in *What Were the Crusades*, ed. Johnathan Riley-Smith, 4th ed. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2002).

²⁶ Madden, *Concise History of the Crusades*, 9 & 165.

²⁷ O’Callaghan, *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain*, 213-214.

the newly formed Crusader Kingdoms. These kingdoms fell, one by one, rather quickly to Muslim forces and even with a succession of eight more crusades in the Holy Lands, they were all lost by 1291.²⁸ Over the next several hundred years, various popes applauded the efforts made by crusaders in Spain and reaffirmed the crusader vows and indulgences given to the crusades by their predecessors. Therefore, the Crusade of Barbastro should be allowed to claim the title as the so-called “First Crusade.” Of course, even though the true first crusade took place thirty-two years prior, the “First Crusade” of 1096-1099 has been known as such for so long that it might seem foolish to expect the world to refer to it differently. At the very least, however, the name of the First Crusade should be extended to include “in the Holy Land” so future students of the Crusades do not allow themselves to be tricked into believing there had not been a crusade before. There has been a slow rise in historians adopting the pluralist school of thought as the study of the crusades becomes broader, potentially allowing for a greater amount of importance to be placed on the crusades away from the Holy Land. The Iberian Crusades show the power of “slow and steady wins the race” as five hundred years after the end of the Iberian Crusades, Spain remains in Catholic hands, although the long reign of the Muslims will never be erased.

²⁸ Madden, *Concise History of the Crusades*, 165.

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Alexander II. *Bull to Clero Vulturnensi*. In *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain*, ed. Joseph F. O'Callaghan, 24. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- Alexander II. *Letter to the bishops of Spain and the province of Narbonne*. In *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain*, ed. Joseph F. O'Callaghan, 25. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- Alexander II. *Writings of Alexander II*. In *Epistolae pontificum romanorum ineditae*. Ed. Samuel Loewenfeld. United States: Wentworth Press, 2019.
- Bird, Jessalynn, Edward Peters, and James M. Powell, eds. *Crusade and Christendom: Annotated Documents in Translation from Innocent III to the Fall of Acre, 1187-1291*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.
- Callixtus II. *Pope Callixtus II: Concerning Spain* (ca. 1123). In *What Were the Crusades*, ed. Johnathan Riley-Smith. 4th ed. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2002.
- Eugenius III. *Quantum praedecessores* (ca. 1145). *Internet Medieval History Sourcebook*, <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/eugene3-2cde.asp> (accessed December 10, 2019).
- Fulcher of Chartres. *Urban II: Speech at the Council of Clermont, 1095* (ca. 1100). *Internet Medieval History Sourcebook*, <http://legacy.fordham.edu/Halsall/source/urban2-5vers.asp> (accessed September 10, 2019).
- Ibn Abd-el-Haken. *The Islamic Conquest of Spain* (ca. 850 AD). *Internet Medieval History Sourcebook*, <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/source/conqspain.asp> (accessed October 31, 2019).
- John XXII. *Pope John XII: Concerning Spain* (ca. 1326). In *What Were the Crusades*, ed. Johnathan Riley-Smith. 4th ed. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2002.
- Robert the Monk. *Urban II: Speech at the Council of Clermont, 1095* (ca. 1107). *Internet Medieval History Sourcebook*, <http://legacy.fordham.edu/Halsall/source/urban2-5vers.asp> (accessed September 10, 2019).
- Urban II. *Letter of Instruction* (December 1095). *Internet Medieval History Sourcebook*, <http://legacy.fordham.edu/Halsall/source/urban2-5vers.asp> (accessed September 10, 2019).

SECONDARY SOURCES

Journal Article

Chevedden, Paul E. "The View of the Crusades from Rome and Damascus: The Geo-Strategic and Historical Perspectives of Pope Urban II and 'Alī Ibn Ṭāhir Al-Sulamī." *Oriens*. Vol. 39, no. 2 (2011): 257-329.

Books

Cowdery, H. E. J. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Folda, Jaroslav. *Crusader Art in the Holy Land: From the Third Crusade to the Fall of Acre*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Housely, Norman. *The Later Crusades: From Lyons to Alcazar 1274-1580*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Madden, Thomas F. *The Concise History of the Crusades*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2013.

McAlister, Lyle N. *Spain and Portugal in the New World, 1492-1700*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Nirenberg, David. *Communities of Violence: Persecution of the Minorities in the Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

O'Callaghan, Joseph F. *Reconquest and Crusade in Medieval Spain*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.

**Pagan Ritual, Witchcraft, and Heresy:
Transformation from the Early to High Middle Ages: ca. 500-ca. 1300 A.D.**

Katarina M. Rexing

Witchcraft or such accusations are often associated with Christianity, bringing forth images of the Salem Witch Trials, innocent women being burned at the stake, cauldrons of potions, and naked dances under a full moon. Based on contemporary culture's images of witchcraft, it would be easy to assume that magic was deeply ingrained in Christianity, especially its original form, Roman Catholicism. However, magic and sorcery existed well before Christ throughout all of human civilization, including Classical Greece and Rome.¹ After Christianity's legalization, the religion spread throughout Europe and was established as the dominant belief of the continent. Christianity taught its opinions on witchcraft to its converted peoples. Thus the spread of Christianity led to a denunciation of magic and pagan ritual present in the preexisting cultures of its new converts. Despite the adamance of the Church, pagan practices involving magic and sorcery died away slowly, even though Church theologians continued to condemn them for centuries. However, as much as Christians argued against pagan practices, they seem not to have been as concerned with witchcraft during the Early Middle Ages (ca. 476-1000 A.D.).² With the rebirth of Europe in the High Middle Ages (ca. 1000-1300 A.D.), however, reportings of sorcery became more common, arguably due to an increase in learning and higher interest in recording and commenting on these occurrences. As a result, more texts were written by the Roman Catholic Church's theologians condemning these people and their practices. Nevertheless, these occurrences were still regarded by contemporaries as rare and generally unsuccessful. While medieval Europe was becoming more concerned with witchcraft and sorcery, it was not yet creating the widespread fear that would be seen in the Later Middle Ages, ca. 1300-1500 A.D., and Early Modern Period, ca. 1500-1800 A.D.³ Throughout the Early and High Middle Ages, thought on witchcraft slowly transformed from a deep concern over pagan magical rituals to fears of diabolical witchcraft, which became widely regarded as heretical.

Witchcraft in the periods of the Early and High Middle Ages has been widely ignored by historians who have instead favored the more popular Later Middle Ages or Early Modern period. Therefore, in this study, these two earlier time periods will be exclusively explored. Secondary sources on Early and High Middle Ages magic and witchcraft are lacking; although this scholarship exists, it should be greatly expanded because these time periods provide independent richness as well as origins for the beliefs of the following time periods.

¹ Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters, *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700: A Documentary History*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 41.

² Kors and Peters, *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700*, 4.

³ Kors and Peters, *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700*, 4.

Christians throughout the Middle Ages condemned witchcraft, but during the late Roman Empire, Christians themselves were accused of the same actions they themselves later associated with witches. Even Jesus was accused of being a sorcerer by the Greek philosopher Celsus, a fierce opponent of Christianity.⁴ In 197 A.D., the Christian Minucius Felix recorded in his *Octavius* allegations by pagans against the Christians: “I hear that they adore the head of an ass, that basest of creatures . . . some say that they worship the genitals of their pontiff and priest . . . An infant covered over with meal . . . this infant is slain . . . they lick up its blood; eagerly they divide its limbs.”⁵ The comments on cannibalism likely stem from pagan misunderstanding or fear surrounding the early Christian sacrament of the Eucharist, in which bread was believed to be changed through God’s power into the literal body of Christ, which the Christians then consumed. These accusations nevertheless provide valuable insight into late Roman minds since they behaved in a very similar way to future Christians when they denounced witchcraft.

Once Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire under Emperor Theodosius in the late fourth century,⁶ Church officials presented laws condemning magic. No longer would Christianity tolerate accusations of animal and genital worship or of venerating anything but God. Instead, staunch laws were passed under the Theodosian Code, which was heavily influenced by Christianity,⁷ laws that severely punished any worshiping of idols. Justinian’s *Code* states the adoration or summoning of demons is a capital offence.⁸ Christianity was starting strong in its fight against magic and demon worship.

Between the fifth and the seventh centuries, as Europe transformed from an empire centered in Rome to a series of Germanic kingdoms, Christianity became the dominant religion on the continent. In the Early Middle Ages, both Arian Christians and Roman Catholic Christians began to travel as missionaries to convert the people of other regions and cultures to Christianity; these missionaries were especially successful with the Germanic tribes.⁹ However, even when these clans became faithful Christians, they still held onto aspects of their pagan, magic rituals such as the use of amulets to prevent disease. An anonymous source from a Germanic tribe, who personally practiced ritual healing stated, “Procure a little bit of the dung of a wolf, preferably

⁴ Jeffrey Burton Russel, *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1972), 45.

⁵ Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, *Internet Ancient History Sourcebook*, <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/ancient/christian-cannibals.asp> (accessed November 25, 2019).

⁶ Jackson J. Spielvogel, *Western Civilization*, vol. A: *To 1500*, 8th ed. (Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2012), 182.

⁷ Julio Caro Baroja, *The World of Witches*, trans. O.N.V Glendinning (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), 43.

⁸ Baroja, *The World of Witches*, 43.

⁹ Spielvogel, *Western Civilization*, 198.

some which contains small bits of bone, and pack it in a tube which the patient may easily wear as an amulet.”¹⁰ Aspects of the natural world, such as wolf’s dung are not enough to create healing; they must be joined with an amulet to create the magical healing properties. Catholic prelates and clergy did not approve of these magical rituals leftover from their converts’ previous spiritual beliefs. Theologians such as Church Father St. Augustine quickly condemned these customs as well as all magic in general. Augustine’s work, *On Christian Teaching* (completed 426 A.D.) stated, “to this category belong all the amulets and remedies which the medical profession also condemns, whether these consist of incantations, or certain marks which their exponents call ‘characters,’ or the business of hanging certain things up.”¹¹ Amulets of various kinds were a deep concern for Church leaders; Augustine does not simply denounce one kind of charm, such as the healing one with wolf dung, but all that exist in pagan ritual. Because he was one of the most influential of all the Church Fathers, one to whom medieval authors of works on witchcraft and magic looked for guidance, Augustine’s disapproval of pagan practices resulted in their condemnation throughout the entirety of the Middle Ages.

Although the Roman Catholic Church condemned pagan ritual, Norwegian University of Science and Technology theology professor Nils Hallvard Korsvoll suggests many aspects of pagan ritual were incorporated into Christianity,

. . . archaeological evidence shows that the use of amulets and magical manuals continued within the dominion of the new Church and Christian state. Moreover, these magical practices did not only continue as some sort of pagan remnant, many amulets and magical manuals show that they actively engaged with and took up Christian themes and ritual elements together with the older, traditional ritual elements. Popular Christian elements in these amulets are invocations of Christ and the Virgin, drawings of crosses.¹²

Objects such as the personal crucifix and saint’s medallion are therefore Christianized versions of amulets. Ironically, approved Catholic objects such as the medal and cross have origins in pagan magic and sorcery, which creates questions as to how many Christian practices and objects emerged from these origins even though the source of power of these objects was believed to originate from God and his saints rather than from nature or pagan gods.¹³ Korsvoll

¹⁰ Anonymous, in *Western Civilization*, ed. Spielvogel, 224.

¹¹ Augustine, *On Christian Teaching*, in *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700*, ed. Kors and Peters, 43-47 at 45.

¹² Nils Hallvard Korsvoll, “Official Teaching and Popular Practice: Are Church Opinions on Magic Reflected in the Surviving Amulets from the Early Middle Ages?” in *Bild und Schrift auf ‘magischen’ Artefakten*, ed. Sarah Kiyanrad, Christoffer Theis, and Laura Willer (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2018), 149-164 at 149-150.

¹³ Spielvogel, *Western Civilization*, 224.

explains that for Christians this difference was vital in separating good Christian practices from evil magic,

After all, Christ and his disciples performed miracles and wonders, and this will not have lessened the belief in supernatural assistance. Other scholars further argue that the miracles in the Gospels differ from other contemporary magical practices only in that they originate from the Christian God. But, of course, this distinction of origin was for Christian theology the very key of the matter. And, with the biblical stories of Simon Magus and the Witch of Endor as infamous examples of the evil of magic, official Christianity remained strictly opposed to magic.¹⁴

While differences between pagan and Christian ritual may seem slight to modern observers, to medieval people, the power of God was the defining factor in their practices, which made Christian elements moral and pagan ones diabolical.

In ca. 530 A.D., the Christian monk Caesarius of Arles's Sermon 54 proclaimed, "No one should summon charmers, for if a man does this evil, he immediately loses the sacrament of baptism, becoming at once impious and pagan. Unless generous almsgiving together with hard, prolonged penance saves him, such a man will perish forever."¹⁵ Caesarius of Arles makes quite a bold statement here as he asserts interactions with sorcery and magic can immediately destroy one's Christianity. Although Caesarius despises pagan ceremonies, he does not deny many of them are effective. He explains, "God permits this to the Devil . . . to try the Christian people. Thus, when they sometimes are able to recover from sickness by these impious remedies, men see some truth in them and afterwards more readily believe in the Devil."¹⁶ Burchard of Worms in the *Corrector* (1008-1012 A.D.) inquired, "Have you sung diabolical songs there and performed dances which the pagans have invented by the teaching of the Devil?"¹⁷ The Devil was associated with teaching pagans diabolical ritual rather than their gods. This statement also suggests that medieval Europeans feared that all was not Christian; even medieval therapies which appeared to be authentic could be tricks of the Devil as he attempted to gain souls for damnation. Isidore of Seville (560-636 A.D.) expanded the explanation of pagan ritual in his massive encyclopedic work, *Etymologies*, written in the early seventh century. Isidore's work was highly influential throughout the entirety of the Middle Ages; in fact, copies of his work

¹⁴ Korsvoll, *Bild und Schrift auf 'magischen' Artefakten*, 150.

¹⁵ Caesarius of Arles, *Sermon 54*, in *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700*, ed. Kors and Peters, 47-50 at 48.

¹⁶ Caesarius of Arles, *Sermon 54*, 49.

¹⁷ Burchard of Worms, *Corrector*, in *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700*, ed. Kors and Peters, 63-67 at 65.

have even been found in Ireland.¹⁸ He listed the different kinds of sorcerers and their diabolical acts, all of which were condemned:

Horoscopers speculate on the hours of the nativity of men in terms of their different fates. *Salsitores* are so called because by observing parts of their members leaping they predict the meaning of future happiness or sadness . . . In all these the demonic art has arisen from a pestilential association of bad men and angels . . . Whence all must be avoided by Christians and rejected and condemned with thorough-going malediction.¹⁹

Any action seeking knowledge about oneself, the past, present, or future with means besides the power of God was rejected.

There were many different texts in medieval Europe about witchcraft, and not all of them had material approved by the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore, Bishop Halitgar of Cambrai was asked in 830 A.D. by Archbishop Ebbo of Rheims to create a text that would exclusively have Church-approved evidence.²⁰ A universal work on witchcraft would help prevent any potential heretical works by authors with opinions different from the Church because there would be a definition for the Church's beliefs. Halitgar of Cambrai's *The Roman Penitential* (830 A.D.), a compilation of official Roman Catholic texts on witchcraft, stated, "If anyone is a conjurer-up of storms he shall do penance for seven years, three years on bread."²¹ The repentance of seven years is especially long, reserved for other crimes like murder.²² Additionally, these were holy numbers: three was the number of the Holy Trinity, and seven was considered the most mysterious digit by the Fathers of the Church.²³ Weather-magic could easily destroy crop fields and animal herds, resulting in famine and widespread pain and death. People were especially afraid of witches who could control the elements and who could destroy their entire livelihood within minutes. With all these condemnations of each form of magic, pagan rituals began to die out and be replaced by "miracles" originating from the divine power of God and the saints.²⁴ However, this issue would not be entirely solved, as shown by theologians who enforced teachings against pagan ritual through the High and Later Middle Ages.

¹⁸ Caesarius of Arles, *Sermon 54*, 50

¹⁹ Isidore of Seville, *Etymologies*, in *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700*, ed. Kors and Peters, 50-54 at 53-54.

²⁰ Halitgar of Cambrai, *The "Roman" Penitential*, in *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700*, ed. Kors and Peters, 54-57 at 55.

²¹ Halitgar of Cambrai, *The "Roman" Penitential*, 56.

²² Halitgar of Cambrai, *The "Roman" Penitential*, 56.

²³ Emile Mâle, *The Gothic Image: Religious Art in France of the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Dora Nussey, 3rd ed. (New York, Evanston, and London: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1958).

²⁴ Spielvogel, *Western Civilization*, 224.

The High Middle Ages experienced an increase in texts describing witchcraft, which provide us with the opinions of theologians, the Church, and common people on this subject. Previously, in the Early Middle Ages, pagan rituals were the Church's primary concern. The thought was that, although sorcery occurred, it was an occasional event brought on by an individual act of the Devil and skepticism was wise in the face of tales of witchcraft. In the High Middle Ages incidents of witchcraft and black magic are believed to have increased, possibly as a result of the rise of learned magic in the eleventh through thirteenth centuries that resulted from the emergence of universities and urban schools outside of monasteries and cathedrals.²⁵ Additionally, learned magic may have increased due to frequent Christian interactions with Muslims who provided the Europeans with Arabic texts, many dealing with astrology and alchemy. Muslims and Jews received this knowledge from the Ancient Greeks.²⁶ The Church condemned this magic both morally and legally as heresy. Generally, temporal authorities would act against those accused of witchcraft on behalf of the Church.²⁷

During the High Middle Ages, recognizable aspects of witchcraft began to emerge as well as strict control over Christian actions and beliefs. An early form of the witches *sabbat*, a gathering of witches to perform rituals dedicated to the Devil, was mentioned in a text from a 10th-century penitential, entitled *Canon Episcopi*, recorded in Regino of Prüm's *Libri de synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis* (906 A.D.) and incorporated into Gratian's influential compilation of canon law, the *Decretum* (1140 A.D.):

. . . [S]ome wicked women, turned back after Satan, seduced by illusions and phantoms of demons, believe and affirm that: with Diana, a goddess of the pagans, and an unnumbered multitude of women, they ride on certain beasts and transverse many areas of the earth in the stillness of the quiet night, obey her commands as if she were their mistress and are called on special nights to her service.²⁸

The Roman goddess Diana is here presented as a servant of Satan, who has seduced and deceived these women into imagining that they were riding with the deity. Many in the Middle Ages believed that pagan gods – whether Egyptian, Greek, Persian, or Roman – were demons who served Lucifer and tricked ancient peoples into worshiping them as gods.²⁹ The *Canon Episcopi* commanded bishops and priests to drive out of their parishes and dioceses those who

²⁵ Michael David Bailey, *Magic and Superstition in Europe: A Concise History from Antiquity to the Present* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc., 2007), 93.

²⁶ Bailey, *Magic and Superstition in Europe*, 93.

²⁷ Bailey, *Magic and Superstition in Europe*, 108.

²⁸ Regino of Prüm, *Canon Episcopi: Decretum, Book 2, Chapter 371*, in *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700 Documentary*, ed. Kors and Peters, 60-63 at 62.

²⁹ Kors and Peters, "Introduction," in *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700*, 4.

practiced such arts as divination and magic. Christians were no longer tolerant of those who worshipped pagan gods.

Catholicism was incredibly rigid in its beliefs due to fear of witchcraft. Texts such as Burchard of Worms' *The Corrector* (1008-1012 A.D.) highlighted increased strictness of the Church: "Have you come to any place to pray other than a church or other religious place which thy bishop or your priest showed you . . . do penance for three years on the appointed feast days."³⁰ Worship was strictly controlled, praying in any unapproved place was deemed sinful as well as belief in certain superstitions. The Roman Catholic Church's restriction of the approved places of adoration allowed prelates and clergy to control the faithful laity more effectively. Any veneration outside an accepted place was cause for concern over witchcraft or heresy, which intimidated the faithful laity into obeying the Church. Burchard of Worms stated, "Have you believed what some are wont to believe? When they make any journey, if a crow croaks from their left side to their right, they hope on this account to have a prosperous journey . . . they trust more to this augury and omen than to God."³¹ Here he clearly warned against being deceived by those who believed in magic and superstition more than in Divine Providence.

Medieval Christians had many rules to follow to ensure they were indeed faithful to God and properly avoiding witchcraft to achieve eternal salvation. Among the clearest of these influences, especially on learned magic, was Hugh of St. Victor. A schoolmaster as well as a teacher of canon law at the prestigious Abbey of St. Victor outside Paris, the man was also author of *The Didascalicon* (ca. 1120 A.D.), which offers readers a clear and concise explanation of every different aspect of witchcraft. Hugh of St. Victor recorded the origins of sorcery: "[T]he first discoverer of magic is believed to have been Zoroaster, king of the Bactrians, who some say is none other than Cham the son of Noah with his name changed."³² Therefore, this claim that the first magician was the son of Noah brings sorcery full circle, as its origins are tied in the Old Testament. The *Didascalicon* continued, "as generally received it [magic] embraces five kinds of sorcery: *mantiké*-which means divination, vain mathematics, fortunetelling, enchantments, and illusions."³³ The text then went on to state that divination has five subcategories: necromancy, geomancy, hydromancy, aeromancy, pyromancy. These are all a form of divination, necromancy through the means of the dead and the others through means of one of the four elements: earth, air, fire, and water. Vain/False mathematics has the sub-categories of soothsaying, augury, and horoscopy. Soothsaying is the prediction of time, augury is the practice of observing birds, and horoscopy is the practice of seeking answers about life from the stars. Hugh was strongly

³⁰ Burchard of Worms, *Corrector*, at 64.

³¹ Burchard of Worms, *Corrector*, 66.

³² Hugh of St. Victor, *Didascalicon*, in *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700*, ed. Kors and Peters, 67-70 at 68.

³³ Hugh of St. Victor, *Didascalicon*, 69.

opposed to all forms of magic and believed they all had the same diabolical origins whether they were pagan magic or learned magic.

As previously mentioned, Christians in late antiquity were accused of infanticide and cannibalism. In 1154, the Christian John of Salisbury accused witches of killing children for diabolical rituals in his text, *Policraticus*: “Moreover, infants are set out for *lamias* [witches] and appear to be cut up into pieces, eaten, and gluttonously stuffed into the witches’ stomachs. Then, through the mercy of the witch-ruler, they are returned [in one piece] to their cradles.”³⁴ Here Christians were seen associating witches with the terrible crimes Christians themselves were once accused of by members of the Late Roman Empire. Perhaps these associations of witchcraft with the deaths of infants were used as scapegoats to explain the high death rate of children from accidents and sickness during the Middle Ages.³⁵

Witchcraft was regarded as heresy because witches were believed to achieve their power through the completion of a contract with Satan, often sexual in nature.³⁶ Contracts with the Devil were often seen as inescapable even with repentance. In his *Chronicle of the Kings of England* (1140 A.D.), William of Malmesbury wrote about a witch who regrets her choices and says, “although you [clergymen] cannot revoke the sentence already passed upon my soul, yet you may, perhaps, rescue my body.”³⁷ The witch’s body is unable to be rescued, however, and she is carried away by a ferocious demon while screaming for mercy.³⁸ The story was meant to show that even true repentance and the aid of priests are not enough to save the soul of a witch or sorcerer; this tale intended to scare the devout into avoidance of any magic or debauchery, or else face the pains of Hell. The Dominican author of the *Summa theologiae*, Thomas Aquinas, was another forerunner, not just on magic and witchcraft, but on theology in general. In his thirteenth-century *Commentary on the Four Books of Sentences* (of Peter Abelard), Aquinas wrote, “Sorcery is therefore to be considered permanent because remedy may not be had for human agency, although God may impose a remedy either by forcing the Devil or even against the resistance of the Devil.”³⁹ Therefore, the power of God is confirmed to be stronger than that

³⁴ John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, in *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700*, ed. Kors and Peters, 77-78.

³⁵ Judith M. Bennett, *A Medieval Life: Cecilia Penifader of Brigstock*, c. 1295-1344 (Boston: McGraw-Hill College, 1999), 74-77.

³⁶ Henry Charles Lea, *Materials Toward A History of Witchcraft*, vol. 1, ed. Arthur C. Howland (New York and London: Thomas Yoseloff, Inc., 1957), 201.

³⁷ William of Malmesbury, *The Sorceress of Berkeley*, in *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700*, ed. Kors and Peters, 70-72 at 71.

³⁸ William of Malmesbury, *The Sorceress of Berkeley*, 72.

³⁹ Thomas Aquinas, *Commentary on the Four Books of Sentences*, in *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700*, ed. Kors and Peters, 104-105 at 105.

of the Devil; only God can rescue one from the grasps of Lucifer. Aquinas was not attempting to reassure witches that they will be saved, but rather, to ensure that the infinite power of God was known, so that stories of the Devil's power would not cause the masses to doubt God's strength.

Although all witchcraft was popularly believed to be heresy, papal sources did not always allow the two to be condemned together. Indeed, as shown by Pope Gregory IX's 1233 decretal letter, *Vox in Rama*, the Holy Father believed witchcraft had many heretical aspects:

The novice kisses him [a demon] and feels cold, like ice, after the kiss the memory of the catholic faith totally disappears from his heart . . . They even receive the body of our Lord every year at Easter from the hand of a priest, and carrying it in their mouths to their homes, they throw it into the latrine [toilet] in contempt of the savior . . . These wretches also believe in him [Lucifer] and affirm that he is the creator of heaven, and will return there in his glory when the Lord has fallen, through which with him and not before him they hope that they will have eternal happiness.⁴⁰

This shows that the many heretical aspects of sorcery, heresy, and witchcraft were treated as different issues by the pope. The investigation of sorcery and heresy were separated into two distinct jurisdictions. Inquisitors of heretical depravity appeared in the 1230s; their job was to find and eliminate heresy. They became increasingly concerned with witchcraft, however, likely due to a surge in cases, and asked Pope Alexander IV in the 1250s A.D. if it was appropriate for them to examine both. Due to sorcery's place in the jurisdiction of secular courts and with bishops, the pope wished to keep the two separate. In 1258 Pope Alexander IV issued a statement on sorcery and the role of Inquisition: "The inquisitors of pestilential heresy, commissioned by the apostolic see, ought not intervene in cases of divination or sorcery unless these clearly savor of manifest heresy."⁴¹ Despite the Roman Catholic Church's concern over witchcraft, it was also worried about the preservation of the medieval European political structure and was reluctant to sacrifice this for the hunting of witches and sorcerers as heretics. Additionally, the pope may have been concerned with inquisitors gaining too much power over the Church as his next text is on the subject of inquisitors examining usury.

In the Early Middle Ages, the concern was not witchcraft but rather pagan magical rituals, which threatened the authority and beliefs of the Christian faith. The High Middle Ages transformed belief in witchcraft into one of great unease regarding sorcery, which was newly considered to be diabolical and heretical. Christians were always fearful of magic and sorcery; however, a widespread increase in writings on witchcraft in the High Middle Ages resulted in the belief that all enchantment was heresy. Although an increased quantity of detailed texts on witchcraft appeared in the Later Middle Ages, the Early and High Middle Ages are still rich with

⁴⁰ Pope Gregory IX, *Vox in Rama*, in *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700*, ed. Kors and Peters, 115-116 at 115-116.

⁴¹ Pope Alexander IV, *Sorcery and the Inquisitors*, in *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700*, ed. Kors and Peters, 116-118 at 117-118.

evidence of pagan ritual and witchcraft. The sources available demonstrate the increase in witchcraft and the shift of magic from pagan rituals to diabolical spells and sacrifices. Evidence from the Middle Ages allows insight into the dangerous and anxiety-inspiring occurrences in Europe and helps modern-day readers understand where the horrifying legends of witches originate. However, for medieval people, witchcraft was not merely a legend, but a reality of life to which anyone could easily fall victim if he or she were not strong in their Roman Catholic faith.

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Aquinas, Thomas. *Commentary on the Four Books of Sentences*. In *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700: A Documentary History*, 43-47. Ed. Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Augustine, *On Christian Teaching*. In *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700: A Documentary History*, 43-47. Ed. Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Buchard of Worms. *Corrector*. In *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700: A Documentary History*, 63-67. Ed. Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Felix, Minucius. *Octavius*. *Internet Ancient History Sourcebook*. <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/ancient/christian-cannibals.asp> (accessed November 25, 2019).
- Halitgar of Cambrai. *The "Roman" Penitential*. In *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700: A Documentary History*, 54-57. Ed. Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Hugh of St. Victor. *Didascalicon*. In *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700: A Documentary History*, 67-70. Ed. Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Isidore of Seville. *Etymologies*. In *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700: A Documentary History*, 50-54. Ed. Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- John of Salisbury. *Policraticus*. In *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700: A Documentary History*, 77-78. Ed. Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Pope Alexander IV. *Sorcery and the Inquisitors*. In *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700: A Documentary History*, 116-118. Ed. Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Pope Gregory IX. *Vox in Rama*. In *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700: A Documentary History*, 114-116. Ed. Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Regino of Prüm. *Canon Episcopi: Decretum, Book 2 Chapter 371*. In *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700: A Documentary History*, 114-116. Ed. Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

William of Malmesbury. *The Sorceress of Berkeley*. In *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700: A Documentary History*, 70-72. Ed. Alan Charles Kors and Edward Peters. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Bailey, Michael David. *Battling Demons: Witchcraft, Heresy, and Reform in the Late Middle Ages*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003.

Bailey, Michael David. *Magic and Superstition in Europe: A Concise History from Antiquity to the Present*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc., 2007.

Baroja, Julio Caro. *The World of Witches*. Trans. O.N.V Glendinning. The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Bennett, Judith M. *A Medieval Life: Cecilia Penifader of Brigstock, c. 1295-1344*. Boston: McGraw-Hill College, 1999.

Kors, Alan Charles, and Edward Peters. "Introduction" In *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700: A Documentary History*, 1-40. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

Kors, Alan Charles, and Edward Peters, "Sorcery in Christendom: 900-1300" In *Witchcraft in Europe 400-1700: A Documentary History*, 58-59. 2nd ed., Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.

Korsvoll, Nils Hallvard. "Official Teaching and Popular Practice: Are Church Opinions on Magic Reflected in the Surviving Amulets from the Early Middle Ages?" In *Bild und Schrift auf 'magischen' Artefakten*, ed. Sarah Kiyanrad, Christoffer Theis, and Laura Willer., 149-164. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2018.

Lea, Henry Charles. *Materials Toward A History of Witchcraft*. Vol. 1. Ed. Arthur C. Howland. New York and London: Thomas Yoseloff, Inc., 1957.

Mâle, Emile. *The Gothic Image: Religious Art in France of the Thirteenth Century*. Trans. Dora Nussey. 3rd ed. New York, Evanston, and London: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1958.

Russel, Jeffrey Burton. *Witchcraft in the Middle Ages*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1972.

Spielvogel, Jackson J. *Western Civilization*. Vol. A: *To 1500*, 8th ed. Boston: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2012.

Dr. Denis Mukwege:
Addressing the Nightmare of Sexual Violence against Congolese Women

Malkia A. Wakuika

April is Sexual Assault Awareness Month and, as Dr. Denis Mukwege once said, “The world must draw a line on anything that is unacceptable and one of those is the way women are abused during conflict.”¹ For many years women in the Democratic Republic of Congo have been treated as second-class citizens, and their voices about the horrible and despicable acts of men in their country have gone unheard. Dr. Mukwege, who is a gynecologist as well as a human and women’s rights advocate and Nobel Prize winner, has been addressing the issue of sexual violence and the way it has changed Bukavu, a city that is located on the east side of the DRC, for approximately two decades. Horrendous human rights abuses are widespread in the Congo and are mostly committed by non-state armed groups. These cases, mostly directed against women, are typically underreported because of the fear of being outcast and stigmatized. The data is thus limited, but according to the estimate done by scholars in 2011, between 1.69 to 1.8 million women have been sexually assaulted in their lifetimes, and between 3.07 and 3.7 million Congolese women have been abused by their partners. Additionally, 50% of women have experienced domestic sexual violence in Bukavu.² Sexual violence is clearly a devastating human rights issue in the Congo. Dr. Denis Mukwege, however, provides a living example of advocacy and hope against sexual violence and serves as an example for the rest of the world.

This crisis began in 1996 when the Congo war started. During this time, many women and girls were raped and killed, and these heinous actions spread throughout Goma and Bukavu. The perpetrators of sexual violence were, and still are, members of all the armed forces and armed groups that are in the eastern Congo. These groups include the former Congolese Rally for Democracy in Goma, which is a Rwandan supported armed group that controlled the east Congo during the war, and the Forces Armées de la République Démocratique du Congo (FARDC),

¹ “‘The world must draw a red line on the impunity of abusing women in war,’ Nobel Peace Prize 2018 Laureate – Dr Denis Mukwege,” *New African Magazine*, December 19, 2018, <https://newafricanmagazine.com/17552/> (accessed April 14, 2020).

² Amber Peterman, Tia Palermo, and Caryn Bredenkamp, “Estimates and Determinants of Sexual Violence Against Women in the Democratic Republic of Congo,” *American Journal of Public Health*, vol 101, No. 6 (June 2011): 1060-1067, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3093289/pdf/1060.pdf> (accessed April 14, 2020). According to the United Nations report, 73% of victims are women and 25% are children.

Bukavu (Nord Kivu) is a city in the Democratic Republic of Congo. It is known for its wealth, and it has natural resources like cobalt, diamonds, gold, silver, petroleum and more. Although it is known for its natural resources, it is also known as one of the most dangerous places on earth for women and children to live in.

which is the government armed forces.³ These government armed forces do not only sexually abuse women, but they also steal whatever they have with them as well. In addition, they commit some of the most horrific things that could be done to any human, according to Human Rights Watch, which reported that women and girls have each been raped by 15 to 20 men, and these victims are not only raped but their genitals are destroyed. “Following rape, many women and girls require medical attention for prolapsed uteruses, severe vaginal tears, and obstetric fistulas.”⁴ The first patient of Panzi Hospital, Dr. Mukwege’s Hospital in Congo, was not a delivering mother, but a victim of sexual violence. She was raped, injured and shot in the genitals. This is one of the worst traumas that could ever happen to a woman or any human being.⁵ According to the BBC, 48 women are raped in an hour, and 20% of women report being raped, but unfortunately, nothing has been done.

Women are not the only victims. Men are also sexually assaulted, but most of the assaults are not reported because of the toxic masculinity and stigma in the society. Even with the stigma, 4% of men have reported being raped, but nothing has been done. Stephen Kigoma is a male victim who was raped and then fled to Uganda. His rapist told him that even if he reported the rape, no one would believe him. He went to a hospital where he was taken care of, but out of all the sexual violence victims, he was the only man there.⁶

Children are also harmed. Sometimes Congolese women are raped in front of their children, which is traumatizing for both. One patient of Panzi Hospital was an eighteen-month-old baby that was bleeding. “She had been raped, leaving her bladder, genitals, and rectum severely injured.”⁷ It did not matter for the perpetrators that it was a baby; all they wanted to do

³ Anna Maedl, “Rape as a Weapon of War in the Eastern DRC? The Victims’ Perspective,” *Human Rights Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (2011): 128-47.

⁴ Erika Carlsen, “Rape and War in the Democratic Republic of the Congo,” *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, vol. 21, no. 4 (2009) 474-483 at 476, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10402650903323546> (accessed April 14, 2020).

Goma is a city that is located in the eastern Congo. The Congo war is known as Africa’s first world war; there was a mass killing of Congolese people and the war was between the civilians and the military; President Marshal Mobutu was abroad for his medical treatments; the Rwandan army in support of Anti-Mobutu rebels wanted to overthrow the government.

⁵ Denis Mukwege, “Denis Mukwege – Nobel Lecture,” December 10, 2018, *The Nobel Prize*, <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/2018/mukwege/55721-denis-mukwege-nobel-lecture-2/> (accessed April 14, 2020).

⁶ “‘We need to talk about male rape’: DR Congo survivor speaks out,” *BBC News*, August 3, 2017, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-40801782> (accessed April 14, 2020).

⁷ “Panzi Hospital,” *Panzi Hospital and Foundation*, <https://www.panzifoundation.org/panzi-hospital> (accessed April 14, 2020).

was destroy her. When the baby arrived at the hospital, the nurses could not believe their eyes. They thought it was a nightmare, because it was one of the most inhumane things they had seen. This kind of horror is what Congolese women endure. In addition to feeling weak, having their voices not being heard, and living in fear, they also fear for their children. Women in Bukavu cannot even go to fetch water without the fear of being raped.

Dr. Denis Mukwege is the hope within this nightmare. He is a Congolese gynecologist who is known as the global campaigner against the use of rape as a weapon of war and a world-leading expert on how to treat the wounds of sexual violence. He was born and raised in Bukavu. He studied medicine in Bujumbura, at the University of Burundi and received his medical degree in 1983. What he wanted the most was to help women injured during childbirth. He continued his education in gynecology in France at the University of Angers.⁸ Dr. Mukwege founded Panzi Hospital in Bukavu in 1999. He and his team have treated over 50,000 victims of sexual violence. He performs over 10 operations a day, and the hospital has 370 nurses and staff support. He has been a hero to many women in the world. He does not only treat women in the Congo; he treats women around the world. He ensures that patients receive the help they need. His staff delivers over 35,000 babies a year with a 99.1% survival rate. Panzi Hospital also has psychologists and therapists who help victims to overcome the nightmares they have endured. It provides as much help as possible, with doctors working in obstetrics, gynecology, dermatology, cardiology, physiotherapy, neonatal surgery, and more. Dr. Mukwege is not new to the environment; he knows the country very well, because when he was young, his father was a pastor who traveled throughout the community to comfort the sick and dying. Many of the people were laboring mothers who did not have anywhere safe to deliver their babies; this had a huge impact on Dr. Mukwege's life, and that is why he became a doctor.⁹

It was a great sacrifice for Dr. Mukwege to become a doctor – he has been threatened multiple times by politicians and armed groups. In October 2012, he was attacked, his family was almost assassinated, and one of his good friends, Joseph Bizimana, was murdered. These attacks started several days after he chastised the government for failing to protect the people in the country and for the injustice that was widespread. He fled to Belgium with his family for his safety, but unfortunately he could only stay temporarily because he was needed at the hospital. In January of 2013 when he returned to the hospital, many people were happy to see him, and they celebrated.

Panzi hospital does not only help women and children; it also helps men who are victims of sexual violence. In 2018, Dr. Mukwege was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his heroic work and effort to end the use of sexual assault as the weapon of war in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Because this sexual violence has been going on for more than two decades, it also has

⁸ “Denis Mukwege Facts: The Nobel Peace Prize 2018,” *The Nobel Prize*, <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/2018/mukwege/facts/> (accessed April 14, 2020).

⁹ “Panzi Hospital.”

had a significant impact on the young people in the community. Sometimes children witness their mothers, sisters, friends, and cousins being raped, tortured, and killed. Dr. Mukwege said in one of his interviews, “Poverty, isolated communities, and exposure to conflicts are among various factors influencing gender inequality and sexual violence.”¹⁰ In addition to being a Nobel Prize winner, Dr. Mukwege is also on the advisory committee for the International Campaign to Stop Rape and Gender Violence in Conflict.¹¹ He has done remarkable work all around the world.¹² Despite the threats and the injustice, Dr. Mukwege has never stopped helping the Congolese people to overcome the atrocities that they experience every day.

The Democratic Republic of Congo is a wealthy country that is often called “poor.” The population suffers while being surrounded by natural resources. Although the country is very wealthy, it does not have a strong government, and it is being exploited by first world countries.¹³ Many companies have been accused of exploiting Congo for the cobalt. Some of the children working on the mines in Bukavu are orphans, their parents having been sexually abused and killed by the armed forces. This is one of the impacts of sexual violence; children stop going to school because they do not have anyone to pay for their school fees. The lack of education and guardians leads them to work in mines or become part of gangs or armed forces.¹⁴ This issue is exacerbated because Congolese society is very patriarchal and male dominated. Some victims report sexual violence, but unfortunately, nothing gets done because most of the perpetrators are members of the military, and they use their power to abuse women.

This issue has persisted for over two decades and must be addressed. First world countries have a responsibility to help the country instead of exploiting it, which only causes more people to suffer. Because the government is very weak, the UN should intervene in the

¹⁰ Denis Mukwege, “Congo: No Peace without Women,” *Journal of International Affairs* 67, no. 1 (2013): 205-09.

¹¹ United Nations, Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict, “Democratic Republic of Congo,” March 29th, 2019, <https://www.un.org/sexualviolenceinconflict/countries/democratic-republic-of-the-congo/> (accessed April 14, 2020).

¹² “Dr. Denis Mukwege: The Man Who Mends Women,” *Panzi Hospital and Foundation*, <https://www.panzifoundation.org/dr-denis-mukwege> (accessed April 14, 2020).

¹³ United Nations, Security Council, “Security Council Condemns Illegal Exploitation of Democratic Republic of Congo’s Natural Resources,” *United Nations Meetings Coverage and Press Releases*, May 3, 2001, <https://www.un.org/press/en/2001/sc7057.doc.htm> (accessed April 14, 2020).

¹⁴ Matthew Laviertes, “Tesla, Apple among firms accused of aiding child labor in Congo,” *Reuters*, December 16, 2019, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-mining-children-trfn/tesla-apple-among-firms-accused-of-aiding-child-labor-in-africa-idUSKBN1YK24F> (accessed April 14, 2020).

Democratic Republic of Congo's domestic affairs to help those who need help. When we talk about human rights being violated, let us not forget the women in the Congo who live in fear and are suffering day and night. Congo is ranked as one of the most dangerous countries for a woman to live in. Women do not have many rights, and the few rights they have are being violated. Because of the violence, 4.3 million people have been displaced. In addition to the violence they face, these women do not have access to health care and economic resources, and the opposition they face because they stand accused of threatening cultural and regional traditions also make their lives miserable.¹⁵

Sex as a weapon of war has been destroying Congolese women, men, and children's lives; it has been destroying the Congolese society. Dr. Mukwege has dedicated his life to helping his people, advocating for their rights fearlessly, and standing for what he believes in. Although his life has been threatened multiple times, that has not stopped him from being a hero. Dr. Mukwege has empowered many people to come forward and advocate for the rights of Congolese women even though it means putting their lives in danger. The Democratic Republic of Congo needs more people who are strong enough to confront the corrupted government and talk about the injustice that is being done in the Congo.

¹⁵ Thompson Reuters Foundation, "The World's Most Dangerous Countries for Women 2018: 07: Democratic Republic of Congo," <https://poll2018.trust.org/country/?id=democratic-republic-of-the-congo>. (accessed April 14, 2020).

SOURCES CONSULTED

PRIMARY SOURCES:

Cammaert, Patrick. Issue Brief: *The UN Intervention Brigade in the Democratic Republic of the Congo*. International Peace Institute. July 2013.

Mukwege, Denis. "Congo: No Peace without Women." *Journal of International Affairs* 67, no. 1 (2013): 205-09.

Mukwege, Denis. "Denis Mukwege – Nobel Lecture." December 10, 2018. *The Nobel Prize*. <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/2018/mukwege/55721-denis-mukwege-nobel-lecture-2/> (accessed April 14, 2020).

"‘We need to talk about male rape’: DR Congo survivor speaks out." *BBC News*, August 3, 2017. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-40801782>. (accessed April 14, 2020).

SECONDARY SOURCES:

"2018 Nobel Peace Prize: Who is Nobel Peace Prize Winner Denis Mukwege?" *Deutsche Welle (DW)*, December 12, 2018. <https://www.dw.com/en/who-is-nobel-peace-prize-winner-denis-mukwege/a-18011953> (accessed April 14, 2020).

Carlsen, Erika. "Ra/pe and War in the Democratic Republic of the Congo." *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, vol. 21, no. 4 (2009) 474-483. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/10402650903323546> (accessed April 14, 2020).

"Congo Story Background: The History of Rape in the Congo Background." *VOA Afrique*, March 31, 2011. <https://www.voaafrique.com/a/congo-story-background-the-history-of-rape-in-the-congo-114451814/1380867.html> (accessed April 14, 2020).

"Dr. Denis Mukwege: The Man Who Mends Women." *Panzi Hospital and Foundation*. <https://www.panzifoundation.org/dr-denis-mukwege> (accessed April 14, 2020).

"History of Sexual Assault Awareness Month." *National Sexual Violence Resource Center (NSVRC)*. <https://www.nsvrc.org/saam/history> (accessed April 14, 2020).

Harlow, Siobán. "Denis Mukwege, the Nobel Peace Prize, and the Suffering of Congolese Women." *University of Michigan, School of Public Health*. October 10, 2018. <https://sph.umich.edu/pursuit/2018posts/mukwege-peace-prize.html> (accessed April 14, 2020).

Lavietes, Matthew. "Tesla, Apple among firms accused of aiding child labor in Congo." *Reuters*. December 16, 2019. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-mining-children-trfn/tesla-apple-among-firms-accused-of-aiding-child-labor-in-africa-idUSKBN1YK24F> (accessed April 14, 2020).

Maedl, Anna. "Rape as Weapon of War in the Eastern DRC? The Victims' Perspective." *Human Rights Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (2011): 128-47.

"Panzi hospital." *Panzi Hospital and Foundation*. <https://www.panzifoundation.org/panzi-hospital> (accessed April 14, 2020).

Peterman, Amber, Tia Palermo, and Caryn Bredenkamp. "Estimates and Determinants of Sexual Violence Against Women in the Democratic Republic of Congo." *American Journal of Public Health*, vol 101, No. 6 (June 2011): 1060-1067. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3093289/pdf/1060.pdf> (accessed April 14, 2020).

The Nobel Prize. "Denis Mukwege Facts: The Nobel Peace Prize 2018." <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/2018/mukwege/facts/> (accessed April 14, 2020).

"'The world must draw a red line on the impunity of abusing women in war,' Nobel Peace Prize 2018 Laureate – Dr Denis Mukwege." *New African Magazine*, December 19, 2018. <https://newafricanmagazine.com/17552/> (accessed April 14, 2020).

Thompson Reuters Foundation. "The World's Most Dangerous Countries for Women 2018: 07: Democratic Republic of Congo" <https://poll2018.trust.org/country/?id=democratic-republic-of-the-congo> (accessed April 14, 2020).

United Nations. Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict. "Democratic Republic of Congo." March 29th, 2019. <https://www.un.org/sexualviolenceinconflict/countries/democratic-republic-of-the-congo/> (accessed April 14, 2020).

United Nations. Security Council. "Security Council Condemns Illegal Exploitation of Democratic Republic of Congo's Natural Resources." *United Nations Meetings Coverage and Press Releases*, May 3, 2001. <https://www.un.org/press/en/2001/sc7057.doc.htm> (accessed April 14, 2020).

Outstanding Senior History Thesis

Preparing for Greatness: Abraham Lincoln's Failed Term in Congress

Nick Vaughn

Abraham Lincoln represented the state of Illinois in the Thirtieth Congress from 1847 to 1849 as a Whig. According to historian Charles Strozier, Lincoln focused on three specific issues during his time in Congress: he came out “strongly against the Mexican War; he tried to introduce a bill in Congress to abolish the slave trade in Washington, D.C.; and he worked against Henry Clay and for Gen. Zachary Taylor in the 1848 presidential struggle. Lincoln was, in other words, antiwar, anti-slavery, and anti-Clay.”¹ Lincoln would only successfully accomplish one of his three specific tasks he set out to do as Congressman, as Zachary Taylor would be elected president. Lincoln's time in Congress has typically been only a footnote or passing topic in the life of the man who saved the Union, and historians have rarely dedicated more than a section of an article or chapter of a book to his first time in the District of Columbia. Lincoln failed as a Congressman, but his time in Congress and campaigning for Taylor in the 1848 presidential campaign were politically important and personally shaping for the man who would go on to lead the nation as president. Despite his failings, Lincoln's time in Congress was a transformational moment in his life that saw the beginnings of the fine-tuning of his speaking and writing style, the sharpening of his political aptitude, and the solidifying of his views on the extension of slavery.

One of the three specific issues Lincoln worked on during his time in Congress was the Spot Resolutions. The Spot Resolutions requested that President James Polk provide Congress with the exact location or spot upon which blood was spilled on American soil. Polk had claimed in 1846 that blood was spilled first on American soil and thus justified the war that way.² Lincoln introduced the Spot Resolutions on December 22nd, 1847, which was extremely late into the conflict. The war would officially end in early February of 1848, essentially only one month after Lincoln introduced his resolutions. Specifically, Lincoln asked in the resolutions “whether the spot of soil on which the blood of our *citizens* was shed, as in his messages, was, or was not, within the territories of Spain, at least from the treaty of 1819 until the Mexican Revolution,” and “whether that spot is, or is not, within the territory which was wrestled from Spain, by the Mexican Revolution.”³ Historian Charles Strozier argues that “Lincoln over-lawyered himself” and that the type of probing questioning that he was posing to President Polk was good for a

¹ Charles B. Strozier, “Lincoln's Quest for Union: Public and Private Meanings” in *The Historian's Lincoln* ed. Gabor Borritt (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 230.

² David J. Gerleman, “Representative Lincoln at Work: Reconstructing a Legislative Career from Original Archival Documents,” *The Capitol Dome*, vol. 54, no. 2 (2017-2018): 33-46.

³ Charles Strozier, “Lincoln's Quest for Union: Public and Private Meanings,” 231.

courtroom but not so good for the halls of Congress.⁴ Though Lincoln had served in the Illinois State Legislature from 1834 to 1842, he was the most experienced in the field of law and in making legal arguments that fit into the courtroom. The language and nature of the Spot Resolutions made them ineffective and irrelevant in the grand scheme of things, as Strozier points out that “in the end the worst indignity of all occurred -- no one really seemed to hear or care.”⁵ Polk ignored him and instead allowed pro-war Democrats to respond to Lincoln. Additionally, not a single Whig openly supported him on the House floor.⁶ Lincoln’s Spot Resolutions failed, and his first grand undertaking as Congressman blew up in his face. But Lincoln recognized he had been defeated, and he removed himself from further debates surrounding the war that would end very soon after his resolutions. Lincoln would step back from things in Congress for a period before moving on to his next challenge, though not much time would pass between his Spot Resolutions and his bill to abolish the slave trade in D.C. as his time in Congress was limited to only two years.

The Abolition of Slavery in D.C.

Lincoln’s second big initiative that he undertook as Congressman was the introduction of a resolution that would have abolished slavery in the District of Columbia. According to Strozier, “All sensitive observers, including some Southerners, agreed that it was unseemly to allow slaves to be publicly traded in the nation’s capital.”⁷ With the seeming agreement among a majority of those in Congress that the practice in the nation’s capital was an abomination or at the very least “unseemly” shows that Lincoln’s introduction of this bill was not without its merits. Additionally, in his speech on the House floor introducing the piece of legislation, Lincoln stated

That he was authorized to say, that of about fifteen of the leading citizens of the District of Columbia to whom this proposition had been submitted, there was not one but who approved of the adoption of such a proposition. He did not wish to be misunderstood. He did not know whether or not they would vote for this bill on the first Monday of April; but he repeated, that out of fifteen persons to whom it had been submitted, he had authority to say that every one of them desired that some proposition like this should pass.⁸

⁴ Strozier, “Lincoln’s Quest for Union” 231.

⁵ Strozier, “Lincoln’s Quest for Union,” 231.

⁶ Strozier, “Lincoln’s Quest for Union,” 231.

⁷ Strozier, “Lincoln’s Quest for Union,” 232.

⁸ Abraham Lincoln, “Speech on the House Floor” in *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, ed. Roy P. Basler (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1953), 2:20-22.

It seemed as though the bill was heading for success. Strozier notes that the fact that Lincoln went through the trouble of rounding up support among those in the district shows that he might have had a decent amount of support for the resolution in Congress.⁹

On January 13th, 1849, Lincoln made his intentions to introduce the resolution himself clear to his colleagues in the House. This was after his earlier efforts to introduce the bill did not amount to anything significant, including his aforementioned floor speech. Lincoln would not reintroduce the bill, though, and, according to James Quay Howard, Lincoln stated “finding that I was abandoned by my former backers and having little personal influence, I *dropped* the matter knowing that it was useless to prosecute the business at that time.”¹⁰ Strozier supports this claim, stating “Three days later [following his initial statement of support for the bill] he gave further notice of his intention to introduce the bill, but he never brought it up.”¹¹ Whether his support for the measure faded because Lincoln was a lame duck and was set to leave Washington in a few months or another reason is unclear. However, this failure by Lincoln signaled the end of a relatively useless stint in Congress. Lincoln had failed at nearly all he set out to do in Congress viz. the Spot Resolutions and this bill. Additionally, his support for Taylor would turn out to be all for naught. His letters to Taylor regarding a position were never returned, and he was forced to return to his law practice once his term in Congress concluded.

1848 Presidential Election

The 1848 Presidential election, following the nominating conventions, would be a three-person contest among the Whig nominee General Zachary Taylor, the Democratic nominee Secretary of State Lewis Cass, and Free Soiler former President Martin Van Buren. Without the entrance of the Free Soil Party and their accomplished nominee, it seems unlikely that Lincoln would have had as big of a role in the Taylor campaign as he did. This is because of Lincoln’s ability to relate with the Free Soilers and their party platform opposing the extension of slavery, a view that Lincoln also held.

The creation of the Free Soil Party was spurred by the extremely divided Democratic Party Convention which met in Baltimore in 1848. Historian Michael Holt explains that the main division among Democrats was between the Barnburners and Hunkers who split the powerful New York delegation.¹² The Barnburners were radical Democrats who were anti-slavery, while the Hunkers were conservative Democrats who were pro-slavery. Holt explains that “The Hunkers seized control of the party in 1847, and the Barnburners, who probably represented the

⁹ Strozier, “Lincoln’s Quest for Union,” 232.

¹⁰ David H. Donald, *Lincoln* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), 388.

¹¹ Strozier, “Lincoln’s Quest for Union,” 232.

¹² Michael Holt, *Political Parties and American Political Development from the Age of Jackson to the Age of Lincoln* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992), 67.

majority of New York Democrats, held a separate convention and ensured Hunker defeat in the general election. In 1848, the two factions again held separate conventions and sent separate delegations to the Baltimore convention national convention.”¹³ With this split within the Democratic Party, the nomination of Secretary Cass, an ardent proponent of popular sovereignty, led to many defections away from the Democratic nominee in November 1848.

Even before the nominating conventions, Free Soil support was at its peak and the presidential campaign was beginning to heat up. Historian Holman Hamilton explains that “the campaign was off to a sizzling start. Even before the Buffalo convention, Free-Soil meetings were held in Geauga, Lake, Butler, Columbiana, Madison, Mahoning, Cuyahoga, Trumbull and Knox counties [Ohio]. If some anti-extension Democrats fell away from Cass, a majority of Ohio’s Free-Soilers were Whigs--and it was small satisfaction to know Democrats also had troubles.”¹⁴ The “troubles” Hamilton refers to have been made clear on the Democratic side. On the Whig side though, the Free Soil Party’s role in taking votes from Taylor remained to be seen. On the one hand, Taylor, a slaveholding Louisiana resident who had not taken really any clear positions on anything political in his career, had an appeal to some Southerners who feared Cass’s popular sovereignty was anti-extensionism in hiding. On the other hand, free soil Whigs like Lincoln might have been more inclined to support Martin Van Buren and the Free Soil Party because of their clear opposition to the extension of slavery.

In Massachusetts, the Free Soil Party appeared to present more of a challenge to the Whig status quo than anywhere else. According to Holman Hamilton, Bay Stater “Samuel Hoar guided a Whig minority faction [at the Free Soil Convention], which repudiated Cass and Taylor and made C.F. Adams Van Buren’s running mate.”¹⁵ Furthermore, Hamilton recounts another Bay Stater at the Free Soil convention who was “Waving the Buffalo banner ‘Free Soil—Free Speech—Free Labor—Free Men.’”¹⁶ This Bay Stater waving the banner was Charles Sumner, a future United States Senator for Massachusetts. The Free Soil Party had some of its most notable Northern support in Massachusetts. Though Van Buren would only carry one county in the state (not to mention not win a single electoral vote), there was no polling and appearances made a difference.

Because of the (at least) appearance of Free Soil Party strength in Massachusetts, Lincoln would be dispatched there several times as Congressman in 1848. Lincoln was a member of the “Young Indians,” the “pro-Taylor congressional group.”¹⁷ Lincoln was not the only member of

¹³ Holt, *Political Parties and American Political Development*, 67.

¹⁴ Holman Hamilton, *Zachary Taylor: Soldier in the White House* (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company Inc, 1941), 110.

¹⁵ Hamilton, *Zachary Taylor*, 111.

¹⁶ Hamilton, *Zachary Taylor*, 111.

¹⁷ Hamilton, *Zachary Taylor*, 63.

this newly formed group supporting Taylor for President. Included among the group's ranks were Congressman Truman Smith of Connecticut as well as "two Whig representatives from Indiana, three from Ohio, five from Pennsylvania, and four from New Jersey."¹⁸ This wide array of support for Taylor among congress members was echoed at the Whig Convention as "not only did virtually all southern Whigs support the military hero rather than a known advocate of Whig measures, but so too did fully three-fourths of the northern Whigs."¹⁹ Lincoln's political calculation that Taylor was the better candidate to support in 1848 over his idol Henry Clay seemed to be heading in the right direction as the general election campaign began to heat up.

Historiography

Although Lincoln's time in Congress has not dominated an entire book as other points of his life have, historians have dedicated chapters and essays on the interesting case of Congressman Lincoln. Possibly most notably, David Herbert Donald's all-encompassing book *Lincoln* spends a respectable amount of time on Lincoln's time in Congress as well as the lead up to the 1848 election. Although they had a very successful midterm election, Donald argues that the Whigs were in disarray leading up to the 1848 election.²⁰ Donald writes that "[Lincoln] found his party in disarray . . . [P]arty leaders were troubled by the outlook of the 1848 presidential election."²¹ What truly troubled the Whigs, Donald argues, was which issues they would be able to use to advance their cause against the Democrats. To Lincoln's benefit, Donald argues that "the only issue on which the Democrats appeared to be vulnerable was the President's role in originating the Mexican War."²² As Lincoln began to find his way in the halls of Congress, this thinking (which was, according to Donald supported by Whig Party leaders) led to Lincoln's Spot Resolutions and open opposition to the war in 1847.

Unlike Charles Strozier, who argues that the Spot Resolutions were a complete and utter failure, Donald paints the Spot Resolutions in a much different light. Donald explains that a few days after Lincoln's resolutions, Representative George Ashmun of Massachusetts "introduced a resolution declaring that the war had been 'unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States.'"²³ Furthermore, Donald explains that a few days later the

¹⁸ Holt, *Political Parties and American Political Development from the Age of Jackson to the Age of Lincoln*, 197.

¹⁹ Holt, *Political Parties and American Political Development*, 198.

²⁰ Donald, *Lincoln*, 122.

²¹ Donald, *Lincoln*, 122.

²² Donald, *Lincoln*, 122.

²³ Donald, *Lincoln*, 123.

resolution was adopted “by the votes of eighty-five Whig representatives, including Lincoln’s.”²⁴ This is juxtaposed with Strozier who argued that Lincoln’s Spot Resolutions suffered “the worst indignity” by being ignored.²⁵ Contradictorily, Donald seems to backtrack from the apparent success of Lincoln’s resolutions as he later states that “In Washington nobody paid much attention to his [Lincoln’s] resolutions, which the House neither debated nor adopted, or to his speech. The President made no response to Lincoln’s interrogatories; he never mentioned Lincoln’s name, even in his voluminous diaries.”²⁶ This view from Donald is much more in line with that of Strozier, which aligns with Donald’s seeming retraction.

Kenneth Winkle, in his book *The Young Eagle*, agrees with Donald’s assessment of the aftermath of Lincoln’s Spot Resolutions, which greatly weakened the Whig Party in Lincoln’s Congressional District. Winkle argues that Democratic criticism of Lincoln’s opposition to the Mexican-American War was detrimental to the Whig Party’s chances of retaining Lincoln’s seat.²⁷ The real sign of bad things to come for the Whigs in Lincoln’s Congressional District, Winkle and Donald argue, came when Whigs did not retain the seat. Donald explains that “Condemnation from Democrats was to be expected, and discounted, but Lincoln was troubled by the faintness of praise he received from fellow Whigs.”²⁸ In that same vein, Winkle writes “Lincoln’s position proved a tremendous liability during the next congressional election.”²⁹ Donald and Winkle are in agreement regarding the political damage done by Lincoln to his local Whig Party. Donald and Winkle do not share the same reasoning for Lincoln’s views regarding the war though, as Winkle argues that Lincoln stood against the war on principle while Donald argues that Lincoln’s opposition was a political calculation aimed at securing the presidency for the Whigs in 1848. Donald argues that “Lincoln, working closely with Alexander H. Stephens and the small group of other Whigs in the House who called themselves the Young Indians, thought he could resolve the difficulty [preventing the Whig opposition to the war from being a handicap in 1848]. Whigs could assail the Democrats for having wrongly begun the war—and then demonstrate how loyally they supported their country’s cause by nominating a general who was winning that war [Zachary Taylor].”³⁰ Winkle argues, in Lincoln’s own words, that the reasoning for the Spot Resolutions was for personal gain. Quoting a letter from Lincoln to his

²⁴ Donald, *Lincoln*, 123.

²⁵ Strozier, “Lincoln’s Quest for Union,” 231.

²⁶ Donald, *Lincoln*, 124.

²⁷ Kenneth J. Winkle, *The Young Eagle: The Rise of Abraham Lincoln* (Dallas: Taylor Trade Publishing), 242.

²⁸ Donald, *Lincoln*, 124.

²⁹ Winkle, *The Young Eagle*, 242.

³⁰ Donald, *Lincoln*, 126.

law partner Herndon, Winkle writes “‘As you are all so anxious for me to distinguish myself, I have concluded to do so, before losing.’ About a week later, he introduced his famous ‘Spot Resolutions.’”³¹ This interpretation by Winkle fits with his overarching thesis, which looks more critically at the myths of Lincoln. Donald’s interpretation of Lincoln being a cunning politician in his first year in Congress falls in line with a traditionalist view of the mythos of Lincoln. It should be noted that these differing interpretations may not be as different or uncommon, as other authors, including Strozier, have differing opinions on the reasoning for Lincoln’s Spot Resolutions.

In sticking with his detailed approach to covering the political life around Lincoln, Winkle covers the 1848 Congressional election in Lincoln’s district extremely well. Winkle explains that Lincoln, who was bound by a gentleman’s agreement that meant the local Whigs would rotate holding the Congressional seat, bowed out of the race while his law partner Stephen Logan ran in his stead.³² Winkle is extremely detailed here in outlining the political climate of Lincoln’s Congressional District following Lincoln’s unsuccessful stint as representative, stating that “Whigs lost the district for the first time in a decade. Logan lost an extremely close election by a mere 106 votes. Ominously, however, Logan ran 7 percent behind Lincoln’s total in 1846 and lost ground in all eleven counties in the district.”³³ This detailed recounting of what occurred in the aftermath of Representative Lincoln helps to further Winkle’s thesis that Lincoln was not infallible and offers a much more objective look into Lincoln’s political career.

In his two-volume biography of Lincoln, Michael Burlingame offers more insight into Lincoln’s personal life while serving in Congress than his predecessors or contemporaries. In describing some of Lincoln’s pastimes and relationships with colleagues in Washington D.C., Burlingame writes that “Lincoln’s humor won him friends all over Capitol Hill. Around Christmas of 1847, he began to frequent the small post office of the House of Representatives, where members often gathered to swap yarns. After diffidently remaining silent for a while, he eventually started to tell stories and quickly outstripped all competitors.”³⁴ Lincoln seemed to be developing great relationships with colleagues, and, as Burlingame points out, even gained the favor of some journalists upon his arrival to the capitol: “Colleagues in the House admired not only Lincoln’s humor but also his character and personality. In May 1848, a Washington correspondent reported that “no member of whom I have any knowledge, possesses in a higher degree the respect and confidence of the House” than Lincoln— heady praise for a newcomer.”³⁵

³¹ Winkle, *The Young Eagle*, 241.

³² Winkle, *The Young Eagle*, 244-245.

³³ Winkle, *The Young Eagle*, 244.

³⁴ Michael Burlingame, *Abraham Lincoln: A Life* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), 1:261.

³⁵ Burlingame, *Abraham Lincoln*, 261.

It seems, at least according to Burlingame, that Lincoln was gaining quite a bit of favor among his colleagues and felt that these relationships might be able to be leveraged for him to actually get some work done.

According to Burlingame, Lincoln's prowess in the social sphere did not translate to significant accomplishments in Congress. One of the main reasons for this lack of accomplishment by Lincoln was due to the fact that he was a mere freshman congressman placed in the back row. Burlingame explains that "As a lowly freshman, Lincoln occupied an undesirable seat at the back of the House chamber in what was known as the "Cherokee Strip" on the Whig side of the aisle. He also was assigned to unimportant committees (those on Expenditures in the War Department and on Post Offices and Post Roads)."³⁶ Not in the ideal position to make a "magnus opus," Lincoln's first speech on the House floor was about a mail contract. Although pertinent to his committee assignments, it was not an inspiring topic.

On the subject of the Spot Resolutions, Burlingame's position on their success (rather their lack of success) is close to the positions of the other historians named here. Namely, Burlingame argues that the Spot Resolutions were ineffective and a failure. Burlingame also discusses reactions to the resolutions and describes them as largely partisan, stating that "reaction to the speech was predictably partisan" and echoed the sentiments of Winkle that Lincoln was expecting the Democrats to pounce on his speech. Pounce the Democrats did, as the most critical remarks on his resolutions came from Illinois Democrats. Burlingame states that "The shrillest criticism came from the Illinois Democrats. In Sangamon County, they met to condemn Lincoln for supporting 'the schemes of . . . apologists and defenders of Mexico, and revilers of their own country.' A mass meeting in Clark County denounced Lincoln for his resolutions "against his own country" and urged that they 'be long remembered by his constituents.'"³⁷ Similar to Winkle and Donald, Burlingame argues that the Spot Resolutions and the immediate political after effects of them severely damaged Whig prospects in Lincoln's congressional district.

In his article "Always a Whig in Politics," Joel Silbey discusses the political astuteness of Lincoln and describes Lincoln as a strict partisan who put many hours of work into shaping the Illinois Whig Party into a modern political organization.³⁸ Silbey writes that "As part of his explicit commitment to Whiggery, Lincoln also was a staunch articulator and promoter of Whig attitudes, values and policies. He helped codify, institutionalize and perpetuate his party's policy stances."³⁹ Silbey explains that Lincoln's articulate manner of speaking made him an easy choice to speak across the country on behalf of the Whig Party. Silbey importantly notes that in addition to the speaking tours Lincoln carried out in Illinois every election year starting in the 1830s and

³⁶ Burlingame, *Abraham Lincoln*, 263.

³⁷ Burlingame, *Abraham Lincoln*, 269-70.

³⁸ Joel Silbey, "'Always a Whig in Politics': The Partisan Life of Abraham Lincoln," *Papers of the Abraham Lincoln Association*, vol. 8 no. 1 (January 1986): 26.

³⁹ Silbey, "'Always a Whig in Politics,'" 25.

going into the 1850s, Lincoln traversed the country as well.⁴⁰ This experience and his proven speaking abilities are no doubt a large reason why Taylor and the Whigs selected Lincoln to travel to Massachusetts during the 1848 Presidential Campaign.

On the topic of Lincoln's only term in Congress, Silbey points out that "His voting record over two sessions of the Thirtieth Congress showed no policy ambiguity when he responded to the range of issues considered. Lincoln, the lone Illinois Whig congressman, voted as he spoke. 'A faithful party man,' he never 'skulked' a vote on touchy issues,' proving himself to be 'a mainstream Western Whig.'"⁴¹ While the majority of Lincoln's time in Congress was very uninspiring, he did toe the party line, which his voting record reflects. In regard to Lincoln's more memorable efforts, Silbey explains that Lincoln's Spot Resolutions were a highly politically calculated move. Silbey argues that "Even his most famous action in those years followed the partisan norm. He was the focal point, as is well known, for a sustained assault on President Polk's Mexican War policy. Opposition to 'Mr. Polk's War' was a party issue."⁴² Silbey's considerations of partisan motivations when detailing Lincoln's actions in Congress offers insight that the previously discussed historians neglect or fail to mention. Specifically, for example, Strozier lacks any mention of political considerations made by Lincoln leading up to the introduction of the Spot Resolutions and instead focuses solely on the political reverberations caused by the resolutions.

Mary Todd's and Lincoln's Relationship

During his time in Congress, Lincoln and Mary Todd were apart from each other for the longest period of their marriage. Mary Todd joined Lincoln in Washington D.C., but she did not stay for the entire two years as she left shortly after their journey to D.C. Lincoln and Mary Todd rarely corresponded during their time apart until 1848, when they corresponded three times. In these letters to Mary Todd, Lincoln professes his regret for sending her away from him in D.C. and expresses his desire for her to rejoin him. The letters, though few in number, give insight into Lincoln's state of mind while in Congress and offer a look into his opinion of the type of work he was doing as Congressman. Overall, in the letters Lincoln paints a pretty depressing view of his life and work and harbors some regrets and longing for his wife who he had not seen for over a year.

On April 16th, 1848, Lincoln wrote and sent a letter to Mary Todd expressing his deepest regret for her not being present with him in D.C. and the lack of mental stimulation in his work. Lincoln wrote that "In this troublesome world, we are never quite satisfied. When you were here, I thought you hindered me some in attending to business; but now, having nothing but business—no variety—it has grown exceedingly tasteless to me. I hate to sit down and direct

⁴⁰ Silbey, "Always a Whig in Politics," 25.

⁴¹ Silbey, "Always a Whig in Politics," 26.

⁴² Silbey, "Always a Whig in Politics," 26.

documents, and I hate to stay in this old room by myself. You know I told you in last Sunday's [sic] letter, I was going to make a little speech during the week; but the week has passed without my getting a chance to do so; and now my interest in the subject has passed away too."⁴³ Lincoln was clearly very lonely in D.C. and expressed that though he initially thought Mary Todd would be burdensome to his work, his work had become burdensome to his mental well-being. It seems, in this letter, Lincoln felt as though Mary Todd would have offered some much needed company and much needed relief from his monotonous tasks as a Congressman. Outside of the beginning of the letter expressing his feelings of loneliness and boredom, the remainder of the letter features little to no insight into the thoughts of Lincoln and deals with non-consequential "small talk."

On June 12th, 1848, Lincoln wrote another letter to Mary Todd which seems to be responding to a lost letter from her in which she expresses her desire to come back to D.C. to be with Lincoln. In the letter, Lincoln writes

On my return from Philadelphia, yesterday, where, in my anxiety I had been led to attend the Whig convention I found your last letter. I was so tired and sleepy, having ridden all night, that I could not answer it till to-day; and now I have to do so in the H.R. The leading matter in your letter, is your wish to return to this side of the Mountains. Will you be a *good girl* in all things, if I consent? Then come along, and that as *soon* as possible. Having got the idea in my head, I shall be impatient till I see you. You will not have money enough to bring you; but I presume your uncle will supply you, and I will refund him here. By the way you do not mention whether you have received the fifty dollars I sent you. I do not much fear but that you got it; because the want of it would have induced you [to?] say something in relation to it. If your uncle is already at Lexington, you might induce him to start on earlier than the first of July; he could stay in Kentucky longer on his return, and so make up for lost time. Since I began this letter, the H.R. has passed a resolution for adjourning on the 17th. July, which probably will pass the Senate. I hope this letter will not be disagreeable to you; which, together with the circumstances under which I write, I hope will excuse me for not writing a longer one. Come on just as soon as you can. I want to see you, and our dear—*dear* boys very much. Everybody here wants to see our dear Bobby. Affectionately A. Lincoln.⁴⁴

An interesting point made by Lincoln in this letter is the phrase "The leading matter in your letter, is your wish to return to this side of the Mountains. Will you be a *good girl* in all things, if

⁴³ Abraham Lincoln, "Letter to Mary Todd Lincoln," 16 April 1848, in *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, ed. Basler, 1:465.

⁴⁴ Abraham Lincoln, "Letter to Mary Todd Lincoln," 12 June 1848, in *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, ed. Basler, 1:477.

I consent?”⁴⁵ This seems to be a bit of manipulation from Lincoln, who most certainly wants his wife and children to come visit him, as he knows that Mary Todd is also very interested in coming and visiting him. It seems as though Lincoln made a point to say this in order to have a reasonable explanation for asking Mary Todd to leave D.C. if she were to become too much to handle. In addition to serving a functional purpose, the phrasing in the letter is humorous and offers some insight into the marriage of Lincoln and Mary Todd.

While Lincoln and Mary Todd’s marriage was likely strained during his time in Congress, if for no other reason than distance, Lincoln’s correspondence with Mary Todd while in Congress offers insight into their relationship as well as Lincoln’s feelings regarding the type of work he was doing in Congress. No doubt, Lincoln longed for Mary Todd to join him as his term was coming to a close. By 1848, it had been over a year since he had last seen his wife. Lincoln’s political shortcomings also likely played a role in his longing for his wife to rejoin him in D.C. As Lincoln’s Spot Resolutions and bill to abolish slavery in Washington D.C. failed, his opinion regarding the type of work and the meaning of work as Congressman was weighing heavily on him.⁴⁶ The timing of the two letters discussed here took place in the Spring and Summer which means Lincoln had not yet embarked on his journeys to Massachusetts to stump for Taylor. Had he known in advance he was going to be doing that, he might have offered Mary Todd a chance to meet him there. Additionally, as the campaign season wore on in 1848, Lincoln’s opinion of his work began to shift back to some form of meaningfulness, and he might have been interested in Mary Todd joining him for electioneering activities.

The Stump Speeches

As Abraham Lincoln tried to find his way in Congress, he was called on by General Zachary Taylor, the Whig Party candidate for President in 1848, to speak on behalf of Taylor across the country. Lincoln delivered a total of six speeches on behalf of Taylor in 1848, the majority of which were given in Massachusetts and outside of Illinois. It made sense for Lincoln to be chosen to deliver stump speeches in a northern state like Massachusetts, where Lincoln’s views on slavery would have tempered northern Whig fears about Taylor, who owned slaves. It also made sense for Lincoln to deliver these speeches on behalf of Taylor as he had already begun to develop into quite a good orator in Congress.⁴⁷ While the actual transcriptions of the speeches have been lost, reporters covered each of the six speeches in varying detail.

The best coverage of one of Lincoln’s stump speeches, which features quotes, comes from the *Bristol County Democrat’s* coverage of Lincoln’s speech in Taunton, Massachusetts. While the paper is politically opposed to Lincoln’s positions, the account offers insight into Lincoln’s own rhetorical style through the paper’s commentary on the contents of the speech.

⁴⁵ Lincoln, “Letter to Mary Todd Lincoln,” 12 June 1848.

⁴⁶ Winkle, *The Young Eagle*, 244.

⁴⁷ Burlingame, *Abraham Lincoln*, 262.

The *Bristol County Democrat's* account begins with a description of the event held in Union Hall and a synopsis of the crowd's reaction, stating

The Taylor men were well entertained Wednesday evening, the 20th inst., at Union Hall, by an address from the Hon. Abraham Lincoln of Illinois. The address as well as the speaker was such as to give unlimited satisfaction to the disheartened Taylorites. Such a treat it is indeed seldom their good luck to get, and they were in ecstasies [sic]. At former meetings their spirits were too low for a good hearty cheer, but on this occasion 'the steam was up.' It was reviving to hear a man speak as if he believed what he was saying and had a grain or two of feeling mixed up with it; one who could not only speak highly of Taylor, but could occasionally swell with indignation or burst in hatred on the Free Soilers. When political spite runs high nothing can be too pungent or severe, and the speaker is appreciated in proportion as his statements are rash and unscrupulous.⁴⁸

The argument that Lincoln laid out in his address to this particular Whig club in Taunton sought to showcase the principles of Zachary Taylor, a Mexican-American War veteran who had no political experience. It seems as though the principles of Taylor were to be what would get him elected because of Taylor's lack of pronounced platform points. Lincoln argued that "General Taylor, *has* principles, though he has not given expression to them on the Tariff, Bank and other questions of policy."⁴⁹ The author of the account of the speech rebukes this though, by quoting a letter from Taylor stating "'As regards the second and third inquiries (about a bank and tariff), I am not prepared to answer them. *I could only do so after investigating them.* I am no politician; near forty years of my life have been passed on the Western frontier and in the Indian count[r]y."⁵⁰ In an effort to shore up support for Taylor among his fellow Whigs, Lincoln stated that "We can't go for General Taylor because he is not a Whig. Van Buren is not a Whig; therefore, we go for him."⁵¹ This quote showcases Lincoln's position on Taylor's candidacy and offers a bit of humor. Lincoln was an anti-slavery Whig who, like many of those he was talking to in Massachusetts, were a bit nervous of Taylor's positions (or lack thereof) especially regarding slavery. Lincoln was a partisan who had seen and been disaffected by Whig defections from their presidential candidates in the past, namely with Henry Clay in 1844. This quote by Lincoln points out the hypocrisy of Whigs who would go for Van Buren over their own party's nominee.

In his speech to a Whig delegation to the convention in Worcester, Massachusetts, Lincoln utilized allusions to being an "everyday" man who pulled himself up by his bootstraps, a

⁴⁸ Lincoln, "Speech at Taunton Massachusetts," 21 September 1848, in *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, ed. Basler, 1:53-61.

⁴⁹ Lincoln, "Speech at Taunton Massachusetts."

⁵⁰ Lincoln, "Speech at Taunton Massachusetts."

⁵¹ Lincoln, "Speech at Taunton Massachusetts."

method he had used in some of his best speeches. This was also coupled with his Midwestern sensibility and showcased by his quip that it was good to be on “this side of the mountains.”⁵² In this speech, Lincoln also discussed slavery and his Whig position on slavery, arguing

. . . that the people of Illinois agreed entirely with the people of Massachusetts on this subject, except perhaps that they did not keep so constantly thinking about it. All agreed that slavery was an evil, but that we were not responsible for it and cannot affect it in States of this Union where we do not live. But, the question of the *extension* of slavery to new territories of this country, is a part of our responsibility and care, and is under our control.⁵³

This was not a new position by Lincoln on slavery and was one that would not change until much later in life when he became a strong proponent of the 13th Amendment as president in 1865. In fact, that same year Lincoln introduced a resolution that would have banned slavery in Washington, D.C., under the clear discretion of the federal government. The sentiment behind his resolution is felt in this speech as well and showcase his commitment to the prevention of the extension of slavery into new territories as being under the purview of the federal government.

The speech would end with similar notes regarding Taylor as a principled man: “We had a candidate whose personal character and principles he had already described, whom he could not eulogize if he would. Gen. Taylor had been constantly, perseveringly, quietly standing up, *doing his duty*, and asking no praise or reward for it. He was and must be just the man to whom the interests, principles and prosperity of the country might be entrusted.”⁵⁴ These points about Taylor being a principled man would show up in all of his stump speeches for the general and presidential candidate and showcased the type of apprehensions other Whigs felt for Taylor as their nominee.

An interesting point of interest in regard to these speeches is the fact that Lincoln never spoke to anyone other than people within his own party. Another point of interest is that, as far as we can tell, all of the speeches he delivered on behalf of the Taylor campaign were delivered in Massachusetts save for two, with one being delivered in Lacon, Illinois, and the other being delivered in Chicago. Taylor would not win Illinois in the general election, but he would win Massachusetts. It seems that the purpose of these speeches to Whigs and potential Free Soil deserters was to showcase a Western Whig who held similar views about the prevention of slavery’s extension into territories, the Free Soil party’s single issue. While this raises questions about why Lincoln did not join the Free Soil party (likely due to his ambitions for future office), Lincoln was utilized as a campaign representative in a state that he had no connections to except

⁵² Lincoln, “Speech at Worcester Massachusetts,” 12 September 1848, in *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, ed. Basler, 2:1-5.

⁵³ Lincoln, “Speech at Worcester Massachusetts.”

⁵⁴ Lincoln, “Speech at Worcester Massachusetts.”

similar politics. This was a strategically sound strategy by the Taylor campaign, and it also allowed Lincoln to gain experience on a national stage where he was able to sharpen his rhetorical skills.

Two years after the presidential election of 1848, Zachary Taylor died and Lincoln was selected to deliver a eulogy. While some of the stylistic improvements and elements that are not seen in prior Lincoln speeches can be attributed to the topic of the speech, Lincoln's eulogy of the former president offers insight into the development of his speaking style. Most notably, Lincoln posits "I fear the one *great* question of the day, is not so likely to be partially acquiesced in by the different sections of the Union, as it would have been, could Gen. Taylor have been spared to us. Yet, under all circumstances, trusting to our Maker, and through his wisdom and beneficence, to the great body of our people, we will not despair, nor despond."⁵⁵ This section of the speech is extremely wordy but it does echo some of Lincoln's most famous speeches such as his First Inaugural Address and the Gettysburg Address. This section of the eulogy truly sounds like a rough draft of the final remarks of Lincoln's First Inaugural Address where he proclaimed

I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battle-field, and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.⁵⁶

Specifically, the "all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature," rhetorically sounds like a polished version of the section of the Taylor eulogy outlined previously through the mention of the Union, divine Providence's hand, and the appeal to one's sensibilities. Though these themes are not outwardly apparent in Lincoln's eulogy of Taylor, when looking at the two speeches side-by-side, the development of rhetoric is clear.

As with all writers and speakers, refinement comes with time and practice. Lincoln was no different in this regard. His eulogy of Taylor featured some hints of his great oratorical ability, such as when he wrote that "the Presidency, even to the most experienced politicians, is no bed of roses; and Gen. Taylor like others, found thorns within it. No human being can fill that station and escape censure. Still I hope and believe when Gen. Taylor's official conduct shall come to be viewed in the calm light of history, he will be found to have *deserved* as little as any who have succeeded him."⁵⁷ This excerpt from the eulogy of Taylor features some semblance of

⁵⁵ Lincoln, "Eulogy of Zachary Taylor," July 1850, in *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, ed. Basler, 2:84-90.

⁵⁶ Lincoln, "First Inaugural Address," 4 March 1861, in *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, ed. Basler, 4:262-271.

⁵⁷ Lincoln, "Eulogy of Zachary Taylor."

the “plain-speak” Lincoln would adopt later in his political career but also a more rigid tone. This rigidity is not only present in Lincoln’s early works. In his First Inaugural address, Lincoln writes “I now reiterate these sentiments, and in doing so I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible that the property, peace, and security of no section are to be in any wise endangered by the now incoming Administration. I add, too, that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitution and the laws, can be given will be cheerfully given to all the States when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause—as cheerfully to one section as to another.”⁵⁸ This excerpt possesses rigidity in its own right as a product of the multiple commas present. The style that both of the excerpts have, though eleven years apart, is “sidetracking,” which is showcased through the breaks in the initial thought pattern and introduction of qualifying phrases.

Nonetheless, the flow of Lincoln’s First Inaugural address is certainly an improvement when compared to his eulogy of Zachary Taylor. To a certain extent, the momentous occasion that accompanied his First Inaugural shapes the narrative and readings of it. Conversely, Taylor was less than two years into his first term as president and was already a reluctant politician; this was nowhere near as momentous an occasion as the prospects of southern secession and Civil War that were facing Lincoln’s words in his First Inaugural. Regardless of the moment in time, the words written and spoken by Lincoln beginning with his stump speeches for Taylor, to his eulogy of Taylor, to his First Inaugural Address, show rhetorical improvements and a fleshing out of his ideas of America (idealism, freedom, etc.) while also offering structural writing improvements with fewer noticeable sidetracks, or at least the writing possesses sidetracks with a purpose.

In 1852, Lincoln was again tasked with delivering a eulogy. This time though, Lincoln was charged with delivering a eulogy for one of his political inspirations and fellow Whig, Henry Clay. In his eulogy of Clay, Lincoln began by stating “On the fourth day of July, 1776, the people of a few feeble and oppressed colonies of Great Britain, inhabiting a portion of the Atlantic coast of North America, publicly declared their national independence, and made their appeal to the justice of their cause, and to the God of battles, for the maintenance of that declaration.”⁵⁹ This opening was used as a way to date just how encompassing Clay’s life was. About eleven years later in 1863, Lincoln would be tasked with delivering another eulogy of sorts, this time at the battlefield of Gettysburg. Many historians declare the Gettysburg Address to be the pinnacle of Lincoln’s rhetorical genius and plain-speaking style. At only two hundred and seventy-two words, the speech truly elicits patriotism and the idealism that Lincoln felt for the Union. Not unlike Lincoln’s eulogy of Clay, the Gettysburg Address begins by dating the topic of his speech. Instead of a person though, in the Gettysburg Address Lincoln dates what he

⁵⁸ Lincoln, “First Inaugural Address.”

⁵⁹ Lincoln, “Eulogy of Henry Clay,” presented in Springfield, 6 July 1852, in *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, ed. Basler.

believes to be the cause of Union. In a similar stylistic fashion, Lincoln begins the Gettysburg (famously) with “Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth, on this continent, a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.”⁶⁰ In both of these speeches, in both of these eulogies of sorts, Lincoln points back to the signing of the Declaration of Independence as the starting date of the American Republic and the Union he was fighting to preserve. This theme is further underscored in his eulogy of Clay as he paints Clay as someone with a deep devotion to these same causes by stating “Mr. Clay’s predominant sentiment, from first to last, was a deep devotion to the cause of human liberty—a strong sympathy with the oppressed everywhere, and an ardent wish for their elevation.”⁶¹

Lincoln confirms his view that the “birth” of the United States occurred with the signing of the Declaration of Independence and that the Declaration itself codified one of the most important principles of our nation: “that all men are created equal.” In his “Response to a Serenade” which he delivered on July 7th, 1863 he underscores the importance of the Declaration when he states “How long ago is it? — eighty odd years — since on the Fourth of July for the first time in the history of the world a nation by its representatives, assembled and declared as a self-evident truth that ‘all men are created equal.’ [Cheers.] That was the birthday of the United States of America.”⁶² In addition to showcasing the importance that Lincoln placed on the Declaration of Independence, many historians and scholars declare his “Response to a Serenade” as being a quasi-first draft of the Gettysburg Address. The importance of the Declaration of Independence to Lincoln is shown as early as 1852 in his eulogy of Henry Clay. Although his views are not as expressly stated in the eulogy, for obvious reasons, a close reading of the eulogy followed by close readings of the Gettysburg Address and “Response to a Serenade” show clear similarities. Differences are also apparent though, and Lincoln much more eloquently places the date of the signing of the Declaration of Independence in his Gettysburg Address than he does in his eulogy of Clay. The reason for this is because of the natural development of Lincoln’s writing and rhetorical skills.

These speeches, with typically over a decade between them showcase the development of Lincoln’s writing ability and rhetorical capacities. There are clear similarities among several of the speeches listed throughout this analysis, most notably between Lincoln’s “Eulogy of Zachary Taylor” and his First Inaugural Address and among his “Eulogy of Henry Clay” and his Gettysburg Address and “Response to a Serenade.” Beyond these similarities, these early Lincoln speeches, which include his stump speeches for Taylor during the 1848 Presidential

⁶⁰ Lincoln, “The Gettysburg Address,” presented in Gettysburg, 19 November 1863, in *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, ed. Basler, 7:234-238.

⁶¹ Lincoln, “Eulogy of Henry Clay.”

⁶² Lincoln, “Response to a Serenade,” 7 July 1863, in *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, ed. Basler, 6:319.

Campaign, highlight a clear progression of his speaking talents and rhetorical abilities. From 1848 to 1852, Lincoln was beginning to find his footing regarding what would become his more pronounced view of the Union and the bond that bound the states together: the Declaration of Independence, and, more specifically, the statement that “all men are created equal.” Lincoln’s earlier speeches during his time as Congressman and campaign deputy, and his eulogies that came later, were at times clunky and wordy, with many side-tracks and qualifying statements throughout, which distracted from the point he was making.

Lincoln’s time in Congress, while not his first time in public office, provided the first opportunity Lincoln had at becoming a national figure. Unfortunately for Lincoln, his time in Congress was extremely restricted due to a gentleman’s agreement he made with two other Whig politicians in Illinois.⁶³ The rotation agreement he made to hold office only every other cycle meant that his window of opportunity to develop a national profile was rather small. Good signs abounded, though, as he was tasked with stumping for Zachary Taylor in order to shore up support among Free Soilers in New England who wanted to stop the expansion of slavery, much like Lincoln.⁶⁴ Even though he was presented with this great opportunity to begin to build a larger profile, when he was speaking to the Whig groups in Massachusetts and elsewhere, it seems his timidity and lack of a rhetorically gifted presidential candidate held him back. Lincoln was among the policy-focused and was, according to Joel Silbey, intensely partisan.⁶⁵ Because of this, Lincoln was a good choice to stump for Taylor, who had little to no outwardly expressed political opinions. Lincoln’s expertise in toeing the party line would have been extremely helpful for Taylor.

Lincoln played an integral role in the success of the Taylor campaign in 1848. Although he was not the first Taylor supporter, Lincoln was among the first. Lincoln’s placement in Taylor’s campaign was a logical one as he had travelled the state of Illinois every election year prior since the 1830s stumping for candidates.⁶⁶ This meant that he had plenty of experience making political speeches on behalf of other Whig candidates. In addition to this skill, Lincoln also was a free soiler and vehemently opposed the extension of slavery. The Free Soil Party, led by former president Martin Van Buren, seemed poised to poach other anti-extension and free-soil Whigs, especially considering Taylor was a slaveholding Southerner. While in reality, according to Michael Holt, “Democrats lost votes to the Free Soilers in New York, Ohio, Vermont, Maine, and Massachusetts, and some may even have defected to the Whig Taylor in Alabama, Virginia, and Georgia.”⁶⁷ Even though the Free Soil Party did not have nearly the impact on Whig votes as

⁶³ Winkle, *The Young Eagle*, 246.

⁶⁴ Winkle, *The Young Eagle*, 246.

⁶⁵ Silbey, ““Always a Whig in Politics,”” 26.

⁶⁶ Silbey, ““Always a Whig in Politics,”” 26.

⁶⁷ Holt, *Political Parties and American Political Development*, 70.

many may have thought heading into the November election, the perception that Free Soil votes would have otherwise been Whig votes was a strong sentiment felt by many Whig partisans. Because of this perception, the Whigs deployed Lincoln to Massachusetts (where Free Soil Party support seemed at its highest) to show that the Whig Party was the party advocating for free soil.

Conclusion

On February 27, 1849, Abraham Lincoln sent a short correspondence to President-elect Taylor stating “Yesterday you were so kind as to say it would be convenient for you to receive the papers recommending [sic] Col. Baker for a Cabinet appointment, through the mail. I herewith transmit them in that way, with the request, that my name be considered as added to the recommendation. Your Obt. Servt. A. Lincoln.”⁶⁸ As his term in Congress was expiring, Lincoln sought a role in the Taylor administration. It is not clear which appointed office Lincoln was referring to in this short letter. This was not the only letter he sent to Taylor inquiring about a position. Heading into the 1850s, Lincoln’s role in Whig politics was uncertain. He had just completed an uninspiring term in Congress that saw both of his major legislative efforts fail. On the other hand, he had been a helpful hand in the electing of Taylor as President, though not an integral piece of the campaign. It was not unreasonable for Lincoln to have hoped that Taylor would find a place, no matter how small, in his administration. A postmaster position or surveying role would not have been out of the question. Unfortunately for Lincoln, Taylor would not appoint him to any position, and Lincoln was left to return to Springfield empty handed. What lay ahead for Lincoln, though well known to everyone now, was very much unknown to him.

With the election of Taylor to the Presidency, Lincoln was completely flooded with requests for patronage positions (which he could help them secure by writing a letter of endorsement to the President-elect).⁶⁹ Eventually, Lincoln would be involved in an attempt to secure himself a new position as well. Burlingame points out that

At first, Lincoln had not planned to ask for an office at all, because, as he explained to Joshua Speed, “there is nothing about me which would authorize me to think of a first class office; and a second class one would not compensate me for being snarled at by others who want it for themselves.” He could, he said, “have the Genl. Land office [a position in the Department of Interior] almost by common consent,” but he did not wish to antagonize other Illinoisans who sought that lucrative post, which paid \$3,000 a year. (The governor of Illinois earned \$1,000 annually, and an Illinois Supreme Court justice

⁶⁸ Lincoln, “Letter to Zachary Taylor,” 27 February 1849, in *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, ed. Basler, 2:30.

⁶⁹ Burlingame, *Abraham Lincoln*, 294.

\$1,200.) In due course, however, Lincoln did become a candidate for that job and thereby found himself embroiled in a complicated and often mean-spirited struggle.⁷⁰

Although he had not initially wanted to get involved in an appointment fight, Lincoln saw the writing on the wall that he was not in a favorable position among his Illinois Whig colleagues.⁷¹ Though he did take a one term pledge, he wanted to inquire about his chances at re-nomination in 1848 for his seat in Congress. Only one delegate stated that he would support Lincoln's re-nomination, and so the convention nominated someone else.⁷² So after the election of Taylor, it seemed as though Lincoln really only had two options: the first was to return to Springfield and go back on the law circuit, and the second was to land an appointed position with the Taylor Administration. Burlingame suggests that "perhaps, Lincoln may have had little desire to return to provincial Springfield after consorting with leading lawyers and politicians in sophisticated Washington."⁷³ Unfortunately for Lincoln, returning to Springfield was the only option as he failed to receive any patronage position with the Taylor Administration.

Lincoln's only national political experience before becoming president had come to an end in 1849, and he returned to Springfield. Lincoln failed to accomplish anything of note as Congressman, including securing a patronage position for himself. As Burlingame notes, "Five years would pass before he again sought public office. During that political hiatus he underwent a painful introspective ordeal from which he emerged a different man."⁷⁴ Despite his failings, Lincoln's time in Congress was a transformational period in his life. While his Spot Resolutions, his bill to abolish slavery in the D.C., and his effort to secure a patronage position in the Taylor Administration were all failures, Lincoln gained a good deal of political experience and was given opportunities to refine his speaking and writing abilities. Additionally, Lincoln was a member of the winning Taylor campaign for president. Through his role on the Taylor campaign, Lincoln was given the opportunity to speak on behalf of Taylor's candidacy, most notably in Massachusetts. In an attempt to shore up Whig support for a presidential candidate who had very few known political positions and in the face of a serious third party bid for the White House, Lincoln delivered Massachusetts and the presidency for Taylor. Though Lincoln would not be rewarded by Taylor for his efforts, Lincoln would use his experience as Congressman and campaign surrogate for Taylor during his five year political hiatus to develop his skills and run an extremely energetic and principled campaign for the United States Senate in 1854. Though often overlooked, Lincoln's time in Congress was crucial in the political and rhetorical development of the Great Emancipator.

⁷⁰ Burlingame, *Abraham Lincoln*, 296.

⁷¹ Burlingame, *Abraham Lincoln*, 294.

⁷² Burlingame, *Abraham Lincoln*, 290.

⁷³ Burlingame, *Abraham Lincoln*, 306.

⁷⁴ Burlingame, *Abraham Lincoln*, 308.

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCE

Lincoln, Abraham. *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*. Ed. Roy P. Basler et al. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1953.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Burlingame, Michael. *Abraham Lincoln: A Life*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008.

Donald, David Herbert. *Lincoln*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.

Gerleman, David J. "Representative Lincoln at Work: Reconstructing a Legislative Career from Original Archival Documents." *The Capitol Dome*. Vol. 54, no. 2 (2017-2018): 33-46.

Holt, Michael F. *Political Parties and American Political Development: From the Age of Jackson to the Age of Lincoln*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992.

Silbey, Joel H. "'Always a Whig in Politics': The Partisan Life of Abraham Lincoln." *Papers of the Abraham Lincoln Association* 8, no. 1 (1986): 21-42.

Strozier, Charles B. "Lincoln's Quest for Union: Public and Private Meanings." In *The Historian's Lincoln*, edited by Gabor Borritt, 211-241. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988.

Winkle, Kenneth J. *The Young Eagle: The Rise of Abraham Lincoln*. Dallas: Taylor Trade Publishing, 2001.