CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-51517-7 - The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages
Edited by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre
Excerpt
More information

1 Introduction

Janet L. Nelson, on behalf of the contributors

More than one contributor to this book observes that the historiography of gift giving is now extremely large. It is beyond a representative summary here. Yet its main directions, and achievements, can be indicated, beginning with the *Essai sur le don* of Marcel Mauss, first translated into English in 1954 as *The Gift*.[1] His strong emphasis on reciprocity in 'archaic societies', and his universalizing and evolutionary take on historic ones, in which, over time, contract and markets replaced gift exchange, have left deep marks on subsequent work. In the social anthropological data on which Mauss relied, two models were influential: the reciprocal friendly exchanges of Polynesia, and the competitive, extravagant and destructive giving of **potlatch*** by Indian chiefs of the American Northwest.[2] Most subsequent scholarship by social scientists (anthropologists and sociologists), who tended to write in English (the majority) or French (a significant minority), refined the models without discarding them, and nuanced through re-application in very different global contexts an evolutionary scheme derived from European history. For as long as there were colonies, the anthropologists' fieldwork was mostly done in colonial settings, and even nowadays, some of the discipline's own practitioners still reflect ruefully on its past as 'the handmaid of imperialism'. Since the 1960s, the social-science-inclined sub-group of the historians' tribe, including some chiefs of its ancient, medieval and early modern clans, dared to borrow new discourse and new skills which they displayed in *Annales* and *Past and Present*. Among medieval historians

[1] The starting point of one of the most stimulating papers on gift, J. Parry, '*The gift*, the Indian gift, and the "Indian gift"', *Man* n.s. 21 (1986), pp. 453–73, was the revelation of how Mauss's French had been misrepresented in the then standard English translation. Now available in a good translation by W. D. Halls, with a foreword by M. Douglas, as *The gift: the form and reason for exchange in archaic societies* (London, 1990), Mauss's work is best read in French, not in the original publication (*L'Année sociologique* n.s. 1 (1923–4), pp. 30–186), but as reprinted with an introduction by C. Lévi-Strauss, in Mauss's collected papers, *Sociologie et anthropologie* (Paris, 1980), pp. 145–279.

[2] C. Bracken, *The potlatch papers: a colonial case history* (Chicago, 1997); A. Mills, *Eagle down is our law: Witsuwit'en law, feasts, and land claims* (Vancouver BC, 1994).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-51517-7 - The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages
Edited by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre
Excerpt
More information

down to the 1970s, adherence to the evolutionary model reinforced the divide between earlier 'Dark Age' and properly medieval segments, characterized respectively by gift and contract: here indeed, especially in Paris, the critical moment of change from gift to contract seemed crystal clear to historians working chiefly on the twelfth century and later.

Germanophone medieval scholarship, meanwhile, mostly attended to its own folkways. But from the 1980s some German specialists on both the earlier and the later Middle Ages began to cultivate fields of cultural history which included gift giving as a sub-plot of symbolic communication. From this, more recently, has emerged a new historiography, international in its inclusion of American-anglophones and its openness to francophone as well as anglophone influences. It is well exemplified in the volume of papers, *Negotiating the Gift*, which originated in a workshop at the Institut Historique Allemand in Paris in 1998 attended by a number of American scholars as speakers and commentators.[3] One of the speakers, and author of the Introduction to the published proceedings, was Gadi Algazi, an Israeli historian, trained in the German historical tradition, who defies bracketing as 'late-medievalist'/'early-modernist' by being both. He regrets the tendency of the study of gift giving 'to artificially archaize [the] image' of pre-modern societies, and hence create 'an archaic world of shared meanings and pre-established harmony'. For Algazi, gifting always involves not a 'smoothly-functioning system', but competition, rivalry, divergent expectations, '"good" and "bad" gifts . . . constantly competing with each other, each of them defining itself in opposition to the others, occasionally . . . changing its designation before our very eyes'. Gifting, then, has to be seen 'as a living medium of social action' in which 'the management of meaning' is always involved; and these meanings in turn 'rely on given cultural repertoires of models for shaping interactions, on available vocabularies and recognised modes of applying them'.[4] Algazi warns that words are slippery, though, and as encountered in our sources may be *faux amis* (false friends): 'dangerous doubles and treacherous synonyms'.[5]

Mauss had written quite explicitly that he did not mean *The Gift* as 'a model to be followed': rather, he thought, implicitly, that gifts should

[3] G. Algazi, V. Groebner and B. Jussen (eds.), *Negotiating the gift: pre-modern figurations of exchange* (Göttingen, 2003).
[4] Algazi, 'Introduction: doing things with gifts' in Algazi *et al.* (eds.), *Negotiating the gift*, pp. 9–27, at pp. 12–13, 15; cf. Algazi's paper in the same volume, 'Feigned reciprocities', p. 101: 'Gifts . . . owe their most salient properties to their relative position within given repertoires of transaction modes. It is by being modelled on other available templates or in contrast to other models within specific cultural repertoires . . . that they acquire their particular shape and potential effects.'
[5] Algazi, 'Introduction', p. 20.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-51517-7 - The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages
Edited by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre
Excerpt
More information

be treated as, in Algazi's words, 'modelling devices . . . acceptable and discussible [*sic*] ways of doing things'. The uses of gifts, as historians encounter them, do not necessarily follow rules, hence, Algazi writes, 'cannot be inferred from existing cultural forms', but 'can be diverse and even contradictory, embedded in particular situational logics and influenced by specific traditions of usage'. Only those who mistakenly thought gifts 'remnants of an archaic age' could be surprised at the realization of their role in the development of written records in the earlier medieval period: these were not just passive documents but active elements of 'strategies of representation', parts of the 'negotiating' of the title.[6] As a historian, therefore, Algazi is sceptical about any quest for a general theory of 'The Gift', but sees the usefulness of 'a history of uses'. That plural signals not a historianly penchant for variety and detail, but a lively awareness of the plurality, instability and mutability of meanings involved in gifts, as their positioning in cultural repertoires undergoes change. Algazi's analogy is of a family of models – related but not identical (he might have added that the family changes shape as its members grow, move, and are repositioned, as well). 'Offerings are not constructed like everyday presents; gifts to God . . . are not the prototype for those exchanged among kin or between states.'[7] The efforts of the authors of the present book began before Algazi wrote (or uttered) those words, and I think we were already thinking along similar lines. 'Changing designations', 'available vocabularies and recognized modes of applying them', documents as 'strategies', were among things that already interested us as we embarked on *The Languages of Gift*. Our title accommodates the plurality of the languages and linguistic registers we find in our sources.

Among the commentators at the Paris conference was Natalie Davis, an early modernist, who two years later published *The Gift in Sixteenth-century France*.[8] This model of interdisciplinary scholarship, informed, always critically, by social anthropology, is rooted in her own very extensive readings in both archives and all forms of written output from literature to courtesy books, letters to travelogues, theology to liturgy. Important points here that complement Algazi's, are, first, qualifying any simple evolutionary model, that gift modes and market modes coexisted

[6] Algazi, 'Introduction', pp. 9–10, 15, 18–19, and cf. p. 26, the sub-section 'Shifting and displacing vocabularies'.

[7] Algazi, 'Introduction', pp. 21–2. Resemblances and analogues can be explanatory clues to meaning.

[8] Davis's *The gift in sixteenth-century France* (Oxford, 2000) originated in the Fifth Jerusalem Lectures in History in Memory of Menahem Stern, given in 1998 (a vintage year for historical studies of gift giving).

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-51517-7 - The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages
Edited by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre
Excerpt
More information

'in creative tension' and 'enduring interactions',[9] and second, qualifying overly positive, even romanticized, evaluations of gift giving in the work of ethnographers and historians alike, is that reciprocity had limits, and these limits show up clearly in the contexts in which gifts went wrong, as when they failed to resolve or even accentuated conflicts within families, or were not approved in the first place, as in the case of **simony***.[10] Historians of pre-modern Europe have often turned to social scientists rather than fellow historians for theory. Fine: theory can often generate more and better questions; and it was an anthropologist, C. A. Gregory, who emphasized the coexistence of gift exchange with markets.[11] But attentive reading of fellow historians, especially of other periods of European pre-modern history, often signposts answers. 'The potentiality both for trouble and for renewal in gifts', are cases in point for the authors of the present book.[12]

As individuals, we trace intellectual pedigrees emanating variously, and indirectly as well as directly, from the scholarship of the 1970s onwards. It was at the end of that decade, after all, that our group first came into an inchoate existence. It then evolved through individual and collective engagement in the trends just identified, and through mutual influence. There never has been a party line. Each of us has plied his or her own trade, working on different geographical regions and to some extent with different disciplinary affiliations, yet just as shared interests in certain kinds of social history brought us together, so the realization that we could go on meeting like that encouraged shared approaches and methods, call them interdisciplinary, *annaliste*, *marxisant*, cultural, or what you will. Our first book, *The Settlement of Disputes*, focused attention on a theme explored until then for the most part by social anthropologists in the anglophone Africanist tradition, in which legal ideas and practices loomed large.[13] For each of us, our own source material was our fieldwork data. Common themes and findings emerged: the ubiquity of what modern people recognize as rational procedures and proofs, the use of writing, local variety, the interplay at local level of power and consensus, property disputes that gave rise to trouble and yet were resolved. We wrote individually; we read each others' drafts, then discussed and

[9] Davis, *The gift*, ch. 4, 'Gifts and sales', *passim*, esp. p. 74.
[10] Davis, *The gift*, ch. 5, 'Gifts gone wrong', p. 128; cf. p. 168.
[11] C. A. Gregory, *Gifts and commodities* (London, 1982). [12] Davis, *The gift*, p. 219.
[13] W. Davies and P. Fouracre (eds.), *The settlement of disputes in early medieval Europe* (Cambridge, 1986). Among Africanist anthropologists, E. E. Evans-Pritchard, M. Gluckman, M. Fortes and J. Goody have been especially important, with S. Roberts especially influential on legal matters. In the study of modern Africa, anthropology and history are combined in the work of M. Bloch, T. Ranger, and J. and J. Comaroff.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-51517-7 - The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages
Edited by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre
Excerpt
More information

re-discussed them collectively; something like a common approach and style developed, not least in our very close readings of texts. *Property and Power*, ten years later, focused on some related themes and was produced by similar work methods.[14] The present book visibly continues if not in a tradition then along a parallel track. Its co-editors would wish to offer this much guidance to readers: familiarity with the earlier two volumes might help clarify the agenda and method of the present one, but is not a prerequisite, and nor is knowledge of social-scientific theory. The authors are a fairly pragmatic bunch, who have found some theory to a greater or lesser extent stimulating and helpful, but always regard the proof of the pudding as in the eating. Our serious conversations have often been held in English gardens and the nearby countryside. Our minds' eyes, though, are fixed on early medieval landscapes Europe-wide, and even beyond Europe. All of us would want to acknowledge huge debts to international colleagues, especially in Continental Europe and North America, and to the fruits of their labours in the historiography of gift giving: its scale and solidity, as signalled in our combined bibliography, provide this book's platform.

But still, why add to it? For, after all, the earlier medieval material, compared with what came later, is refractory, and those who produced it not, on the whole, given to self-reflection: you will not find a developed notion of an *ars donandi* (art of giving), artful as it is, in any earlier medieval writer (though Gregory of Tours once used the phrase), nor did early medieval theologians capable of engaging in technical debate about the Eucharist discuss, let alone relate to that topic, the gift-terms in early medieval liturgy.[15] Here, nevertheless, are four reasons for undertaking the present project – apart from the classic one that the challenge is there. First, modern typologies of social development have put the earlier Middle Ages on the wrong side of a line after which European experience of the gift becomes complicated by the emergence of commerce, and therefore interesting, whereas we wish to argue that earlier medieval gift giving was already complicated, already coexisted with other forms of exchange, and that the ways people thought about gifts were already complicated, unstable and sometimes contentious – and all those things in distinctive ways – before the twelfth century. So, we are looking for subtler ways of periodizing. Second, earlier medieval Europe was more extensive and outward-looking, and less Francia-centred, than it is often

[14] W. Davies and P. Fouracre (eds.), *Property and power in early medieval Europe* (Cambridge, 1995).
[15] Allusions here are to works and themes discussed below by Nelson and Ganz respectively.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-51517-7 - The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages
Edited by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre
Excerpt
More information

presented: it included or was in touch with the Mediterranean world on the one hand, Britain and Ireland on the other. Our book's scope tries to do justice to this geography. Third, earlier medieval gift giving was the subject of a great deal more, and more varied, negotiation in social practice, than has tended to be recognized in available accounts of earlier medieval societies as 'two-class' (warriors and peasants, powerful and powerless), or 'pre-monetized'. In short, the sources of the period deserve more variegated and more closely contextualized appreciations, and more nuanced readings. Fourth, as our title indicates, gift languages need closer and more respectful attention – meaning that we intend to avoid the patronizing assumptions that early medieval people were unable, for instance, to differentiate gift from sale or loan, or to relate liturgical to theological meanings of gift in the experience of attending Mass, incapable, as it were, of giving and praying at the same time; meaning also that we do not mistake metaphorical extension of language for mental confusion, that we take genre fully into account, and that our approach to each text or sometimes image, and even each word, is situational.[16] This book is not about semantics: our intention is to bring home to readers the meanings and uses of language, and of languages, in historical and textual contexts, for language as understood is not just a matter of words, but of tone and register, of discourses, and of concepts conveyed.

To these specifics we can add traits of our group's method. Though each chapter is self-contained, they speak to each other, and they invite comparison. Case-studies are excellent entry-points, and most chapters include at least one, analysed in some detail and with special attention to languages. The glossary will aid linguistic inquiry. Our intent is that the book should be read as a whole, right through its conclusion. Readers will we hope want to make connections – and/or draw contrasts (and the index is designed to help in that regard). Careful reading of the footnotes will encourage them to follow where the authors have gone, in engaging with each others' chapters, and offering comments and criticisms of them: in imagination to join the group.

We ought to admit that some important aspects of giving are missing from our book, or underplayed in it. Marital prestations, especially dower, for instance, do not form a major part of any chapter, though mentioned by Christys and briefly alluded to by others, while one or two

[16] Cf. P. Geary, 'Gift exchange and social science modelling: the limitations of a construct' in Algazi *et al.* (eds.), *Negotiating the gift*, pp. 129–40, echoing Geary, 'Ethnic identity as a situational construct in the earlier middle ages', *Mitteilungen der anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien*, 113 (1983), pp. 15–26.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-51517-7 - The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages
Edited by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre
Excerpt
More information

of us have addressed these themes elsewhere;[17] and nor do gifts of women in marriage. Gifts of food, and hospitality, are likewise given little attention, as are gifts of books.[18] A number of us mention ***pro anima**** gifts, but without presenting a sustained discussion.[19] Here we have written on topics that we are sure offer direct bearings on the matter of language, without meaning to imply that other topics do not. We never aimed to be comprehensive; and the loss of two of our group, Patrick Wormald and Tim Reuter, has left cruel gaps in our coverage. Patrick, not long before his death, had become very interested in Émile Benveniste's philological approach to social organization, and had hoped to write on that field for the present book, naturally with an Anglo-Saxon tilt,[20] while Tim had written a brief but immensely thought-provoking paper on the upshot of eleventh-century critiques of simony ('There *is* such a thing as a free lunch!'), and would have developed it on a larger scale, had he lived.[21] He would probably have thrown in for good measure some comparative *aperçus* on Iceland, whose social arrangements fascinated him.[22] Despite

[17] W. Davies, '*Wynebwerth* et *enepuuert*: l'entretien des épouses dans la Bretagne du IXe siècle' in F. Bougard, L. Feller and R. Le Jan (eds.), *Dots et douaires dans le haut moyen âge* (Rome, 2002), pp. 407–28; Nelson, 'The wary widow' in Davies and Fouracre (eds.), *Property and power*.

[18] Food-gifts appear in the contributions of Ganz, Nelson and especially Davies, below, but are never a major theme. Understated earlier-medieval evidence for domestic dinners fostering social relations between seniors and juniors at court appears in *De ordine palatii*, ch. 27, and Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, III, 4: see Nelson, 'Aachen as a place of power', cited below, p. 148, n. 103. Interesting comparative material can be found, for the very early medieval period, in B. Effros, *Creating community with food and drink in Merovingian Gaul* (New York and Basingstoke, 2002), for Anglo-Saxon England, in A. Gautier, *Le Festin dans l'Angleterre anglo-saxonne* (Rennes, 2006), and for the early modern period, in F. Heal, 'Food gifts, the household, and the politics of exchange in early modern England', *Past and Present*, 199 (2008), pp. 41–70, and Davis, *The gift*, pp. 57–9, 67–72. On books as gifts, and a form of treasure, in the Carolingian period, see R. McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the written word* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 155–7.

[19] Wendy Davies has written extensively on these in *Acts of giving: individual, community, and church in tenth-century Christian Spain* (Oxford, 2007); she, and also Ganz, Fouracre, Wood, Nelson and Wickham make briefer reference to them here. Cf. S. D. White, *Custom, kinship, and gifts to saints: the Laudatio Parentum in western France, 1050–1150* (Chapel Hill NC, 1988); B. Jussen, 'Religious discourses of the gift in the middle ages: semantic evidences (second to twelfth centuries)' and E. Magnani Soares-Christen, 'Transforming things and persons: the gift *pro anima* in the eleventh and twelfth centuries' in Algazi *et al.* (eds.), *Negotiating the gift*, pp. 173–92 and 269–84, both with abundant references to the rich bibliography on this subject.

[20] É. Benveniste, *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européens*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1969); and see Wormald, 'Pre-modern "state" and "nation": definite or indefinite?' in S. Airlie, W. Pohl and H. Reimitz (eds.), *Staat im frühen Mittelalter* (Vienna, 2007), pp. 179–90, at pp. 186–9.

[21] Reuter, 'Gifts and simony' in E. Cohen and M. de Jong (eds.), *Medieval transformations: texts, power and gifts in context* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 157–68.

[22] See the fleeting references in Reuter, *Medieval polities and modern mentalities*, ed. J. L. Nelson (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 14, 94, 172.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-51517-7 - The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages
Edited by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre
Excerpt
More information

these absences, we hope to have assembled a collection which is representative of our current research interests, genuinely wide-ranging, and makes a distinctive contribution to the historiography of gift.[23]

The order of the chapters in this book has been carefully designed. We begin with broad parameters, straddling verbal and visual languages, and across Christendom, eastern and western. David Ganz discusses gift language in Christian texts, drawing on hagiography and homiletics from the Eastern Mediterranean and North Africa but coming to rest on Spanish, Italian and Frankish material. Unlike Bernhard Jussen, writing on 'religious discourses of the middle ages', Ganz's chronological span is earlier-medieval (rather than later), and unlike Arnold Angenendt in a recent study of gifts for the soul, he does not restrict his material to liturgy, though his starting point is liturgical.[24] His aim is to explore the role of the twinned ideas of gift and sacrifice in the **Offertory***. At the same time, he stresses that the experience of the liturgy in this period was a widely generalized one, though it varied considerably by region. Preachers' sermons complemented the experiential lessons of participation in the Mass: the miracle of the Mass as taught to these earlier medieval believers was that by which their offerings were transformed into Christ's sacrifice of body and blood. The gifts of these offerings were strongly personalized: givers and gifts were named, and lists read out. Gifts to God are not the prototype for other gifts, yet, as noted, there are some family resemblances. And while theologians insisted that God could not be coerced or persuaded by gifts, early medieval Christians thought 'they could *deal* with God'.[25]

In a complementary paper, Leslie Brubaker encourages readers to read the icon's visual language, literally, to see the gift, by taking the case of a familiar genre in Christian art, the donor image, but an instance of it that is exceptional in several respects: where the actual donor is not one of the imperial subjects depicted, and further, is outside the temporal frame of the subject matter. Brubaker's starting point is that the donor cannot be

[23] For further references to relevant literature, see the notes to Algazi and other contributors to *Negotiating*; also J. T. Godbout and A. Caillé, *The world of the gift* (Montreal and Kingston, 1998); and our combined bibliography below.

[24] B. Jussen, 'Religious discourses of the middle ages'; A. Angenendt, '*Donationes pro anima*: gift and countergift in the early medieval liturgy' in J. R. Davis and M. McCormick (eds.), *The long morning of medieval Europe: new directions in early medieval studies* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 131–54.

[25] Cf. the comment of Wickham, 'Conclusion', below, pp. 244–5; and cf. P. Bourdieu, 'The economy of symbolic goods', in his *Practical reason* (London, 1998), pp. 92–126, esp. pp. 113–14, on 'the laughter of bishops' when they speak of 'supply and demand' in the context of the church's economy: Bourdieu observes, 'The truth of the religious enterprise is that of having two truths: economic truth and religious truth, which denies the former.'

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-51517-7 - The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages
Edited by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre
Excerpt
More information

taken for granted, and that the gift's intended or hoped-for countergift is a problem to be solved. If Hagia Sophia is a uniquely significant location, what is the meaning of the image's location above the very entranceway taken by the emperor, beyond which he doffs his crown and places it in the patriarch's keeping for the duration of the service? What could this destabilized gift language reveal of its tenth-century context, and the relationship between that and the imagined age of Constantine and Justinian? Brubaker's original answers to these questions challenge old orthodoxy about unchanging Byzantium and raise new possibilities for the expressiveness of the visual gift.

Once we are prepared to recognize that the terms we encounter in our sources may be *faux amis*, it becomes urgent to ask how such terms can be seen as 'strategies of representation' that reflect change and difference – not just over time, or as between one genre and another at the same time, but from context to context! One type of social relation, reciprocity, say, may be being transposed into another, as *dona* (gifts) become ***servitia****, not (or not just) to signal changes in power relations, but to stabilize new relations.[26] Using the sharp-edged tools of class and gender Paul Fouracre takes a slice through Francia from the eighth century to the early twelfth, to analyse changes and continuities in the uses and meanings of the term *beneficium/beneficia*. *Mis*used by historians in 'too rigid and juridical' fashion to show social change from gift to contract, *beneficium* is more fruitfully, and accurately, usable as evidence of flexible and adaptive continuity. A gift with too many strings attached loses elasticity. But precisely in the Carolingian period when *beneficium* first loomed large in denoting rulers' resources and gifts that remained, simultaneously, in the regime's hands, kept while given,[27] Fouracre shows *beneficia* being assimilated by recipients to their own private resources. Peasants on lordly **domain***-lands were at the 'benefice-free' end of a spectrum, where any reciprocity between lord and workforce was as near notional as it could be, though even there some 'gift' language could occur when lords specified the renders peasants should pay. Move along the spectrum and benefice occurred with a diminishing load of dependency, and more flavour of favour: an element which could never really be 'stripped out'; and in literary texts, the term continued to denote the 'ideally honourable and generous'. These were important moral continuities. Finally, from the eleventh century, *feodum* tended to replace

[26] Cf. L. Kuchenbuch, 'Porcus donativus' in Algazi *et al.* (eds.), *Negotiating the gift*, pp. 193–246.
[27] Cf. A. B. Weiner, *Inalienable possessions: the paradox of keeping-while-giving* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/Oxford 1992), esp. pp. 131–48.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org

CAMBRIDGE

Cambridge University Press
978-0-521-51517-7 - The Languages of Gift in the Early Middle Ages
Edited by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre
Excerpt
More information

it in legal contexts, while *beneficium* became increasingly preferred in, and confined to, ecclesiastical ones, 'with its growing sense of exclusion' from lay control including female influence.[28] In the 1090s, Guibert of Nogent's mother found her efforts to get her son a canonry stymied by new hostility to what smacked of simony. Guibert's mother, now using the right language, simply waited for another suitable vacancy to occur where no objection could be made to the lord's exercising his right of presentment to a *beneficium*.[29] Fouracre's focus on the single specific Latin term gives a more precise indicator, and also suggests more convincing explanations, of changed and more restricted meanings across the *longue durée*. *Beneficium* could never be ring-fenced in a change-free zone.

The next chapter shifts in time to the age of Bede (+734), and in space to Northumbria and the mouth of the river Wear. Ian Wood uses a set of near-contemporary narratives by Bede and others to explore understandings of gift in the context of the founding and endowment of Northumbrian monasteries. Differing authorial voices produce polyphony, sometimes dissonance. The same author could offer, or credit subjects with, different views in different circumstances, or at different times of life – the deathbed being the ultimate one. Monastic founders wanted to free their foundations from external control, hence to gift their property without family strings attached, and they wanted the gift to last 'in perpetuity'. Kin asked how long was a piece of string. They expected to retain an interest in their relative's foundation, and in some foreseeable contexts, the founder too relied on their continuing interest. Wood's comments on Bede's contrast between 'real' monasteries in some imagined kin-free zone, and 'false' ones in family hands, are refreshingly astringent; and they also accord with what is increasingly being recognized as true of churches and patrons elsewhere.[30] Where did this leave the perpetual gift? Kings, major founders in Bede's world, had proprietorial attitudes of their own, in which notions of real gift jostled with, on the one hand, interests of state – as when a king sponsored the growth of a port at

[28] Cf. S. D. White, 'Service for fiefs or fiefs for service: the politics of reciprocity' in Algazi *et al.* (eds.), *Negotiating the gift*, pp. 63–98, and for Roman notions of gratuitous gifts, see E. Flaig, 'Is loyalty a favor? Why gifts cannot oblige an emperor' in Algazi *et al.* (eds.), *Negotiating the gift*, pp. 29–62, at pp. 47–9.

[29] See S. Wood, *The proprietary church in the medieval West* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 904–21, for the twelfth-century shift 'on the [northern European] ground' from the language of gift (*donum*) to that of 'introduction' (*conductus*), 'patronage' (*patronatus*), or 'consent' (*consilium*).

[30] See Nelson, 'Church properties and the propertied church: donors, the clergy and the church in medieval western Europe, from the fourth century to the twelfth' (review article of S. Wood, *The proprietary church*), *English Historical Review*, 506 (2009), pp. 355–74.

© in this web service Cambridge University Press www.cambridge.org