

# Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	vii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xi
<i>List of Illustrations</i>	xxiv
Introduction	1
<b>Part I</b>	
1. Religious Houses and the Laity in Eleventh- to Thirteenth-Century England: An Overview	19
2. Lamps, Lights and Layfolk: “Popular” Devotion Before the Black Death	35
3. Monastic Burials of Non-patronal Lay Benefactors	61
4. Small Gifts, but Big Rewards: The Symbolism of Some Gifts to the Religious	85
5. Pittances and Pittancers	113
6. The Austin Canons in English Towns, ca.1100-1350	131
7. Heads of Religious Houses as Administrators	159
<b>Part II</b>	
8. Gifts in Frankalmoign, Warranty of Land, and Feudal Society	177
9. Seeking the Language of Warranty of Land in Twelfth-Century England	199
10. Tenure in Frankalmoign and Knight Service in Twelfth-Century England: Interpretation of the Charters	221
11. Choosing Witnesses in Twelfth-Century England	241

## Introduction

Since religion involves confession, a useful starting point is perhaps to admit some of the difficulties in formulating a title for this book. One possibility considered was “the age of monasticism: the impact of religious houses on English society in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries”. The rationale here was that the twelfth century, but more particularly its first half, constituted the period of the most intensive foundation of religious houses in England. Accordingly, the existence of these proliferating religious houses had a profound impact on society, particularly at the local level, as indicated in Part I of this collection of papers, but also, as examined in Part II, on wider social norms and customs. A second candidate was “before parochialism” with the same subtitle. By “parochialism” here is meant simply a deep attachment to the parish and the parish church. The idea behind that potential title was that these religious houses were introduced in part because of a perceived failure of the secular clergy in the prior century: an inability to respond to efforts to reform the clergy in the face of monumental new social changes. In fact, the parochial “system” was developing in parallel with the expansion of religious houses. The reforms of the early thirteenth century combined with the full evolution of parishes abrogated the impact of the religious houses. The religious houses were eclipsed by a reformed, celibate, sacramental clergy whose role was invigorated by the emphasis placed on communication (the mass) and confession. Finally, the title “missed opportunities” was selected because the new religious orders were despatched as part of a movement for religious reform, in the case of some Orders (such as the Austin Canons) as missionaries. In this objective, they ultimately failed, but not without having attracted significant interest amongst the laity and influenced lay social and cultural organization.

Whilst the book thus concentrates on the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it does so in a wider context of what might be described as “phases” of religious devotion. The term “phases” is employed without any implication of stages, or ineluctable linear movement from one stage of development to another. The “phases” are, moreover, not entirely discrete; characteristics of some phases existed in others. The “phases” are perhaps no more than heuristic devices for detecting large-scale changes.

The twelfth and early thirteenth centuries (“Phase I” for our purposes here) are thus regarded as a phase of expansion of the religious Orders and religious houses in England, probably at the expense materially of parishes and parish churches. The tardy reform of the parochial clergy contributed to their relative eclipse. That “dissatisfaction” applied to colleges of secular canons too. The spiritual services of the professed religious offered a more effective alternative for salvation.

By the early thirteenth century (“Phase 2”), however, the position was beginning to be reversed, as the character of the secular clergy was transformed, with the emphasis on the parish church and the parish clergy as sacramental centers and sacramental intermediaries, formally instituted by the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 and disseminated in England through the Council of Oxford of 1222 and diocesan synods. Religious houses, nonetheless, retained the affection of some of lay society. In particular

this “phase” was characterized by lower levels of secular society, who had not the means to found their own religious houses or make large donations to them, attempting through smaller benefactions to participate in the spiritual benefits afforded by religious houses. In this context too, the supervision of chantries and the foundation of chantries within religious houses signified this continued belief in the greater efficacy of the regular Orders.<sup>1</sup>

From the early to mid fourteenth centuries through the later middle ages (“Phase 3”), the religious Orders were superseded in the affections of the laity by the secular clergy and the local attachment to the parish (and also by the mendicant Orders, particularly in urban places). Any effervescence of late-medieval devotion was channelled through the parish and the “parish community”. It should be clarified that the general effacement of religious houses by the secular clergy does not assume a complete eclipse of religious houses, but their relative demise. That outline is the bald schema which is adapted here, but it is not uncontentious.

If we take a rather crude approach, chantries can be perceived as an intermediate phenomenon in the transition from phase 2 to phase 3. As Wood-Legh indicated, chantries were predominantly (although not exclusively) established first either in religious houses employing the regular clergy in priests’ Orders in the houses or, if the chanter was a secular cleric, under the supervision of a religious house.<sup>2</sup> During the later middle ages, chantries became much more the preserve of the secular clergy.

The paradigm promoted by David Knowles contended that the significance of religious houses, with the exception of the mendicant establishments, declined in the later middle ages.<sup>3</sup> It appeared that Benjamin Thompson’s exploration of the severance of the relationship between families of patrons and founders from “their” religious houses during the later middle ages added some grist to this argument.<sup>4</sup> Partly, the dissolution of ties resulted from the changing fortunes and genealogies of the families and partly from an indifference to religious houses. More recently, however, a substantial body of research has questioned the decline propounded by Knowles. Pioneering examination of houses of the female religious in Norfolk by Marilyn Oliva maintained that these houses continued to have a strong association with local society, in particular with “middling” social groups.<sup>5</sup> Martin Heale and Karen Stöber both effectively challenged the dismal deterioration suggested by Knowles.<sup>6</sup> The vitality at St Albans Abbey has been expounded by James Clark who has advanced some conclusions about a more general continuation of the contribution of monastic life in the later middle ages.<sup>7</sup>

If we can then no longer adhere strictly to the thesis of Knowles, how far has his depiction been revised? If we dissect and digest the revisionist research, does it amount to a wholesale rebuttal of Knowles? The following comments are predicated as devil’s advocate, as a lowest level of acceptance. Much revisionist research has illustrated that late-medieval devotion in East Anglia remained eclectic. There too individual female devotional fervour flourished. Whilst we must not be dogmatic, there is still some mileage in the association of religious piety with women. So there is the possibility that what Oliva’s research has detected is an association of a local laity with female

devotional practices in a geographically-specific environment. It is quite possible that her conclusions have a much wider application, but the argument above is deliberately a reductive one.

How typical was St Albans? How does it compare with Westminster?<sup>8</sup> Are either representative of the generality of very large Black Monk houses? How does the position of these large Benedictine houses reflect on the fortunes of houses of medium and lesser size of that and other Orders? In other words, is St Albans, with its immense resources and liberties, a special case of vitality? More generally, have Clark, Heale, and Stöber discerned a wide pattern of resilience? Or have they discovered: examples of establishments which had a different experience; and relationships between some specific social affinities with religious houses? The problem is that the picture is still provisional. We might at this point conclude that either Knowles was incorrect to the extent that there was no more than a relative decline or that he completely misjudged the impact of religious houses in the later middle ages.

Whilst this debate about the fortunes of religious houses in the later middle ages is important on its own terms, why should these propositions matter for the following text which is almost exclusively concerned with the development of religious houses in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries? The pragmatic reason is that overviews of the contribution of religious houses still tend to conform to a chronological division around 1300 (although in the case of this present work, the *terminus ad quem* is extended to about 1350). Although no historian may thus accept Knowles unreservedly, his paradigm may still influence general treatments of monastic development. In those works, historians are attempting to discern some cohesion—and their effort is important.<sup>9</sup>

It is in the same spirit that the text which follows is circumscribed by a boundary about 1350. The text acknowledges that there is something qualitatively different between the period of the proliferation of foundations in the twelfth century, but extending into the thirteenth, and the later middle ages. The differences examined here revolve around the relationships between the laity and the religious house rather than the internal condition of religious houses.

We can define those particular issues from two perspectives. First is the question of the association between the laity and religious houses. In the later middle ages, the parish became increasingly a focus of lay devotion and spiritual awareness, perhaps, in the perception of some, eclipsing the position of religious houses.<sup>10</sup> In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, that distinction was less clear cut. The formation of the parish was yet in its evolutionary stages. Whilst the impetus of the enunciations of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, disseminated in England through the Council of Oxford in 1222 and synodal and diocesan decrees thereafter, may have simply recognized the developing importance of the parish for lay participation in religion, plenty of scope existed in the twelfth and thirteenth century for lay people to seek another association. In their minds, those different attachments may not have been exclusive, of course. It was sagacious to make all arrangements possible for salvation. On the other hand, there is a sense that the professed religious offered a more efficacious option than the secular clergy: a hierarchy of recourse.

The problem, of course, was one of accessibility. Although everyone engaged on a regular basis with the parish church, association with a religious house might involve more discretion. It required the capacity to make an additional benefaction. It equally required that the religious house be prepared to accept the association. The element of social emulation was an influence, containing all those elements of honor, status, marking off, and distinction.

Those issues of association and relationship are addressed in the first part of the text. By and large, the focus is on the new foundations of the twelfth century which radically increased the numbers of religious houses and reflected the devotional interest in the religious Orders. The concentration is on the newer, smaller religious houses which had more local significance and which did not have the cachet or prestige of the great Benedictine houses of the *Regularis Concordia* and tenth-century reform. The attempt is also made to assess how far these lesser houses made an impact on their local society, and how far the active participation of the local laity was attracted.

What cannot be neglected, however, is the impact of religious houses through the very acquisition of benefactions. The proliferation of religious houses in the twelfth century had immense consequences for the tenure of land—in particular the perception, if no more, of the balance of land in the hands of religious houses and the laity. So contained within the affection for religious houses in the twelfth century was the seed of its own destruction. The endowment at foundation of the smaller religious houses was, as is well known, often parsimonious, sometimes a deliberate policy, often as a consequence of the immaterial status of the founder. There was a stimulus then to attempt to increase the resources of the religious house, from two perspectives: for survival, but also for the glorification of the patronal saint of the house (and God). Those motives cannot really be separated, although there is a temptation to emphasize the aspect of materiality. Religious houses became the beneficiaries of innumerable gifts and grants which detracted from the resources of the laity. Equally, religious houses entered into the land market, at varying levels, occasionally acquiring manors and larger holdings, more frequently smaller amounts of land, rents or services. At different points, the political and social consequences were reversed. By the late twelfth century, concerns were expressed about the balance of land removed from the hands of the significant laity. Benefactions from the lower laity, nonetheless, continued to be directed to religious houses as the lower laity attempted to obtain the same spiritual benefits that the higher laity had obtained, if at a lower material cost. Through the thirteenth century, however, those lesser benefactions diminished too.

Through their acquisitions—and, indeed, acquisitiveness—in the twelfth century, religious houses had a profound effect on the genesis of ideas about tenure and the proper and appropriate conditions for land held for spiritual purposes. The second part of the text accordingly investigates these implications.

If, as above, it has been explained that even the benefactions from the lower laity declined during the thirteenth century, why, then, does the examination here continue down to about 1350? The explanation is that a residual sentiment may have existed which regarded the professed religious as still more efficacious than the secular clergy.

That confidence is manifested through the foundation of *cantarie* in religious houses or under their supervision. The laity continued to solicit regular clergy as soul priests or, where secular clergy were instituted, to request a religious house to oversee the secular priest. It was only in the later middle ages that trust was unreservedly invested in the secular clergy for this purpose.

Inevitably, in approaching all these issues, there is a tendency to dichotomize, to produce distinctions which appear too hard and fast. The differences import many nuances, confusion, and lack of clarity. Much overlapped. So it should finally be clarified that the distinctions are indeed heuristic ones, designed to make some sense and provide some cohesion. Those dichotomies may indeed become more blurred as more detailed research is conducted into the condition of late-medieval religious houses. For the moment, however, it makes sense to concentrate on the relationship between the laity and religious house from the twelfth century through to about 1350 as a coherent discussion.

Within the overall context of religious houses and the laity in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, a number of particular issues are important. One is the sentiment for “association” on the parts of both the religious house and local lay society. That concern is especially important in the situation of relationships between the lesser laity and religious houses. It is a notion (somewhat ashamedly) derived from Megan McLaughlin’s exploration of relationships between people of higher status and larger religious houses at a much earlier time.<sup>11</sup> It strikes me, however, that it is a persistent influence. Somewhat allied is the idea that donations by the local laity consolidated local networks of the laity which promoted or confirmed local sentiments (although not as concrete as “identities”). That notion was promulgated at a higher and lower level by the considerations of Cassandra Potts on Normandy and C. J. Wales on north Lincolnshire (the relationship between knightly families and the abbey of Wellow in particular).<sup>12</sup> Again, it seems to me that the same force operated in the context of the lesser laity and local religious houses.

Two subjects in particular require addressing further: gift-exchange and the gift; and ritual. Some of the papers published here made an effort to engage more widely with anthropological and sociological notions, in particular those two aspects of symbolic economies. Both themes have been elaborated and understanding advanced since my papers were written.

The significance of the gift was, indeed, well established in considerations of medieval relationships, perhaps best expressed in Stephen White’s research into western “France”. The stimulus remained, of course, the reflections of Mauss as they were made available to an English audience. An additional impetus was provided by the contributions of Ilana Silber which had a profound influence, for she demonstrated how gift-exchange applied to western monasticism.<sup>13</sup> Discussion of gift-exchange specifically in the context of medieval society was then advanced further by Arnoud-Jan Bijsterveld.<sup>14</sup> In the last twenty years, there has been a profusion of writing about gift and exchange in pre-modern English society, consolidated recently by Ilana Ben-Amos.<sup>15</sup>

Whilst Mauss had relied principally on anthropological information from other societies (especially Malinowski on the Trobriand islanders and Boas on the Kwakiutl tribe), the importance of gift-exchange in pre-modern western culture has thus been confirmed. Mauss had implied as much, but the exact operation of gift-exchange has only recently been more concretely explained by historians of the European past.

One of the most cogent dissections of the notion has, however, largely been ignored in the historical literature, Lewis Hyde's expansive reflections.<sup>16</sup> The reason for this omission is perhaps because Hyde is not concerned with the full repertoire of what the gift does, but only with that gift which "speaks commandingly to the soul and irresistibly moves us." Whilst recognizing the multiple motives and expectations which inspire any single gift, Hyde attempts to extract the beneficent. Again, however, he concedes the "limits of altruism". So, for his main purpose Hyde sets aside the "gifts that leave an oppressive sense of obligation, gifts that manipulate or humiliate, gifts that establish and maintain hierarchies ..."<sup>17</sup> Before addressing the altruistic, nonetheless, his book contains an interesting exploration of the the whole notion of gifts: the "Indian" gift anticipating a return; the necessity for circulation of some gifts (either to reinforce notions of the small "community" or to confirm that acquisition is only purposeful for redistribution); the demand for consumption of gifts (to use them up as conspicuous consumption); reciprocity, but the return of the gift as equivalence, although without any regulation or complaint that it be so; the status exhibited by the capacity to give; the ritual activity involved in the process of some giving; the emotional content of the gift, on both sides, "enriched with social feeling, with generosity, liberality, goodwill".<sup>18</sup>

For the context of gifts to the religious examined in this present book, there are some succinct and felicitous expressions in Hyde's writing.

... as a natural fact (when gifts are actually alive); as a natural-spiritual fact (when gifts are the agents of a spirit that survives the consumption of its individual embodiments); and as a social fact (when a circulation of gifts creates community out of individual expressions of goodwill).<sup>19</sup>

Inherent in gifts then is the possibility of "the gifts of incorporation", which produce solidarity through emotional bonds.<sup>20</sup> It remains, nonetheless, only the possibility: the gift can go wrong if there is unaccustomed emphasis on the obligation or on the status of the "giver". Indebtedness can "create an inexorable tension." The "giver" may be disappointed if the recipient does not express the expected level of gratitude, even whilst exclaiming that nothing is owed.<sup>21</sup> The acceptance of the "gift" may be regarded by the recipient as coercive, and so may be resented. So, whilst we must return to Mauss, who contemplated all these issues in small societies, Hyde is an accessible, but also profound, introduction.

The gift is then a multi-faceted social event and process. In the discussion of the relationship between religious houses and laity, the attempt has been made to acknowledge all these variations which may operate simultaneously. Maurice Godelier has explained how the process of the gift produces and reproduces social relationships,

extending the considerations of Mauss.<sup>22</sup> Problems arise, however, because the gifts with which we are concerned, are not exchanges confined to the secular world, between lay people. The relationship is between inferiors and superiors, the latter comprising the saints and God.<sup>23</sup> Whilst the saints might have been coerced or manipulated in the earlier middle ages, tempting God was anathema. The gift could have no more effect than anticipate a change in the course of events through the mediation of the religious and the intercession of saints. At canon law, these gifts sailed close to the wind of simony: the performance of spiritual services in return for material reward.

Godelier has made the distinction between the non-agonistic gift and the antagonistic gift, the latter as an elaboration of Mauss's description of the potlatch. The antagonistic gift is explicitly deployed to gain the acknowledgement of the superiority of the giver: competitive giving.<sup>24</sup> Non-agonistic gifts, whilst expecting some ultimate reciprocity, were extended with the purpose of social harmony, since the anticipation is for a counter-gift, in due course, of an equivalent level or amount.<sup>25</sup> The intention is not to embarrass. How that differentiation might apply to gift-giving and religious houses involves a number of issues. Theoretically, one might conceive of the foundation of a religious house as involving some aspects of the antagonistic gift. It is an assertion and display of superior status. The act represents the importance of the founder and represents the founder to the outside world. In particular, the foundation of religious houses in the later years of Henry I's reign and during the "Anarchy" as an exhibition of "territorial lordship" contained elements of antagonistic giving, although it does not equate with the potlatch since the endowments of these houses were slender rather than conforming to the extreme consumption and waste of the potlatch.<sup>26</sup> The question remains open whether gifts from lower social groups contained any element of the antagonistic or remained purely non-agonistic. One suspects that, to some extent or another, most gifts comprehended some element of the "antagonistic" broadly defined in that they exhibited the ability to expend.

One final aspect of the gift calls for consideration. Again, it involves an aspect which Mauss perceptively implied, but which was only elaborated by later anthropological investigation: revisiting the *kula* of the Trobriand islanders. Annette Wiener noticed the separation of goods into those which can (and should) circulate as gifts and those which are "inalienable".<sup>27</sup> "Inalienable" goods perform a number of roles. Confirming individual identity is one, but in the collective social world obligations to kin and wider social interests are others. Godelier invested them with the quality of "sacred", in the widest sense.<sup>28</sup> The ability to detain them from circulation also marked social status, so we have the paradox of social position acknowledged in giving, but also confirmed by reserving to oneself.

Reciprocity only provides the outer manifestation of social interaction. Such acts appear to disguise difference, but in reality they proclaim the variation between participants in status and rank authenticated by the inalienable possessions a person is able to retain.<sup>29</sup>



Inalienable possessions impact on the present discussion in several ways, one of which is to demonstrate the complexity of motives which may obtain behind any gift. Another aspect is the restraint on the alienation of land, an obligation defined by the various interests in the land: lord and kinship. That latter complication has been much considered in the relationships between the laity and religious houses, whether from anthropological, legal or normative perceptions. This complication is a recurrent theme in part two of this book, inevitably owing much to the prior and perspicacious research of Stephen D. White, Barbara Rosenwein, Emily Tabuteau, Paul Hyams, and latterly John Hudson.

Whilst there has been a return to the discussion of the gift in historical contexts, the problem of ritual has never disappeared. It remains, advisedly, a problem, because of the various nuances, emphases, interpretations and expectations of what ritual is, means and does. Below, the coercive intention and outcome of ritual has been explored, but ritual could simultaneously have several different impacts. To another extent, then, the cautions of Humphrey and Laidlaw have been assimilated, that ritual can become an empty vessel for the imposition of meaning. I have avoided the structural-functionalist interpretations of ritual, despite the frequent recourse by historians to such as the Turners (Victor and Edith). Partly, the omission is precisely because that understanding is so well known and recited, but also because it seems too tidy, insufficiently ambiguous.

The ambivalences of ritual are very well addressed in two detailed examinations of ritual by Catherine Bell.<sup>30</sup> Where my text below is inadequate, perhaps, is in not acknowledging the contribution of Roy Rappaport. Whilst I discovered Rappaport's book shortly after its publication, it has not been integrated into the papers reproduced here.<sup>31</sup> On the other hand, there does not seem to be too much point in entering on a grand excursus about ritual here, what it means or what it does. It is the subject of a continuing debate in early medieval history.<sup>32</sup> Whilst Rappaport's book is immensely welcome, there are some points of discussion for the present context.<sup>33</sup>

First, he emphasized, like many others, the invariance of ritual.<sup>34</sup> In fact, he constantly qualifies this constancy and iteration, allowing some change. Deviation from the established code, however, may also cause calamity, so we return to the invariance and the mystical circumstances when change is accepted. One of the problems of ritual is that it is often observed only in its "mature" and "perfected" state. How did it originally occur and how was its text produced? A deeper reading than I originally gave to the material below may illustrate some incremental development of ritual, from inchoate to substantial text.

The second point of Rappaport's to address is the close association of ritual with religion. Whilst he intended religion as a broad concept, it still retains the air of transcendence. Ritual performances usual depend on some element of the transcendent, perhaps the "sacred", through oaths or ultimate belief, but for what must be construed as *secular* circumstances, as are involved in the second part of this present book, in matters of land tenure.

## Notes

1 Since the references are recited in the chapters below, I deliberately keep them to a minimum here.

2 Kathleen L. Wood-Legh, *Perpetual Chantries in Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965). See also Chapter 1 below.

3 David Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England: Volume 2 The End of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955); Joan Greatrex, "After Knowles: Recent Perspectives in Monastic History", in *The Religious Orders in Pre-Reformation England*, ed. James G. Clark (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2002), 35-47.

4 Benjamin Thompson, "Monasteries and their Patrons at Foundation and Dissolution", *TRHS* 6<sup>th</sup> ser., 4 (1994): 103-25.

5 Marilyn Oliva, *The Convent and the Community in Late Medieval England: Female Monasticism in the Diocese of Norwich, 1350-1540* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998).

6 Karen Stöber, *Late Medieval Monasteries and their Patrons: England and Wales, c.1300-1540* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007); Heale in various places.

7 James G. Clark, *A Monastic Renaissance at St Albans: Thomas Walsingham and his Circle, c.1350-1440* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) and elsewhere.

8 Barbara F. Harvey, *Living and Dying in Medieval England 1100-1540: The Monastic Experience* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

9 Janet Burton, *Monastic and Religious Orders in Britain 1000-1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

10 The vast literature is encapsulated by Katherine L. French, *The Good Women of the Parish: Gender and Religion after the Black Death* (Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007).

11 Megan McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints: Prayer for the Dead in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1994).

12 Cassandra Potts, *Monastic Revival and Regional Identity in Early Normandy* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997), but see also Chapter 1 below; C. J. Wales, "The Knight in Twelfth-century Lincolnshire", PhD dissertation (Cambridge, 1983), 235-60.

13 Ilana Silber, "Gift-giving in the Great Traditions: The Case of Donations to Monasteries in the Medieval West," *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 36 (1995): 209-43; Silber, Jeffrey C. Alexander, and Steven Seidman, *Virtuosity, Charisma and Social Order: A Comparative Sociological Study of Monasticism in Theravada Buddhism and Medieval Catholicism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

14 Arnoud-Jan Bijsterveld, "The Medieval Gift as Agent of Social Bonding and Political Power: A Comparative Approach", in *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context*, ed. Esther Cohen and Mayke B. de Jong (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 123-56.

15 Ilana K. Ben-Amos, *The Culture of Giving: Informal Support and Gift-Exchange in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 1-14, recapitulates the historiographical contexts.

16 Lewis Hyde, *The Gift: How the Creative Spirit Transforms the World* (Edinburgh: Canongate Books, 2006, but first published in the USA and Canada in 1983).

17 Hyde, *The Gift*, xix.

18 Hyde, *The Gift*, 35, for the expression of social emotions.

19 Hyde, *The Gift*, 38.

20 Hyde, *The Gift*, 59.

21 Hyde, *The Gift*, 71.

22 Maurice Godelier, *The Enigma of the Gift*, translated by Nora Scott (Cambridge: Polity, 1999), 104-5.

23 Godelier, *Enigma of the Gift*, 186.

24 An important context for this issue is Paul R. Hyams, *Rancor and Reconciliation in Medieval England* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 2003).

25 Godelier, *Enigma of the Gift*, 92-3.

26 This well-known phenomenon is briefly described in Chapter 1.

27 Annette B. Wiener, *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping While Giving* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992) (which is also a critique of Lévi-Strauss on the circulation of women as exchange).

28 Godelier, *Enigma of the Gift*, 111-38: "sacred" from multiple perspectives, the one concerning us here their detention from circulation.

29 Wiener, *Inalienable Possessions*, 64.

30 Catherine Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); Bell, *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), reflects on the previous literature.

31 Roy Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

32 Centered on the varying perceptions of Geoffrey Koziol, *Begging Pardon and Favor: Ritual and Political Order in France* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992) and Philippe Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual: Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory*, English edn. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).

33 References to other anthropological discussions of ritual occur in the chapters below.

34 Rappaport, *Ritual and Religion*, 36-7 introduces it as the "third feature" of ritual.