



Volume 3 Issue 2

The University of Aberdeen

July 2024

Editorial Board

2023-2024

Managing Editor

Cerwyss Mckay (class of '24)

Submissions Editor

Kathryn Berry (class of '24)

Layout Editor

Amelia-Jane Rogers (class of '25)

Editorial Assistant

Matthew McCallum (class of '24)

Assistant Layout Editor

Anna Lackie (class of '25)

Faculty Advisors

Dr. Bradford Bow

Dr. Owen Walsh

Peer Reviewers

Andrew Fleming (class of '24)

Anna Pizzuto-Pomaco (class of '24)

Marie Soberg Grig (class of '24)

Carla Clarke (class of '24)

Joseph Bagnall (class of '25)

Molly McCallum (class of '24)

The Aberdeen Historical Review (AHR) is produced by the University of Aberdeen History Society. Unless otherwise noted, all content published by the AHR is published under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence (CC BY 4.0), which allows liberal reuse of the final published work as long as appropriate attribution is made (for more details, visit: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Reproduction, posting, transmission, or other distribution or use of the article or any material via any medium requires credit to AHR as the initial publisher (e.g., AHR© 2024) and the acknowledgement of the authorship of individual essays.

For all correspondence, please contact the Editorial Board at info@abdnhistory.co.uk.

Letter from the Editors

After the success of this academic year, we are delighted to present the sixth issue of the Aberdeen Historical Review (AHR). Our March 2024 issue, which was published on our website (<https://abdnhistory.co.uk/published-issues>.) has excitedly welcomed more readers than ever! We hope that with each new issue published this engagement with the Review will continue to grow.

The Aberdeen Historical Review began in February 2021 amid the second semester of online teaching when a group of students from the university came together to discuss how they missed the uplifting atmosphere created by being on campus. As a result, the Review was established to celebrate the successes of Aberdeen University's students and continue to inspire academic accomplishments throughout the pandemic and beyond. The AHR is an open-access academic undergraduate journal that publishes first-class scholarship produced by students at the University of Aberdeen. Each paper was written for a history Honours course at the university and thoroughly peer-reviewed by a dedicated board of students. Authors and reviewers partake in an anonymised dialogue, through which authors are challenged to review and develop their papers. In this way, the essays are allowed to reach their greatest potential. Simultaneously, peer reviewers are enabled to take a unique approach to each paper and utilise their creativity, critical thinking, and academic writing skills in advising the author on improvements.

Throughout the 2023/24 academic year, we introduced our project to many Honours students. We were delighted to see students and staff referring to the journal as a continuing source of inspiration and a vital student-led project. Although the AHR is part of a global network of undergraduate publications it is primarily intended as a tool for its community in Aberdeen. We hope that students from across the year groups will use the AHR as a guiding voice as they write their assessments. This volume includes the course number and title for which each essay is produced, allowing students and tutors alike to refer to first-class essays from a specific history course.

Sarah Redwood opens our newest issue with an analysis of the Fourth Lateran Council and its long lasting influence on European legal culture. Following this, Drew Robertson offers a chronological overview and examination of Anglo-Irish resistance to Scotland's invasion of Ireland between 1315 and 1318. In our third essay, Anna Lackie explores the evolving attitudes towards blood in European

medicine and how these changes impacted the practise of animal to human blood transfusions in 17th century Europe. Craig McKenzie then looks to analyse the historical debate surrounding the extent of Abraham Lincoln's role as "the primary agent of freedom" in ending American slavery, and how this position contrasts with the argument that enslaved people themselves were the key factor in ending slavery in the United States. Finally, Matilda Haley closes the issue with an examination of how the 2016 movie *Anthropoid* portrays Nazi-occupied Czechoslovakia during WW2 and how useful the film is as an example of modern public history.

As the outgoing editorial board, we would like to thank everyone who was involved in helping to create the Aberdeen Historical Review. Specifically, we wish to thank our peer reviewers who were crucial in the editing process and all the student authors who submitted their essays to the journal. We were honoured to work with many talented and dedicated undergraduate students who now embark on new paths within academia and beyond. Producing the sixth issue of the AHR has been a rewarding experience but we could not have achieved this without the support of our faculty advisors Dr Bradford Bow and Dr Owen Walsh. We also want to thank the History Department for their continuing guidance and support. Finally, thank you to the readers for supporting us, we hope you enjoy reading the journal as much as we enjoyed making it.

Your Editors

Table of Contents

The Influence and Afterlife of the Fourth Lateran Council on European Legal Culture 6

SARAH REDWOOD

The Effectiveness of Anglo-Irish Resistance to the Bruce Invasions of Ireland: 1315-1318..... 18

DREW ROBERTSON

An Agent of Life and Death: How the Perception of Blood in Hippocratic Medicine Shaped the Practice of Animal to Human Blood Transfusions in 17th Century Europe. 30

ANNA LACKIE

“Primary Agent of Freedom”: Abraham Lincoln, Slavery, and the American Civil War..... 45

CRAIG MCKENZIE

A Public History Affair: How is Memorialisation of Nazi-Occupied Czechoslovakia Explored in Sean Ellis’ 2016 Film *Anthropoid*? 56

MATILDA HALEY

The Influence and Afterlife of the Fourth Lateran Council on European

Legal Culture

SARAH REDWOOD

Sarah Redwood is a single honours history student. Her areas of interest mostly include the medieval and early modern period with a focus on gender and social historical approaches. This essay is an example of her interest in the influence of the church in the medieval period. In her upcoming fourth year she hopes to focus her dissertation research based on these areas of interest.

Christianity was highly influential to everyday life in the medieval period. The Fourth Lateran Council was called to address issues surrounding crusading, heresy, ecclesiastical administration, and church reforms among other issues. It played a part in thirteenth century reforms and resulted in longstanding changes to legal proceedings toward clergy and influenced on Christian life. At the time of Lateran IV, there was little distinction between theology and law. This means that canonical issues could impact and develop legal culture more widely due to the nature of the content. This is relevant because it was instituted throughout Christendom in the medieval period and on canonical issues, the papacy has ultimate authority. Rulings such as canon eight instructed on court procedure and upheld the importance of strong evidence. Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) called the Fourth Lateran Council in April 1213. Held in Rome in November 1215, it may be considered a culmination of his papacy. Seventy-one canons were agreed upon. Over four-hundred representatives of the western and Latin churches attended: the largest attendance of any church council of the medieval period. As a result of Canon eighteen, trial by ordeals ceased to exist in civil courts. Canons fifty to fifty-two address legal proceedings and laws surrounding marriage. These canons address the importance of evidence and procedure for courts on a matter that affected the lives of laity. This essay will argue that the Fourth Lateran Council's had widespread impact on legal culture across Europe.

The Fourth Lateran Council was one of the largest church councils of the medieval period. It contained more canons than the previous three Lateran councils combined. As a result, it was highly influential on legal development. As it had a higher attendance than most other church councils, the bishops were able to return to their diocese and relay the information to lower clergy and the laity directly. This means the information had a greater chance to take effect across Christendom. Jeffrey Wayno argues that Lateran IV should not be evaluated simply as a written text. Attention should also be turned to the application of canons.¹ Bishops were heavily relied upon to convey results of councils. Documents of the canons have survived. This displays an effort to effectively remember the contents of the council. This would help the clergy once they returned home. Wayno believes that none of these would have been officially produced by the papacy. This supports his understanding that the papacy did not put effort into the implementation of the canons.² Danica Summerlin notes that the medieval clergy knew of the need for textual references for effective implementation. Yet, she also noted that the popularity of a canonical collection was due to its effectiveness and not ‘papal endorsement’.³ In the years following the council, decrees were included in collections of law such as *liber extra*.⁴ Summerlin also claims canons had “had seeped into local consciousness” due to English bishops’ letters referencing Lateran IV.⁵ This shows that the fourth Lateran council had influence in the thirteenth century more so than other medieval councils. The high attendance ensured effective communication. Written texts also show the popularity of the canons and there is evidence for their lasting effect. These canons were referred to in law beyond the thirteenth century proving their influence on legal development in Europe.

Canon eight established a new procedure for ecclesiastical trials. It was legally influential in the thirteenth century due to a change in judicial proceedings. Over the previous century, changes

¹ Jeffrey Wayno, ‘Rethinking the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215.’, *Speculum* 93.3 (2018), 611-637, p. 615.

² Wayno, 616.

³ Danica Summerlin, ‘Papal Councils in the High Middle Ages’, in *A Companion to the Medieval Papacy*, eds. Atria Larson and Keith Sisson (Boston: BRILL, 2016), 174-198, p. 176.

⁴ Anne Duggan, “Conciliar Law 1123-1215 The Legislation of the Four Lateran Councils” in *The History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140-1234: From Gratian to the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX*, eds. Wilfried Hartmann & Kenneth Pennington (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2008), 318-366, p. 353.

⁵ Summerlin, 194.

to judicial proceedings were slow. Canon eight begins with the statement “*as we said distinctly some time ago and now confirm with the approval of this holy council.*”⁶ This displays that these changes in judicial proceedings took time to become official canon. Brundage argues church officials needed to bring about change because the previous procedure was ineffective.⁷ Prior to 1215, church courts used the accusatory procedure. Brundage claims this was derived from roman law and ecclesiastical practices mixing.⁸ It required someone to come forward with an accusation and cases were discouraged from being brought forward. The accuser had to pay fees and provide evidence themselves and therefore, Brundage argues it was likely that the guilty often went unpunished.⁹ Canon eight states a case should come forward when “*the matter reaches the ears of the superior through an outcry or rumour ... from prudent and honest persons and has come not only once but frequently.*”¹⁰ A change from previous procedures can be seen. A case can be brought forward on rumour alone. The standard of evidence did not drop, however. Canon eight repeatedly states a fear of “malicious accusations”. Some canonists in the thirteenth century concluded this precautionary stance impeded the effectiveness of the procedure. William Durandus disputed this. The high standard of evidence meant innocent parties were not punished.¹¹ A just legal system should maintain the importance of evidenced based trials. Nonetheless, a fair society would not let guilty people go unreprimanded. Contemporaries of Durandus believed this to be happening.¹² Brundage argues that canon law decretals, decretals, a written response from the Pope on a question around the church, grew in complexity over the thirteenth century.¹³ If so, canons such as eight that instructed on judicial procedures would be welcomed. They would aid the application of canon law into society. Building upon this, therefore I argue canon eight helped develop court proceedings. The emphasis on a high standard of evidence meant innocent parties would go unpunished. This means canon eight upheld an important feature of legal culture. It defined how and when a case could

⁶ Fourth Lateran Council, Canon 8.

⁷ James A. Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law* (London; Longman, 1995), 144.

⁸ Brundage, 142.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Lateran IV, Canon 8.

¹¹ Brundage, 150.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid, 165.

be brought before a judge. It made it easier for the accusations to be heard. This emphasised the importance of gathering evidence, conducting fair hearings, and ensuring a just resolution.

Canon eight is an example of delegated jurisdiction. The pope could not address all cases brought to Rome. By delegating jurisdiction, the papacy could turn their attention to more issues. Canon eight demonstrates delegating authority on accusations against clergy. “*Then the superior ought diligently to seek out the truth before senior persons of the church.*”¹⁴ By referencing the ‘superior’ and ‘senior persons of the church’, it displays delegation in church courts. Harald Müller says Innocent III knew the importance of judge delegation to avoid delays.¹⁵ Canon eight instructs on the following procedure: “*He may proceed against them in three ways: namely, by accusation, denunciation and inquest.*”¹⁶ This is evidence of standardised procedure that could be applied across Christendom. Müller believes Lateran IV fully formed procedural law and delegated jurisdiction in the church.¹⁷ This exemplifies legal culture developing due to Lateran IV as Innocent III was able to build upon the work of previous centuries on delegation and procedural law. Delegating court proceedings to dioceses relieved pressure on the papacy. Canon eight is one of many canons to focus on delegation and procedural law. Its afterlife can be seen in its inclusion in later canon law collections such as Gratian. The canon demonstrates the procedure that should be followed, “*the superior should carry out the duty of his office not as if he were the accuser and the judge but rather with the rumour providing the accusation and the outcry making the denunciation*”.¹⁸ This is important to the development of justice and fairness as it provides a framework for navigating legal proceedings fairly.

The Fourth Lateran Council was instrumental in the decline of trial by ordeals. Canon eighteen forbade the clergy’s involvement in the shedding of blood. As a result, canon eighteen inadvertently influenced secular proceedings. Although ancient in origin, a common medieval judicial practice was the trial by ordeal. The accused would be subjected to a hot iron or trial by water. It was believed to be a judgement of God due to a blessing on the tools beforehand. The blessing was a crucial

¹⁴ Lateran IV, Canon 8.

¹⁵ Müller Harald, “The Omnipresent Pope: Legates and Judges Delegate.”, in *A Companion to the Medieval Papacy*, ed. Atria Larson and Keith Sisson (Boston: BRILL, 2016), 199-219, p. 200.

¹⁶ Lateran IV, Canon 8.

¹⁷ Müller, 215.

¹⁸ Lateran IV, Canon 8.

element to the trial in medieval Europe. Canon eighteen stated “*Nor may anyone confer a rite of blessing or consecration on a purgation by ordeal of boiling or cold water or of the red-hot iron.*”¹⁹ By this instruction, clergy were banned from being involved. Logan declares the practice could only disappear because of the ban.²⁰ Anne Duggan supports this by citing the English Royal Council encouraging other practices to replace the ordeal in 1219.²¹ This suggests the effect of Lateran IV on judicial practices. Yet it does not represent the whole of Christendom. Germany for example continued the practice longer than France or England. Nonetheless, Brundage concludes that by 1300 the practice had all but died out.²² Before Lateran IV, priests were susceptible to being bribed in the process of trial by ordeal. Their removal from the practice allowed fairer proceedings to develop in Europe. Baldwin notes how previous Popes disagreed over the church’s involvement. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, popes occasionally approved the use of ordeal trials.²³ Innocent III’s ruling in 1215 represents a turning point. It influenced a change that would occur across European legal culture over the next century.

Following the decline of trial by ordeals led to the development of new judicial practices. John Baldwin is of the belief that jury trials came to fruition in English law after Lateran IV.²⁴ Bartlett agrees that the result of the 1215 council allowed judicial trials in Denmark and England. He argues that medieval documents claim 1215 to be the turning point toward judicial trials in these countries.²⁵ The council marks a move toward evidence-based trials. Strong evidence and oaths therefore became more important to cases than previously. The focus moved away from a judgement of God. Overall, in the medieval period Lateran IV highly influenced legal culture. It aided in the development of fairer trials. It influenced changes in secular law and was implemented across Christendom. It is important to not overstate its influence. The Magna Carta in the same

¹⁹ Lateran IV, Canon 18.

²⁰ Donald Logan, *A History of the Church in the Middle Ages*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2013), 183.

²¹ Duggan, 347.

²² Brundage, 142.

²³ John Baldwin, “The Intellectual Preparation for the Canon of 1215 against Ordeals.”, *Speculum* 36.4 (1961), 615.

²⁴ *Ibid*, 614.

²⁵ Robert Bartlett, *Trial by Fire and Water: The Medieval Judicial Ordeal* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 138.

year disproved of the practice for English secular law. It can be concluded then that the early thirteenth century was a period of change in legal culture. It is further evidence for the Fourth Lateran Council's nature of reform. It also shows the church developing alongside European law whilst continuing to be separate from the secular issues. Nonetheless, the trial by ordeal seemingly returned to Europe by the fifteenth century. An accused witch may have been subjected to an ordeal by water. However, canon eighteen only banned clerical involvement in ordeals. It can be argued the practice could continue without inciting 'God's judgement'. Canon forty-two of Lateran IV established the importance of the separation of canon and secular law. Initially, canon eight may have influenced the end of trial by ordeals. However, the intention was not to influence secular proceedings as the church understood civil lawyers were experts in their own field. After a few centuries, the return of ordeals shows that the canon continued to only influence the church. Secular law had moved on and returned to the practice. Lateran IV was not always able to have a lasting impact on secular practices.

Canon fifty reduced the prohibition of marriage from the seventh degree of affinity to the fourth. A degree of affinity measures how closely related people are through marriage. By limiting the degree of affinity, which was prohibited, the requirement of evidence in marriage cases became stronger. The canon states "*prohibitions against contracting marriage in the second and third degree of affinity, and against uniting the offspring of a second marriage with the kindred of the first husband, often lead to difficulty and sometimes endanger souls*"²⁶ Canon law was concerned with the salvation of the soul. Church councils sought to prevent damnation by preventing unions disallowed by God. Richard Helmholz presents a thirteenth century divorce case in Canterbury as an example of the requirement of strong testimonies in marriage cases.²⁷ The case involves Richard Broke and his wife Joan. Peter Daneys alleges a sexual relationship with Joan prior to the marriage. In addition, he claims he is related to Richard to a second degree of affinity. Daneys is asked for evidence of his shared ancestry with Broke. Daneys is unable to provide a name for the grandparent or parent of the two sisters he declared shared affinity. Furthermore, the judge could not see any clear evidence either way on the claim of a sexual relationship. No divorce was granted. Richard Helmholz

²⁶ Lateran IV, Canon 50.

²⁷ Richard Helmholz, *Marriage Litigation in Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 83.

argues this shows the difficulty in finding firsthand testimony for marriage cases. For affinity, witnesses often disagreed to the degree of relation. Due to the lack of birth records it was difficult to keep track.²⁸ As a result it was often difficult to prove illegitimate unions. It was not the intention of the canon to provide a simple way of divorce. Instead, it was upholding the importance of strong evidence. Evidence continues to play a crucial role in modern courts of law. Proof beyond reasonable doubt features in British and American law. It requires sufficient evidence to prove guilt beyond any reasonable doubt. Similarities can be seen with the medieval courts where it is insufficient to assume. The principle "innocent until proven guilty" upon which the criminal justice system is grounded is evident in these medieval proceedings also. The above mentioned case is evidence of the council being upheld. It has application in Christendom and reflects a willingness to adjust practices to allow for a more reliable court.

The prevention of illegitimate unions was reasoned in canon fifty-one. This canon instructs churchmen on the publication of banns of marriage. A bann announced a couple's intention to marry. This allowed "*whoever wishes and is able to may adduce a lawful impediment.*"²⁹ Prior to 1215, banns were only practised loosely in some areas. The inclusion into Lateran IV would be an attempt to apply the practice across Europe and become common practice. Canon fifty-one could be applied alongside Canon fifty. A reason to come forward with knowledge of an illegitimate couple may be due to affinity. Helmholz argues that the canon was only loosely followed. He asserts discovery of the truth of the matter was more important than following procedural law.³⁰ This would argue the canons introduced by Lateran IV were not all best in practice. Therefore, certain canons may not have had a lasting impact in comparison to more widely successful canons. Canon fifty-one states "*If any persons presume to enter into clandestine marriages of this kind, or forbidden marriages within a prohibited degree, even if done in ignorance, the offspring of the union shall be deemed illegitimate.*"³¹ Forbidden marriages, even if the parties were unaware, were consequential. The consequences can be understood as a reason the canon was followed. Even if as

²⁸ Ibid, 84.

²⁹ Lateran IV, Canon 51.

³⁰ Helmholtz, 108.

³¹ Lateran IV, Canon 51.

Helmholtz argues knowing which marriages were forbidden is the important factor the canon attempts to ascertain. It can then be understood the reason for the canon was more important than the practice of bann publication.

Over time, marriage banns use as a prevention of illegitimate marriages became less common. In a post reformation England, decrees from the fourth Lateran council lost influence. Banns were not needed in Scotland. Gill Newton declares in eighteenth century London, clandestine marriages were “not so much the exception as the rule.”³² Newton’s focus on London marriages shows the influence of Lateran IV disappearing in Protestant areas. However, London does not represent the entirety of England. Neither does it inform about possible changes in Catholic regions after the thirteenth century. In addition, clandestine marriages are not limited to marriages performed without the reading of banns. The influence on legal culture diminished over the centuries as Newton notes that these clandestine marriages became illegal again. Following the introduction of Hardwicke’s ‘Act for the Better Preventing of Clandestine Marriage’ in 1754.³³ Furthermore, the marriage act 1949 represents the influence the fourth Lateran council continues to hold in British practices. Banns are not required for civil weddings, but the clergy is still required to publish banns prior to a wedding. Canon forty two’s influence is also seen here. Ecclesiastical and civil matters are not interfering with one another. Therefore, the council’s legacy can still be seen.

Due to reducing affinity to the fourth degree, canon fifty-two established that hearsay was insufficient evidence in marriage cases. The canon emphasises the importance of trustworthy testimonies; “*and not from persons who are of bad repute and suspect*”. The requirement of strong evidence was to ensure an annulment did not occur when unnecessary. To avoid the annulment of legitimate marriages “*it is preferable to leave alone some people who have been united contrary to human decrees than to separate, contrary to the Lord’s decrees, persons who have been joined together legitimately.*”³⁴ Using English courts as an example, witness testimonies were almost exclusively used as evidence. There was a risk of perjury. Helmholtz supposes the courts did not

³² Gill Newton. "Clandestine Marriage in Early Modern London: When, Where and Why?", *Continuity and Change*, 29.2 (2014), 152.

³³ Ibid, 151.

³⁴ Lateran IV, Canon 52.

do enough to prevent false witness statements.³⁵ The church relied upon trained judges' expertise in law. This expertise would evaluate the evidence presented. It is impossible to know the extent to which testimonies were false. Helmholz claims the loose definition of bribery, lack of cross examination and weak investigation as evidence for English courts lack of prevention.³⁶ This shows a long-term influence as it shaped the church courts, even if it was ineffective at times. The canon's directives on justice administration laid down principles of due process. This had an impact on the development of legal norms and procedures.

The fourth Lateran council evidently influenced the development of legal culture in Europe. This essay has shown evidence of canons of the council in effect. Canon eight showed the importance of evidence for a fair trial. Furthermore, it was an example of delegated jurisdiction. This provided a framework which could apply equal proceedings across Europe. Lateran IV caused the end of the trial by ordeal in the medieval era and the rise of the jury trials particularly in England and Denmark. On marriage, the canons outlined prohibited unions, how to prevent them and how to prove them. Once again, the importance of strong evidence is outlined in canons fifty through fifty-two. They share similarities to modern law's proof beyond reasonable doubt. As the centuries passed, the canons were followed more loosely. After the fifteenth century, in a post-reformation Europe, Catholic canons understandably largely fell out of use. However, the practical elements have had a longer lifespan and influenced secular law. Procedural law, judicial delegation, evidence, and jury trials are all still in operation today, in one form or another. As this council was implemented across a wide geographical area, one issue is that there was not a uniform application of the canons. This has meant that much of the academic argument uses examples from different countries. However, the influence of the canons can still be seen in this evidence although it may not always be applicable to Christendom as a whole. Much of the research into the Fourth Lateran Council has been on the influence on Christian life. However, many have investigated a specific influence of a canon rather than the wider influence of the council as this essay has done. Jeffrey Wayno for example, looked at the effectiveness of the council in its ability to relay the canons rather than evidence of the canons

³⁵ Helmholz, 152.

³⁶ Ibid, 159.

in practice.³⁷ Therefore, I would argue this essay has shown that the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 was influential in many areas of legal culture and across a wide geographical area.

³⁷ Wayno, 615-620.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Council Fathers. Fourth Lateran Council:1215, Papal Encyclicals Online.

Secondary Sources

Baldwin, John W. “The Intellectual Preparation for the Canon of 1215 against Ordeals.”

Speculum 36.4 (1961).

Bartlett, Robert. *Trial by Fire and Water: The Medieval Judicial Ordeal* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).

Brundage, James A. *Medieval Canon Law* (London: Longman, 1995).

Duggan, Anne. “Conciliar Law 1123–1215: The Legislation of the Four Lateran Councils.” In *The History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140-1234*, eds. Wilfried Hartmann & Kenneth Pennington (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2008), 318-366.

Helmholz, R. H., *Marriage Litigation in Medieval England* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1974).

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

Müller, Harald. “The Omnipresent Pope: Legates and Judges Delegate.” In *A Companion to the Medieval Papacy*, eds. Keith Sisson & Atria A. Larson (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 197-219.

Newton, Gill. “Clandestine Marriage in Early Modern London: When, Where and Why?” *Continuity and Change* 29.2 (2014), 151-180.

Summerlin, Danica. "Papal Councils in the High Middle Ages." In *A Companion to the Medieval Papacy*, eds. Keith Sisson & Atria Larson (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 174–196.

Wayno, Jeffrey M., "Rethinking the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215." *Speculum* 93.3 (2018), 611-637.

The Effectiveness of Anglo-Irish Resistance to the Bruce Invasions of

Ireland: 1315-1318

DREW ROBERTSON

Drew Robertson is a 4th year single honours History student. He has a particular interest in early medieval history, particularly in Scotland, but is also interested in the 19th and 20th centuries with interest in the Austrian Empire. His undergraduate dissertation is on the Norse Kings of the Isles and their conflict with Scotland, and he hopes to write more in the historical field in narrative style.¹

Introduction

In 1315, Edward Bruce landed in Ulster with an army of veterans from the Battle of Bannockburn.² With him came commanders of great experience and they made short work of the Anglo-Irish army which attempted to stop them. These local barons were all that stood between the Bruces' invasion and the takeover of the English lordship.³ However, how effective was the English resistance to the Scottish invasion and how did they manage to hold off an experience Scottish invading army while receiving little help from king Edward 1st? This essay will examine to what extent the Anglo-Norman barons effectively held off the Scottish invasion and how outside factors led to the defeat and death of Edward Bruce, High King of Ireland.

In May 1315, a Scottish fleet set sail for Ireland: this was the next task in Robert Bruce and Edward Bruces's mission for Scottish independence. The ships carried an invasion force of six thousand experienced soldiers. Earlier that year, the Scots had retaken the Isle of Man from the English and with this victory in their mind, Edward Bruce, Earl of Carrick embarked on an invasion of Ireland.⁴ The men

¹ This essay was written for HI4009: The Scottish Wars of Independence, 1286-1328.

² Colm McNamee, *The Wars of the Bruces, Scotland, England and Ireland 1306-1328*, (Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2022), 193.

³ Ibid, 195.

⁴ Ibid, 192.

who would face him were the Anglo-Irish barons and their Gaelic allies. They included the Bulter's of Carrick, the Fitzgeralds of Desmond and Kildare, and the de Burgh earls of Ulster.⁵ However, the English kings often exploited Ireland. Edward II continued this and in 1312 the king regained control of and took £2000 of revue from Ireland which he gave to his Italian bankers in order to pay off his debts, illustrating the hostile relationship between the English crown and its Irish territory whereby the English crown considered it as a place to take taxes from rather than a place that needed support.⁶ This meant that the lords of Ireland had to see to their own defence and Edmund Bulter, the justiciar of Ireland, gathered ten thousand men to strengthen Ireland's defence. It is also important to note that at this time King Robert would be heavily involved in fighting across the north of England.⁷ Despite knowing that there was Scottish activity in the Irish sea when the Scottish army landed in Ireland, the 'cash strapped' Anglo Irish barons (as Andy King and Clarie Etty put it) were caught off guard when Edward Bruce and his army came ashore.⁸

The Campaign

When considering how effective the Anglo-Irish resistance to the Scottish invasion was it is important to evaluate their actions against the Scottish invasion. The Scottish invasion was cut up into four campaigns across the four years it took place.

1315

The first campaign began with Edward Bruce landing at Larne and his first battle against the Anglo-Irish army. This army, led by Sir Thomas De Mandeville, included many of the local Anglo-Irish nobility and explains while the local barons were able to gather their forces to deal with the invaders the wider Anglo-Irish community at large were caught off guard and was slow to react in mounting a quick effective defence.⁹

⁵ Ibid, 194.

⁶ Ibid, 192.

⁷ Andy King & Claire Etty, *England and Scotland, 1286-1603* (London: Palgrave, 2016), 35.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Sean Duffy, *Robert the Bruce's Irish wars, the Invasions of Ireland 1306-1329* (Stroud: Tempus, 2002) 132.

The Anglo-Irish loss led to the Siege of Carrickfergus. It is here we see our first example of effective Anglo-Irish resistance; Edward Bruce was unable to storm the castle and so he put it to siege. This meant that the Anglo-Irish garrison forced Edward to leave part of his army to hold the siege while the rest of the army (after Edward Bruce was declared High King of Ireland) marched south from Carrickfergus and into Dundalk, Adree, and finally Louth.¹⁰

Two months after the initial invasion in July, the Anglo-Irish barons and their Gaelic allies gathered to confront the Scots. One important thing to highlight is that both the Scottish and Anglo-Irish barons had the support of Gaelic Irish leaders. Bruce had the support of Domhnall O'Neill, King of Tyrone, while Richard de Burgh had the support of the king of Connacht.¹¹

The Justiciar of Ireland (Edmund Butler) had gathered a host in Dublin but at the same time Richard De Burgh was racing to Ulster from Connacht. De Burgh persuaded Bulter that his army would be enough to deal with Bruce and Bulter went back to Dublin.¹² Michael Dolley notes that Richard wished to fight Bruce himself to save his lands from men not under his command, however another view could be that the reason he marched alone was more personal.¹³ Edward's Sister-in-law, Queen Elizabeth, was Richard's daughter and here was his son-in law's brother attempting to push him out of his lands and supplant him: this was something Richard could let stand.¹⁴ This is a very fine example of the divisive nature of the Anglo-Irish lordship. There were a lot of personal rivalries between the Anglo-Irish barons as Sean Duffy notes this in his article on Richard De Burgh, who throughout his rule in Ulster fought with the FitzGerald earls of Kildare. What this reveals is the divided nature of the lordship as, despite the fact they were all collectively facing the same threat, these men did not all like each one another and were willing to let others fail even in the face of a larger threat. This, in turn, would make mounting an effective defence against the Scots more difficult.¹⁵

¹⁰ McNamee, *The Wars of the Bruces*, 195.

¹¹ Ibid, 194.

¹² Michael Dolley, *Anglo-Norman Ireland* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1972), 179.

¹³ Ibid, 179.

¹⁴ Sean Duffy, *Burgh, Richard de, Second earl of Ulster [called the Red Earl]*, 2004, <<https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-3995?rskey=SMKcrv&result=2>>.

¹⁵ Ibid.

The next battle of this campaign was to be at Connor. De Burgh finally met Edward in battle in September and, with an unfavourable summer, De Burgh's undersupplied forces were defeated. The last battle of the 1315 campaign was held at Kells where Roger Mortimer (the Lord of the Kells) was defeated by Edward, partly because his rivals left him to fight the Scots alone. These defeats led to fear in Ireland, particularly in Dublin, but, like Carrickfergus, Dublin was bypassed. What the first campaign highlights is that the divided Anglo-Irish had not been effective at dealing with the Scottish invasion. The battles at Connor and Kells shows this best, as Mortimer had been abandoned at Kells and Richard de Burgh's defeat could be put down to his refusal to allow Butler's troops into Ulster. This divided nature made it easy for the Scots to parry each counterattack that the Anglo-Irish defenders threw at them. When considering the 1315 campaign, the Anglo-Irish had not put up an effective defence. The destruction of two main armies left Ireland open to attack and it left the Scots as the masters of Ulster. However, one crucial factor here is the defence of Carrickfergus. Without siege equipment the Scots were forced to leave a force to lay siege to the castle, thereby meaning that the garrison was effectively holding down at least one position of the Scottish army.

1316

Despite being fought in winter the Battle of Skerries began the campaigning season of 1316. It is here that we see the first glimpse of united Anglo-Irish resistance. In response to the summons of Edmund Butler several lords gathered a new Anglo-Irish host in Northern Ireland made up of prominent Anglo-Irish lords, among them Edmund Butler himself and the Earl of Desmond.¹⁶ What this shows is that the Anglo-Irish lords did gather to force the Scots out. This is backed up by Roy Haines, who says that “...all men who are said to have willingly answered the justiciars summons”. This does tell us that the Anglo-Irish had come to the consensus that their situation was tenuous and only together could they hold back the Scots. Alongside this it brings to the forefront the strong character of Edmund Butler, who was taking charge of the Anglo-Irish war effort in Ireland rather than a representative of the English

¹⁶ Roy Martin Haines, *King Edward II his life, his reign and its aftermath, 1284-1330* (Montreal: McGill-Queens's University Press, 2003), 293.

crown. He was giving orders to men like the Earl of Kildare on how to conduct his campaigning and Duffy backs this up by saying he was able to keep most Anglo-Irish barons in check.¹⁷

Butler's authority is further highlighted in the *Calander of patent* roles, when Edward II appointed John De Hotham to deal with the debts due to the king. The following quote states "*Grant to John de Hothum, king's clerk, who is going to Ireland on business touching the king and the state of Ireland ...Power to John de Hothum to enter into agreements with those who had proceeded or were to proceed in the king's service against the Scots, who had invaded Ireland, to remit debts due to the king, and to dispose of ward-ships and marriages, which shall fall in, in such manner as shall be thought fit by Edmund le Bo tiller, justiciary of Ireland, and others of the Council*".¹⁸ This spells out that the chief governmental authority in Ireland was Edmund Bulter, as despite being the king's man in Ireland John Hotham had to work on the advice of the justiciar Edmund Bulter, telling us how much power he had in the Anglo-Irish lordship.

In April the English government began to take an interest when Roger Mortimer returned to Ireland after being named the king's lieutenant in Ireland, bringing with him a small contingent of mercenaries paid for by the king. The fact that the king was paying for Edmund is shown in a primary source provided by *The National Archives* wherein there is a receipt that shows Roger Mortimer was given £400 pounds to sustain his men in the field. This underlines the extent to which English crowns was willing to support the Irish government money. Despite this however, it was still going to be up to the Anglo-Irish to fight the war on the king's behalf.¹⁹

While the Anglo-Irish were mobilizing it is here we see that King Edward Bruce and his Scots were faltering. The famine which struck Europe then led to food shortages on both sides, however, unlike the Anglo-Irish, the Scots relied on their supply lines from back home coming across the Irish

¹⁷ Duffy, *Robert the Bruce's Irish Wars*, 134.

¹⁸ Calander of Patient Roles, *Calendar of the patent rolls preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward II, A.D. 1307-1327. Prepared under the superintendence of the Deputy Keeper of the Records* 2, <<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=gri.ark:/13960/t0wq2kg62&seq=361&q1=Scots>> [accessed 6th November 2023].

¹⁹The National Archives, *The End of the Bruce Invasion of Ireland, 1318, (no date)*, <<https://blog.nationalarchives.gov.uk/end-bruce-invasion-ireland-1318/>> [accessed 7th October 2023].

sea. Beside this the harvest in Ireland had been so bad they could not gather enough provisions to sustain themselves.

After fighting in Leix and Kildare for some time in the spring the Scots withdrew north back to Ulster. At this time, the English government sent a fleet to begin operations in the Irish sea to assist the Anglo-Irish, all at great expense to the English treasury.²⁰ This further illustrates that the Anglo-Irish were now getting assistance from the crown and with English ships in the Irish Sea the scant supplies the Scots were receiving from the mainland were disrupted, alleviating some pressure on the Anglo-Irish as the Scots would be placed in a difficult position with their one supply line in a dangerous position and demonstrating the effectiveness of their defence of Ireland.

In the west the Anglo-Irish too were seeing success. *The Annals of Ulster* says as much as in August 1316, “*the foreigners of the west of Connacht all assembled against them: to wit, William de Burgh...battle was engaged in by them, and defeat inflicted on...feidhlimidh o’concobuir... king of Connacht...*”.²¹ William Du Burgh was Richard’s nephew, and this battle was the first significant victory for the Anglo-Irish. This in fact illustrates that the Anglo-Irish were very capable of winning battles in the field and were beginning to effectively defend Ireland.

Next to come was the end of the epic 17-month siege of Carrickfergus. Here we again see a good, concise effort on behalf of the Anglo-Irish to hold out and their 17-month hold out was significant and effective because it pinned down Scottish forces and meant that they could not be used in the campaigns of the previous 17 months. The Anglo-Irish control of the castle was one of the effective tools in disrupting the already stretched Scottish supply lines, thereby depleting the Scots of much needed supplies which were already being stretched thin due to the great famine of 1315.

Before the year was over, the English would strike again. Colm Macnamee notes this when they write that “*...in November 1316 John Logan and Hugh Bisset killed 300 Scots*”.²² They go on to point out that this shows that Bruce was by no means in a secure position despite having Carrickfergus in their possession. The long siege of Carrickfergus, the Logan Bisset attacks, and the capture of Sir Alan

²⁰ Mcnamee, *the Wars of the Bruces*, 180.

²¹ *The Annals of Ulster 1057-1378*, 429.

²² Mcnamee, *The Wars of the Bruces*, 181.

Stewart shows that the Anglo-Irish had managed to disrupt and throw the Scots off balance, and that they could now operate more effectively to hold the Scots off.²³

1317

In 1317 according to the *Annals of Connacht* “Robert Bruce King Of Scots, came to Ireland bringing many gallowglasses with him to help his brother Edward and expel the galls from Ireland”.²⁴ The *Annal of Ulster* also states that he came “along with many Gallowglasses”.²⁵ This injection of troops, supplies, and new leadership saw Robert and Edward begin a winter campaign whereby they moved south and came within striking distance of Dublin. Despite this increase of force and the offensive momentum the Scots gained with this injection by February the Bruce brothers were not in a tenable enough position to continue their offensive and so decided not to lay siege to Dublin and (starving) marched back north to their base at Carrickfergus.

Not much happened afterwards and there was a pause in the Bruce campaign. Colm McNamee puts this down to the famine as this had forced to supply-strapped Scots to strip everything they could from Ireland, thereby making them as much of an enemy to the Irish as the Anglo-Irish already were.²⁶ This, in turn, had a two-fold positive effect on the Anglo-Irish war effort. The pause in the campaign gave the Anglo-Irish time to gather fresh supplies and troops and time to plan a new and effective course to the campaign. Also, the fact that the Gaelic Irish hated the Scots just as much will have whittled down support for the Scots in Ireland, thereby meaning that the Anglo-Irish could exploit this to their own ends, drawing the Gaelic Irish to their side.

By 1317 fortunes swing in favour of the Anglo-Irish. Roger Mortimer had arrived in Ireland with a mix of royal troops, Genoese mercenaries, and his own levies and joined Edmund Bulter’s own large force.²⁷ Ian Mortimer states that Roger knew he did not have to fight the Bruce brother right away, something that clearly highlighting the new strength of the Anglo-Irish barons. They decided that the

²³ McNamee, *The Wars of the Bruces*, 181.

²⁴ *The Annals of Connacht*, 249.

²⁵ *The Annals of Ulster*, 429.

²⁶ McNamee, *The Wars of the Bruces*, 184.

²⁷ Ian Mortimer, *The Greatest Traitor, The Life of Sir Roger Mortimer Ruler of England 1327-1330* (London: Pimlico, 2004), 85.

best course of action was to shadow the Scots rather than engage in battle.²⁸ Despite these positives, this also shows that the Anglo-Irish knew how precarious their position still was. Andy King and Claire Etty state that they were cash strapped and if this large army of upwards of ten thousand was defeated the Anglo-Irish would have once again been on the back foot in Ireland. Holding their forces back and shadowing their enemies allowed them to use the famine as a weapon as the Scots were forced to withdraw through devastated territory void of supplies as they were unable to bring the Anglo-Irish into battle.²⁹ This double hit of strengthened forces and the withdrawal of the Scottish through a devastated, famine riven country will have served the Anglo-Irish well in their defence of Ireland. The Bruce brothers would have seen their forces depleted whilst the Anglo-Irish would take minimal casualties and therefore would find themselves in a stronger position than that of the Scots. This strategy does seem to have worked and Mortimer states that “*However brave, the Scots were suffering from fatigue, malnutrition, and disillusionment. They were, in effect, already beaten*”.³⁰ This quote strengthens the position that the campaign of 1317 was a reflection of the effectiveness of the Anglo-Irish in their defense of Ireland as, despite not having won a battle in the field, the manipulation of the global effects of the great famine and the refusal to join a battle forced the Scots onto the back foot in the 1317 campaign.

1318

The 1318 campaign would be the last in the four-year struggle between the Anglo-Irish and the Scots. The summer would bring a good harvest for the first time since 1315.³¹ This reinvigorated the Scots and Edward Bruce assembled to him many Gaelic Irish while also rallying his own Scottish commanders. However, the good harvest also gave the Anglo-Irish a much-needed boost. Edmund Bulter, John de Birmingham, and the Archbishop of Armagh alongside many other Anglo-Irish rallied to the justiciar to eject the Scots. However, what the Anglo-Irish did not know was that Robert the Bruce was once

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Mcnamee, *The Wars of the Bruces*, 185.

again on his way to help his brother, and with the Scots on the defensive there was little they could do apart from hope they could lure Edward's small army into battle.

In the end, the Anglo-Irish did not have to do this as Edward came to them. Colm McNamee claims it was Edward's own arrogance which drove him, alongside his wish to stand as tall as his brother. However, Edward rushed down into Dundalk, and it is here that the *Annals of Connacht* says "*Edward Bruce, he who was the common ruin of the galls and Gaels of Ireland, was by the galls of Ireland killed at Dundalk...*".³² This quote gives some insight into the opinions of the Gaelic Irish in terms of their new high king: as a result of the great famine the Scots had to strip the land they were attempting to conquer of supplies. They were not being any better than the English who had been stripping Ireland of its resources since the Anglo-Normans first set foot in Ireland and the Scots lost much support from the Gaelic Irish because of this. Battle was joined at a place called Faughart in October of that year. Facing Edward's core of battle-hardened army were locally raised troops under John de Birmingham. The resulting battle saw the final defeat of the Scots at the hands of the Anglo-Irish. What followed was the collapse of the Scottish hold in Ulster, Carrickfergus, which was quickly retaken, and the Scots lost their hold in Anglo-Irish Ireland.

The final campaign, while successful for the Irish, was by no means a victory caused by their own strategic planning. On analysis, if Edward Bruce had waited for his brother King Robert, he would have had a large force and could have exploited the better harvest to conduct a more successful campaign. However, his rashness had him rushing into a battle he was unable to win. On the part of the Anglo-Irish however, they were quick to exploit their victory by quickly retaking Carrickfergus and strengthening their hold in Ireland. Following this campaign, once the Scots had been expelled from Ireland, terrible rainfall damaged the crops in Ireland, and this would have made any future campaigning in Ireland exceedingly difficult and would have acted as a useful tool in the Anglo-Irish war effort.³³

³² *The Annals of Connacht*, 253.

³³ Colm McNamee, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland', *History Ireland*, 1.1 (1993), 11-16, p. 15.

Conclusion

On analysis, the Anglo-Irish barons' defence of Ireland was effective in places. They did see many successes, with their raids on Scottish forces in 1317 as well as their two main victories of the campaign in Connacht and at Faughart being key examples. They also received aid from the English crown in the form of Roger Mortimer and his royal mercenaries' reinforcements, something which did give them an edge in the campaign. English naval support was especially important as it meant that the Scots main supply line which lay across the Irish Sea was known to be under threat of attack by the English navy. However, during the rest of the campaign their divided nature caused much difficulty in defending Ireland, most notably Richard de Burgh and his refusal to allow Butler's men into Ulster. Repeatedly the Anglo-Irish were defeated in battle against the Scots. Despite this, the Anglo-Irish barons conducted an effective defence of their realm despite their many setbacks including their divided nature and the lack of funds; they were able to assemble several armies to hold the Scots back. Moreover, they were able to use the poor conditions (including the famine) to their advantage to make the Scottish war effort exceedingly difficult.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Calander of Patent Roles, Calendar of the patent rolls preserved in the Public Record Office: *Edward II, A.D. 1307-1327. Prepared under the superintendence of the Deputy Keeper of the Records 2*, <<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt>> [accessed 6th November 2023].

The Annals of Connacht.

The Annals of Ulster, (1057-1378).

The National Archives, *The end of the Bruce Invasion of Ireland, 1318*, (no date), <<https://blog.nationalarchives.gov.uk/end-bruce-invasion-ireland-1318/>> [accessed 7th October].

Secondary Sources

Davis, R.R., *Mortimer, Roger, first earl of March*, (23 September 2004). <<https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-19354?rskey=Ybg35v&result=4#odnb-9780198614128-e-19354-div1-d1071209e313>> [accessed 7th October 2023].

Duffy, Sean, *Robert the Bruce's Irish Wars, The Invasions of Ireland 1306-1329* (Stroud: Tempus, 2002).

Duffy, Sean, *Routledge Revivals: Medieval Ireland an Encyclopedia* (London: Taylor and Francis Group, 2005).

Duffy, Sean, *Ireland in the Early Middle Ages* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1997).

Duffy, Sean, *Burgh, Richard de, Second Earl of Ulster [called the Red Earl]* (23 September 2004),
 <<https://www.oxforddnb.com/display/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-3995?rskey=SMKcrv&result=2>> [accessed 7th October 2023].

Dolley, Michael, *Anglo-Norman Ireland* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1972).

Haines, Roy Martin, *King Edward II: His Life, His Reign and its Aftermath, 1284-1330* (Montreal: McGill-Queens's University Press, 2003).

King, Andy & Etty, Claire, *England and Scotland, 1286-1603* (London: Palgrave, 2016).

Mcnamee, Colm, 'The Bruce Invasion of Ireland', *History Ireland*, 1.1 (1993), 11-16.

Mcnamee, Colm, *The Wars of the Bruces, Scotland, England, and Ireland 1306-1328* (Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2022).

Mortimer, Ian, *The Greatest Traitor, The Life of Sir Roger Mortimerr Ruler of England 1327-1330* (London: Pimlico, 2004)

An Agent of Life and Death: How the Perception of Blood in Hippocratic Medicine Shaped the Practice of Animal to Human Blood Transfusions in 17th Century Europe.

ANNA LACKIE

Anna Lackie will be a 4th year history student. She has a particular interest in the progression of modern science as well as military history. With fourth year approaching, she hopes to combine these interests and write her dissertation on the influences of WWI on the progression of medicine.

Introduction

Paris, 1667. A fifteen-year-old boy, who remained unnamed, puzzled doctors with an incurable fever which had persisted for two months. The boy who was once described to be full of spirit, appeared as though “his wit wholly sunk, his memory perfectly lost, and his body so drowsy that he was not fit for anything.” To alleviate his discomfort, physicians bled him an estimated twenty times. To their dismay, the blood that left his body was “so black and thick that it could hardly form itself into a thread.”¹ Instead of continuing to bleed the boy, leading medic Jean Baptiste-Denis suggested the blood be replaced by transfusion. A procedure that yielded positive results when performed on animals, but there were no records ever involving human participants. Instead of recommending the transfusion of human blood to the child, Denis suggested the use of lambs' blood. Therefore, on the 15th of June, blood sourced from the neck of a lamb was directly transported into the veins of the fifteen-year-old, completing the first documented animal to human blood transfusion. According to Denis's notes, he reported that the following day the boy's “humor [was] much more lively” because “he hath no longer the slowness of spirit nor heaviness of body.”² The experiment's success shocked the medical

¹ Jean-Baptiste Denis, ‘A letter concerning a new way of curing sundry diseases by transfusion of blood, written to monsieur de montmor counsellor to the french king, and master of requests,’ *Journal de Savants*, 1667, 490-500.

² Ibid, 495.

community, thus catalysing extensive experimentation into the possibility of transfusing animal blood to treat diseases.

Before further investigation into the questionable blood transfusions performed in the 17th century, an analysis of the origination of Western medicine must ensue. The progression of medical knowledge and theory descended directly from the legacy of ancient Greek physician, Hippocrates Asclepiades. Educated in the fifth century, Hippocrates was subjected to a world where observation and experience were the foundations of knowledge. Understanding ancient explanations for medical phenomena requires recognizing qualities representative of philosophical-based thought. Hence, the emergence of the humoral system. According to Hippocratic beliefs, the human body was a microcosm of nature, and therefore their bodies were composed of the four elements that were analogous to those found in nature. As earth, fire, air, and water constitute the nature of the universe; blood, black bile, yellow bile, and phlegm compose the human body. For the elements to properly function, there must be a degree of equilibrium between them. For instance, as one may observe in nature, when there is an excess of water there is a flood, or if there is not enough, there is a drought. Either way, the outcome is unfavourable and potentially disastrous. Based upon these observations, the Hippocratic humoral system offered the same explanations, however, an imbalance in the body would result in disease.³ Responses to disease resulted in purging the humor; since blood was considered the place in the body where the humors met, any excess of one humor would corrupt the blood. Spoiled blood was considered a danger not just for the physical human body, but also for the essence and spirit of the individual in which it flowed. Thus, Hippocrates suggested the practice of bloodletting, to rid the body of 'bad blood,' restore the equilibrium to the humors, and most significantly preserve the spirit of the individual. The relationship between the essence of a creature and their blood flow perpetuated by Hippocratic medicine led to the conception that blood was symbolic of life.⁴ For centuries, blood was considered to hold the secret of the life and death of all creatures, being identified both as the cause

³ David C. Lindberg, 'Greek and Roman Medicine,' in *The Beginnings of Western Science: The European Scientific Tradition in Philosophical, Religious, and Institutional Context, 600 BC to AD 1450*, ed. David C. Lindberg (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 111-131.

⁴ Hippocrates Asclepiades, 'Regimen on Acute Disease,' in *The Genuine Works of Hippocrates*, trans. By Francis Adams (London: Leslie B. Adams, 1985), 271-313.

and the cure of diseases. The remainder of this essay will evaluate how the works produced by Hippocratic physicians shaped western blood practices in 17th century Europe, specifically focusing on the philosophical significance of blood and how it guided the way physicians approached treatment well into the early modern era.

Perception of blood in Hippocratic Medicine

Hippocrates's medical legacy endured well beyond his lifetime, as his successors ingrained his conclusions into their own treatises. The culmination of these contributions resulted in the creation of the Corpus Hippocraticum.⁵ Historians attribute the Corpus to be an embodiment of five centuries worth of medical knowledge, enabling scholars to use the source as a tool to trace the progression of Western Medicine. Among the earlier publications is the doctrine, 'On the Nature of Man,' an instrumental work aimed to explain the role of each of the humors and their respective importance to the body. Upon the author's dissection, the four fluids were associated with the following conditions: hot, cold, moist, and dry. The corresponding relationship was thus, phlegm: cold and moist, black bile: cold and dry, yellow bile: hot and dry, blood: hot and moist. Associating the humors' with the various weather conditions emphasized the connection individuals have with their environment, suggesting that their well-being may vary according to the climate.⁶ Amidst all conditions however, blood remained the constant "regulator" as it "nourished" the body with warmth and spirit. From then on, blood was assigned the role of maintaining equilibrium amongst humors, strictly for the preservation of the spirit and health of the individual. A belief that can be traced back directly to Hippocrates own assertion that because of blood, "the whole body is animated by one spirit and flows together."⁷ Consequently, blood was cemented as an integral symbol amidst the progression of Hippocratic medicine.

Although blood was defined to be the 'carrier' of human essence, in terms of science, its presence continued to mystify physicians as its visibility occurred in times of both healing and death. This prompted the ancient medical professionals to seek scientific explanations to supplement their

⁵ Ira Rutkow, *Empire of the Scalpel: The History of Surgery*, (New York: Scribner, 2022).

⁶ *Hippocrates: On The Nature of Man*, trans. by W. Jones, vol. 4 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959).

⁷ Ibid.

philosophical theories. Claudis Galenus (Galen), a second century physician, dedicated his career to this pursuit, successfully contributing works that constituted roughly eighty-five percent of the Corpus Hippocraticum. Galen derived all his medical knowledge from Hippocratic doctrines, earning his fame for “perfecting,” the humoral system. Much of *his* medical experience was acquired through his treatment of injured gladiators and performance of animal dissections, both of which were responsible for establishing his understanding of medicine. While many of his conclusions were disproved during the Renaissance era, they were pertinent for the survival of Hippocratic thought. The foundation of Galenic theory can be seen in the series of volumes of, *Methods of Medicine*,⁸ in which he defended Hippocratic theory, addressing the role of the four humors and their equal necessity for good health. In his analysis, he discussed the presentation of symptoms, the diagnostic process, and treatment, thereby proving blood to be an essential factor to each of those stages. He noted that the liver was the organ responsible for blood production and the initial site for its distribution through the veins.⁸ Further investigation into the process of blood production was launched in, *On the Natural Faculties*,⁹ primarily focusing on the consequences of these physiological functions. Although he had previously identified the original source of the human body’s blood supply, there was still great uncertainty as to how the liver acquired the resources needed to formulate the substance. Therefore, Galen initiated an inquiry into the role of food as a potential catalyst for blood generation. The examination of food digestion led to his conclusion that when food entered the body it would then be converted into a nutritive milk fluid, known as chyle. Once the conversion process was finished, chyle was carried to the liver where it would then be concentrated and transformed into blood. It was then the role of the veins to administer the warmed blood equipped with pneuma, or “vitality,” to restore the spirit to the rest of the body.⁹

Charged with conveying the essence and warmth through the body, any disruption of the purity of blood was believed to compromise the overall health of the individual. Once spoiled, according to Galen, the blood would change thickness and colour- becoming exceedingly toxic to the human body.

⁸ *Claudius Galenus: Methods of Medicine*, trans. by Ian Johnston and G.H.R. Horsley, 1st vol (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2011).

⁹ *Claudius Galenus: On the Natural Faculties*, trans. by Arthur John Brock (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1916).

The blood's colour, whether dark or light, was often used to determine which humor was impeding on the body's equilibrium and would dictate the treatment. In accordance with his predecessors, the suggested treatment was to bleed the patient, a practice that was frequently referred to as "bloodletting." A method born from the Hippocratic conviction that, "[the body] is not nourished from the blood itself by the pure and luminous superfluity of it," and enabled its survival well into the nineteenth century. Hippocrates was the original proponent of the practice, with his detailed instruction and analysis provided in, *'Regimen in Acute Disease.'* This treatise became a guide for his fellow physicians, providing scenarios in which bleeding was necessary. Instances where patients experienced the loss of speech, Hippocrates advised to "open their vein of the right arm." However, coagulation indicated that the opening of sublingual veins would prove the most effective. After the patient bled, it was believed that they would wake up relieved of their symptoms, if not the practice would be carried out a few more times.¹⁰ Bloodletting, then, became the primary course of treatment in Galenic medicine. Due to Galen's perceived "advancement" in human anatomy and physiology, physicians trusted his judgment, prompting acceptance of bloodletting as the predominant method of treatment for a millennium.

Although there were multiple doctrines dedicated towards providing specific instruction as to how to carefully carry out bleeding practices, the method remained extremely hazardous. Often, physicians were unsure how to accurately measure the blood that was leaving the body and would accidentally bleed their patients to death. Alternatively, if the patient survived but the physician remained dissatisfied with the results, they would be bled continuously until the physician determined that it had worked. At that point, the patient's body would be weakened to a state that was more dangerous than the previous symptoms had posed. A phenomenon that can be attributed to their false interpretation of the human circulatory system and failure to consider the possibility that blood might require time to replenish. In 1628, however, Willaim Harvey transformed medicine with his publication of the correct explanation of circulation of blood in the human body. Harvey became the first individual to publicly contradict Galens' anatomical identification of the liver as the primary site of blood flow. Instead, he posited the heart as the organ responsible for this physiological function, publishing his

¹⁰ Hippocrates Asclepiades, 'Regimen on Acute Disease,' in *The Genuine Works of Hippocrates*, 273.

findings in, *‘On the Motion of the Heart and Blood’*. Through extensive experimentation, he successfully traced the path of blood flow through human veins, determining that it moves in a singular direction rather than oscillating back and forth, as waves do in the ocean.¹¹ Thus, he abandoned the preconceived idea that the liver sourced blood and instead explained that it was because of the beat of the heart that the blood gained enough momentum to travel through the veins. Pumped from the heart, through the veins, arteries, and capillaries, warmed blood was delivered to all the extremities, supplying vital sustenance to the organs and tissues. Once the blood reached the whole body, he explained the “exhausted blood” would return to the heart where it would “recover life and heat.”¹² While Harvey’s conclusion disproved the core of Hippocratic medicine, he kept its reverence for the sacred nature of blood through his distinction between “old” and “new” blood. He, therefore, associated “old” blood with the term “exhausted” and tied new blood to “life,” thereby reinforcing the significance attributed to blood as the “nourisher” of spirit. Harvey’s perpetuation of the correct circulatory model was pivotal for the medical world, as physicians were then able to understand proper physiological functions and blood replenishment.

Progression of Medical Knowledge in the 17th Century

Following Harvey’s revision of the anatomical model and demonstration of unidirectional blood flow in the human body other scientists, namely Christopher Wren and Richard Lower, implemented these discoveries to advance their experiments. A theory emphasized by Professor Harcourt Brown, a scholar who focused his research on the origination of blood transfusions, suggests that Harvey’s circulatory model spurred Lower and Wren’s exploration into the possibility of intravenous injections in the mid-1660’s.¹³ Recognizing that veins distribute blood throughout the body, they hoped that injecting a substance would provide relief by traveling alongside the blood to alleviate symptoms and illness. The question, however, remained: What substance could alleviate symptoms without harming the patient? Lower and Wren injected various substances into the veins of dogs, including opium and wine, with

¹¹ William Harvey, *The Circulation of Blood, and Other Writings* (London: J.M. Dent, 1952).

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Harcourt Brown, ‘Jean Denis and Transfusion of Blood, Paris, 1667-1668,’ *History of Science Society*, vol. 39, (1948), 15-29.

syringes made from animal bladder, with the hope of yielding any positive results. Professor Brown recounted their series of unsuccessful trials in detail; however, it was only when Lower suggested the injection of a liquid believed to possess life and spirit—blood — that the true significance of their experiment only began to unravel. From then on, Lower and Wren shifted their focus toward the successful execution of blood transfusions from one dog to another. Their process began with the extraction of blood from various arteries within the donor's body; once enough was collected it would be inserted into the vein of the designated recipient. However, once the blood was injected, it would immediately coagulate, leading to the death of the recipient and the consequential failure of the experiment. Forced to adjust their method according to the previous trials, Lower and Wren decided to connect the artery of the donor with the artery of the recipient using a set of quills, forming a tube-like structure. Once the blood left the donor, the dog began “to cry, and faint, and fall into convulsions, and at last dye,” a common occurrence within their experimental process, though, to their astonishment, “the other leapt off the table,” shook himself, and ran away, “as if nothing ailed him.”¹⁴ A monumental result, as it marked the first successful blood transfusion in the Western world, awarding Lower and Wren with the honour of being the first scientists to do so. While the original experiment was conducted in 1665, the pair published their finalized conclusions in 1666. Found in the December edition of *Philosophical Transactions*, a newspaper created to disseminate the latest scientific across Europe, scholars read Lower and Wren’s proof that blood held the ability to revive a creature from a state of presumed death. The pair concluded that each transfusion, if conducted properly, would yield the same results. They encouraged others to explore new ways it could be applied to increase the overall well-being of individuals. Hence, the proposition of the exchange of blood from “the old and young, sick and healthy, hot and cold, fierce and fearful, lame and wilde.”¹⁵ Their suggestion not only endorsed the use of blood for rejuvenation but also hinted at its potential to alter one's pre-existing traits for the better. This concept intrigued French physician Jean Baptiste Denis.

¹⁴ Richard Lower, ‘The Method observed in Transfusing the Bloud out of one Animal into another,’ *Philosophical Transactions*, 17 December 1666, 353-358.

¹⁵ Ibid.

Synthesis of Hippocratic medical theory with 17th century medical practices

When Jean Baptiste Denis heard of Lower's success, he conducted the same experiments in Paris, though he preferred to draw blood from the crural rather than the carotid artery. A change was meant to reduce the death rate of the donor by minimizing the occurrence of convulsions. With his second experiment he followed the same procedure, where he found that the use of thinner tubes helped counteract blood coagulation, increasing the survival rate of his subjects. His successes enabled the performance of more complex experiments, represented by his transfusion of the blood of three calves into three dogs, in which the dogs appeared unbothered.¹⁶ Denis recorded his conclusions and published them in the 1667 April edition of *Philosophical Transactions*. When studying his report, it became undeniably clear that his curiosity about blood transfusion was only beginning. This was later confirmed when, just a few months later, he requested permission to transfuse the blood of an animal into a human. His proposal addressed all the controversies surrounding the transfusion of animal blood into man, however, he argued that it was a suitable compromise for doctors who favoured bloodletting and those who did not. Appealing to the mutual desire to preserve the purity of blood, he contended that animal blood was less likely to have been corrupted by passion or vice.¹⁷ Therefore, positioning it to be the more acceptable and refined choice, and recommended the transfusion of calf's blood to cure a 15-year boy's relentless fever. In that same year, Denis went ahead to conduct the first transfusion on a human and met what appeared to be a success. Thus, catalysing a one-year period during which physicians in Europe, particularly France and Britain, offered animal to human transfusions as an alternative to bloodletting. The prevailing notion was that human blood was vulnerable to corruption, either from one's own emotions or the imbalance among the humors, leading to frequent questioning of the purity of human blood. Consequently, popularizing the use of animal blood as a purifying agent, solely for the replacement of the 'old' blood with the 'new,' a practice believed to cure both physical and mental ailments. A theory which scientific historian Douglas Starr expands upon in his book, *'Blood: An Epic*

¹⁶Jean-Baptiste Denis, 'Of a Letter of M. Denis Prof. Of Philosophy and Mathematicks to M. *** touching the Transfusion of Blood, of April 2, 1667,' *Philosophical Transactions*, 6 May 1667, 453.

¹⁷ Jean-Baptiste Denis, 'A letter concerning a new way of curing sundry diseases by transfusion of blood, written to monsieur de montmor counsellor to the french king, and master of requests,' 492.

History of Medicine and Commerce'.¹⁸ By examining the historical symbolism of blood, he argued that its significance was the primary motivation behind animal-to-human blood transfusions in the 17th century.

The case of Antoine Mauroy sustained Starr's argument, as he became Jean Baptist Denis's second transfusion patient. Prior to his procedure, Mauroy was referred to as the "mad man" in his little French town, as his behaviour was crude and his habits were menacing. His overindulgence in alcohol only heightened his anger issues, inducing his infliction of violence against his wife. Allegedly, Denis discovered Mauroy running naked in the streets, and felt as if it was his duty to relieve the poor man of his mental illness. He was diagnosed and then transfused with the blood of a calf, due to the inherent innocent nature of calf it was believed that it would expel his violent tendencies. A few minutes after the tube had been inserted, and the calf blood had entered his bloodstream, Mauroy complained of a warming sensation ascending in his arm. Denis then withdrew the tube and instructed him to go to sleep. When he woke up it was reported that he felt much better and appeared calm. To ensure that he would remain that way, he was transfused yet again two days later and complained of the same heat sensation. His pulse rapidly increased and decreased, and he complained of substantial pain in his kidneys. When the tube was removed, he vomited and urinated black. His response was caused by the proteins that are within animal blood as they are completely foreign to those found within humans. This, in turn, induces the human body to react and send antibodies to destroy the "foreign invaders." The result is hemolysis, the destruction of all red blood cells, causing the patient to spark a fever and feel discomfort around the kidneys. A process that is fatal if not tended to immediately and considering that Denis ceased the operation as soon as Mauroy complained of discomfort a non-lethal amount had entered his bloodstream. Mauroy's consequential survival was misinterpreted to be a demonstration of the procedure's success, thus encouraging physicians to resort to transfusions as a suitable treatment.¹⁹

In Britain, Lower and another colleague named Edmund King were jealous that Denis received the credit for being the first to perform an animal to human blood transfusion. To display their skills, they paid a man by the name of Arthur Coga twenty shillings to transfuse the blood of a lamb into his

¹⁸ Douglas Starr, *Blood: An Epic History of Medicine and Commerce* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, 1998).

¹⁹ Ibid.

veins-- a procedure Professor Brown described as being carried out more for “curiosity than for necessity.”²⁰ Prior to the transfusion they bled him twelve ounces for the sole purpose of making room for the ‘newer’ and ‘purer’ blood. Once the process was completed, and the lamb’s blood was coursing through his veins, he too was instructed to get some rest. The next day he was reportedly in high spirits and requested the operation be done again. Lower and King decided against a second transfusion however, they were exceedingly satisfied with their results.²¹ Despite this, the increased practice of these transfusions began to alarm physicians across Europe, and prompted the publication of many doctrines against Denis’s and Lowers methods.

Opposition to the performance of Transfusions

The Academie des Science in France, devoted to the advancement of experimental science, spearheaded the opposition to animal-to-human blood transfusions after they had tried to mimic the Lower-Wren method. Although they never successfully transfused blood from one dog to another, let alone an animal to a human, they were confident that the practice of transfusion would inevitably fail. According to their conclusions, blood would automatically become corrupted due to the “evil properties” it acquired as soon as it left the body. If the patient managed to endure the presence of “evil” blood, they would still meet their deaths due to the “impossibility of nature to accommodate foreign blood.”²² Charles Perrault, member of the Academie, therefore, challenged the “successes” of human transfusions, emphasizing the obvious flaws within Denis’s procedures. What he felt was the most shocking was that there was no exact way to measure the amount of blood that was entering the bloodstream of the recipient. Because of that small factor, Perrault argued that the survival of the patients can be attributed to the probability that only a minimal amount of foreign blood, if any, was passed between the two. Despite his realistic scientific analysis, doctors still operated according to the conception that the “new” blood restored vigor and powers to the individuals. He questioned their symbolic justification, claiming that “the blood of a

²⁰ Brown, ‘Jean Denis and Transfusion of Blood, Paris, 1667-1668,’ 20.

²¹ Learoyd, P., ‘The History of Blood Transfusion Prior to the 20th Century - Part 1,’ *Transfusion Medicine (Oxford, England)*, 5.22 (2012), 308–14.

²² Hebbel E. Hoff and Roger Guillemin, ‘Experiments on Transfusion in France,’ *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, 2.18 (1963), 110.

calf ought to carry stupidity into the veins of the recipient,” therefore challenging its effectiveness as a remedy. He thereby concluded that these sorts of transfusions, “produce nothing but pernicious accidents,” and encouraged total abandonment of the practice completely.²³ Perrault's objections were thoroughly structured and effectively communicated, thus promoting a widespread reassessment of European blood practices.

The rejection of transfusions by the Academie des Science and the Faculty of Paris, prompted the French Parliament to prohibit all animal-to-human blood transfusions, which paused medical interest in blood transfusions until 1749. The influence of the French decision reached England, leading the Royal society of London to adopt a similar attitude. Italy followed suit when the Pope enforced the same ban in 1679.²⁴ This persisted until Dr. Cantwell, member of the Faculty of Medicine in Paris, recommended the use of blood transfusions to help those who suffered significant blood loss, rather than for the transmission of desired traits and vigour.

Conclusion

While the practice of animal-to-human blood transfusions was short-lived, they were justified according to the notion that blood symbolized the existence of life. An ideal that was a guiding principle within the Hippocratic humoral system, as blood was the humor examined at the first sign of illness. It was according to this regimen that disease was a direct result of the spoilage of blood, therefore corrupting the spirit and health of the individual. The treatments prescribed by Hippocrates and encouraged by his predecessors were thus designed to restore purification back to the human body. This was believed to be achieved by bleeding the patient of anywhere from twelve to eighteen ounces, so that there might be room for ‘new’ blood to replenish the veins. Hence, the birth of bloodletting, a practice that began in ancient Greece and survived until the mid-nineteenth century due to its perceived effectiveness in treating a range of various illnesses. As time passed, and physicians worked to widen the scope of

²³ Ibid, 111.

²⁴ Learoyd, P. “The History of Blood Transfusion Prior to the 20th Century-Part 2.” *Transfusion Medicine* (Oxford, England), 6.22 (2012), 372–76.

Hippocratic theory, the practice was amended to accommodate the more progressive medical conclusions that arose throughout the 1600's.

Thanks to William Harvey's revised circulatory model, and the experiments conducted by Richard Lower and Christopher Wren exploring intravenous injections, blood was no longer solely considered a cause of disease; instead, it began to be viewed as a potential cure. As there was no better cure than the very substance believed to carry the very essence of life, a traditional conception that was continuously perpetuated by Hippocrates and his corresponding doctrines. A conviction that was understood quite literally by Lower and Jean Baptiste Denis, as they were among the few physicians in history to document their attempt to exploit the life redeeming properties in blood by transfusing the blood of an animal into the veins of a human being. While the idea of blood transfusion was a medical operation that was beyond their time they did not shy away from the challenge, as their results seemingly proved that the transferal of animal blood into humans did indeed work and their experiments were deemed successful. Patients not only survived but also exhibited signs of improved well-being. Denis was able to prove that the transfusion of blood could be used to treat illnesses, shown by the case of the fifteen-year-old boy who suffered from a two-month long fever, only to be relieved once the blood of a lamb entered his bloodstream. Aside from physical illnesses, it was also shown to help those suffering with mental disorders, as the violent and "mad" man, Antoine Mauroy, was a new man after he was transfused with the blood of a calf. Medical historians have since analysed these cases and concluded that since a nonlethal amount of foreign blood entered their veins the life of patients was preserved. Though the medical community at the time was eager to prove that the vigour and vitality carried by blood could in fact be used to save patients from their expected 'fatal' state. However, the longer the practice was accepted, the more scientists grew wary about the collision of animal blood with that of humans, thus, leading to the refutation of the overall purity of the foreign blood. The opposing arguments were grounded in the fear that the barbaric and animalistic properties within the blood of non-human organisms would irreversibly contaminate the human bloodstream. A concern that gained considerable traction, eventually overwhelming those who remained in favor of the practice and led to the outright ban of all animal-to-human blood transfusions in 1678.

Although traditional Hippocratic medicine did not encourage or promote the scientific practice of transfusion, its perpetuation of the sacredness of blood can be linked to the blood transfusions performed in 17th century Europe. Its continued emphasis on the connection between blood and the presence of life shaped centuries of medical practices driven by the curiosity of physicians to explore the 'hidden' properties within blood. Thus, the symbolic nature of blood dictated the way physicians approached treatment in the early modern era, most prolifically with the performance of animal-to-human blood transfusions.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Claudius Galenus: Methods of Medicine, trans. by Ian Johnston and G.H.R. Horsley, 1st vol (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2011).

Claudius Galenus: On the Natural Faculties, trans. by Arthur John Brock (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1916).

Jean-Baptiste Denis, 'A letter concerning a new way of curing sundry diseases by transfusion of blood, written to monsieur de montmor counsellor to the french king, and master of requests,' *Journal de Savants*, 1667, 490-507.

Hebbel E. Hoff and Roger Guillemin, 'Experiments on Transfusion in France,' *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, 2.18 (1963), 103-124.

Hippocrates: On The Nature of Man, trans. by W. Jones, vol. 4 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959).

Hippocrates Asclepiades, 'Regimen on Acute Disease,' in *The Genuine Works of Hippocrates*, trans. By Francis Adams (London: Leslie B. Adams, 1985), 271-313.

Jean-Baptiste Denis, 'Of a Letter of M. Denis Prof. Of Philosophy and Mathematicks to M. *** touching the Transfusion of Blood, of April 2, 1667,' *Philosophical Transactions*, 6 May 1667, 453.

Richard Lower, 'The Method observed in Transfusing the Bloud out of one Animal into another,' *Philosophical Transactions*, 17 December 1666, 353-358.

William Harvey, *The Circulation of Blood, and Other Writings* (London: J.M. Dent, 1952).

Secondary Sources

David C. Lindberg, 'Greek and Roman Medicine,' in *The Beginnings of Western Science: The European Scientific Tradition in Philosophical, Religious, and Institutional Context, 600 BC to AD1450*, ed. David C. Linberg (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), 111-131.

Douglas Starr, *Blood: An Epic History of Medicine and Commerce* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc, 1998).

Harcourt Brown, 'Jean Denis and Transfusion of Blood, Paris, 1667-1668', *History of Science Society*, 39 (1948), 15-29.

Ira Rutkow, *Empire of the Scalpel: The History of Surgery* (New York: Scribner, 2022).

Learoyd, P., 'The History of Blood Transfusion Prior to the 20th Century - Part 1', *Transfusion Medicine* (Oxford, England), 5.22 (2012), 308–14.

Learoyd, P. "The History of Blood Transfusion Prior to the 20th Century-Part 2." *Transfusion Medicine* (Oxford, England), 6.22 (2012), 372–76.

Olivier Garraud, 'Blood and Blood-Associated Symbols Beyond Medicine and Transfusion: Far More Complex Than First Appears,' *Frontiers in Medicine*, 5 (2018), 14-21.

“Primary Agent of Freedom”: Abraham Lincoln, Slavery, and the American Civil War.

CRAIG MCKENZIE

*Craig McKenzie is a fourth-year Joint Honours History and Politics Student, graduating in June 2024. He is particularly interested in both local Aberdeen history and The American Civil War. He recently completed his dissertation on Reactions towards Air Raids in Aberdeen during the Second World War. Upon Graduation, he intends to study LLB Law – Accelerated.*¹

There is a complex and ongoing debate towards the idea of whether Abraham Lincoln was the “primary agent of freedom” during the American Civil War or not. This statement refers to the idea that it was solely Abraham Lincoln who was the pursuer of freedom for enslaved persons during the American Civil War, as well as the freedom of ideas granted by the Constitution. This is the more traditionalist viewpoint held by historians like Richard Striner and Allen C. Guelzo. They held Lincoln to be the “Great Emancipator.” This viewpoint has been challenged in historiography most importantly by W.E.B Du Bois in 1935 with his book ‘*Black Reconstruction in America*’ and in the mid-20th century, during the Civil Rights movement, with the idea of Black self-emancipation. This states that enslaved persons freed themselves whether that be through courageous American escapes and some rebellions. Modern historians have attempted to find a synthesis of the two prominent arguments. To investigate whether Lincoln was the “primary agent of freedom” this essay will examine the historiographical ideas on the topic and analyse them. This essay will agree with the modern historiographical viewpoint that Lincoln was not the “primary agent of freedom” but that he did play a leading role in it. Other leading influences came from prominent Black figures and enslaved persons of the time. This essay also will look at how no one person could be the “primary agent.”

The more traditional argument towards whether Abraham Lincoln was the “primary agent of freedom” is that he was the “Great Emancipator.” The traditional viewpoint is generally positive

¹ This essay was written for HI356J: Thinking History.

towards Lincoln, and it looks at him as the sole reason for the Emancipation Proclamation because he was the President that signed it.² This idea was accepted by both historians and the population to create a hero from the American Civil War and add to the Great Men Theory of history, an idea that most of history can be explained through the study of important male leaders and figures.³ But, during the first half of the 20th century, this argument was neglected, and more emphasis was placed on the idea that Lincoln would rather have saved the Union. In the second half of the 20th century, especially the 1960s, the idea that Lincoln was the “Great Emancipator” was rejected by some historiographies. Then, in more recent years there has been a resurgence in the support, amongst some historians, of the idea that Lincoln was the “Great Emancipator.”⁴

One such historian that follows this traditional viewpoint is Richard Striner. Throughout his writings he has supported the idea that Lincoln was a master-political operator which made him the “primary agent of freedom.” He argues that Lincoln did not need to enact the Emancipation Proclamation to win the war, but Lincoln did it anyway.⁵ Striner emphasises that Lincoln showed off his political mastery by creating a “Stealthy Emancipation Plan” and that he had been working on from 1861 onwards. This would lead to the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863.⁶ Striner paints this “Plan” as one solely of Lincoln’s creation hence, making him the “primary agent of freedom”. This argument is challenged by many historians including, W.E.B Du Bois and because it portrays Lincoln as the sole person responsible for the freedom of the enslaved persons. This could not be true because it was not only Lincoln that had wanted emancipation. There is an argument that has been pursued which shows that Lincoln only cared for emancipation as a War Measure. Another Historian who follows the traditional viewpoint on whether Lincoln was the “primary agent of freedom” is Allen C. Guelzo. He has been one of the largest defenders of the idea that Lincoln was the “Great Emancipator.” He rejects the argument about self-emancipation and believes that it was Lincoln himself who emancipated the

² Abraham Lincoln, *The first edition of Abraham Lincoln's final emancipation proclamation* (Washington D.C, Library of Congress, 1863).

³ Stephen B. Oates, “The Man of Our Redemption” Abraham Lincoln and the Emancipation of the Slaves,’ *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 9.1 (1979), 15–25.

⁴ Dorothy Ross, ‘Lincoln and the Ethic of Emancipation: Universalism, Nationalism, Exceptionalism,’ *The Journal of American History*, 96.2 (2009) 379-399, pp. 381-383.

⁵ Richard Striner, *Lincoln, and Race* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2012), 39-40.

⁶ Striner, *Lincoln and Race*, 35-37.

enslaved persons. He counters this argument by asking how the enslaved persons would have freed themselves when they did not have any voting rights or representatives in Government.⁷ He argues that it is Lincoln's name on the bottom of the document and this means that, no matter what his true intentions were, he still signed the document.⁸

The traditional viewpoint can be challenged as it is created by a group of white historians emphasising the importance of one white man, Lincoln, over the Black enslaved persons and prominent Black figures of the time. Also, the importance of Striner's Lincoln "Stealthy Emancipation Plan"⁹ argument, which can be challenged because Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation was only for the States that had seceded and not the border states and many captured territories where enslaved persons were kept. Guelzo does contest this argument by stating that Lincoln did not have control over the enslaved persons in those States because slavery was a state right and not one that the Federal Government could change.¹⁰ Robert Fabrikant replies to Guelzo in an article by challenging the idea that Lincoln was the "primary agent of freedom." He writes that the enslaved persons that came to the Union did play a role in securing their own freedom. Also, he writes that Guelzo is wrong in his assumption that it was Lincoln who "ended slavery in the American."¹¹ This debate amongst two historians displays the differences in the historiography about this topic. The "Great Emancipator" traditional viewpoint on the question of whether Lincoln was the 'primary agent of freedom' is easier to understand than other arguments because it displays the leader of the country as being responsible for an event, which tends to happen throughout history. It is the leader of a country using his position to take credit for an idea that had been advanced by others before them. Which is correct because Lincoln did not write the Emancipation Proclamation himself, he was presented with it months before he enacted it. This viewpoint as well falls into the classic idea of Great Men theory of history where it

⁷ Allen C. Guelzo, 'Restoring the Proclamation: Abraham Lincoln, Confiscation, and Emancipation in the Civil War Era,' *Howard Law Journal*, 50.2 (2007), 397-415, pp. 413-414.

⁸ Guelzo, 'Restoring the Proclamation,' 415.

⁹ Striner, *Lincoln and Race*, 35-37.

¹⁰ Guelzo, 'Restoring the Proclamation,' 414-415.

¹¹ Robert Fabrikant, 'The Emancipation Proclamation Unveiled: A Reply to Professor Guelzo,' *Howard Law Journal*, 50.2 (2007), 314-444 pp. 443-444.

was thought that Lincoln was the sole reason for emancipation, but studies by historians since have provided more nuance to the history of the Emancipation Proclamation.

In 1935 W.E.B Du Bois released a book called *Black Reconstruction in America*. This book created the self-emancipation theory and became a significant part of the historiography because of the impact it had on the debates around emancipation. This argument is that the enslaved persons and prominent Black figures were the “primary agent of freedom” during the Civil War. These prominent figures include both white and Black abolitionists who fought for freedom before, during and after the American Civil War. Some of these figures include John Brown, Frederick Douglass, and William Lloyd Garrison. The argument that the enslaved persons were their own primary agents of freedom during the American Civil War was not widely considered until the writings of Black historians started during the early 20th century and was heavily added to with writings during the Civil Rights movement.

W.E.B. Du Bois’s argument in his book is that the freedom of the enslaved persons came about because of the enslaved person’s own rebellions where they would cause havoc for their holders by robbing, sabotaging, rebelling and most importantly escaping from plantations. These acts managed to change the purpose of the war into not just one about saving the Union, but one which would defeat slavery. This stopped the forces of France and Great Britain from joining the war on the Confederate side because they could not support a side in a war which was pro-slavery.¹² Du Bois argues that the Union could not win the war if it was not for the enslaved persons being emancipated and he argues that they freed themselves because many of the escaped enslaved persons would join the Union army.¹³ Du Bois later argues that it was not only the Black and white abolitionists who had helped gain freedom, but it was also the enslaved persons themselves because of the power they held against the Confederacy. If the enslaved persons stopped working it could have thrown the Confederates into starvation and also they would not be able to gain their resources because they were not being made.¹⁴ Another historian who follows this viewpoint is David Williams who in his book, “I Freed Myself”, argues that before

¹² W. E. B Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction: An Essay Toward a History of the Part which Black folk played in the attempt to reconstruct democracy in America 1860-1880* (Rahway: Quinn and Boden, 1935), 86-92.

¹³ Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 84.

¹⁴ Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 119-120.

the Emancipation Proclamation there were thousands of enslaved persons who had revolted against their owners and managed to escape towards Union lands. Even the President of the Confederacy, Jefferson Davis's, enslaved persons had "effectively emancipated themselves."¹⁵ Williams later argues that the Emancipation Proclamation was a "Half-way Measure" that was a recognition of the freedom that many enslaved persons had already granted to themselves.¹⁶

The viewpoint that sees enslaved persons as the "primary agent of freedom" during the American Civil War is difficult to challenge because of a lot of the arguments towards self-emancipation. Nevertheless, these events did play a significant role in securing the freedom of the enslaved persons during the American Civil War. Some historians, like Allen C. Guelzo, have challenged this theory by discrediting the idea that thousands of enslaved persons left during the period before the Emancipation Proclamation because they could not have been certain if they would have been able to become free or not, because this was before the Proclamation was enacted.¹⁷ This means that according to Guelzo it was Lincoln who was the "primary agent of freedom" and not the enslaved persons saving themselves because they had to wait until a governmental Proclamation was created. Only then could they gain their freedom. George M. Fredrickson criticises the writings that created the self-emancipation theory because he believes that it failed to consider Lincoln's personal views, which were racist before the American Civil War and changed throughout the war. This was because he took advice from many prominent Black figures and some white abolitionists and he became more supportive of the emancipation cause.¹⁸ He writes that a lot of the historiography about self-emancipation theory uses the ideology that the Emancipation Proclamation did not massively change the situation for Black people, especially in the book *Forced into Glory* by Lerone Bennett Jr.¹⁹ The viewpoint that the enslaved persons and prominent Black figures' self-emancipation was the "primary agent of freedom" during the American Civil War is easier to support than to deny. This is because although it may seem like a

¹⁵ David Williams, *I Freed Myself: African American Self-Emancipation in the Civil War Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 88-89.

¹⁶ Williams, *I Freed Myself*, 113.

¹⁷ Allen C Guelzo, *Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation: The End of Slavery in America* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006), 212-213.

¹⁸ George M. Fredrickson, *Big Enough to be Inconsistent: Abraham Lincoln Confronts Slavery and Race* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), 27-29.

¹⁹ Fredrickson, *Big Enough to be Inconsistent*, 21-23.

reasonable argument because of the sheer number of self-freed enslaved persons that fought for the Union Army, it does not consider the apparent importance of Lincoln in the creation of the Emancipation Proclamation. This is because even though some have argued it was a war measure to help his efforts during the war it was still incredibly significant that it was enacted. A synthesis of the two arguments shows that there is no one “primary agent of freedom” because there were significant developments on both sides towards the Emancipation Proclamation, with both playing vital roles in getting it enacted.

In more recent historiography there has been an attempt at a synthesis between the two viewpoints previously discussed. This viewpoint combines the others and creates the argument that there is not one sole “primary agent of freedom” during the American Civil War but that it was a group of factors and people that led towards enslaved persons being granted their freedom. Of course there is not a complete synthesis, there is still much disagreement amongst historians in modern historiography. The synthesis historiographical argument tends to be spread amongst a range of historians who all share different viewpoints on which of these factors may have played a more of a key role. However, they tend to agree on the idea that it was not just one “primary agent” that was fighting for freedom during the American Civil War.

James M. McPherson is the most well-known writer that follows the synthesis argument when it comes to who was the “primary agent of freedom” during the American Civil War. In his essay “Who Freed the Enslaved persons” McPherson argues that the enslaved persons may have freed themselves if they reached Union lines but if those areas were re-captured, they would be sent back into slavery. He argues here that the “freedom” that they gave themselves was different from the freedom granted from the Emancipation Proclamation.²⁰ Here as well he writes that, while Lincoln did play the most significant role in the freedom of the enslaved persons, he was not a “Great Emancipator” like many have written before. He also debunks the myth that the second that Lincoln put pen on paper all enslaved persons were free.²¹ This means that McPherson challenged both sides of the arguments and wrote that

²⁰ James M. McPherson, *Drawn with the Sword: Reflection on the American Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 205-207.

²¹ McPherson, *Drawn with the Sword*, 207.

there were numerous factors that contributed to emancipation. Another argument that McPherson makes is that the Emancipation Proclamation would not have any military and legal standing when the American Civil War ended because only a constitutional amendment could do this.²² Eric Foner follows this argument by writing that the “freedom” that was chased during the American Civil War was not full freedom, it was just the end of the institution of slavery. By this he means that a type of slavery still existed where poor Black and white labourers had to work in horrible conditions which created an inequality that is still present today.²³

The attempt at a synthesis argument can be challenged because it can be seen as white historians trying to downplay the part that different racial and ethnic minorities may have had in the advance of freedom with some of the historians trying to bring back the traditional viewpoint which had started to be rejected by wider historiographical debate. The defeat of the synthesis argument is that none of the historians that created and use this argument stray away from pursuing their own agenda. McPherson states that it was the Union Army led by Lincoln that freed the enslaved persons in his essay.²⁴ This shows that whenever a synthesis of a historiographical debate is attempted it can sometimes never get away from a historians’ own ideas. Also, Black historians such as Barbara Fields and some white historians like Eric Foner still support and put more of an emphasis on Black self-emancipation. Altogether, the synthesis argument does seem to be more heavily written by white historians who have tried to downplay the importance of Black writers by combining the idea that the enslaved people freed themselves with the idea that a white man did. This is a problem within the history of the Emancipation Proclamation because there are many limitations with contemporary sources which tend to be written by white people who downplay the importance of freed enslaved persons and other Black intellectuals of the time which has led some historians to oversubscribe to idea of Lincoln as the ‘Great Emancipator’.

This essay has looked at “freedom” during the American Civil War as the freedom of the enslaved persons. This is not the only interpretation of “freedom” that could be taken from the American Civil

²² James M. McPherson, *The Might Scourge: Perspectives on the Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 219-221.

²³ Eric Foner, ‘The Meaning of Freedom in the Age of Emancipation,’ *The Journal of American History*, 81.2 (1994), 435-461, pp. 459-460.

²⁴ McPherson, *Drawn with the Sword*, 207.

War. McPherson argues in “Battle Cry of Freedom” that the American Civil War was not only fought for the freeing of the enslaved persons but that it was fought to protect that “freedom” of ideas and rights that were granted to the American when the Constitution was created in 1776.²⁵ The assumption that the only “freedom” fought for during the Civil War was the ending of slavery is wrong because during the war the idea that they were fighting to free enslaved persons only started around 1863, after both tactical and political pressure, especially by prominent black figures, prompted it. The wider idea was to free the Confederate States from their apparent restricted “freedom” and bring them back to the union.

In conclusion, the idea that Lincoln was the “primary agent of freedom” is flawed because it was not one person who fought for freedom during the American Civil War and the historian’s argument’s show a clear progression with a change in ideas. The more traditional viewpoint used, by writers like Guelzo and Striner, displays Lincoln as the “Great Emancipator” because he was the President that signed the Emancipation Proclamation and freed the enslaved persons by himself. This point is challenged because it was not just Lincoln who was a pursuer of freedom but that he was part of a wider group of abolitionists. As well as this the Emancipation Proclamation is flawed itself because it only includes States in rebellion. The Black self-emancipation theory viewpoint that is used by W.E.B Du Bois and David Williams is the idea that it was the enslaved persons who freed themselves because they were resisting their enslavement through acts of rebellion, escape, sabotage, and theft. This can be challenged because it fails to consider the vital role that Lincoln played in the freeing of the enslaved persons. The more modern argument, followed by James McPherson, looked to combine both arguments and create a synthesis where the most prominent parts of both are grouped together as a group of factors for freedom.

This essay has shown that the idea of a “primary agent of freedom” is flawed because while Lincoln, as President, may have been a figurehead towards the pursuit of freedom he was not the only contributor. The answer is no - Lincoln was not the “primary agent of freedom” during the American Civil War. This is because it is evident that there were other groups, like abolitionists, which played a

²⁵ James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 238-242.

vital role in securing freedom during the American Civil War, and that it was not just the actions of one person that fought for the freedom of the enslaved.

Bibliography

Berlin, Ira, et al. *Slavery and Emancipation*, (Malden: Blackwell, 2002).

Du Bois, W.E.B, *Black Reconstruction: An Essay Toward a History of the Part which Black folk played in the attempt to reconstruct democracy in America 1860-1880*, (Rahway: Quinn and Boden, 1935).

Fabrikant, Robert., 'The Emancipation Proclamation Unveiled: A Reply to Professor Guelzo,' *Howard Law Journal*, 50.2 (2007), 314-444.

Foner, Eric, 'The Meaning of Freedom in the Age of Emancipation,' *The Journal of American History*, 81.2 (1994), 435-461.

Fredrickson, George M., *Big Enough to be Inconsistent: Abraham Lincoln Confronts Slavery and Race* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2008).

Guelzo, Allen C., 'Restoring the Proclamation: Abraham Lincoln, Confiscation, and Emancipation in the Civil War Era,' *Howard Law Journal*, 50.2 (2007), 397-415.

Guelzo, Allen C., *Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation: The End of Slavery in America* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006).

Lincoln, Abraham, *The first edition of Abraham Lincoln's final emancipation proclamation* (Washington D.C, Library of Congress, 1863).

McPherson, James M., *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).

McPherson, James M., *Drawn with the Sword: Reflection on the American Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

McPherson, James M., *The Might Scourge: Perspectives on the Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Oates, Stephen B., "'The Man of Our Redemption'" Abraham Lincoln and the Emancipation of the Slaves,' *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 9.1 (1979), 15–25.

Ross, Dorothy, 'Lincoln and the Ethic of Emancipation: Universalism, Nationalism, Exceptionalism,' *The Journal of American History*, 96.2 (2009), 379-399.

Striner, Richard, *Lincoln, and Race* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2012).

Williams, David, *I Freed Myself: African American Self-Emancipation in the Civil War Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

A Public History Affair: How is Memorialisation of Nazi-Occupied Czechoslovakia Explored in Sean Ellis' 2016 Film *Anthropoid*?

MATILDA HALEY

Tilda is a fourth-year joint honours student in History and International Relations, graduating summer 2024. Throughout their degree, they took particular interest in the 'big' history of the 20th century and how this connects with present-day issues, such as the war in Ukraine – which was the focus of their undergraduate dissertation. Following graduation, Tilda aims to pursue a career in intelligence.¹

Public understanding of history today is primarily communicated through film, not schools.² Film is seen as a more accessible medium than academia, capable of engaging us through personal resonations with the characters and highly moralised representations of the past.³ This form of public history is becoming an increasingly important interpreter of events, narrating the past to a wide audience. Therefore, how history is portrayed to the public through film is of integral importance to understanding how it is presented and consumed. This is true for all kinds of history, such as World War II (WWII) which is often one of the most prevalent historical topics in the public domain owing to its profound effect worldwide and as a comparatively recent event.

This is also true for seemingly smaller events, where the audience can engage on a much more personal level with the figures and characters representing the past. One example of a smaller story is Sean Ellis' 2016 film *Anthropoid*, concerning the only successful assassination of a high-ranking Nazi officer – Reinhard Heydrich – during WWII from the viewpoint of assassins Jozef Gabčík and Jan Kubiš. *Anthropoid* differs from some other WWII movies as it does not focus so much on 'big history',

¹ This essay was written for HI4518: History in Practice.

² Sabine Moller, 'Experiencing History in Film: An Empirical Study of the Link between Film Perception and Historical Consciousness', *Research in Film and History* 1.1 (2018), 1-15.

³ Moller, 'Experiencing History'.

mainly the primary discourse of the war, but instead on what appeared to be a minor event that proved to carry major repercussions for the entire European theatre of the war.

This article will first briefly discuss the historical context of Heydrich's assassination and how this context is explored in the film. Then the article will turn to two methods used by Ellis in *Anthropoid* to convey this piece of history to a public audience. The first is historical accuracy. *Anthropoid* portrays events largely with accuracy and is placed within the wider context of WWII at the start and end of the film. The second tool that will be investigated is the use of emotion with tools such as affections between characters and audio. This article will investigate how these tools can encourage the audience to resonate with the characters' emotions and embody these feelings themselves before discussing the importance of historic film for memorialisation in the public domain.

Prior to WWII, the Czechoslovak people had been described as having an 'allergy to violence', instead opting for more passive forms of resistance, such as intelligence gathering for the Allies.⁴ The barbarism of Operation Barbarossa (the Nazi assault on the Soviet Union, launched 22 June 1941) had initiated the first signs of change. Underground Communist presence in Czechoslovakia was greatly opposed to the brutality of Barbarossa, contributing to gathering momentum of resistance. Historians such as Milan argue the instalment of Heydrich as Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia in September that same year to be the decisive catalyst for resistance.⁵

These factors combined were to prove one measure of violence and oppression too far for Czechoslovakia. Furthermore, the exiled Czechoslovak government in London needed leverage over the Allied powers to pressure them to dissolve or reject the Munich Agreement⁶ (in which the Allies relinquished the Sudetenland peacefully to Hitler to appease him), where they had been given no voice over Czechoslovakia's fate. The President in exile Edvard Beneš had growing concerns over the future existence of Czechoslovakia, and the legitimacy of his government should his country survive amidst both the Nazi occupation and growing influence of the Communists.⁷ Despite the incredible secrecy of

⁴ Milan Hauner, 'Terrorism and Heroism: The Assassination of Reinhard Heydrich', *World Policy Journal* (2007), 24.2, 86.

⁵ Milan, 'Terrorism and Heroism', 86.

⁶ Adam Leong Kok Wey, 'Operation Anthropoid', *The RUSI Journal* (2012), 157.2, 70.

⁷ Leong Kok Wey, 'Operation Anthropoid', 70.

the government-in-exile's involvement in Operation Anthropoid, Historians such as Leong Kok Wey believe the operation was orchestrated and ordered by Beneš, who hoped that a successful assassination could secure Czechoslovakia's legitimacy in Allied eyes, despite the certainty of brutal reprisals.⁸

Anthropoid leaves the government-in-exile absent from the film, despite referring to orders as from 'the Czech government in London',⁹ creating ambiguity about the extent of their involvement.¹⁰ This was possibly the intention of the government-in-exile to allow for Operation Anthropoid to maximise resurgence of Czechoslovak resistance to Nazi occupation.¹¹ Jozef (Gabčík) and Jan (Kubiš) appear largely unaware of the ulterior political motives above them, focusing only on the task at hand. When challenged by resistance operatives Ladislav Vaněk and Uncle Hajskey, Jozef reasserts with growing agitation 'We have our orders, comrade', and that 'All Czech patriots should be ready to die for their country.'¹² The lack of Allied contributions to Czechoslovakia's reality under Heydrich in the film is not an omission of fact; it is a true representation of the sense of abandonment felt by the Czechoslovak people amidst their rapidly fading morale.¹³ Only Uncle Hajskey appears to make the connection between the parachutists' mission and the political motives behind it; 'I think what the Czech government in London is asking is this: is Czechoslovakia still ready and willing to resist Nazi Germany?'¹⁴

Heydrich is portrayed as both a symbol and the source of oppression by Ellis. This is an example of how the context of Heydrich's assassination has been effectively portrayed in the film from the viewpoint of the assassins. *Anthropoid* takes the classical structure of a story of a small group who stand to represent a greater cause.¹⁵ Although Operation Anthropoid is somewhat self-contained, the greater cause is resisting Nazi occupation to secure Czechoslovakia's future and defeating them in WWII. This

⁸ Leong Kok Wey, 'Operation Anthropoid', 71.

⁹ *Anthropoid*, dir. by Sean Ellis, (UK, US, Czechia, 2016), 0:17:50-0:17:53.

¹⁰ *Anthropoid*, 0:16:30-0:16:45.

¹¹ Leong Kok Wey, 'Operation Anthropoid', 70.

¹² *Anthropoid*, 0:16:30-0:17:30.

¹³ Leong Kok Wey, 'Operation Anthropoid', 70.

¹⁴ *Anthropoid*, 0:18:10-0:18:22.

¹⁵ Robert Rosenstone, *History on Film/Film on History*, (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2006), 50.

is one of many examples of using microhistory to portray macro-history.¹⁶ Given the magnitude of many instances of ‘big’ history, directors can use microhistory to convey key aspects of larger events.

Ellis lays the foundations of the micro-macro history connection from the very start of the film, opening with the historical context of how Heydrich became the leader of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia. A combination of written text and primary film is used. The audience experiences real images from the Munich Agreement, Nazi soldier marches, and Reinhard Heydrich, who is introduced as the Butcher of Prague, with footage of executions to evidence this.¹⁷ These sequences are explained through the text on screen, to explain the setting of the film. Such use of real primary footage increases a sense of reliability, emphasising Ellis’ commitment to accuracy from the outset, and links the ‘big’ history of Nazi occupation of Eastern Europe during WWII with the microhistory of the parachutists’ mission to assassinate Heydrich.

Contextualisation engages the audience, as they develop an understanding of how the film they are watching connects to a major piece of history. The sequence ends with the statement ‘based on actual events’.¹⁸ This conveys a higher calibre of accuracy in comparison to ‘based on a true story’, which alludes to the deliberate blending of fact and fiction.¹⁹ Ellis maintains this calibre of accuracy for much of the film; for example the torture scene of Ata Moravec was filmed in the same basement room in the Petschek Palace (Gestapo Headquarters) where it took place in 1942.²⁰ Although possibly unknown to the audience, Ellis’ dedication to accuracy and memory is a sensitive and empathetic way to commemorate Czechoslovakia’s experience under Heydrich’s rule. Even if the nuances of his approach are not known, his presentation of the film resonates with strong authenticity.

We are inclined to accept the director’s juxtapositions as accurate,²¹ but it is beyond the scope of a two-hour film to encapsulate issues of such magnitude, as they often present as doing.²² In *Anthropoid*,

¹⁶ Another (famous) example – relating to the US Civil Rights movement – is *Forest Gump*, dir. by Robert Zemeckis (United Kingdom, 1994).

¹⁷ *Anthropoid*, 0:00:33-0:02:01.

¹⁸ *Anthropoid*, 0:02:02-0:02:08.

¹⁹ Donald Stevens, *Based on a True Story: Latin American History at the Movies* (Wilmington: SR Books, 1997), xi.

²⁰ See *Anthropoid* on Amazon Prime Video under ‘trivia’.

²¹ Stevens, *Based on a True Story*, 8.

²² Marcia Landy, *The Historical Film: History in Memory and Media*, (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2001), 55.

Heydrich is presented as a one-dimensional tyrant. As ‘the leading architect of the Final Solution to the Jewish Question’,²³ this is hardly undeserved, but when we delve into the historical data, Heydrich was the master of the carrot and the stick. His notorious terror tactics were selectively applied, but he worked to win the confidence of the Czech workers through methods such as equal ration cards for labourers regardless of nationality; he rewarded the Czechs for fuelling the German war effort.²⁴

The reasons for omitting the carrot of Heydrich’s approach go beyond the time constraints of the film: Ellis must justify the assassination to the audience. The presentation of Heydrich is not by definition inaccurate, but by focusing solely on his tyranny, Ellis can convey Jan and Jozef’s viewpoint and justify their actions. The parachutists saw Heydrich only as a tyrant. In addition, it is possible Ellis chose to portray Heydrich in this one-dimensional manner to simplify the story and prevent controversy of presenting a powerful symbol of the Holocaust and wider Nazi oppression in any manner of favourable light. Another film on Operation Anthropoid, *The Man with the Iron Heart* (Jimenez, 2017), conveys a different perspective, as a portion is from the viewpoint of Heydrich’s wife, Lina. This film presents Heydrich as a loyal figure unafraid of hard work throughout.

Anthropoid uses historical accuracy to convey the terror of Nazi occupation. The cost of Heydrich’s assassination was colossal. The village of Lidice was razed to the ground on suspicion of hiding the assassins, and all its male inhabitants executed.²⁵ This is briefly mentioned by Father Petrek in the film.²⁶ The final fight and suicides in the Saint Cyril and Methodius Cathedral also attest to the parachutists’ preference of death over the repercussions of capture.²⁷ Ellis’ film, like many historical sources, maintains a singular perspective – that of the assassins – and as such does not show every detail of this event.²⁸ The limitations of this approach are somewhat overcome using characters like Father Petrek to convey outside information to the assassins. Sometimes, what appear to be inaccuracies are better described as the overlooking of certain details in favour of others. It is important to remember

²³ *Anthropoid*, 1:53:35-1:53:53.

²⁴ Gunther Deschner, *Heydrich: The Pursuit of Total Power* (London: Orbis, 1981), 197, 206, 210.

²⁵ War Cabinet 74(42), 15 June 1942, item 2 (The National Archives. CAB 65/26).

²⁶ *Anthropoid*, 1:17:15-1:17:40.

²⁷ *Anthropoid*, 1:33:36-1:52:48.

²⁸ Another example is the death of Heydrich, the parachutists receive the intelligence of his death from within the Cathedral where they were hidden.

that historical inaccuracy is not unique to film, and the reliability of primary and secondary materials vary within all their forms.

Accuracy is an important tool in public history, but it alone does not guarantee the engagement of an audience. Certainly, films such as *Braveheart* (Gibson, 1995) are known for deviating from ‘official versions of the national story’.²⁹ Accuracy cannot be relied upon as the sole tool for engaging an audience with history. Emotion is a strong engager which Ellis uses in a variety of ways, from portraying the characters’ emotions to evoking emotion within the audience itself. He uses a range of techniques to achieve this. Ellis develops a juxtaposition of hope and sacrifice on which he builds the emotive sentiment of the film. Love is commonplace in cinema, but often fails to add value to the story. This is not the case in *Anthropoid*. Instead, love is a lever for conveying the passion and fear of the characters. Upon arriving in Prague, Gabčík and Kubiš are faced with a seemingly hopeless situation. Heydrich had practically paralysed or destroyed all resistance groups in Czechoslovakia³⁰ including the parachutists’ contacts in Prague who had been forced deep underground, and their named contact captured.³¹

Marie Kovárníková and Lenka Fafková were members of the Czech resistance who aided Jan and Jozef in their mission, but strong romantic affections grew between these figures³² which is portrayed in the film. The romance between Jan and Marie became so strong, they made plans to marry, which Jozef criticises him for, worried that it could prove a fatal distraction from their mission.³³ Jozef and Lenka also develop romantic affections, but theirs is portrayed as more reserved and professional. The use of romance to emphasise the juxtaposition of hope amidst despair is a uniquely strong tool in cinema; presentation of history through the immediate contact of emotion in film rather than the reason and deduction of academic writing helps to generate interest in a historical topic. Historians such as Sorlin argue artistic tools such as the portrayal of emotion can be leveraged to increase public

²⁹ Tim Edensor, *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life* (London: Taylor and Francis Group, 2002), 142.

³⁰ Deschner, *Heydrich*, 197.

³¹ *Anthropoid*, 0:15:20-0:15:35.

³² Robert Gerwarth, *Hitler’s Hangman: the life of Heydrich* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 7.

³³ *Anthropoid*, 0:46:30-0:48:34.

engagement.³⁴ Whilst emotions can be present in written material, film is more persuasive and an increasingly important interpreter of history, as it combines the visual and the auditory³⁵ to create a more digestible message for the audience.

The emotions of the characters are also effectively portrayed using audio. Unreal music – which is a soundtrack that is not physically possible in reality – is a tool used in filmmaking to express characters' moods and feelings where image alone cannot, and as such is a window into the psychological world hidden beneath the images on screen.³⁶ *Anthropoid*'s soundtrack, by Robin Foster, amplifies our understanding of Jan and Jozef's experience. When Jozef leaves Lenka on the day of the assassination, the soundtrack highlights the sorrow felt by both characters, given the possibility they may die, or never meet again, and culminates upon their final kiss and embrace.³⁷ It is the only song of the soundtrack that builds beyond the pensive theme of the film. Another such example is the assassination itself, where the extreme apprehension of the parachutists is felt through a gradually building soundtrack, and the dulling of other sounds such as Heydrich's car. When Jozef's gun jams, the music appears to imitate his rapid heartbeat, creating apprehension that is inescapable for the audience.³⁸

Buhler describes movie soundtracks as unheard and unobtrusive³⁹ but this does not apply to the deaths of most protagonists in *Anthropoid*. Deaths including Mrs Moravec and Uncle Hajskey's⁴⁰ are in absence of any music. This helps to prevent romanticisation of the brutal repercussions of Heydrich's death. It forces the audience to engage with the history as it is told here, instead of relying on romanticised portrayals of war. Ellis furthers this through Lenka's comment 'War is not romantic'.⁴¹ *Anthropoid* does not present as a story of gallant war heroes, but one of immense fear and sacrifice.

In contrast, Jozef's death takes a far more artistic presentation. In the final scene, Jozef is trapped in the church crypt with some of the other parachutists on adjacent missions. When the Nazis explode

³⁴ Pierre Sorlin, *The Film in History: Restaging the Past* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1980), 4.

³⁵ Stevens, *Based on a True Story*, 1, 5.

³⁶ James Buhler, *Theories of the Soundtrack* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 15.

³⁷ *Anthropoid*, 0:56:45-0:57:43.

³⁸ *Anthropoid*, 1:01:55-1:02:58.

³⁹ Buhler, *Theories*, 15.

⁴⁰ *Anthropoid*, 1:27:27 and 1:39:38 respectively.

⁴¹ *Anthropoid*, 0:28:01-0:28:03.

their way into the crypt, the emotive theme tune of the film is suddenly introduced as all other sounds are silenced. Amidst a violent scene of fighting and facing death, Lenka appears before Jozef in the flooding crypt.⁴² This is the only scene where the audience is separated from the sound and harsh reality of the characters' deaths, conveying the end of the film's main story. Using the theme of the film shows that, although Jozef's death is somewhat romanticised, it stays true to the film's narrative. Another exemplary case of the use of audio is in *The Zone of Interest* (Glazer, 2023), which relies almost entirely on audio to evoke emotional connection from the audience to the past. Although *Anthropoid* is a far more visually graphic film, both films showcase the power of audio in increasing public engagement with history.

The concept of history on film can be unpopular amongst historians, largely due to the belief that it is not reliable, yet it is often overlooked that all aspects of history are a construction, written history included.⁴³ Where historical film should be particularly applauded is in its impact over public memory. There is a sense of 'obligation to remember'⁴⁴ past atrocities, and remembrance is tastefully achieved in *Anthropoid*. Where emotions reach their culmination at the end of the film, Ellis employs music to keep the audience captivated. As a film designed to hit hard emotionally, Ellis must be careful not to overload the audience with a level of brutality to which they cannot relate. The primary purpose of Jozef's death is to evoke strong emotion from the audience.

Through engaging the audience emotionally through such intense display of sacrifice, Ellis solidifies the assassins of Operation Anthropoid in public memory. To cement this, the end of the final scene is followed by eighty seconds of complete silence and a black screen which slowly shows the names of the seven parachutists, the statistical cost of Heydrich's assassination on Czechoslovakia, and the impact of these reprisals on the country's role in the Allied war effort.⁴⁵ The dramatic film is aimed directly at the audience's emotions,⁴⁶ and Ellis skilfully combines the audio and visual to achieve the memorialisation of Operation Anthropoid.

⁴² *Anthropoid*, 1:50:03-1:52:41.

⁴³ Landy, *The Historical Film*, p. 52.

⁴⁴ Landy, *The Historical Film*, p. 247.

⁴⁵ *Anthropoid*, 1:52:52-1:54:12.

⁴⁶ Rosenstone, *History on Film*, 16.

It is only after this that the end credits music is gradually introduced. Interestingly, the last piece of music (and the second for the credits) is Guy Farley's *Dulce et Decorum*,⁴⁷ the lyrics to which include the phrase *dulce et decorum est, pro patria mori* which roughly translates from Latin to *it is sweet and proper to die for one's country*. Unfortunately, the credits end before this section of the lyrics can be reached, but the sentiment of this choice of music remains apparent. Although Ellis never attempts to present Jan and Jozef as gallant war heroes, this choice of music is one final appreciation of their ultimate sacrifice for a far greater cause, of which they may not have been fully aware.

The role of film is to remove the distance between ourselves and the past, and to make the public experience the pain – in this case – of the past.⁴⁸ As film grows in influence in public history, understanding where this strength lies is of increasing importance to historians, who must learn to work with, rather than against, these depictions and presentations of history in public media. Considering the increasingly influential role of film in the public's relationship with history, its main value lies in its memorialisation and commemoration of past events. The ability of film to emotionally engage an audience quickly, and its accessibility comparative to dense academic writing and primary sources makes it the most effective medium of public engagement with the past.

Film allows the public to resonate, at least on some level, with the experiences, emotions, and pains of people of the past.⁴⁹ Where academia reaches its limit of influence, film engages larger audiences with history in an often memorable and emotive manner. Although accuracy is valuable – particularly amongst historians – films such as *Braveheart* regrettably show that it is not of integral importance for emotional engagement from an audience. However, accuracy in the historical film remains essential for fair and reputable representations of the past. To know history is not enough, it must be understood; and to understand the past, we must be willing to both know what occurred, and – imperatively – engage on the emotional level of the human experience. The advantages of the audiovisual create a popular presentation of history that is accessible and engaging to the public,⁵⁰ and

⁴⁷ *Anthropoid*, 1:59:24-2:00:25.

⁴⁸ Rosenstone, *History on Film*, 16.

⁴⁹ Rosenstone, *History on Film*, 153.

⁵⁰ Thomas Freeman & David Smith, *Biography and History in Film*, eds. Thomas Freeman & David Smith (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 2.

films such as *Anthropoid* deserve praise for achieving this whilst maintaining historical accuracy. As discussed, Ellis provides a stellar example of *using* accuracy as a driver for emotion and engagement.

Sean Ellis' *Anthropoid* is an exemplary case of engaging the public with history. He balances historical accuracy with artistic tools to create a largely authentic and highly emotive film. Ellis leverages authenticity through explaining the wider context of the story and opting for a raw presentation of Nazi brutality. *Anthropoid* is only one example of historical film, and film is only one example of history in the public domain. Historians would benefit from further appreciating the strengths of history on film for engaging the public with past events. As the primary medium of conveying the past to a public audience, film deserves praise for its role in the memorialisation and commemoration of the past. Minor levels of imperfect accuracy and romanticisation – from which *Anthropoid* is not immune – should be forgiven if they add to its impact on the audience, as remembering history is essential to learning from it.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Anthropoid, dir. by Sean Ellis (UK, USA, & Czechia, 2016).

Braveheart, dir. by Mel Gibson (USA, 1995).

CAB 65/26 Original Reference Cabinet Conclusions 40-(42) 84, 1942 2 April – 30 June, link:

<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20231023131226mp/http://filestore.nationalarchives.gov.uk/pdfs/large/cab-65-26.pdf> [accessed 7 March 2024].

Forest Gump, dir. by Robert Zemeckis (USA, 1994).

The Man with the Iron Heart, dir. by Cedric Jimenez (USA, 2017).

The Zone of Interest, dir. by Jonathan Glazer (UK, USA, & Poland, 2023).

Secondary Sources

Buhler, James, *Theories of the Soundtrack* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

Deschner, Günther, *Heydrich, the Pursuit of Total Power* (London: Orbis, 1981).

Edensor, Tim, *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life* (London: Taylor and Francis Group, 2002).

Freeman, Thomas S., and David L. Smith, *Biography and History in Film* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019).

Gerwarth, Robert, *Hitler's Hangman: The Life of Heydrich* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2012).

Hauner, Milan, 'Terrorism and Heroism: The Assassination of Reinhard Heydrich', *World Policy Journal*, 24.2 (2007), 85–89.

Landy, Marcia, *The Historical Film: History and Memory in Media* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2001).

Leong Kok Wey, Adam, 'Operation Anthropoid', *The RUSI Journal*, 157.2 (2012), 68–75.

Moller, Sabine, 'Experiencing History in Film: An Empirical Study of the Link between Film Perception and Historical Consciousness', *Research in Film and History*, 1.1 (2018), 1-15.

Rosenstone, Robert, *History on Film/Film on History* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2006).

Sorlin, Pierre, *The Film in History: Restaging the Past* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1980).

Stevens, Donald F, *Based on a True Story: Latin American History at the Movies* (Wilmington: SR Books, 1997).

