

Rewriting
the Middle Ages
in the
Twentieth Century

Edited by

Jaume Aurell and Francisco Crosas

BREPOLS

François Louis Ganshof (1895 – 1980)

Dirk HEIRBAUT

(Université de Ghent, Belgium)

Aniceto MASFERRER

(Universidad de Valencia, Spain)

Life and career

François Louis Ganshof was born in Bruges on March 14, 1895 in a very distinguished family. His father was a lawyer and his mother, a lawyer's daughter too, was descended from general van der Meersch who had led the revolutionary armies of the Southern Netherlands in their revolt against Joseph II at the end of the eighteenth century. To foreigners Ganshof may be well-known as a scholar, but in legal circles in Belgium his brother Walter Jean Ganshof van der Meersch –in a very unusual move for a Belgian– he added his mother's name to his, to ensure that her great family name would not die out-, is still much more famous, as he was, as Commissioner for the Security of the State, responsible at the end of World War II for restoring order in newly liberated Belgium (at the height of his power and influence he was even called the 'viceroy of Belgium'). Another notable achievement of his has been that, as Belgium's highest senior magistrate, he was responsible for making the highest court in the land accept the principle that international rules should have priority over Belgian law¹.

François Louis Ganshof might have had a career like his brother as a magistrate or a civil servant. In fact, during both World Wars he served in the Belgian army. In the First he was a lieutenant, junior grade, working for the Geographical Department of the Belgian army; in the Second he took part as commander in the short, though valiant resistance of the Belgian army to the German invasion in 1940. In 1944 he was his brother's trusted right hand man in pacifying Belgium². Thus, Ganshof has become one of the few historians who not only wrote about history,

Note: several of Ganshof's works were translated and/or reprinted. Unless otherwise indicated, references will be to the first edition. Because it was impossible to look up all editions and translations, no distinction will be made between revised and non-revised editions or translations. The best way of accessing later editions and translations is by looking up the publication at the date of its first edition in the following bibliography: VAN CAENEGEM, Raoul, *In memoriam F.L. Ganshof (14 maart 1895 - 26 juli 1980). Bibliografie Prof. Dr. F.L. Ganshof*, in: "Koninklijke academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, Jaarboek", 1980, 242-251. Later editions and translations are indicated in the footnotes.

¹ These are only a few of the highlights in the career of one of the key figures of Belgian twentieth century history. For a biography of Ganshof's brother, see MARTIN, D., *Ganshof van der Meersch, burggraaf Walter (Brugge 18 mei 1900 - Tintange 12 september 1993)*, in: "Nieuwe encyclopedie van de Vlaamse beweging", Tiel, Lannoo, 1998, 1230-1231 and the literature referred to there.

² His secret reports of his activities have been published by Wilfried Pauwels, *De bevrijdingsdagen van 1944: de geheime rapporten van François Louis Ganshof* (De Nederlanden: Antwerp, 1994).

but also made it. In 1919, he was a member of the Belgian delegation at the Paris Conference and the Versailles Peace Treaty which ended World War I, although at that time he had not yet finished his university studies, interrupted because of the war³. He obtained his doctoral degrees in philosophy and letters in 1921, and in law in 1922, both at Ghent University, where Henri Pirenne, arguably Belgium's greatest historian ever, was his teacher. Thereafter he went to study with Ferdinand Lot in Paris and was enrolled at the bar, but his career there was a very short one, as he became a lecturer for two courses at Ghent University in 1923.

There, he taught all sorts of medieval history until his retirement in 1961⁴, in the meantime having become professor ordinarius in 1932, and serving as dean of his faculty in 1937-1938. It is to be remarked here that he started his career at Ghent University when it was bilingual, so that he was teaching in both French and Dutch. When the university became unilingual Dutch in the 1930's, Ganshof succeeded his master Pirenne, who had no wish to teach in Dutch and left Ghent for Brussels⁵. Ganshof was a member of the editorial boards of several reviews, president of the *Commission royale pour la publication des anciennes lois et ordonnances de Belgique* and working member of the Royal Flemish Academy for Sciences, Letters and Arts, corresponding or foreign member of so many foreign academies and other organisations that it would take too much paper to list all of them here. The same holds for the many prizes he received, so that it should be sufficient to say that in his native Belgium he received the Francqui prize and the State Prize for Historical Sciences, whereas thirteen universities from other countries awarded him a doctorate honoris causa. After this long and distinguished career Ganshof died in Brussels on June 26, 1980.

Ganshof: a Pirenne student going his own way

When a scholar is awarded as many honours as Ganshof, and, at the same time, is the student of an even more famous scholar, it is justified to ask whether the student did not achieve greatness in the slipstream of his master. Such a question is only justified, if one does not know Belgian (or for that matter also Dutch) historians. The idea of a 'school', i.e. of students following in their master's footsteps, is very alien to them. The great Belgian historians are rather isolated figures, teaching their students the craft, but thereafter leaving them free to develop on their own. Thus, if anything, it is almost normal for students to have interests very different from their masters. Nowhere is this more evident than in the case of François

³ Ganshof was present as an expert of historical geography, the subject of his first publications (*La Belgique en 1786. Les Pays-Bas Autrichiens, les principautés de Liège et de Stavelot-Malmédy, le duché de Bouillon et leur évolution territoriale de 1713 à 1794* (Brussels: Elsevier, 1919) (Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique, 1919-1932, V); *La Belgique sous la domination française (1794-1814). Les départements belges et les départements voisins au 1er janvier 1812* (Brussels: Elsevier, 1919) (Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique, 1919-1932, VI); *La Belgique dans le Royaume des Pays-Bas (1814-1830)* (Brussels: Elsevier, 1920) (Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique, 1919-1932, VII); *La Belgique de 1830-1839* (Brussels: Elsevier, 1920) (Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique, 1919-1932, VIII).

⁴ The complete list of the courses he taught, can be found in *Rijksuniversiteit te Gent. Liber memorialis 1913-1960*, éd. by Luyckx Theo (Ghent: RUG Rectoraat, 1960), I, pp. 245-247.

⁵ About the languages at Ghent university, see *Kromiek van de strijd voor de vernederlandsing van de Gentse universiteit*, ed. by Karel De Klerk e.a. (Ghent: RUG Archief, 1985).

Louis Ganshof. In fact, Ganshof became a specialist of legal and institutional history, a subject about which Pirenne could teach him little, so that he had to acquire his knowledge by reading foreign literature. His interest in legal and institutional history was stimulated by Ferdinand Lot, but Lot was not a legal historian himself. In fact, Ganshof's interest in law and institutions goes back to his childhood, to his maternal grandfather, who Ganshof fondly recalled thus: "*Si nous avons placé en tête de ce petit volume le nom d'Auguste Van der Meersch, de son vivant avocat à Bruges, c'est qu'il fut pour son petit-fils, le premier maître qui l'a initié à l'histoire de son peuple. Avec l'amour de la langue de la Flandre et de sa culture, il a su lui inspirer le culte de son passé*"⁶.

Even though Ganshof went his own way, he was, of course not free of Pirenne's influence. He sometimes wrote about social and economic history, Pirenne's favourite fields of study, but always in such a way that its legal and institutional aspects were highlighted. Besides, at times Ganshof was sceptical of his master's great theories⁷. Only one book can be seen as continuing Pirenne's work, a study of the development of cities in the area between Loire and Rhine, first published in 1941⁸, but as Ganshof looks at this subject from a topographer's viewpoint, his World War I experiences in the Geographical Department of the Belgian army seem to be just as important an influence as Pirenne. Besides, it would have been hard for him, loving his native Bruges, one of the most beautiful medieval cities in the world, not to be interested in the development of medieval cities⁹. Another influence by Pirenne might be Ganshof's 'belgitude'. Ganshof, like Pirenne, was a Belgian patriot and had no qualms about giving one of his books the title *La Belgique Carolingienne*¹⁰, even though Belgium would only come into existence more than a thousand years after the death of Charlemagne. Ganshof saw his study of history as a way of serving Belgium, as becomes evident in the foreword of one of his books: "*Ce petit livre a été écrit sur l'amicale invitation de Mme Suzanne Charlier-Tassier... Nous n'avons pas cru pouvoir nous dérober à cet appel, puisqu'aussi bien il s'agissait de servir la Belgique en répandant une exacte connaissance de son histoire au sein du grand public*"¹¹. For Ganshof who had served his country in two wars, writing about its history, was just another, though much more preferable, answer to a call to arms. There is no need to see Pirenne's influence here, Ganshof was himself enough of a patriot.

However, Ganshof was a Belgian and a Flemish patriot. The quotation above is to be found in the introduction to a study of Flemish, not Belgian, history. To Ganshof, his allegiance to one part of the country, Dutch-speaking Flanders and its language, was not contrary to his love for Belgium as such. Ganshof supported the fight for the recognition of Dutch as a language of science in Belgium, but he also wrote in French and sometimes a study was first written in Dutch and then in French

⁶ Ganshof, *La Flandre sous les premiers comtes* (Brussels: La renaissance du livre, 1943), pp. 10.

⁷ See e.g. 'Quelques aspects principaux de la vie économique dans la monarchie franque au VIII^e siècle', in *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, V (1958), 73-101.

⁸ *Over de stadontwikkeling tussen Loire en Rijn gedurende de middeleeuwen* (Antwerp: Standaard, 1941) (second edition, 1944); (French translation, Paris: PUF, 1943).

⁹ He wrote a few short articles about the history of Bruges, e.g. 'Bruges au moyen âge', in *Congrès archéologique de France. CXXe session* (Paris: Flandre, 1964), pp. 12-15; 'Iets over Brugge gedurende de preconstitutieperiode van haar geschiedenis', in *Nederlandsche historischebladen*, I (1938), 281-303.

¹⁰ *La Belgique Carolingienne* (Brussels: La renaissance du livre, 1958).

¹¹ Ganshof, *La Belgique Carolingienne*, 9.

or the other way round¹². In this, he was the opposite of Pirenne, who had no love for the Flemish movement, which fought for the recognition of Dutch as the language of Flanders, and also of many of today's Flemings who would rather get rid of Belgium. To Ganshof, it was not Belgium or Flanders, but Flanders and Belgium.

Ganshof's works

a. The universal works

Ganshof has written almost six hundred publications, and even if one would discount the smaller ones like reviews of books, there are still too many left to study them all in detail. Only some general patterns can be indicated here, though this is an injustice to the wide scope of his scholarship. In fact, Ganshof could write about very varied subjects of medieval history and has also authored some great general works. Examples of these abound: his *La Flandre sous les premiers comtes*¹³, *La Belgique Carolingienne*¹⁴, and his contributions to great general series or general works like the *Geschiedenis van Vlaanderen* of Van Roosbroeck¹⁵, the (old) *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden*¹⁶, *The Cambridge economic history of Europe*¹⁷, *Pelgrimstocht der mensheid*¹⁸, the *Histoire générale* of Glotz¹⁹, the *Propyläen Weltgeschichte*²⁰, or Renouvin's *Histoire des relations internationales*²¹. Apart from these general publications, Ganshof's works seem to concentrate on a certain theme and a certain period: law and institutions from the eighth to the thirteenth century, in either a Flemish/Belgian or a European context, though there are of course exceptions,

¹² E.g. his book about the development of cities (see note 8) was first published in Dutch, then in French and, likewise, his book about the capitularies (see note 50). On the other hand, *La Flandre sous les premiers comtes* was first available in French (Brussels: La renaissance du livre, 1943); new editions in 1944 and 1949; Dutch translation, Antwerp, Standaard, 1944.

¹³ See note 12.

¹⁴ See note 10.

¹⁵ "Staatkundige geschiedenis. XIIIe, XIIIe, XIVe eeuw. De staatsinstellingen van Vlaanderen en Brabant", in Robert Van Roosbroeck *Geschiedenis van Vlaanderen, 1936-1949* (Brussels: Standaard, 1937), II, pp. 9-188.

¹⁶ 'Het tijdperk van de Merovingen. Het tijdperk van de Karolingen. Het laat-Karolingisch tijdperk', in (old) *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden, 1949-1958* (Utrecht: De Haan, 1949), I, pp. 252-366.

¹⁷ 'Mediaeval agrarian society in its prime. France, the Low Countries and Western Germany', in *Cambridge economic history of Europe, 1941-1977* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1941), I, pp. 278-322 (reprinted in 1942; separately printed with biographical additions, Wetteren, De Meester, 1947; new edition, Cambridge, 1966 in collaboration with Adriaan Verhulst).

¹⁸ 'De middeleeuwen', in *De pelgrimstocht der mensheid 1925-1938*, ed. by Jan Berkelbach van der Sprenkel (Utrecht: De Haan, 1937), pp. 170-288, (new editions in 1940, 1948, 1952, 1960).

¹⁹ *Histoire du moyen âge*, t. I: 'Les Destinées de l'Empire en Occident de 395 à 888', ed. by Gustave Glotz, Ferdinand Lot and Christian Pfister (Paris: PUF, 1934); (second edition, 1941).

²⁰ *Das Hochmittelalter. Von Bernhard von Clairvaux zu Papst Bonifaz VIII* (Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 1963) (*Propyläen Weltgeschichte*, 1960-1964), V (later editions, 1968, 1991; CD-ROM version Frankfurt, Directmedia, 1999).

²¹ Ed. by Pierre Renouvin, *Le moyen âge*, t. I: 'Histoire des relations internationales' (Paris: Hachette, 1953), (later editions, 1958, 1964, 1968); (Spanish translation, Madrid: Aguilar, 1960); (Italian translation, Florence: Vallecchi, 1961); (English translation, New York: 1971).

like his few publications on Byzantine history²². One should, however, not always trust the titles of Ganshof's publications. Even if they seem to indicate a social or economic subject, Ganshof always managed to lead it back to its legal and institutional aspects²³.

b. The thesis: a sin of youth, forgotten later?

Within this general preference for law and institutions several main themes can be distinguished, but again some works stand on their own. Strangely enough one of these is Ganshof's doctoral thesis, published in 1924: *Etude sur les ministériales en Flandre et en Lotharingie*²⁴. In this Ganshof studies the ministerials, a group of persons in the high middle ages who combined a high social status with a servile condition. Whereas many others do not manage to study anything else but the subject of their thesis for the rest of their careers, Ganshof never went back to it. After 1924, he stayed clear of this subject, but the reasons for this are not known. Reading this book, one has the impression that Ganshof was still learning at the time he wrote it, that he was still trying to find his way as an historian. Moreover, though at the time this thesis was favourably received, obtaining a prize from the Académie royale de Belgique and assuring its author of a position at the university, it is with hindsight, a book that may be called unworthy of 'the great Ganshof', i.e. good for others, but not really at the level, anyone familiar with his later work would expect of him. It may be that Ganshof himself shared this judgement and, therefore, never returned to his study of the ministerials.

c. 'Ganshof of feudalism'

One of Ganshof's early publications was about feudalism, a theme that he would study throughout his career. In fact, to many historians, Ganshof 'is' feudalism. Americans sometimes called him 'Ganshof of feudalism' and others later coined the expression 'Ganshofian feudalism'²⁵. Although Ganshof wrote many fine articles about feudalism, the main themes being feudal courts²⁶ and the union of benefice and vassalage²⁷, his fame rests mainly on one book, his *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité*, first published in French in 1944, with several new editions thereafter, and also transla-

²² However, Ganshof's few publications about Byzantine history, in one way or another studied themes related to the rest of his research, like the military aid the count of Flanders sent the Byzantine emperor after the defeat at Manzikert ('Robrecht de Fries en Alexios Comnenos', in *Handelingen der koninklijke Zuidnederlandse maatschappij voor taal- en letterkunde en geschiedenis*, XIV (1960), 145-160. (French revised translation in: "Byzantion", XXXI (1961).

²³ E.g. his publications about tolls (for example, *Het tolwezen in het Frankische rijk onder de Merovingen. Het tolwezen in het Frankische rijk onder de Karolingen*, in *Mémoires de l'Académie royale de Belgique, classe des lettres, second series*, XX (Brussels: 1958-1959). *Mémoires de l'Académie royale de Belgique, classe des lettres*, second series, XX (Brussels: Lamartin, 1926).

²⁴ E.g. Chris Wickham, « Structures féodales et féodalisme dans l'Occident Méditerranéen (Xe-XIIIe siècles). Bilan et perspectives de recherche Rome », 1980, in *English historical review*, XCVII (1982), 835-837.

²⁵ E.g. 'Note sur la compétence des cours féodales en France', in *Mélanges d'histoire offerts à Henri Pirenne*, (Brussels: Vromant, 1926), pp. 161-170.

²⁷ E.g. 'Note sur les origines de l'union du bénéfice avec la vassalité', in *Études d'histoire dédiées à la mémoire de Henri Pirenne* (Brussels: Nouvelle société d'édition, 1937), pp. 173-190.

tions, sometimes re-edited, in English, German, Spanish, Portuguese and Japanese²⁸. This small book did not stand alone, as Ganshof was only one of the many scholars who studied feudalism in the years before and after World War II, like Heinrich Mitteis, Joseph Calmette, Marc Bloch, Robert Boutruche, Léopold Génicot and Noël Didier²⁹. These authors and their contemporaries were responsible for elaborating what one could call the classic view of feudalism.

Although they had many differences of opinion, the classic authors on feudalism also shared some general opinions. The first was that the High Middle Ages (tenth to thirteenth centuries) were the classic era of feudalism. This implied two things: first of all, that in the High Middle Ages feudalism was the central element of society, so that one could talk of a 'feudal society'; second, that in the High Middle Ages feudalism was in its full bloom, whereas it was still in its infancy in the Carolingian era, and became only a shadow of its former self, relevant for private, but not for public law, after 1300. This classic feudalism of the High Middle Ages was seen as being typical for the heartland of the Carolingian empire, Northern France, Western Germany and the regions in between, anything else belonging to the periphery, where a pure feudalism could not be found. This feudalism, so prominent in the successor states of the Carolingian empire, was also seen as an element of disintegration, a centrifugal power, which had contributed to the break-up of Charlemagne's state.

Within the studies of classic feudalism, two tendencies can be distinguished. Some authors focused on the social and political aspects of feudalism, i.e. feudal society, whereas others limited themselves to studying its legal elements. One of these is Ganshof, as becomes clear in his definition of feudalism: 'la féodalité peut être définie comme un ensemble d'institutions créant et régissant des obligations d'obéissance et de service - principalement militaire - de la part d'un homme libre, dit "vassal", envers un homme libre dit "seigneur", et des obligations de protection et d'entretien de la part du "seigneur" à l'égard du "vassal"; l'obligation d'entretien ayant le plus souvent pour effet la concession par le seigneur au vassal d'un bien dit "fief"³⁰. This narrow feudalism is 'Ganshofian feudalism', a feudalism that is so legal that it can no longer be distinguished from feudal law. This narrow view should not be overestimated, as Ganshof was not against a broader view, against the idea of a feudal society³¹. His definition seems to be more of a way of defining it in his terms. Ganshof had nothing against studying feudalism in a broader context, he was full of praise for books like Marc Bloch's *Société féodale*; he only wanted to assure that the legal aspects of what was, to him, at heart a legal phenomenon, should not be overlooked.

²⁸ *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité* (Brussels : Office de publicité, 1944) (later editions, 1947, 1957, Presses Universitaires de Bruxelles, 1968 ; Paris : Tallandier 1982; English translation, London : Longman, 1952, later editions, New York : Harper & Row, 1961, London / New York : Longan / Harper & Row, 1964, Toronto : University of Toronto Press, 1996; Portuguese translation, Lisbon : Publicações Europa-America, 1959; German translation, Darmstadt : Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1961, later editions, 1967, 1970, 1975, 1983, 1989; Spanish translation (with an Appendix by Luis de Valdeavellano), Barcelona : Ediciones Ariel, 1963; Japanese translation, Tokyo, 1968; Italian translation, Turin : Einaudi, 1989).

²⁹ For the references to their books, see the bibliography added to the 1982 edition.

³⁰ *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité*, 13 (1982 edition).

³¹ Cf. *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité*, 12-13.

Ganshof was not alone in studying feudalism as a legal phenomenon, Didier's book on feudal law in Hainault³² or Mitteis's *Lehnrecht und Staatsgewalt*³³, are at least as good and sometimes based on a more detailed study of the sources. Nevertheless, their books never were reprinted, whereas Ganshof's *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité* still is. The explanation is to be found in its title: this is a book that puts a question any student of the Middle Ages could ask: What is feudalism? The clear answer to that question is only to be found in Ganshof. His book reads as a kind of a legal manual. The confusion of the sources disappears to be replaced by a clarity that is all the more remarkable, because it is not based upon an abstract theory, but upon a very detailed erudite knowledge of the sources. Erudition and great teaching do not always go hand in hand, but in this book they are perfectly matched, and this has ensured its success. One can read libraries about feudalism without getting any wiser, and then there is this one book which says it all. An extra bonus was that the author kept on adding to his work, integrating new research by himself and others³⁴, although most of the articles he wrote on feudalism in his later career were limited to feudalism in the Carolingian era³⁵.

d. Ganshof, the Fleming

As has already been mentioned, Ganshof was, in his way, a patriot. He was very proud of being from Bruges, Flanders and Belgium. Although he wrote a few articles about Bruges, and some books, which can be seen as Belgian, Flanders had his special attention. One should however not confuse Flanders, today's Dutchspeaking part of Belgium and the old county of Flanders, mainly held as fief from the king of France (Crown Flanders), though a small part of it was held from the German king (Imperial Flanders). It was the latter, not the former that was the subject of Ganshof's research. His main articles and books dealt with the judicial organisation³⁶ and urban law³⁷. The key publication was his book about early Flemish history, *La Flandre sous les premiers comtes*³⁸, and his study of the local comital feudal courts, *Recherches sur les tribunaux de châtelainie en Flandre*³⁹. Ganshof's publications about Flemish institutions culminated in another of his masterpieces, his article about Flanders in Lot and Fawtiers, *Institutions françaises au moyen âge* in 1957⁴⁰. Yet,

³² Noël Didier, *Le droit des fiefs dans la coutume de Hainaut au moyen âge* (Paris : Picard, 1945).

³³ Heinrich Mitteis, *Lehnrecht und Staatsgewalt. Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Verfassungsgeschichte* (Weimar : Böhlau, 1933).

³⁴ The last 'update' by Ganshof is to be found in the 1975 German edition, but the 1982 French edition has a more recent bibliography.

³⁵ E.g. 'L'origine des rapports féodo-vassaliqes: les rapports féodo-vassaliqes dans la monarchie franque au nord des Alpes à l'époque carolingienne', in *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, I (1954), 3-45.

³⁶ E.g. 'Die Rechtsprechung des gräflichen Hofgerichtes in Flandern bis zur Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts', in *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung*, LXVIII (1938), 163-177; 'Etude sur le faussement de jugement dans le droit flamand des XIIe et XIIIe siècles', in *Bulletin de la commission royale des anciennes lois et ordonnances de Belgique*, XIV (1935) 115-140.

³⁷ E.g. 'Le droit urbain en Flandre au début de la première phase de son histoire', in *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, XIX (1951), 387-416.

³⁸ See note 12.

³⁹ *Recherches sur les tribunaux de châtelainie en Flandre avant le milieu du XIIIe siècle* (Antwerp : De Sikkell, 1932).

⁴⁰ 'La Flandre', in *Histoire des institutions françaises au moyen âge*, ed. by Ferdinand Lot and Robert Fawtier (Paris : PUF, 1957) I, pp.343-426.

the great in depth study of Flemish judicial organisation which he had hoped to make in the 1930's was never written and after 1957 Ganshof almost stopped writing about Flanders. The reason is that his research into Flanders, a Carolingian successor state, inevitably led him to study its origins, the Carolingians.

e. Ganshof and the tragedy of Charlemagne

Ganshof's study of classic feudalism and of Flemish institutions made him realise the importance of the Carolingian era for the history of medieval institutions. Therefore, his post World War II research was mainly about Carolingian institutions.

Although he had written about Carolingian subjects before the war, including even a general book about Carolingian history⁴¹, these studies did not really leave a great impression, unlike Ganshof's later publications by which he became known as probably the greatest scholar of Carolingian studies in his time. Again, Ganshof's work is of an impressive variety, as he wrote many of his best Carolingian articles for the congresses of the Société Jean Bodin and the Settimane di Spoleto⁴². These would have a central theme which Ganshof would then study for the Carolingian era. In fact, in certain years one can guess what the topic of these congresses was, by just looking at Ganshof's publications for those years.

However, there was a central theme underlying Ganshof's work, as becomes very clear when consulting the two collections of his Carolingian articles which have been published in English⁴³. To him the Carolingian state was at its heart weak, the historical importance of Carolingian institutions not so much being the impact they had on their own times, but the influence they would exert on the successor states. This was an opinion only to be expected from a man who had come to study the Carolingian era because of the influence they had on their successor states. In their own time, Carolingian institutions were instruments for strengthening central power⁴⁴, and at first Charlemagne seems to have had some success. However, his later years show an ageing and failing emperor, whose empire is already crumbling before his death, hence articles like *La fin du règne de Charlemagne. Une décomposition*⁴⁵, *L'échec de Charlemagne*⁴⁶ and *Het falen van Karel de Grote*⁴⁷. Ganshof's Charlemagne is somewhat of a tragic figure, a man who could have been great, whom later historians have called great, but who was not. Likewise, Ganshof is kinder towards Louis the Pious⁴⁸, like his father a failure, but can one blame the son for failing to achieve what his father could not?

⁴¹ See note 19.

⁴² For the Settimane, see Cinzio Violante, 'Ricordi Spoletini di François-Louis Ganshof e di Jean-François Lemarignier', in *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, XXIX (1983), I, 67-71; for the Société Jean Bodin, see John Gilissen, 'In memoriam Frans L. Ganshof 1895-1980', in *Bulletin de la commission royale des anciennes lois et ordonnances de Belgique*, XXX (1980-1981), vii.

⁴³ *Frankish institutions under Charlemagne*, trans. By Bryce and Mary Lyon (Providence: Brown university press, 1968); *The Carolingians and the Frankish monarchy. Studies in Carolingian history*, Janet Sondheimer (London: Longman, 1971).

⁴⁴ See e.g. 'Charlemagne et le serment', in *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de Louis Halphen* (Paris: PUF, 1951), pp. 259-270 (English translation, *Carolingians*, nr. 7).

⁴⁵ 'La fin du règne de Charlemagne. Une décomposition', in *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Geschichte*, XXVI-II (1948), 533-552 (English translation, *Carolingians*, nr. 12).

⁴⁶ 'L'échec de Charlemagne', in *Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres. Comptes rendues des séances* (1947), 248-254 (English translation, *Carolingians*, nr. 13).

That Ganshof was trained as a lawyer is nowhere more evident than in his study of Charlemagne. For Ganshof, the main instrument for Charlemagne in imposing his will upon his enormous empire, was legislation, though of a special kind, the *capitularia*, "des édits subdivisés en articles, émanant des chefs d'état carolingiens"⁴⁹. By these *capitularia* Charlemagne tried to either enforce existing rules which had been neglected, or to adapt these rules to new circumstances, which sometimes meant creating new rules. Because the *capitularia* were so important as instrument of Carolingian power, Ganshof made a small study of their technical aspects. The title of his book about them is again his program: *Wat waren de capitularia*?⁵⁰ (What were the capitularies?). What *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité* is to feudalism this book is to the capitularies; a book that gives a clear introduction to the technical aspects of what had hitherto for many people been a confusing subject. Again, translations were published, and the author was hailed for his clarity.

In his *Wat waren de capitularia*? Ganshof did not go into the details of their effects. These are to be found in his general publications⁵¹, where it becomes clear that the *capitularia* fell short of their objectives, as the emperor had to reissue the same orders over and over again, his power being too personal, too dependent on his presence, to have much lasting effect. At the end, Charlemagne is a crisis-manager who failed to contain crises. It should be stressed here that Ganshof's Carolingian studies were to a certain extent only preparatory, because his original intent and the expectation of his colleagues was that he would write the final (in so far as any history book can be final) great biography of Charlemagne⁵². Yet, it was not to be. What the scholarly world has to miss because of that, can be experienced by reading his *La Belgique Carolingienne*⁵³, one of his best books, which was based on earlier articles written in Dutch for the (old) *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden*⁵⁴. When a new version of this *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden* was published in the early 1980's, only one author's articles had stood the test of time, and were only updated, not replaced: Ganshof's⁵⁵. This is no mean feat if one takes into account that more than four hundred scholars worked on the new *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden*.

⁴⁷ 'Het falen van Karel de Grote', in *Verslag der algemene vergadering der leden van het historisch genootschap gehouden te Utrecht* (1948), 26-46.

⁴⁸ 'Louis the Pious reconsidered', in *History*, XLII (1957), 171-180 (also published in: *Carolingians*, nr. 14).

⁴⁹ Quoted from the French translation of his book about the *capitularia* (see next note), 36.

⁵⁰ *Wat waren de capitularia*? (Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie, 1955) (Verhandelingen van de koninklijke Vlaamse academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, XXII) (French translation in: *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, XXXV (1957) 33-87, 196-246, published separately, Paris: Sirey, 1958; German translation, Weimar: Böhlau, 1961).

⁵¹ Most of these can be found in the collections mentioned in note 43.

⁵² B. Lyon, 'Foreword', in *Frankish institutions*, ix.

⁵³ See note 10.

⁵⁴ See note 16.

⁵⁵ Dirk Peter Block and Adriaan Verhulst, 'Inleiding', in *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden, 1977-1983* (Haarlem: Fibula van Dishoeck, 1981), I, p. 20.

Foreign scholars may be forgiven for thinking that we miss only one major work of Ganshof, his Charlemagne biography. There were a few more: a general history of medieval institutions, an introduction to the sources of medieval history and an historical introduction to private law. Ganshof's college notes about all these were available in Dutch to his Ghent students⁵⁶. In fact, the book about medieval institutions was as good as ready and an English editor was willing to publish a translation, but Ganshof refrained from publishing it, because he thought his text was immature. Anyone who has read it, can only wonder what the mature version might have been.

Ganshof's failure to publish what could have been works as influential as his *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité*, is related to his 'philosophy of history', a term which is not very apt here, as it implies great theories of the author, about which he has written lengthy articles. In reality, Ganshof never wrote about his philosophy of history and abhorred this subject (he got rid of the books about philosophy he received as soon as he could), though his ideas are very clear. Ganshof was a very Rankian historian, whose device really was: *Was nicht in den Akten, hat nicht gelebt*, but this 'positivism' was more a practical attitude, than the consequence of an elaborate philosophy of history. Because of his positivistic bent, Ganshof's preferred method of working was to neglect the literature about the subject he studied, which does not mean that he did not read it, but rather that he did not write his publication as a response to another author (for example in his book about the *capitularia*: "*Il nous a paru superflu de placer toujours, en face de nos opinions propres, celles des auteurs qui se sont occupés de la question.*")⁵⁷, using only what could be based upon the sources. When he had to rely on literature, he profoundly excused himself for not justifying every statement by direct references to the sources as he usually did⁵⁸. Preferably, every new publication meant a new consultation of the relevant sources, as Ganshof was very critical and even his own publications were still less trustworthy to him than the sources themselves. Ganshof self-criticism went so far that when he had to write an article in French about Flemish institutions⁵⁹, he did not just translate an older article of his in Dutch⁶⁰, but wrote a new one instead. Not being satisfied with it, he threw it away and wrote a new version from scratch. It was published in 1957, followed one year later by his last book⁶¹. Thereafter, he would write no more great books, although he was to live for another twenty-two years.

After 1958, Ganshof never judged his great works to be ready, to be finished, there was always one more detail to be studied first (it is typical for Ganshof that more than thirty of his articles start with *Note sur*, or a like expression)⁶², and the fact that he found an occasion for studying these details in the thematic congress-

es of the Société Jean Bodin and the Settimane di Spoleto only strengthened him in this. At the end of his life, he realised that he had been wrong, now that his mind was finally ready to write the next great books, the physical ability was no longer there. Like his 'hero' Charlemagne, Ganshof became some kind of a failure, a man who people called great, although they did not realise how great he really could have been. When one reads Ganshof's short and masterful description of Charlemagne's life in his dinner speech for the Medieval Academy of America in 1948⁶³, one can only feel sympathy for the emperor as described by Ganshof, not a superman, but a giant whose last years were hindered by his declining capacities, but did Ganshof realise in 1948 that somehow his last days were to mirror the emperor's?

Ganshof's method of sticking to the sources had other defects than gradually making it impossible for him to write the great syntheses which had made him famous. His method made the eighth to thirteenth centuries ideal for him: enough sources to enable a solid historical study, but no so many that he would no longer be able to consult them all. However, other periods would have been beyond him and his method also limited him to writing about political, legal and institutional history, because anything which required a leap of faith into imagination, like history of ideas, or history of mentalities, would have made him leave the solid ground his texts offered him. Likewise, Ganshof had no great liking for great and sweeping theories of a sociological nature. To him, a historian, doing sociology, was a soul lost to the true faith. In this, more than in anything else, he was the antipode of his master, Pirenne, whose *Mahomet et Charlemagne* is as 'un-Ganshoflike' as can be⁶⁴.

In the end, Ganshof's ideas about history could only lead to a study of the sources, and this is what happened. His last major work was the edition and commentary of a Carolingian source: the polyptyque of the abbey of Saint-Bertin⁶⁵. The Ganshofian 'philosophy of history', if brought to its extreme, turns historiography into nothing more than a detailed reading of the sources.

Ganshof's legacy

What is now left of Ganshof's work? First of all, as Ganshof himself was a student of Pirenne, but did not follow in the footsteps of his master, Pirenne having no real 'school', likewise Ganshof had many students, but they all went their own ways, going in directions he would not have thought of. An example is his most famous student, and Ghent University's leading historian of the post-Ganshof generation, Van Caenegem. Although Van Caenegem continued one work of Ganshof's (he published a book about the sources of medieval history for which Ganshof had laid the groundwork)⁶⁶, his career went in a very different direction when he took up

⁵⁶ *Geschiedenis van de middeleeuwse instellingen*, 1946-1947; *Maatschappij en instellingen van de middeleeuwen*, 1947 (later versions, 1949, 1953, 1957, 1959); *Encyclopedie van de geschiedenis. Middeleeuwen*, 1951 (second version 1955); *Geschiedkundige inleiding tot het burgerlijk recht*, 1956 (later versions, 1956, 1957).

⁵⁷ French translation of his book about the *capitularia* (see note 50), 34.

⁵⁸ 'Les traits généraux du système d'institutions de la monarchie franque', in *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, IX (1962), 91.

⁵⁹ See note 40.

⁶⁰ See note 15.

⁶¹ See note 10.

⁶² E.g. 'Note sur les Capitula de causis cum episcopis et abbatibus tractandis de 811', in *Studia Gratiana*, XIII (1967), 1-25.

⁶³ Charlemagne, in *Speculum*, XXIV (1949), 520-527 (also published in: *Carolingians*, nr. 2).

⁶⁴ Cf. Henri Pirenne. *Le maître. L'historien* (Brussels: Le flambeau, 1936).

⁶⁵ (in collaboration with Françoise Godding-Ganshofen and Antoine De Smet), *Le polyptyque de l'abbaye de Saint-Bertin (844-859). Edition critique et commentaire* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1975) (*Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*, XLV).

⁶⁶ Van Caenegem, Raoul (with the collaboration of Ganshof, François Louis), *Encyclopedie van de geschiedenis der middeleeuwen*, Ghent, Story scientia 1962 (German translation, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964; English translation, Amsterdam, North-Holland, 1978; French translation, Turnhout, Brepols, 1997).

the study of English law and other subjects, which never appear in Ganshof's work⁶⁷. Much more Ganshofian was Jan Dhondt, who in his early career wrote some studies about post-Carolingian France⁶⁸, very akin to what Ganshof had written, but thereafter switched to the study of modern history. Adriaan Verhulst studied the Carolingian domains and historical geography⁶⁹, topics which Ganshof had written about, but even then he did not really continue Ganshof's work⁷⁰. Some of 'Ganshof's intellectual grandchildren', students of his students took up his favourite subjects again⁷¹, but without having known him and sometimes going in directions he would not have approved of⁷². Ganshof's greatest influence upon his students may be a negative one. They all deeply regretted the fact that their master had not been able to write the other great books he had in him⁷³ and they set out to do all they could to avoid his mistake, and sometimes they have admirably succeeded, as anyone can see who looks at the list of the great syntheses of history published by Raoul Van Caenegem⁷⁴.

The influence of Ganshof's publications varies. His *Etude sur les ministériales* is the oldest and most outdated of his studies⁷⁵. His universal works about the Middle Ages are still worth reading, though other books are now available, so that they are not very popular anymore. More complicated is the situation of his publications about Flemish history. For many details his work is to be corrected by what has been written by among others, Van Caenegem, Koch, Verhulst, De Hemptinne, Prevenier, De Gryse, Heirbaut and others⁷⁶. His book about the *Tribunaux de châtellenie*, for example, is no longer up to date⁷⁷. Yet, Ganshof's articles about Flemish institu-

tions and Flemish history are still used a lot by foreigners, though this is mainly due to a language problem, much of the new literature not being available in other languages than Dutch. Another fact is that, although a great collective work about Flemish institutions has been published⁷⁸, as a short synthesis Ganshof's general articles about Flemish institutions are still so good, that authors who have to deal with this subject like Lambrecht and Van Rompaey⁷⁹, or Heirbaut⁸⁰, have tried to reconcile their articles with his, estimating that it was impossible to improve the great master.

Ganshof's legacy as a historian of feudalism also reveals the longevity of his great syntheses. All of the central tenets of the classic historians of feudalism have in recent years been overturned: the High Middle Ages were not the golden age of feudalism, because a feudal society never existed, many so-called feudal institutions, like feudal aids, not being feudal at all; feudalism as such only broke through later than Ganshof and his contemporaries thought, its rise being linked to the centralisation in the emerging kingdoms of Europe and thus, it was not a centrifugal element, but an instrument of the prince's power: feudal order instead of feudal anarchy. All this was directed against the old historians of feudalism in general (an introduction to these new ideas about feudalism can be found in Susan Reynolds's *Fiefs and vassals*)⁸¹, but specifically 'anti-Ganshofian' were complaints about the 'Belgocentrism' in the study of feudalism⁸² and the new claim that the 'South', i.e. the mediterranean world, instead of being the periphery, was the real heartland of feudalism⁸³. Undoubtedly, much of the anti-Ganshof criticism is justified. For example, the reproach of Belgocentrism in Ganshof's work is not without reason. To Ganshof, the feudalism *par excellence* was to be found between Loire and Rhine, and more specifically in Flanders and Lotharingia⁸⁴. Anyone looking at a map cannot but realise that these two territories amount to some kind of greater Belgium. Yet, some of Ganshof's critics have not been much better, as they emulated, not corrected, his mistakes, by exchanging his 'belgocentrism' for radical 'meridionalism'⁸⁵. Many of the sources from Flanders and Lotharingia which Ganshof used, are absent in the works of his critics. Even such a well-known text as the 1127 homage and fealty done by the Flemish vassals to William Clito, in the description of Galbert of Bruges, is neglected by them⁸⁶. Recent surveys of feudalism sometimes

⁶⁷ E.g. Raoul Van Caenegem, *The birth of the English common law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

⁶⁸ E.g., Jan Dhondt, *Etude sur la naissance des principautés territoriales en France* (Bruges: De tempel, 1948).

⁶⁹ E.g., Adriaan Verhulst, *De Sint-Baafsabdij te Gent en haar grondbezit (7e-14e eeuw)* (Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse academie, 1958) (Verhandelingen van de koninklijke Vlaamse academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, XXX); A. Verhulst, *Landschap en landbouw in middeleeuws Vlaanderen* (Brussels: 1995).

⁷⁰ See, however, note 17.

⁷¹ E.g. Dirk Heirbaut, *Over heren, vazallen en graven. Het persoonlijk leenrecht in Vlaanderen, ca. 1000-1305*, (Brussels: Algemeen rijksarchief, 1997); Dirk Heirbaut, *Over lenen en families. Een studie over de vroegste geschiedenis van het zakelijk leenrecht in het graafschap Vlaanderen* (Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie, 2000) (Verhandelingen van de koninklijke Vlaamse academie van België voor wetenschappen en kunsten, new series, II).

⁷² E.g. Steven Vanderputten, *Een heilig volk is geboren. Opkomst en ondergang van een christelijke staatsideologie uit de vroege middeleeuwen (c. 750-900)* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2001), who goes much farther in interpreting his sources than Ganshof would have liked.

⁷³ Cf. Adriaan Verhulst, 'Nécrologie: François Louis Ganshof', in *Le moyen âge*, LXXXVI (1986, 1980), 534.

⁷⁴ For brevity's sake, only two are mentioned here, in their English version: Raoul Van Caenegem, *An historical introduction to private law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Raoul Van Caenegem, *An historical introduction to Western constitutional law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

⁷⁵ See about ministerials in Lotharingia, a.o. Ary Leo Peter Buitelaar, *De Stichtse ministerialiteit en de ontginningen van de Utrechtse Vechtstreek* (Hilversum: Gouda Quint, 1993); Johanna Maria Van Winter, *Ministerialiteit en ridderschap in Gelre en Zutphen* (Arnhem: Fibula van Dishoeck, 1962).

⁷⁶ References to their works, can be found in the bibliography of Dirk Heirbaut, *Heren*.

⁷⁷ See Dirk Heirbaut, 'De grafelijke leenhoven in Vlaanderen: hun ontstaan en hun vroegste ontwikkeling', in Prevenier, ed. by Walter and Augustyn, Beatrijs, *De Vlaamse instellingen tijdens het Ancien Régime: recent onderzoek in nieuw perspectief* (Brussels: Algemeen Rijksarchief, 1999), pp. 41-58.

⁷⁸ Walter Prevenier en *De gewestelijke en lokale overheidsinstellingen in Vlaanderen tot 1795*, ed. by Beatrijs Augustyn (Brussels: Algemeen Rijksarchief, 1997).

⁷⁹ Daniël Lambrecht en Jan Van Rompay, 'De staatsinstellingen in het Zuiden van de 11de tot de 14de eeuw', in *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden, 1977-1983* (Haarlem: Fibula van Dishoeck, 1982), III, pp. 77-134.

⁸⁰ Dirk Heirbaut, 'Le cadre juridique. Institutions et droit en Flandre vers 1302', in, *1302. Le désastre de Courtrai*, ed. by R. Van Caenegem (Antwerp: Mercatorfondss, 2002), pp. 106-139.

⁸¹ Susan Reynolds, *Fiefs and vassals. The medieval evidence reinterpreted* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

⁸² Robert Fossier, *L'enfance de l'Europe* (Paris: PUF, 1982), I, p. 443.

⁸³ E.g., Pierre Bonnassie, *La Catalogne du milieu du Xe à la fin du XIe siècle* (Toulouse: Association des publications de l'université de Toulouse-le-Mirail, 1975), p. 736: "Sans pousser trop loin le paradoxe, on pourrait soutenir que les institutions majeures de la féodalité <<classique>> ont été définies dans les pays du Midi."

⁸⁴ *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité*, 15 (1982 édition).

⁸⁵ For the word, see e.g. Dominique Barthélemy, 'Nouvelle contribution au débat sur l'an mil en France', in *Les origines de la féodalité. Hommage à Claudio Sánchez Albornoz* (Madrid: Casa de Velázquez, 2000), p. 96.

⁸⁶ Cf. Dirk Heirbaut, *Not European feudalism, but Flemish feudalism. A new reading of Galbert of Bruges' data on feudalism in the context of early twelfth century Flanders* (forthcoming).

even 'forget' the crucial area between Loire and Rhine⁸⁷. One may suspect that one reason is, that the sources from this region are still closer to the Ganshofian model than to the new theories⁸⁸. Anyway, anyone wanting to study feudalism in the Loire-Rhine region still has to take up Ganshof, because his critics have not really offered an alternative to him there. This is also true in general. The new historians of feudalism have been very good at tearing down the beautiful structure Ganshof made of feudalism, but they have, up to now, been unable to put something new in its place, a new synthesis, which can stand the comparison with the simplicity and clarity of Ganshof's *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité*. At least, a beginning student is still better off reading Ganshof than his critics. Like them, he will only give a glimpse of a more complex reality, but, at least, he has the advantage of not leaving one confused.

For Carolingian studies, Ganshof's memory is hindered by the lack of his great book, but even if he had written it, it would now have been something of the past. Ganshof's extreme fidelity to the sources would have made his work incomplete in our eyes, as it would be lacking some dimensions. The 'sociology of power'⁸⁹ which is so predominant in recent studies, would have been anathema to Ganshof. However, this means most of all that Ganshof's Carolingian publications nowadays can be seen as being incomplete, rather than wrong. This is most of all true for Ganshof's study of the *capitularia*, which is still indispensable, although it cannot be read without looking at more recent studies like the ones from Hubert Mordek⁹⁰ or Bühler⁹¹. Recent historiography also seems to agree with Ganshof in his ideas about Charlemagne's failure and his more positive evaluation of Louis the Pious⁹². Thus, whereas the new historians of feudalism are antagonistic to Ganshof, the new historians of the Carolingian era seem to be complementary.

Conclusion

In 2002 an article was published about multiple vassalage⁹³, fundamentally criticising an article by Ganshof, written in 1929⁹⁴, more than seventy years earlier, and

⁸⁷ E.g. Reynolds' (see note 81) beautiful book or the latest (and very impressive) synthesis in French on feudalism [*Les féodalités*, ed. by Eric Bournazel and Jean-Pierre Puy (Paris: PUF, 1998)].

⁸⁸ Cf. Dirk Heirbaut, *Galbert of Bruges*.

⁸⁹ See e.g. Janet Nelson, "Kingship and royal government", in *The new Cambridge medieval history* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), II, pp. 383-430.

⁹⁰ Hubert Mordek, *Studien zur fränkischen Herrschergesetzgebung. Aufsätze über Kapitularien und Kapitulariensammlungen ausgewählt zum 60. Geburtstag* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2000).

⁹¹ Arnold Bühler, 'Capitularia relecta. Studien zur Entstehung und Überlieferung der Kapitularien Karls des Großen und Ludwigs des Frommen', in *Archiv für Diplomatik*, XXXII (1986), pp.305-501.

⁹² Cf. Dirk Peter Block en Adriaan Verhulst, *Inleiding*, 20; *Charlemagne's heir. New perspectives on the reign of Louis the Pious*, ed. by Peter Godman and Roger Collins (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); Peter Landau, "Ludwig der Fromme als Gesetzgeber. Das Gesetzgebungsprogramm des Kaisers am Beispiel von Verwandtenerbrecht und Verfügungsmacht" in *Festschrift für Gerd Kleinheyer zum 70. Geburtstag* (Heidelberg: CF Müller, 2001), p.371.

⁹³ Roman Deutinger, 'Seit wann gibt es Mehrfachvassalität', in *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung*, CXIX (2002), 78-105.

⁹⁴ 'Depuis quand a-t-on pu, en France, être vassal de plusieurs seigneurs?', in *Mélanges Paul Fournier*, (Paris : Sirey, 1929), pp. 261-270.

thereby proving that Ganshof still influences and stimulates current research. In fact, whatever the subject he wrote about, Flemish, feudal or Carolingian institutions, Ganshof's works have become classics with a long life still ahead of them.

Chronology

1895. Born, Bruges March 14

1914-1918. Lieutenant, j.g., in the Belgian Army

1919. Member of the Belgian delegation at the Paris Peace Conference

1921. Ph. D. (History)

1922. LL. D.

1923. Lecturer at Ghent University

1932. Full professor at Ghent University

1940. 1944-1945. Commander in the Belgian Army

1944. Publication of *Qu'est-ce que la féodalité*

1946. Is awarded the Franqui prize,

1955. Publication of *Wat waren de capitularia*

1957. Publication of *La Flandre*

1961. Professor Emeritus

1980. Dies, Brussels June 26

Selected bibliography

1. Books

La Belgique en 1786. Les Pays-Bas Autrichiens, les principautés de Liège et de Stavelot-Malmédy, le duché de Bouillon et leur évolution territoriale de 1713 à 1794, in *Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique*, vol. 5 (Bruxelles: Elsevier, 1919).

La Belgique sous la domination française (1794-1814). Les départements belges et les départements voisins au 1er janvier 1812, in *Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique*, vol. 6 (Bruxelles: Elsevier, 1919-1932).

La Belgique dans le Royaume des Pays-Bas (1814-1830), in *Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique*, vol. 7 (Bruxelles: Elsevier 1920).

La Belgique de 1830-1839, in *Atlas de géographie historique de la Belgique*, vol. 8 (Bruxelles: Elsevier, 1920).

Étude sur les ministérielles en Flandre et en Lotharingie, 'Mémoires de l'académie royale de Belgique, Classe des lettres', second series, XX, (Bruxelles: Lamartin, 1926).

Recherches sur les tribunaux de châtellenie en Flandre avant le milieu du XIII^e siècle (Antwerp: De Sikkel, 1932).

La Flandre sous les premiers comtes (Bruxelles: La renaissance du livre, 1943).

Over de staatsontwikkeling tussen Loire en Rijn gedurende de middeleeuwen (Antwerp: Standaard, 1941; 2nd ed., 1944; Paris: PUF, 1943).

Pages d'histoire (Bruxelles: La grande Librairie belge, 1941; 2nd ed., 1944).

Les destinées de l'Empire en Occident de 395 à 888, in *Histoire générale, 1925-1938, Histoire du moyen âge*, ed. by Gustave Glotz, vol. I (Paris: PUF, 1934; 2nd ed., 1941) (with Ferdinand Lot and Christian Pfister).

Henri Pirenne. Le maître. L'historien (Bruxelles: Le flambeau, 1936).

Étude sur le développement des villes entre Loire et Rhin au Moyen Age (Paris: PUF, 1943).

Qu'est-ce que la féodalité (Bruxelles: Office de publicité, 1944); Later editions in french: (1947; 1957; Bruxelles: Presses universitaires de Bruxelles, 1968; Paris: Tallandier 1982); English

- translation (London: Longman, 1952; New York: Harper & Row, 1961; London/New York: Longman/Harper & Row, 1964; Toronto: University of Toronto press, 1996); Portuguese translation (Lisboa: Publicações Europa-America, 1959); German translation (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1961); later editions, 1967, 1970, 1975, 1983, 1989; Spanish translation –with an Appendix by Luis de Valdeavellano– (Barcelona: Ariel, 1963); Japanese translation (Tokyo, 1968); Italian translation (Torino: Einaudi, 1989).
- Le moyen âge*, in *Histoire des relations internationales*, ed. by Pierre Renouvin, vol. 1 (Paris: Hachette; later editions, 1958, 1964, 1968); Spanish translation (Madrid: Aguilar, 1960); Italian translation (Florence: Vallecchi, 1961); English translation (New York, 1971).
- Wat waren de capitularia?* (Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie, [collection: Verhandelingen van de koninklijke Vlaamse academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, XXII], 1955). French translation in *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 35 (1957), 33-87, 196-246; published separately (Paris: Sirey, 1958). German translation (Weimar: Böhlau, 1961).
- La Belgique Carolingienne* (Bruxelles: La renaissance du livre, 1958).
- Das Hochmittelalter. Von Bernhard von Clairvaux zu Papst Bonifaz VIII* (Berlin: Propyläen Verlag, 1963) (Propyläen Weltgeschichte, 1960-1964, V); later editions, 1968, 1991; CD-rom version (Frankfurt: Directmedia, 1999).
- Monarchie franque (6.-9. siècles)* (Bruxelles: Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1964). Introduction bibliographique à l'histoire du droit et à l'éthnologie juridique; B, 6.
- Frankish institutions under Charlemagne*, trans. by Bryce and Mary Lyon of articles written by Ganshof (Providence: Brown University Press, 1968).
- Droit romain dans les capitulaires* (Milano: Giuffrè, 1969) (*Ius romanum medii aevi*, I, 2, b, cc, α-β).
- The Carolingians and the Frankish monarchy. Studies in Carolingian history*, transl. by Janet Sondheimer (London: Longman, 1971).
- Royaume Burgonde* (Bruxelles: Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1972). Introduction bibliographique à l'histoire du droit et à l'éthnologie juridique; B, 7.
- Les institutions féodo-vassaliques* (Bruxelles: Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1972). Introduction bibliographique à l'histoire du droit et à l'éthnologie juridique; B, 8.
- Le polyptique de l'abbaye de Saint-Bertin (844-859). Edition critique et commentaire*, Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, XLV, (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1975) (in collaboration with Françoise Godding-Ganshof and Antoine De Smet).

2. Articles

- This list contains only a selection of articles by François Louis Ganshof. For a complete bibliography of his articles, see Raoul van Caenegem, *Bibliografie Prof. Dr. F.L. Ganshof*, in 'Koninklijke academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, Jaarboek', (1980), 241-251.
- 'De middeleeuwen', in *De pelgrimstocht der mensheid, 1925-1938*, ed. by Jan Berkelbach van der Sprekel (Utrecht: De Haan, 1937), pp. 170-288; new editions in 1940, 1948, 1952, 1960.
- 'Note sur la compétence des cours féodales en France', in *Mélanges d'histoire offerts à Henri Pirenne* (Bruxelles: Vromant, 1926), pp. 161-170.
- 'Contribution à l'étude des origines des cours féodales en France', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 4th series, 7 (1928), 1-20.
- 'La Tractoria. Contribution à l'étude des origines du droit de gîte', *Tijdschrift voor rechts-geschiedenis*, 8 (1928), 69-91.
- 'Depuis quand a-t-on pu, en France, être vassal de plusieurs seigneurs?', in *Mélanges Paul Fournier* (Paris: Sirey, 1929), 261-270.
- 'Étude sur le faussement de jugement dans le droit flamand des XII^e et XIII^e siècles', *Bulletin de la commission royale des anciennes lois et ordonnances de Belgique*, 14 (1935), 115-140.

- 'Staatkundige geschiedenis. XII^e, XIII^e, XIV^e eeuw. De staatsinstellingen van Vlaanderen en Brabant', in *Geschiedenis van Vlaanderen*, ed. by Robert Van Roosbroeck, 1936-1949, II (Brussels: Standaard, 1937), pp. 9-188.
- 'Note sur les origines de l'union du bénéfice avec la vassalité', in *Études d'histoire dédiées à la mémoire de Henri Pirenne* (Bruxelles: Nouvelle société d'édition, 1937), pp. 173-190.
- 'Jets over Brugge gedurende de preconstitutioneele periode van haar geschiedenis', *Nederlandsche historischebladen*, 1 (1938), 281-303.
- 'Die Rechtsprechung des gräflichen Hofgerichtes in Flandern bis zur Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts', *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung*, 68 (1938), pp. 163-177.
- 'Mediaeval agrarian society in its prime. France, the Low Countries and Western Germany', in *Cambridge economic history of Europe, 1941-1977*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1941), pp. 278-322; repr. in 1942; separately printed with biographical additions (Wetteren: De Meester, 1947); new edition, in collaboration with Adriaan Verhulst (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966).
- 'L'échec de Charlemagne', *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Comptes rendus des séances*, (1947), pp. 248-254.
- 'La fin du règne de Charlemagne. Une décomposition', *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Geschichte*, 28 (1948), pp. 533-552.
- 'Het falen van Karel de Grote', *Verlag der algemene vergadering der leden van het historisch genootschap gehouden te Utrecht*, (1948), 26-46.
- 'Het tijdperk van de Merovingen. Het tijdperk van de Karolingen. Het laat-Karolingisch tijdperk', in *Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden, 1949-1958*, vol. 1 (Utrecht: De Haan, 1949), pp. 252-366.
- 'Charlemagne', *Speculum*, 24 (1949), pp. 520-527.
- 'Le roi de France en Flandre en 1127 et 1128', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 4th series, 27 (1949), 204-228.
- 'Les origines du concept de souveraineté nationale en Flandre', *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, 18 (1950), 135-158.
- 'Le droit urbain en Flandre au début de la première phase de son histoire', in *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, 19 (1951), 387-416.
- 'Charlemagne et le serment', in *Mélanges dédiées à la mémoire de Louis Halphen* (Paris: PUF, 1951), pp. 259-270.
- 'Le droit urbain en Flandre au début de la première phase de son histoire (1127)', *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, 19 (1951), 387-416.
- L'origine des rapports féodo-vassaliques: les rapports féodo-vassaliques dans la monarchie franque au nord des Alpes à l'époque carolingienne', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 1 (1954), pp. 3-45.
- 'Les relations féodo-vassaliques aux temps post-carolingiens', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 2 (1955), pp. 67-114.
- 'Het statuut van de vreemdeling in het Frankische Rijk', *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren*, 18,3 (1956); revised French translation in *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, 10 (1958).
- 'Louis the Pious reconsidered', *History*, 42 (1957), 171-180.
- 'La Flandre', in *Histoire des institutions françaises au moyen âge*, ed. by Ferdinand Lot and Robert Fawtier, 1957-1962, I (Paris: 1957), pp. 343-426.
- 'L'immunité dans la monarchie franque', *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, 1 (2nd ed. Bruxelles: G. Van Campenhout, 1958), pp. 171-216.
- 'Les liens de vassalité dans la monarchie franque', *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, 1 (2nd ed. Bruxelles: G. Van Campenhout, 1958), pp. 153-169.
- 'Quelques aspects principaux de la vie économique dans la monarchie franque au VII^e siècle', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 5 (1958), pp. 73-101.
- 'Note sur le premier traité anglo-flamand de Douvres', in *Mélanges dédiés à la mémoire de*

- Raymond Monier (Lille: Faculté des Lettres, 1958), pp. 245-257 (with Raoul Ch. van Caenegem and Adriaan Verhulst).
- 'Het tolwezen in het Frankische rijk onder de Merowingen. Het tolwezen in het Frankische rijk onder de Karolingen', *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten, Klasse der Letteren*, 20, 4 and 21,1 (1958-1959).
- 'Aantekening over de betekenis van 'adheriter' en 'erven' in enkele veertiende eeuwse oorkonden afkomstig uit Vlaanderen', *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, 28 (1960), 348-359.
- 'De internationale betrekkingen van het Frankisch rijk onder de Merowingen', *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren*, 22, 4 (1960).
- 'L'église et le pouvoir royal dans la monarchie franque sous Pépin III et Charlemagne', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 7 (1960), pp. 95-141.
- 'Over Robrecht de Fries en Alexios Comnenos', *Handelingen der Koninklijke Zuidnederlandse Maatschappij voor taal- en letterkunde en geschiedenis*, 14 (1960), 145-160; French revised translation, *Byzantion*, 31 (1961).
- 'Droit romain dans le Liber Floridus', *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, 29 (1961), 432-444.
- 'Recherches sur le lien juridique qui unissait les chefs de la première croisade à l'empereur byzantin', in *Mélanges offerts à M. Paul-E. Martin par ses amis, ses collègues, ses élèves* (1961), pp. 49-61.
- 'Les relations extérieures de la monarchie franque sous les premiers souverains carolingiens', *Annali di storia del Diritto*, 5-6 (1961-1962), 1-53.
- 'Les traits généraux du système d'institutions de la monarchie franque', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 9 (1962), pp. 91-127.
- 'La paix au très haut moyen âge', *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, 14/1 (1962), pp. 397-413.
- 'Le statut de la femme dans la monarchie franque', *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, 12 (1962), pp. 5-58.
- 'De internationale betrekkingen van het Frankisch rijk onder de Karolingen', *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren*, 25, 2 (1963).
- 'Bruges au moyen âge', *Congrès archéologique de France. CXX^e session. Flandre* (Paris: 1964), pp. 12-15.
- 'Les traités des rois mérovingiens', *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, 32 (1964), pp. 163-192.
- 'Charlemagne et les institutions de la monarchie franque. Charlemagne et l'administration de la justice dans la monarchie franque', in *Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben* (Düsseldorf, 1965), I, pp. 349-419.
- 'Note sur une charte de Thierry d'Alsace, Comté de Flandre, intéressant la propriété foncière à Saint-Omer', *Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Stadtgeschichte* (1965), pp. 84-96.
- 'The impact of Charlemagne on the institutions of the Frankish realm', *Speculum*, 40 (1965), pp. 47-62.
- 'La preuve dans le droit franc', *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, 17/2 (1965), pp. 71-98.
- 'Note sur les Capitula de causis cum episcopis et abbatibus tractandis de 811', *Studia Gratiana*, 13 (1967), pp. 1-25.
- 'L'épreuve de la croix dans le droit de la monarchie franque', *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni*, 38 (1967), pp. 217-231.
- 'Een kijk op het regeringsbeleid van Lodewijk de Vrome tijdens de jaren 814 tot 830', *Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren*, 29/2 (1967).
- 'Note sur la preuve dans la procédure en cas de flagrant délit en droit franc', in *Miscellanea mediaevalia in memoriam Jan Frederik Niermeyer* (Groningen: Wolters, 1967), pp. 11-16.
- 'L'armée sous les Carolingiens', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 15 (1968), pp. 109-130.
- Op de vooravond van de eerste crisis in het regeringsbeleid van het Frankische rijk onder

- Lodewijk de Vrome, de jaren 828 en 829', *Bijdragen en mededelingen van het historisch genootschap*, 82 (1968), pp. 11-34; German revised translation, *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 6 (1972).
- 'L'historiographie dans la monarchie franque sous les Mérovingiens et les Carolingiens. Monarchie franque unitaire et Francie Occidentale', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 17/2 (1970), pp. 631-685.
- ### 3. Ganshof in memoriams and biographies
- Bibliographie des travaux historiques de François-Louis Ganshof*, (Wetteren: impr. De Meester, 1946).
- Theo Luyks, 'Frans-L. Ganshof', in *Rijksuniversiteit te Gent. Liber memorialis 1913-1960* (Ghent: Rectoraat Rijksuniversiteit te Gent, 1960), pp. 245-253.
- Léopold Genicot, 'Décès. Ganshof et Lemarignier', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 85 (1980), 658-661.
- John Gilissen, 'In memoriam Frans L. Ganshof 1895-1980', in *Bulletin de la commission royale des anciennes lois et ordonnances de Belgique*, 30 (1980-1981), v-viii.
- Stephan Kuttner, 'Nachrufe. François Louis Ganshof 14.3.1895-26.7.1980', *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Jahrbuch*, (1981), 217-223.
- Archibald Lewis, Robert Lopez and Bryce Lyon, 'François L. Ganshof', *Speculum*, 56 (1981), 695-696.
- Heinz Löwe, 'Nachruf. François Louis Ganshof', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 30 (1981), 939-941.
- Jos Marechal, 'In memoriam François-Louis Ganshof', *Handelingen van het genootschap voor geschiedenis te Brugge*, 118 (1981), 135-136.
- Ludo Milis, 'Necrologie: François-Louis Ganshof', *Belgisch tijdschrift voor filologie en geschiedenis*, 59 (1981), 518-528.
- Wilfried Pauwels, *De bevrijdingsdagen van 1944: de geheime rapporten van François Louis Ganshof* (Antwerp: De Nederlanden, 1994).
- Adriaan Verhulst, 'Nécrologie: François Louis Ganshof', *Le moyen âge*, 86 (1980), 523-538.
- Raoul Van Caenegem, 'In memoriam F.L. Ganshof (14 maart 1895-26 juli 1980) Bibliografie Prof. Dr. F.L. Ganshof', *Koninklijke academie voor wetenschappen, letteren en schone kunsten van België, Jaarboek*, (1980), 231-251.
- Raoul Ch. Van Caenegem, 'In memoriam F.L. Ganshof (1895-1980)', *Tijdschrift voor rechtsgeschiedenis*, 49 (1981), 5-12.
- Cinzio Violante, 'Ricordi Spoletini di François-Louis Ganshof e di Jean-François Lemarignier', *Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, 5/1 (1983), pp. 67-71.
- Raoul Van Caenegem, 'Ganshof, François Louis, mediëvist en rechtshistoricus, hoogleraar', in *Nationaal biografisch woordenboek*, XII, (Brussels: 1987), pp. 263-274.