The Routledge Companion to Cultural History in the Western World

Edited by Alessandro Arcangeli, Jörg Rogge and Hannu Salmi

THE ROUTLEDGE COMPANION TO CULTURAL HISTORY IN THE WESTERN WORLD

The Routledge Companion to Cultural History in the Western World is a comprehensive examination of recent discussions and findings in the exciting field of cultural history.

A synthesis of how the new cultural history has transformed the study of history, the volume is divided into three parts – medieval, early modern and modern – that emphasize the way people made sense of the world around them. Contributions cover such themes as material cultures of living, mobility and transport, cultural exchange and transfer, power and conflict, emotion and communication, and the history of the senses. The focus is on the Western world, but the notion of the West is a flexible one. In bringing together 36 authors from 15 countries, the book takes a wide geographical coverage, devoting continuous attention to global connections and the emerging trend of globalization. It builds a panorama of the transformation of Western identities, and the critical ramifications of that evolution from the Middle Ages to the twenty-first century, that offers the reader a wide-ranging illustration of the potentials of cultural history as a way of studying the past in a variety of times, spaces and aspects of human experience.

Engaging with historiographical debate and covering a vast range of themes, periods and places, *The Routledge Companion to Cultural History in the Western World* is the ideal resource for cultural history students and scholars to understand and advance this dynamic field.

Alessandro Arcangeli is Associate Professor of Early Modern History at the University of Verona, Italy, the author of a reference book on cultural history and its methods and a scholar in Renaissance studies. He chaired the International Society for Cultural History from 2013 to 2017.

Jörg Rogge is Academic Director and Adjunct Professor of History, Middle Ages, at the University of Mainz, Germany, and specialized in the history of urban and noble societies. He is the current Chair of the International Society for Cultural History.

Hannu Salmi is Professor of Cultural History at the University of Turku, Finland, Academy Professor for the years 2017–2021 and a historian of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He was the first chair of the International Society for Cultural History from 2008 to 2013.

THE ROUTLEDGE COMPANION TO CULTURAL HISTORY IN THE WESTERN WORLD

Edited by Alessandro Arcangeli, Jörg Rogge and Hannu Salmi

CONTENTS

Contents

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figures

Table

CONTRIBUTORS

Alessandro Arcangeli teaches early modern and cultural history at the University of Verona. He is the author of a reference book on historiography and method (*Cultural History: A Concise Introduction*, 2012) and of specialist studies of attitudes towards dance (with particular emphasis on cultural exchange) and play (*Recreation in the Renaissance*, 2003). Passions and dreams offered some of his recent research topics. He chaired the International Society for Cultural History from 2013 to 2017. As well as the author of various contributions in the field, he is the editor of several forthcoming collective volumes of cultural history (of memory and sport, among other topics).

Franz-Josef Arlinghaus is Professor of History with a particular focus on high and late medieval history at Bielefeld University. Between 1991 and 1999, he worked in different positions at the 'Collaborative Research Centre (SFB) 231' in Münster on pragmatic literacy, where he wrote his PhD thesis on Italian bookkeeping (Datini Company). In 2007, he finished his habilitation on legal proceedings in late medieval Cologne at the University of Kassel. After a short stay as Assistant Professor at the Max Planck Institute for Legal History in Frankfurt, he became full professor at the University of Vechta and in 2009 at Bielefeld. During the academic year 2014/2015 he was Mercator-Fellow at the University of Duisburg-Essen. His current research interests are urban history, history of literacy and rituals as well as history of law and history of individuality.

Jackson W. Armstrong is a Senior Lecturer in History at the University of Aberdeen. He is co-editor (with Andrew Mackillop) of 'Communities, Courts and Scottish Towns', *Urban History*, special section, 44:3 (2017). His book *England's Northern Frontier: Conflict and Local Society in the Fifteenth-Century Marches towards Scotland* will be published by Cambridge University Press. He is principal investigator in the Law in the Aberdeen Council Registers project (Leverhulme Trust, 2016–2019).

Mita Banerjee is Professor of American Studies at the University of Mainz. In her research she has explored issues of citizenship and naturalization (*Color Me White:*

Naturalism/Naturalization in American Literature, 2013), as well as the role of indigenous communities in their quest for sovereignty. More recently, she has explored the promise of American democracy in its relevance not only for political participation, but also for medical care and health equity (*Medical Humanities in American Studies*, 2018). She is co-speaker of the research training group 'Life Sciences, Life Writing: Boundary Experiences of Human Life between Biomedical Explanation and Lived Experience', which is funded by the German Research Foundation.

Antonio Castillo Gómez is a Professor of the History of Written Culture at the University of Alcalá. He is a specialist in writing and reading practices in the early modern Hispanic world. He has published, among other books, *Entre la pluma y la pared. Una historia social de la escritura en los siglos de Oro* (2006); *Leer y oír leer. Ensayos sobre la lectura en los Siglos de Oro* (2016); and *El placer de los libros inútiles y otras lecturas en los Siglos de Oro* (2018). He has been a visiting professor and given invited lectures in many universities in Spain, Europe and Latin America. At present he is preparing a book on writings displayed in Hispanic cities during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Constance Classen is a cultural historian specializing in the history of the senses. She is the author of *The Museum of the Senses: Experiencing Art and Collections* (2017) and *The Deepest Sense: A Cultural History of Touch* (2012), along with numerous other works. She is also the general editor of the six-volume *Cultural History of the Senses* series (2016) and the editor of *The Book of Touch* (2005). She is a research associate on several international projects investigating the cultural life of the senses, and is currently undertaking research on cognition and perception.

Esther Cohen is Professor Emerita at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel. Her specialty is medieval European history, with an emphasis on the social and cultural history of the later Middle Ages. She has published on the economics of popular religion, on the history of law and crime and on the history of pain. She is a Fellow of the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study (NIAS), a Life Member of Clare Hall, Cambridge University and a Fellow of the National Humanities Center.

Steven Conn teaches American history at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio where he is the W. E. Smith Professor. He is the author of six books, most recently *Nothing Succeeds Like Failure: The Sad History of American Business Schools*, numerous articles and many reviews. He has also taught and lectured widely including in Xi'an, China and Warsaw, Poland. Conn is the founding editor of the online magazine *Origins: Current Events in Historical Perspective* which reaches more than 150,000 readers each month.

Brendan Dooley is Professor of Renaissance Studies at University College Cork. He has previously taught at Harvard, Notre Dame and Jacobs University Bremen. He works on the histories of culture and knowledge with reference to Europe and especially to Italy and the Mediterranean world. Publications include *The Social History of Skepticism* (1999), *A Mattress Maker's Daughter: The Renaissance Romance of Don Giovanni de' Medici and Livia Vernazza* (2014), *Angelica's Book and the World of Reading in Late Renaissance Italy* (2016) and, as author/editor, *The Dissemination of News and the Emergence of Contemporaneity in Early Modern Culture* (2010).

James R. Farr is the Germaine Oesterle Professor of History at Purdue University. He is the author of several books and articles on early modern European history, including *Hands of Honor: Artisans and Their World in Dijon, 1550–1650* (1988), *Authority and Sexuality in Burgundy, 1550–1730* (1995), *Artisans in Europe, 1300–1914* (2000), *A Tale of Two Murders: Passion and Power in Seventeenth-Century France* (2005), *The Work of France: Labor and Culture in Early Modern Times* (2008) and *Who Was William Hickey? A Crafted Life in Georgian England and Imperial India* (2020).

Hjalmar Fors is a historian of science, first librarian at the Hagströmer medico-historical library, Karolinska Institutet and an associate researcher at the department of history of science and ideas, Uppsala University. His research is focused primarily on the circulation of knowledge and the spatiality and materiality of science during the early modern period, and in areas such as chemistry, mining, pharmacy and botany. His monograph *The Limits of Matter: Chemistry, Mining and Enlightenment* was published in 2015.

Jan Hirschbiegel studied Ancient, Medieval and Modern History as well as European Ethnology in Kiel. In 1998 he received his PhD in History. From 1995 to 2011 he worked as a research associate on the research project 'Hof und Residenz im spätmittelalterlichen Deutschen Reich (1200–1600)' of the Göttingen Academy of Sciences. His habilitation effected in 2011. His habilitation treatise is entitled 'Nahbeziehungen bei Hof – Manifestationen des Vertrauens. Karrieren in reichsfürstlichen Diensten am Ende des Mittelalters', published in 2015. Since 2012 he has been working as a research associate on the research project 'Residenzstädte im Alten Reich (1300–1800)' of the Göttingen Academy of Sciences. In 2016 he was appointed as Professor. His fields of interests cover medieval travel accounts, theory, cultural, economic and social history of courts, residences and residential cities.

David Howes is a cultural anthropologist based at Concordia University, Montreal. He has conducted field research on the cultural life of the senses in the Massim region of Papua New Guinea, Northwestern Argentina and the Southwestern United States. He is currently directing a project on 'Law and the Regulation of the Senses' and collaborating with new media artist Christopher Salter to produce a series of sense-based art installations. His latest publications include *Ways of Sensing: Understanding the Senses in Society* (co-authored with Constance Classen) and the four-volume *Senses and Sensation: Critical and Primary Sources* compendium.

Hermann Kamp teaches as Professor of Medieval History at the University of Paderborn. His work focuses on the history of late medieval Burgundy, the history of conflict management and conflict resolution and political rituals in the Middle Ages. He has written books about the pious foundations of the Burgundian chancellor Nicolas Rolin, and about peace-making and mediation in the Middle Ages. Most recently, he has dealt with the forms of conquest policy and resistance to foreign rule at that time. In this area he has edited with Martin Kroker a book of collected articles about violence and Christianization under the title sword mission.

Ville Kivimäki is a social and cultural historian of the Second World War at Tampere University, Finland. He has focused especially on the soldiers' war-related psychological disorders and their psychiatric treatments in 1939–1945 and the transition of traumatic war experiences to postwar society. In his publications, Kivimäki has combined trauma studies and the history of emotions, experience and gender. Together with Tiina Kinnunen, he has edited a comprehensive anthology, *Finland in World War II: History, Memory, Interpretations* (2012). Kivimäki is currently leading the 'Lived Nations' research team at the Academy of Finland Centre of Excellence in the History of Experiences (HEX). His own research in the team is focused on the history of nation-state violence.

Kyrre Kverndokk is Professor of Cultural Studies at the Department of Archaeology, History, Cultural Studies and Religion at the University of Bergen, Norway. He has published on the practice and politics of Second World War memory, the history of folklore studies and the cultural history of natural disasters. He is currently leading the research project 'The Future Is Now: Temporality and Exemplarity in Climate Change Discourse'.

Jonas Liliequist is Professor Emeritus of History at Umeå University, Sweden. His work focuses on the cultural history of violence, sexuality and emotions in the early modern period. He has edited books on the history of emotions, laughter and gender. Currently he is writing a book about the legal prosecution of verbal and violent assaults towards parents in early modern Sweden and Finland.

Christina Lutter is Professor in the History Department, University of Vienna, Member of the Austrian Academy of Sciences and PI of the project 'Social and Cultural Communities across Monastic, Urban, and Courtly Cultures in Central Europe'. She holds a PhD from the University of Vienna (1998), and her habilitation in 2005 won, among other prizes, the 2006 *Preis des Verbandes der Historikerinnen und Historiker Deutschlands*. Her research interests cover medieval and early modern cultural and gender history, especially visions and practices of community, representations of emotions, religious reform movements in medieval and early modern Europe and comparative history. Her recent books include *Kulturgeschichte der Überlieferung im Mittelalter. Quellen und Methoden zur Geschichte Mittel- und Südosteuropa*, with E. Gruber and O. Schmitt (2017).

Tomás A. Mantecón is a Full Professor of Early Modern Social and Cultural History at the University of Cantabria (Spain), Visiting Member of Darwin College in Cambridge (1995, 1996), Guest Lecturer at Rotterdam (1997), Invited Researcher at Naples (2008) and Paris (2015) and Guest Professor at l'E.H.E.S.S. His main interests are the history of violence, justice and social control. He is the author of 137 scientific publications in Spanish, English, Italian and French. His books (in Spanish) include *Counter-Reformation and Popular Religion in Cantabria* (1990), *The Death of Antonia Isabel Sánchez: Tyranny and Scandal in a Rural Community of Northern Spain* (1998; also published in Italian in Verona, 2014) and *Spain in Enlightenment Times* (2014). One of his latest publications is the chapter 'Justice and the Confines of the Law in Early Modern Spain' in the book *The Uses of Justice in Global Perspective* (2019).

Giuseppe Marcocci is an Associate Professor in Iberian History (European and Extra-European, 1450–1800) at the University of Oxford and a Fellow at Exeter College. His main research interests lie at the intersection of political and cultural history of early modern Spain, Portugal and their global empires. However, his approach to the Iberian world is broad and cross-cultural, as is shown by the volume (co-edited with Lucio Biasiori) *Machiavelli, Islam and the East: Reorienting the Foundation of Modern Political Thought* (2018) and his forthcoming book *The Globe on Paper: How Renaissance Historians Learnt to Write the History of the World*.

Asko Nivala is an Adjunct Professor of the Cultural History of Nineteenth-Century Romanticism. He works as a researcher at the University of Turku. His project 'Romantic Cartographies: Lived and Imagined Space in English and German Romantic Texts, 1790–1840' studies spatiality in English and German Romanticism and is funded by the Turku Institute for Advanced Studies (2017–2019) and the Academy of Finland (2019–2022). In 2015, Nivala defended his doctoral dissertation on Friedrich Schlegel's philosophy of history. In addition to many articles, Nivala has published a monograph *The Romantic Idea of the Golden Age in Friedrich Schlegel's Philosophy of History* (2017).

Marianne O'Doherty is Associate Professor in English at the University of Southampton. She has published on medieval forms of spatial representation: maps; travel writing; cosmography; geography. Her recent research has focused on medieval Latin versions of *The Book of Sir John Mandeville* and their transformation in the Renaissance, including in Richard Hakluyt's *Principall Navigations* (1589), medieval pilgrimage books, maps and texts. She has worked on the Digital Humanities Pelagios project 'Understanding the Places of the Past through the Documents That Refer to Them' as named researcher (AHRC Digital Transformations project, 2014–2015), as interim PI on the Mellon-funded Pelagios 3 project (2016) and as Special Interest Group Coordinator for the Mellon-funded Pelagios Commons initiative (Pelagios 6). She has edited a range of publications related to medieval travel, mobility, exploration and spatial representation.

Johannes Pahlitzsch is Professor for Byzantine Studies at the University of Mainz. He wrote a monograph on the history of the Greek Orthodox patriarchate of Jerusalem in the crusader period, is co-editor of *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Historical Bibliography* and published the edition and commentary of the Arabic translation of the Byzantine lawbook *Procheiros Nomos*. He is the author of numerous articles on Oriental Christians under Muslim rule in the Middle Ages and the relations between Byzantium and the Islamic world. He has been awarded fellowships at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton and Dumbarton Oaks, and was Visiting Scholar at Wolfson College, Oxford. He is a member of the board of the Leibniz Science Campus Mainz 'Byzantium between Orient and Occident' and spokesman for the Research Training Group 2304, 'Byzantium and the Euro-Mediterranean Cultures of War: Exchange, Differentiation and Reception'.

Jared Poley is Professor of History at Georgia State University. He is the author of the books *Decolonization in Germany: Weimar Narratives of Colonial Loss and Foreign Occupation* (2005) and *The Devil's Riches: A Modern History of Greed* (2016) and a co-editor of the collections *Conversion and the Politics of Religion in Early Modern Germany* (2012), *Kinship, Community, and Self* (2015), *Migrations in the German Lands, 1500–2000* (2016) and *Money in the German-Speaking Lands* (2017). He is currently working on a history of gambling in nineteenth-century Europe.

Jörg Rogge is Academic Director and Adjunct Professor of History, Middle Ages, at the University of Mainz. His main research interests are the methods and theories of cultural history and the social, military and cultural history of urban and noble societies. He has published on German imperial cities, European high nobility and kings as well as on the methods of cultural history. His publications include the edited collections *Cultural History in Europe: Institutions − Themes − Perspectives* (2011) and *Killing and Being Killed: Bodies in Battle − Perspectives on Fighters in the Middle Ages* (2017). Since 2010 he has been a full member of the philosophical and cultural-historical class of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salzburg). From March to June 2012 he was Fellow at the International Research Center for Cultural Studies (IFK) in Vienna. Currently he is the chair of the International Society for Cultural History.

Linnéa Rowlatt is the Research Coordinator for the International Network for Training, Education, and Research on Culture, based in Ottawa. Her work as an environmental historian focuses on climate history, cultural history and historical anthropology. She has written on the role of climate in early modern society and culture, including the cultural changes introduced by the Protestant Reform. Most recently, she is working with Indigenous communities to explore differences in matrilineal views of nature. In this area, she is currently editing with Marie-Françoise Guédon a book presenting 13 distinct matricultures from around the world.

Willemijn Ruberg is Associate Professor of Cultural History at Utrecht University. Her research interests include the modern history of gender, sexuality and the body as well as the history of forensic medicine and psychiatry in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In 2019 she published the book *History of the Body* as part of the Macmillan International/Red Globe Press's series on Theory and History. In 2017 she received an ERC Consolidator grant for a research project that she is currently leading; the project (running from 2018 to 2023) studies the forensic cultures of four European countries (Russia, Spain, England, the Netherlands) in the period 1930–2000.

Hannu Salmi is Professor of Cultural History at the University of Turku, Finland, and was nominated Academy Professor for the years 2017–2021. His research interests focus on the cultural history of the nineteenth century, media and music history, the history of technology and the history of emotions and the senses. He is also the founding member of the Turku Group for Digital History. He is the author of many books, including *Nineteenth-Century Europe: A Cultural History* (2008), and the editor of *Catastrophe, Gender and Urban Experience, 1648–1920* (with Deborah Simonton, 2017) and *Travelling Notions of*

Culture in Early Nineteenth-Century Europe (with Asko Nivala and Jukka Sarjala, 2016). He was the first chair of the International Society for Cultural History from 2008 to 2013.

Raffaella Sarti teaches early modern history and gender history at the University of Urbino, Italy. She has also worked in Paris, Vienna, Bologna and Murcia. Her studies address the family and material culture; domestic service and care work; Mediterranean slavery; marriage and celibacy; gender and the nation; masculinity; and graffiti. She is the author of approximately 150 publications in nine languages, including *Europe at Home: Family and Material Culture 1500–1800* (2002) and *Servo e padrone, o della (in)dipendenza: un percorso da Aristotele ai nostri giorni* (2015). For more details see www.uniurb.it/it/cdocs/CVPROF/cv-docente_100580.pdf and www.uniurb.it/sarti.

Dominik Schuh finished his studies in history and German literature at the University of Mainz in 2011. From October 2011 to December 2012 he worked as a research assistant at the Research Unit Historical Cultural Sciences in Mainz and began working on his doctoral thesis on lay masculinities in the later Middle Ages. Since January 2013 he has worked at the University Library Mainz on the project 'Academic Integrity', funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF). Since October 2018 he has been assistant of the Vice-President for Learning and Teaching at the University of Mainz. His main topics of practice and research include: gender history (history of masculinities), history of chivalry, historical cultural sciences, information literacy, questions of academic integrity and scientific misconduct and teaching of fundamental methods of scientific working.

Pelle Snickars is Professor of Media and Communication Studies – a chair directed towards the digital humanities – at Umeå University, Sweden, where he is also affiliated with the digital humanities hub, Humlab. His research is situated at the intersection between media studies, media history and the digital humanities. Snickars is currently (since 2019) in charge of two major research projects: 'Welfare State Analytics: Text Mining and Modeling Swedish Politics, Media and Culture, 1945–1989' and 'Digital Models: Techno-Historical Collections, Digital Humanities and Narratives of Industrialisation'. At present Snickars is also finishing a book manuscript on the media history of the cultural heritage sector.

Peter N. Stearns is Professor of History at George Mason University. He has written widely in the field of world history, with books on themes such as childhood and globalization. His research has focused on modern social and cultural history in Europe and the United States, with a strong recent interest in emotional patterns. He has published widely in the growing field of emotions history, with books on the histories of emotions like grief and fear. He also works on the nature of history learning.

Marek Tamm is Professor of Cultural History at the School of Humanities at Tallinn University and Head of the Tallinn University Centre of Excellence in Intercultural Studies. His primary research fields are the cultural history of medieval Europe, the theory and history of historiography and cultural memory studies. He has recently

published *Rethinking Historical Time: New Approaches to Presentism* (ed. with Laurent Olivier, 2019), *Debating New Approaches to History* (ed. with Peter Burke, 2018) and an edited volume, *Afterlife of Events: Perspectives on Mnemohistory* (2015).

Kirsi Tuohela is a cultural historian working as a university lecturer at the University of Turku. She has focused on the cultural history of the North and written about the history of women's writing, the cultural history of psychiatry, madness and melancholia. Her PhD research analysed women's autobiographical texts on melancholia in late nineteenth-century Scandinavia. Lately she has been involved in two research projects, one of them focusing on the written madness – mental illness in Finnish (and Nordic) autobiographies and novels. The other focuses on the 'inner child' in Finnish autobiographical literature, and how the psychic and its roots are narrated as part of one's inner life and subjectivity.

Gabriel Zeilinger studied History and Scandinavian Philology in Kiel and Oslo and was a research associate at Kiel and Greifswald Universities. After terms as Visiting Professor in Heidelberg and Hagen, he is currently Lecturer in Mediaeval Economic and Social History at the University of Kiel, and also a Fellow of the German Maritime Museum at Bremerhaven. His fields of research cover urban history, warfare and disasters in the Middle Ages. His most recent book is *Verhandelte Stadt. Herrschaft und Gemeinde in der frühen Urbanisierung des Oberelsass vom 12. bis 14. Jahrhundert* (2018).

Dhan Zunino Singh is a CONICET Associate Researcher at the National University of Quilmes, Argentina. He is associate editor of the *Journal of Transport History* and vice-president of the T2M (international association of mobility historians). He works on the history of culture, cities and mobilities, looking at the production of urban infrastructures as well as the daily experience of travelling. He has worked on urban mobility in Buenos Aires in the early twentieth century and the transnational history of the underground railways. He has recently edited a volume about keywords in mobilities studies in Latin America.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Alessandro Arcangeli, Jörg Rogge and Hannu Salmi

Cultural history is today established as a respected branch of history.[1] The perspective into the past afforded through the lens of culture has been enrooted in the hermeneutic toolbox of historians of all epochs. A large selection of publications of various types demonstrates this centrality: from collections of important articles[2] and edited volumes taking a specific perspective of cultures in general or those enquiring into specific aspects of culture[3] to case studies.[4] Meanwhile, the interested reader can approach the field of cultural history by accessing introductions, which concentrate more on the theories and methods of cultural history,[5] or by exploring regions and states or epochs.[6]

Aside from the subject matter and topics of research, cultural history has always reflected on its methodological and theoretical premises. Most cultural historians would subscribe to the idea that the choice of focus and method determines the outcome of the research. One of the features of cultural history is its claim to reflect on its own activity – the research concepts, topics and fields – and its track record of doing so. We have to take into consideration that we as historians are influenced by our current social and cultural circumstances.[7]

Therefore, it is part of the state of the art of cultural history today to discuss the history of cultural history and its theoretical and methodological influences as well as current themes and issues.[8] One consequence is that cultural historians consider themselves not just as distanced observers, who are able to write about the past 'as it was': they acknowledge their interest in bringing the past back into our own time, constructing the past with the eyes of our present age. We can hardly escape our norms, prejudices and personal attitudes, even if we try to do this by the use of methodological and theoretical tools.

Cultural history is in more than one respect an interdisciplinary and collaborative effort. On the one hand, a cultural historian has to equip him- or herself with knowledge from different disciplines in the humanities such as anthropology and ethnology. On the other hand, he or she has to rely on the work of colleagues with expertise in other fields and epochs of history. However, if cultural historians want to tackle overall themes or topics – for example, the shaping of Western identities from

the Middle Ages to modern times – then they have to cooperate with colleagues from a wide range of research areas. The editors of this volume are an example of the productivity of such an approach, because they have developed the book project in their additional capacity as members of the committee of the International Society for Cultural History (ISCH).[9]

The present book is an attempt to show how considerations of methods and theories have influenced current research in the field of cultural history. The authors of this volume emphasize that the experiences people have contribute to their behaviour and are the basis for their interpretation of the world. People are linked together and with their environment by social practices and various forms of communication. In the process, they generate interpretations and give their living world meaning.

Culture and cultural history are highly problematic terms to define. They have accompanied and marked very different ways of doing history over the past century and a half. Surely the so-called *new cultural history* that emerged in various academic contexts and linguistic domains from the 1970s and 1980s has departed sharply from a narrow understanding of culture typical of previous historical traditions and has adopted a broader meaning, significantly influenced by anthropology. In the present volume, we have rather followed a bottom-up approach to the question of definitions. The individual contributors were not given a prefabricated set of concepts, or a precise indication of the territory they were to map and the tools they were supposed to use on the task. The editors had described the expected contents in short abstracts of the planned chapters, in order to orientate the volume towards an effective and engaging coverage of a wide expanse of topics and problems. In the end, the plan underwent some adjustments, authors brought in their own expertise and tastes in reshaping their assignment and the notion of culture and cultural history that emerges from the reading of the whole book is the product of interactions between a variety of academic habits and research paths.

What is the result of this polyphony, this flash-mob experience of writing? Some threads and leitmotifs are recognizable, thus offering that bottom-up approach to the definition of the field.

With this volume, we never intended to achieve the comprehensiveness characteristic of a textbook. It is certainly our hope that it may serve, among other purposes, as a wide-ranging illustration of the potentials of cultural history as a way of studying the past in a variety of times, spaces and aspects of human experience, for the use of students, as well as scholars and general readers. Nevertheless, such illustration could only aspire to offer a selection of potential – and actual – areas of research. Whenever desirable and possible, we identified some subject foci and followed their metamorphoses throughout the examined periods. In other cases, a theme emerged as being more relevant to a particular period. Throughout the volume, the reader will have the opportunity to follow some threads, and find aspects of past life structures and experiences that have been highlighted as particularly interesting and examined in their historical dynamics, in the customary dialectics between continuity and change: from the way people made sense of the world to material cultures of living, mobility, cultural exchange and transfer, power and conflict, emotion and communication.

In general, we aimed at striking a balance between the wider generalizations that may assist us in imagining key trends in the past, and the in-depth analysis allowed by the examining of case studies. However, this balance itself is one of the many characteristics that each chapter may to some extent develop in its own way – so the reader will find more theoretical reflection in some places, and more empirical work elsewhere. As a general rule, we avoided a concentration on one cultural area only in any one chapter. The chronological breadth of the contributions also varies: while some concentrate on narrower periods that appear to offer a significant opportunity to map key phenomena and major developments, others engage in overarching long-term views.

Historiography – the history of history writing – is always part of what historians do, and cultural historians may have additional reasons to pay attention to the ways in which their problems had been previously formulated and the answers they had obtained. Such a preoccupation notwithstanding, this book is not predominantly about what historians have already said; a historiographical survey and dialogue with past and current scholarship is likely to appear in most chapters, but it will not predominate.

Cultural history is not easily (or, for many, desirably) identifiable with a specific method or set of research tools. Some approaches have characterized particular phases and research orientations within the discipline: from historical anthropology, to the emphasis on representations, to the rise of constructivism – the idea that many aspects of reality, not only those obviously cultural but also those appearing as social or natural, are the result of some process of production.[10] The essays collected here exemplify a variety of methods: the subject matter, combined with the specific style and taste of the given author, will, each time, offer the reader the opportunity to explore an archive, to apply a comparative approach, to enter into textual analysis, or otherwise to concentrate on the material and sensual experience of the past.

Every history has temporal and spatial boundaries. The title of the book at hand, *The Routledge Companion to Cultural History in the Western World*, refers to both of these axes. Our presentation starts from the thirteenth century, which has been seen as the century of early urbanization in Europe, the infectious intellectual activity at the universities and the rise of vernacular languages and literatures. The dominance of the Christian Church was characterized by the rivalry between Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy, on the one hand, but also by the birth of many religious communities and orders, and thus ways of life, on the other. Furthermore, the emergence of nation states can be traced down to this era, although the sense of belonging to particular regions had longer roots in the past and of course would become even more influential during the centuries to come.

In his article 'The Cultural Logic of Historical Periodization', Peter Toohey has pointed out the seductiveness of periodization. It is comforting to draw on periodization; in 'regularizing, packaging and calibrating the apparent disorder of historical record, positing chronological or intellectual blocks, it creates a type of order'.[11] Evidently, periodization can be deceptive, since it is not a neutral process. But simultaneously, as a counter-argument, its very nature as an act of interpretation is its strength. The historian's work involves the idea of interpreting the past and organizing it in temporal blocks. Once it has been organized, it can again be criticized and possibly

rearranged to emphasize new perspectives. We have chosen a rather conventional composition for the book by dividing it into three chronological parts. The first part begins in the middle of the thirteenth century, on the grounds summarized above, and ends around 1500, where the second part commences. The early signs of modernity, including such features as the consolidation of the printing press as a proponent of culture, increasing movements of texts[12] and the changing of reading habits towards more extensive practices of adopting and digesting knowledge,[13] are usually associated with this era. The period also includes the encounter with the New World, and the significant cultural, social and biological exchange that commenced at the turn of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Intellectually, the second part extends from the fifteenth-century humanism to the birth of the movement that became known as the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century. The third part of the book begins from the 1750s, at the time of emerging industrial production, scientific work and rising social turmoil, and extends to the present day. As the chapters will show, there are always multiple rhythms in history. This means that the chapters will move rather freely in time and encompass larger cultural developments.

This book, as its title suggests, also evokes spatial ramifications, since it concentrates on the cultural history of 'the Western world'. Our idea of 'Western' is more inclusive than exclusive. Already the very idea is defined by its outside, by what is 'non-Western', and goes beyond geographical boundaries. Therefore, all chapters in this book aim at wide geographical coverage, rather than concentrating on narrow and specialized topics. Our notion of the West is a flexible one, in full appreciation of the changing boundaries and connotations that have characterized such a cultural conception, and also of its continuous contacts and exchanges with other areas and cultures, near and far away, which contributed to its reshaping and redefinition through time. This book draws mainly on European and American examples, but it devotes continuous attention to global connections and to the emerging trend of globalization that occurred throughout the period under scrutiny. Many of the chapters in this volume deal with identities, emotions and forms of sociability. At the same time, we hope, it offers a panorama of the transformation of Western identities and the critical ramifications of that evolution from the Middle Ages to the twenty-first century.

Notes

1 For the debate between the protagonists of cultural history and social history in Germany, see J. Rogge, 'Narratologie interdisziplinär: Überlegungen zur Methode und Heuristik des historischen Erzählens', in M. Unseld and L. Oberhaus (eds), *Musikpädagogik der Musikgeschichte*, Münster: Waxmann Verlag, 2016, 15–27; for the development in other European countries, see, for example, J. Rogge (ed.), *Cultural History in Europe: Institutions – Themes – Perspectives*, Bielefeld: transcript, 2011.

2 P. McCaffery and B. Marsden (eds), *The Cultural History Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, 2014.

3 A. Classen (ed.), *Handbook of Medieval Culture*, 3 vols, New York: de Gruyter, 2015; H.-E. Lessing, *Das Fahrrad: Eine Kulturgeschichte*, Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2017; P. Poirrier (ed.), *Histoire de la culture scientifique en France: Institutions et acteurs*, Dijon: Éditions universitaires de Dijon, 2016.

4 For example, memory studies and history of emotions are two very productive fields of research: B. Wagoner (ed.), *Handbook of Memory and Culture*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018; H. Aali, A.-L. Perämäki and C. Sarti (eds), *Memory Boxes: An Experimental Approach to Cultural Transfer in History, 1500–2000*, Bielefeld: transcript, 2014; E. Brenner (ed.), *Memory and Commemoration in Medieval Culture*, Farnham: Ashgate, 2013; E. Sullivan and M. L. Herzfeld-Schild (eds), 'Emotions, History and the Arts', *Cultural History* 7, 2018, 117–238; S. Broomhall, J. Davidson and A. Lynch (eds), *A Cultural History of the Emotions*, 6 vols, London: Bloomsbury, 2019; L. Minou and T. Macsotay (eds), 'Suffering, Visuality, and Emotions', *Cultural History* 8, 2019, 1–119.

5 P. Burke, *What Is Cultural History?*, Cambridge: Polity, 2005; A. Green, *Cultural History*, Houndmills: Palgrave, 2008; P. Poirrier (ed.), *L'histoire culturelle: Un tournant mondial de l'historiographie?*, Dijon: Éditions universitaires de Dijon, 2008: P. Ory, *La culture comme aventure: Treize exercices d'histoire culturelle*, Paris: Complexe, 2008; A. Arcangeli, *Cultural History: A Concise Introduction*, London and New York: Routledge, 2012; A. Landwehr, *Kulturgeschichte*, Stuttgart: Ulmer, 2009; M. Maurer, *Kulturgeschichte: Eine Einführung*, Cologne: Böhlau, 2008.

6 H. Salmi, *Nineteenth-Century Europe: A Cultural History*, Cambridge: Polity, 2008; K. Brunner, *Kleine Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters*, München: Beck, 2012; A. Grabner-Haider, K. Davidowicz and K. Prenner (eds), *Kulturgeschichte der Frühen Neuzeit, 1500 bis 1800*, Göttingen: VuR, 2018.

7 P. Burke, 'Strengths and Weaknesses of Cultural History', *Cultural History* 1, 2012, 1–13.

8 S. Handley, R. MacWilliam and L. Noakes (eds), *New Directions in Social and Cultural History*, London: Bloomsbury, 2018; C. von Braun, *Blutsbande: Verwandtschaft als Kulturgeschichte*, Berlin: Aufbau, 2018.

9 They have been or are the chairs of the ISCH: www.culthist.net.

10 Burke, *What Is Cultural History?*

11 P. Toohey, 'The Cultural Logic of Historical Periodization', in G. Delanty and E. F. Isin (eds), *Handbook of Historical Sociology*, London: Sage, 2003, 209.

12 K. Asdal and H. Jordheim, 'Texts on the Move: Textuality and Historicity Revisited', *History and Theory* 57, 1, 2018, 56–74.

13 The idea of extensive, in contrast to intensive, reading refers to Rolf Engelsing's studies on eighteenth-century literary culture: see R. Engelsing, *Bürger als Leser*, Stuttgart: Metzler, 1974. On Engelsing's ideas, see also G. Reuveni, *Reading Germany: Literature and Consumer Culture in Germany Before 1933*, New York: Berghahn, 2006, 6–7.

PART 1

Shaping Western identities, 1250–1500

INTRODUCTION

Jörg Rogge

In accordance with the general methodological development in cultural history, research on the Middle Ages also stresses the importance of narratives and narrative patterns in the written record. The focus is no longer on the question of whether a reported incident was true in a positivistic sense. Instead, the cultural historians of this period are more interested in how people wrote about their experiences.[1] The manner in which they recounted or recorded events and behaviour was a contribution to the process of world shaping and expressing of values and beliefs within a society. With the focus on the narrative strategies or dominant patterns of argumentation, we can get an insight into the value system and guiding concepts for proper behaviour in a given society.[2] Another fruitful perspective and attempt to understand the cultures of the Middle Ages better is the research on rituals and gestures; perhaps the most important form of communication in our period. Rituals not only reflect the norms and values of a culture, but are also used by contemporaries as a means to create meaning in social or political spaces.[3]

These research fields help to show that people in medieval Europe developed norms, ideas and values which contributed to the shaping of their identities. Some chapters in this part of the book describe and analyse what kind of influence political rituals, travelling and encounters with other cultures had on the shaping of a Western identity proper. Other chapters show how people expressed their emotions, and their understanding of themselves, their bodies and their world, as well as their experience of otherness. All this takes place – as the chapters demonstrate – in political settings, social spaces and material frames like courts, cities, villages, churches, monasteries and frontiers. Contemporaries tried to explain the world by creating a web of meanings that offered orientation in the world and helped them to develop and shape diverse forms of expression of Western identities. In sum, the chapters cover a wide range of recent and important research on the cultures from the High Middle Ages to 1500. In what follows, I will stress and highlight some aspects of the chapters in the first part of the Companion. All chapters argue that the Middle Ages, like our modern world, were characterized by different and sometimes contradictory voices or discourses; in other words, by different cultures.

Concerning politics, there has been a major change in resent research as the focus is more on the decipherment of the symbolic meaning of political actions; we have envisaged the establishment of a cultural history of politics. This is demonstrated in this section of the volume by the chapters (Arlinghaus, Kamp) that deal with the importance of rituals for the creation of (political) order, (social) status and hierarchies (honour). Rituals are considered to be part of the practices of communication in and between individuals and groups in medieval societies, like other forms of communication (writing, gestures).[4] It is argued here (Arlinghaus) that in pre-modern times the social aspect of communication was more important than the information itself, because the culture insists on the co-presence of actors. Valuing the written documents as materializations of immaterial interaction and communication has opened new perspectives for the understanding of medieval cultures (Hirschbiegel and Zeilinger). Even for the regulation of conflicts, communication played an important role, because in the late Middle Ages kings and other juridical authorities had to work with their nobles and/or subjects to enforce their laws and jurisdiction.[5] The research shows that in most European realms there was an amalgamation of 'private' power and 'public' authority (Armstrong).

Princely and noble courts were important centres for communication and networks of relations. Like the town halls in the cities, they were important for the functioning of face-to-face societies. However, they did not pre-exist but were socially constructed by the interaction of location, objects and actors (Hirschbiegel and Zeilinger). Courts and towns also functioned as catalysts for the development of identities or medieval personhood, which was not an innovation of the Renaissance (Lutter). Moreover, research on the concepts and categories used by medieval people to make sense of their subjectivity has shown that they have always expressed their personalism within different groups (Tamm). This is a form of identity that differs from our modern understanding of individualism. However, the chapters in this section highlight that there was even a medieval form of personality and understanding of oneself at all.

In current research the study of emotions starts with the assumption that we can see the performance of an emotion as a cultural construct (Cohen). The importance of emotions has been stressed and it has become clear that it is not only necessary but also possible to consider the manner in which emotions influenced the creation and stability of social groups of different kinds (couples, families, associations) and cultures as well.[6] Love, for example, was a core emotion, which could be an intimate emotion in the context of religious belief (compassion) as well as a public expression of juridical settlement (Cohen). Moreover, emotions were used as means of communication in the political public sphere if, for example, a queen begged with tears in her eyes for the pardon of trespassers in front of her king.

Closely linked with the research on emotions is the work on medieval bodies, which often includes gender and sex. The questions that have guided and are guiding the research in this field range from whether there was a medieval body at all to whether it was a result of human experience and environmental influences. Again, we are able to describe body concepts of common (peasant), noble (chivalric) and religious (ecclesiastic) people in this case, to illustrate the plurality of medieval cultures (Schuh). On the basis of medieval discourses on medicine and fertility, it becomes

evident that during the Middle Ages much knowledge and scholarly opinion with regard to the human body and gender relations circulated in the towns, courts and universities, as well as in the quarters of soldiers and mercenaries.[7]

During the later Middle Ages people in Europe broadened their knowledge about other people and cultures by travelling. An important consequence of travelling was its potential to open up new perspectives on oneself and one's society and home culture (O'Doherty). Maps and travel accounts, used as gifts for high nobles, are also seen as being important objects for the representation of exclusive knowledge for the noble elite in Western Europe. Encounters with other cultures is shown to have been a frequent experience during the Middle Ages not only in Europe but in other parts of the world as well.[8] The research with regard to these cultural encounters has stimulated a debate about the terms, methods and heuristics that are most suitable for this kind of research. The consequences of the encounters as a form of cultural transfer or exchange are shown in this volume for Syria, Palestine and Egypt after the Muslim occupation (Pahlitzsch).

Notes

1 V. Nünning (ed.), *New Approaches to Narrative. Cognition – Culture – History*, Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2013.

2 J. Rogge (ed.), *Recounting Deviance. Forms and Practices of Presenting Divergent Behaviour in the Late Middle Ages and Early Modern Period*, Bielefeld: Transcript, 2016.

3 B. Stollberg-Rilinger, *Rituale*, Frankfurt, New York: Campus Verlag, 2013.

4 L. Ross, Communication in the Middle Ages, in: Albrecht Classen (ed.), *Handbook of Medieval Culture*, vol. 1, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 203–31.

5 C. Valente, *The Theory and Practice of Revolt in Medieval England*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003; M. Kintzinger, F. Rexroth, J. Rogge (eds), *Gewalt und Widerstand in der politischen Kultur des späten Mittelalters* (Vorträge und Forschungen LXXX), Ostfildern: Schwabenverlag, 2015.

6 S. Broomhall (ed.), *Gender and Emotions in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Destroying order, structuring disorder*, Aldershot: Ashgate 2015.

7 J.M. Bennett, R.M. Karras (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Women and Gender in Medieval Europe*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2013.

8 C. Holmes, N. Standen (eds), *Towards a Global Middle Ages* (Past and Present, vol. 238, Supplement 13), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

1

CULTURE OF POLITICS IN THE MIDDLE AGES

Rituals to create and confirm political order

Hermann Kamp

The people in the Middle Ages did not have a concept of rituals that corresponds to our modern understanding of the term. However, they had a sense for the extraordinary character of certain symbolic acts such as custom (*mos*), festivity (*solemnitas*) or rite (*ritus*). The belief of the binding character of what was demonstrated and said during such acts beyond the present time was inherent to rituals. The binding nature of these acts arose from the participants' claim to act as per tradition and thereby recreate it. Rituals were staged in public because this underlined the extraordinary and memorable character of the event and again increased the binding nature. The chapter shows how rituals stabilized and recreated the political order. Generally, rituals support the cohesion and self-assurance of societies and communities. Their primary function is to initiate and make visible a person or group of people transitioning into a new status. Certain recurring and combined symbolic acts indicate the change of status. At the same time, they display the religious, social and political order altered by this transition.[1] In cases where the intended alteration caused by these acts recedes into the background, and the acts themselves are performed to display the social order, symbolic acts become ceremonies.[2] This makes it difficult in specific cases to distinguish a ritual from a ceremony. In either case, a doubled power is inherent in rituals: they restore and confirm the social order and they provide a sense of meaning for it.[3]

   To what degree rituals can develop their power highly depends on the structure of the respective society. Generally, rituals served to alter the social order in societies with a lack of institutions and literacy, and to make this alteration visible.[4] Nonetheless, rituals did not lose their importance as the literacy rate increased and the political order was more and more institutionalized. This is particularly evident in European medieval history. During this time, the importance of rituals did not decrease; although, from the twelfth century onwards, written records were on the rise, and offices came to be increasingly structured.[5]

However, not only is the degree to which rituals can restore and shape social order subject to change; the form, meaning and practice of rituals also alter and adapt to their circumstances. Rituals consist of a permanent and almost unchangeable set of symbolic acts which ensure the outcome, but because of alterations and additions of symbolic acts as well as substitutions of symbolic acts, the appearance of rituals was changed and meaning added to them.[6] Therefore, rituals are historic phenomena, although the possibility to re-enact them is vital to them. The potential of change depends on the type of ritual. Religious rituals are fixed to a higher degree than those that perform and make social and political changes visible.

However, during the Middle Ages, it is not possible to strictly separate between religious, social and political rituals because the Church supported and the Christian religion legitimized political power. Because of this, religious rituals received political meaning, while political rituals developed in dependence on religious rituals at the same time.[7] Furthermore, rituals that structured the daily routine were vital to political communication.[8] However, some rituals were especially crucial to transfer and exercise power and can therefore be referred to as political rituals.[9] These include enthronements, inaugurations of dukes, bishops or aldermen, entries and the ruler's *adventus*, encounters between rulers, surrender and other rituals of reconciliation, homage, symbolic service or solemn oaths.

Such transitions indicate that rituals contain a fixed meaning, but do not necessarily deliver precise messages. They make statements on various levels about the relationship between the participants, their future responsibilities as well as shared moral concepts. However, this is done without specifying the rights or obligations to meet the future. In the Middle Ages, this was left to customs or sometimes to additional written records, but the ritual did not show it.[10] In view of this tendency to ambiguity, the question whether the meaning of rituals in past societies can be decoded gains weight. To achieve this, older works regarding the inauguration of kings consulted the regalia and especially the ordines of coronation, which contained instructions for the bishops concerning the arrangement of the king's consecration.[11] Although it is uncertain whether these instructions were used in specific coronation acts, they not only describe ritual acts, but also enlist several speeches and prayers that shed light on how these symbolic acts were perceived, at least by the clergy. On the other hand, historiography contains numerous descriptions of rituals by means of which historians tried to decode the meaning of certain rituals during the last decades.[12] However, this method led to the discussion of how valid statements based on historiographic accounts can be. In some cases, it became evident that the medieval authors did not provide a faithful account of the events, but merely recorded one of many possible interpretations to construct a meaning which suited their intended representation of the event.[13] This is intended as a word of caution regarding the interpretation of individual rituals, especially in cases where there is only a single record. However, historiography provides so many descriptions of certain rituals that they may serve as a basis to develop a model of the form, meaning and functions of rituals,[14] the more so as the late Middle Ages offer additional material such as minutes, letters or illustrated accounts that contribute to understanding of the course of events as well as the perception of rituals.

Although the Middle Ages did not have a concept of rituals that corresponds to our modern understanding of the term, medieval people had a sense for the extraordinary character of certain symbolic acts such as custom (*mos*), festivity (*solemnitas*) or rite (*ritus*).[15] The belief of the binding character of what was demonstrated and said during such acts beyond the present time was inherent to rituals.[16] The binding nature of these acts arose from the participants' claim to act as per tradition and thereby recreate it. Rituals were staged in public because this underlined the extraordinary and memorable character of the event and again increased the binding nature. In this respect, the peculiar meaning of their symbolic acts was recognized by the people in these centuries. The ways in which their rituals stabilized and recreated the political order shall be demonstrated below.

To create an aura of sacredness and sanctity

Undoubtedly, one of the most important political rituals was the inaugurations of kings. They were the political highlights as every new king marked the beginning of a new era, since time was measured by the king's years in power. Inaugurations structured the political order and appeared as rituals of inauguration;[17] at the same time, they were rituals of transition, especially since the anointing had developed into a traditional part of the consecration from the eighth century onwards,[18] although it took until the end of the ninth century before the anointing was an inherent part of the ritual. This development started in the Western Kingdom of the Franks[19] and slowly spread to the other Latin Christian realms. During the tenth century, it became a fixed custom in East Francia as well as in Anglo-Saxon England. One century later, this also applied to Poland and Hungary and in the twelfth century, anointing was part of the consecration in the Scandinavian realms and in Sicily, while in Spain it appeared as a fixed tradition only since the thirteenth century.[20]

Consecration was able to spread mainly because of the belief that it could compensate for a lack of legitimation and protect the kingship or the kingship of the descendants from other families or pretenders to the throne.[21] This ritual transformed the ruler into someone anointed by God. It proved his closeness to God and vested the new king with parts of priesthood.[22] Based on this, he received a mediating role between the clergy and the common people and was declared inexorably as the divine right of kings. Because of the newly gained aura of sacredness, the king distinguished himself clearly from other magnates and princes. The anointing changed him into a new person, as it is written in the Old Testament, and as Conrad II's biographer Wipo claims.[23] It was a ritual of transition par excellence.

The importance of creating an aura of the king's sacredness is not least demonstrated by arranging the ritual of inauguration while introducing the anointment, because handing over the regalia and inaugurating the new king were now part of the ecclesiastical consecration and thereby underlined the divine right of kings.[24] Simultaneously, it marginalized the election as part of the inauguration, especially in hereditary kingdoms such as France or England. Since around 1200, no French king had been inaugurated without anointment;[25] in England, the election was pushed back and deleted from the *ordines*.[26]

At the same time, there are indications that the anointing and coronation gradually lost their significance until they merely had a confirming role, because it was already certain at the birth of the new king that he was chosen by God und would sit on the throne one day. From 1270 onwards, this idea led to the practice whereby the prince was considered king immediately after his father's death. Thus, Edward I was declared king after Henry II's death in 1272, but because he was participating in a crusade at that time, he was anointed and crowned two years later at Westminster.[27] The consecration ceased to be a ritual of inauguration. This was not only true for England, but also for France, where Philip II had already held office as king for one year before he was anointed.[28] In the Holy Roman Empire, the consecration lost its significance as well. The Church reform contributed to this development by questioning the king's sacred position and denying the anointing's sacramental character. Furthermore, the Holy Roman kingship developed towards an elected kingship since the thirteenth century and was legitimized by a rule-governed procedure including a majority voting system. This process was brought to a close with the Golden Bull of 1356. It laid down that the newly elected king and emperor could exercise his rights immediately after the election. Therefore, the consecration in Aachen also lost its significance as a ritual of inauguration.[29] Nevertheless, the consecration did not lose its sacred meaning in the mentioned kingdoms and continued to be an essential element of the king's inauguration as it still demonstrated God's grace. The king was recognized as God's representative on earth and was thereby raised above all other princes.[30] Initially, the emperor had also been anointed by the pope in Rome from the mid-ninth century in the context of his coronation, and by the cardinal bishop of Ostia in the tenth century.[31] However, this merely had a confirming function and did not add to the ruler's sacred position since the emperors had usually already been anointed as kings.

Practices were different when queens were anointed. This tradition started in the ninth century in West Francia and spread to the other Latin realms during the tenth and eleventh centuries. The queen's anointing was closely connected to the coronation, bestowed her with sacred authority and raising her above the laypersons.[32] This practice was especially distinct in France, where the queen along with the king had the right to celebrate the Holy Communion in both forms.[33] In addition, the prayers recorded in the *ordines* concerning the queen's or empress' inauguration suggested the idea of her share in the king's reign, which was sacredly legitimized by the anointing.[34] The fact that the queen and the empress in Italy could exercise power even more so because of their coronation reveals that an inauguration and its rituals could have an impact on the political order in another manner: it bestowed authority, rights and property.

Bestowing authority, rights and property

Consecration was only one ritual during the investiture of a king. As with many other rituals of investiture, consecration took its meaning from the fact that it vested the king with his intended regal rank and the associated rights.[35] This was symbolized especially by handing over the regalia by means of which he received his *potestas*, his right to rule his reign.[36] The most common regalia were the sceptre, the crosier, the

sword, the crown, the coat and occasionally the orb.[37] The enthronement had the same function.[38] Although the ritual of handing over the regalia had lost its significance after the thirteenth century, obtaining them continued to be crucial for the assumption of power because they represented the right to rule, although it was not crucial for the regalia to be genuine.[39] For the new king, it was only important to obtain the central symbols to legitimize his future actions and to be able to execute power.[40]

Bishops, dukes or counts were vested with their authority with the help of symbolic actions as well. Since the Merovingian and Carolingian eras, handing over a crosier in return for an oath of loyalty was occasionally recorded in addition to the mere nomination of a candidate.[41] In the Holy Roman Empire, banners or lances with banners were used at rituals of inauguration of dukes and counts since the eleventh century. These objects primarily symbolized the offices' military character.[42] In places where dukes acted rather autonomously, such as in Bohemia or Carinthia, the inauguration usually contained additional elements symbolizing a close relation between the new duke and his land and subjects. In the High Middle Ages, the dukes of Bohemia were therefore seated on a throne during their inauguration in Prague.[43] In Carinthia, the duke acted in an elaborate ritual during which he had to wear peasants' clothes. He was received by a peasant at Kranburg Castle in front of the so-called *Fürstenstein*, which translates as 'stone of princes' and was an upside-down plinth. The duke would not be enthroned before promising the peasant that he would rule the land peacefully and according to the Christian spirit of justice.[44]

While bishops were appointed in writing in Late Antiquity, in the early Middle Ages the position was vested by the king handing over a staff (crosier) to the new bishop. This ritual is recorded since the ninth century, but was probably practised even before that time.[45] During the eleventh century, the Holy Roman kings started to hand over a ring in addition to the crosier and thereby equipped the bishop with the main insignia of their office.[46] Soon, the Church reformers condemned this practice as an inadmissible interference in the 'affairs' of the Church and disavowed it. This turned out to be one point at issue during the Investiture Controversy of the eleventh century. Once it was solved at the beginning of the twelfth century, the Holy Roman kings refrained from handing over the ring. The king's role in the investiture of bishops was restricted to handing over only the regalia, namely the sceptre, and receiving an oath of loyalty.[47] Sooner or later, rulers of other European kingdoms also relinquished symbolic acts that could be mistaken for a spiritual investiture.[48] Because of this, the consecration of a bishop being carried out by other bishops and allowing him to discharge his ecclesiastical duties regained its central meaning for the transmission of an episcopate, but lost its political significance.[49]

In the High Middle Ages, the emergence of the feudal system led to a solemn arrangement of the rituals for the investiture of counts or dukes because the offices developed an increasingly feudal character.[50] Therefore, the entrance into vassalage – which was performed by placing the hands into those of the lords and speaking an oath of fealty since the late Carolingian era – was connected to the investiture of the fief. For princely fiefs, it was common to use sceptres and lances with banners.[51] The latter, for example, applied when the duchy of Austria was granted to its first duke, who received the fief with two banners from Frederick Barbarossa.[52] This practice

was firmly established during the thirteenth century, but changed its character. The focus of interest was no longer the office, but receiving a fief directly from the king. Such fiefs did not merely transform the new office-holder into a duke, but a prince whose rank and rights were confirmed in this manner. However, in such cases, the exercising of regal rights was bound to rituals as well.

Whether it concerned kings, bishops or dukes, all of them were vested with their offices' rights, especially the *potestas* that granted them authority, by performing rituals of investiture. By changing a person's rank and status, these rituals ensured that the political order could be reproduced. This was especially crucial because the offices were granted for a lifetime. This might have been one factor that determined the significance of rituals for an investiture. At least, this impression is evoked by examining the inaugurations of aldermen or mayors in the later Middle Ages, which were elected every year or every second year. There were elements that resemble older rituals of inauguration as, for example, taking the aldermen's chairs in the town hall or the town council's benches in certain churches. However, the rituals primarily sought to represent the election as an open procedure and to express its advantages for the community of the city.[53]

The significance of rituals of investiture for the political order is also reflected in the accounts of divestitures. Since the offices were granted for a lifetime and the inherent rights had become part of the person itself because of the rituals, it did not seem to suffice to merely divest someone of his title. The symbolic language of a ritual was necessary to divest the person in question of his rank, rights and authority.[54] However, only a few cases are recorded. To divest someone, it was first necessary to capture the person. This was rarely successful. In other cases, the persons that were to be divested submitted themselves voluntarily. In this case, they would hand out the insignia of their authority as, for example, Tassilo of Bavaria resituated the duchy of Bavaria by handing over a staff to Charlemagne.[55] Another possibility was that the person appeared before the king in a penitential garment, submitted himself and consciously forwent the symbols of his former position.[56] However, some accounts of divestiture are recorded. The most famous case is the divestiture of Pope Formosus. His dead body was taken from his grave, placed on the throne in full regalia and then stripped of all papal regalia. Furthermore, the finger by which he had sworn his oath of office was cut off. In the end, he was placed onto the back of a donkey facing backwards and led through the streets of Rome to revoke his entrance to the city.[57] However, divestitures could also happen to kings that were still alive. John Balliol, who became king of Scotland in 1292, had to learn this after he rebelled against the English king Edward I, whom he had previously accepted as an overlord. In 1292, King John was captured after losing the battle. Edward I publicly stripped the royal regalia from John's coat and took the kingdom of Scotland under his charge.[58]

Establishing ties

Many rituals were of special importance for the stability of the political order, establishing, revising and supporting the ties between individual persons and individuals and collectives of all types and shapes. Frequently, this strength was gained by an oath or a vow which was part of many political rituals. Since the eleventh century and in

the context of his consecration, the Roman-German king had promised justice and peace for the Church and the people subordinated to him. Moreover, he pledged to give the bishops, abbots, counts and king's lieges the accounted honour.[59] The numerous oaths of fealty to be sworn when entering vassalage or later in a feudal relationship as part of the *Handgang*, or those that were vowed either to the king, a sovereign or a town lord within the framework of the act of a subject's homage, were more specifically related to single persons.[60] The bonding force of such oaths was frequently strengthened by the establishment of mutual obligations. Thus, the vassalistic oath of allegiance was associated with a promise of protection, the oath of fealty with the enfeoffment and, furthermore, the act of the homage of subject communities mostly took place after the respective rulers had formally accepted their privileges.[61] Essentially, these ties, which had been generated through more or less developed ritual acts, established the political order.

In addition, by participating in ritual acts, such ties were also created and renewed. At this point, the coronation can also serve as an illustrative example in several ways. On the one hand, the coronation tied all those present to the new king by means of the different forms of the acclamation. On the other, those who were also directly involved in the performance of the rituals were tied to the king. This applied to the archbishops, who carried out the anointing, as well as to the other ecclesiastical and secular magnates, who were involved in entrusting the insignia or the coronation, as was the case in England, France and Denmark.[62] Besides, it applied to those who attended the feast and who possibly took over specific ritual services there, like serving food and beverages.[63]

The indispensable ritual integration of all important political groups was carried out most clearly in the course of the so-called *adventus*, the late medieval entry of the kings, princes or bishops into their cities, which was, at least at their first encounter, accompanied by their homage.[64] The form of this political ritual had already been developed during Late Antiquity. By the time a ruler approached a city subordinated to him, the city's representatives came to meet him outside the city gates and were welcomed by him, surrounded by his entourage.[65] Thereafter, they would enter the city together in form of a procession, in which the most important groups of the city, including the clergy, participated also. Such entries, which had been carried out by the French and English kings since the High Middle Ages in Paris and London as part of their coronation and which, in terms of the imperial coronation in Rome, dated back to a much longer tradition,[66] played an important role in the late Middle Ages and took on a constitutive significance for the reign of the counts and dukes in the urbanized regions in Flanders and Brabant. Through the entries into the cities of their dominion at the beginning of their rule, said counts and dukes paid their respects to these cities. In doing so, they also confirmed the cities' rights and privileges.[67] The constitutive significance of these entries, legally as well as politically, can be seen with regard to the city government of Ghent, which asked the Duke of Burgundy, Philip the Good, after a failed uprising and a subjugation to him several times to re-establish and visualize the good understanding in the form of a public entry into the city, as the obvious dissent, the missing bond, entailed many disadvantages for the city.[68]

As the medieval political order was mainly kept together by personal relationships, the establishment or re-establishment of bonds was the pivot of rituals for conflict

resolution. This applied particularly after military conflicts and became highly evident during submissions carried out by the magnates and princes who had rebelled against the king. These *deditiones*, which had received a specific, Christian-shaped appeal since the late Carolingian time, aimed at ending a conflict instead of fighting to the bitter end, and played an important part in conflicts involving the king.[69] The arrangement implied that the rebel or rebels should show repentance and that they could reckon with the ruler's leniency in return. Ultimately, the appeal of this arrangement caught on with those who negotiated such a submission. However, the ritual acts essentially resembled each other. The rebels had to be dressed in a simple robe. Occasionally, they also had to appear barefooted and fall on their knees or to the floor in front of the ruler. Thus, they surrendered to his power. Afterwards, the ruler either lifted them up or allowed them to stand up. Now, he had to decide on the extent of punishment for the person in question. However, after such submission, the king was no longer able to sentence the former adversary to death. As the town and territorial lords increasingly made use of the *deditio* in order to settle their conflicts with their cities, it was the representatives of the city who had to be humiliated in front of the ruler.[70] At all times, submissions served as a means of reopening the lines of communication with the ruling authorities. Because of the *deditio*, the rebels were then able to establish direct relations and interactions with the ruler and his entourage. In addition, these rituals were used to reconcile a secular magnate and a bishop, an aristocratic lord and a prince, or an old and a new town council.[71]

Depending on the relationship of the conflicting parties with each other, the forms and rituals of the conflict resolution varied. In the case of foreign and coequal adversaries, the sworn peace treaty, which had been negotiated by envoys, testified under oath and put in place by the respective ruler, was a common feature.[72] Frequently, a personal peace agreement was concluded between the adversaries, which called for a sophisticated arrangement of the rituals that had to have been negotiated beforehand. However, a fixed pattern had quickly been developed in the Middle Ages which was adapted to the particularities on a case-by-case basis. These included approaching by foot, horse or boat, the handshake with the right hand, the embrace, the kiss of peace, the mutual serving of gifts and the common banquet as well as the oath, which was meant to permanently support the peaceful and friendly relationship represented by the respective acts.[73] Whereas the mutual attendance of the mass presumably merely played a minor role during the early Middle Ages, in the later centuries the shared Eucharist came to be a constitutive act in the process of building peace, which was therefore vested with a stronger religious integration.[74] Yet, the mutual and reciprocal performance of the rituals by the protagonists that bound them together and reorganized their relationships was crucial to the ritual's role of restoring order. The importance of this process of the peace agreement becomes apparent in light of the fact that, until the fifteenth century, one consistently urged a face-to-face encounter of the quarrelling parties despite logistical difficulties, to establish or confirm a good and friendly relationship.[75]

Another factor emphasizes the fundamental significance of the ritual in the peace-making process. The development of peace treaties, which increasingly defined the relationships between kings and their realms since the twelfth century,[76] obviously did not result in breaking with the habit of personal encounters.[77] Naturally,

this observation refers not only to peace treaties. Since the High Middle Ages, one had also proceeded in a number of other areas to fix the respective relationships in written form and in detail without abstaining from rituals, which therefore remained fundamental for the establishing of such a relationship. This can be seen in both the feudal relationships, which were frequently based on feudal contracts, and in the relationships between the princely lords and their cities, which were arranged by privileges, contracts of expiation and other statutes. Certainly, the rituals did not lose their importance in these areas, but were arranged even more lavishly than before.[78]

Even though performing rituals created new or renewed old bonds and visibly established consent, they themselves were the result of political, occasionally also military, conflicts and negotiations which made consensus possible. This consensus was then raised by ritual acts to become the normative guideline of future behaviour. With this, a further effect of the rituals has already been mentioned: they obliged those who were involved in them or who went through them to certain values through which not only their own role or position was justified but also the political order was legitimized.

The obligation to values and former role models

The force inherent in political rituals to oblige the protagonists to certain values arose primarily from the symbolic meaning of the objects and actions of which the rituals were composed. No less did the speeches, wordings, litanies and prayers delivered in the course of the ritual contribute to reveal the ethical meaning of the respective actions or symbols for the contemporaries.

The easiest way to identify this ethical dimension of the political ritual is to look at the king's inauguration act with its various ritual acts, and to take into account the abundance of *ordines* regarding the consecration of the ruler, which specified what the bishops had to say and to do during the rituals. Even ahead of the acclamation in the Church, the king had to promise to take a stand for the Church.[79] During the ritual of handing over the sword, the king declared to support the Church against its enemies. The new ruler was supposed to be a guarantor for Christendom who should, as recited during the handing over the sceptre and the staff, 'caress the devout and terrorize the impudent' and raise the supplicants.[80] At the same time, however, the new ruler had to pledge to reign justly and to look after the widows and orphans.[81] What was demanded from him at his inauguration was a full declaration of a Christian king's virtues, which had been renewed throughout the course of the Middle Ages at every inauguration of a new king. Consequently, the rulers opposed the Church and its representatives in individual cases, but could hardly flinch from the Christian ideas of reign. Yet, it is of course another question how far the kings acted strictly in accordance with these norms.

Other political rituals also referred to these virtues of a Christian king. Thus, the submission (*deditio*), which had developed since the ninth century, was an enactment of Christian clemency.[82] Since the submission did not lift the ruler's right to inflict punishment, it could also be used to display his sense of justice and penal power. This started to occur more frequently from the twelfth century onwards and could come to the fore regionally, as in the kingdom of Sicily.[83] Therefore, the virtues claimed

while carrying out the rituals cannot be reliant on the Christian theory of reign alone. Generosity, voluntary submission and a readiness to fulfil duties were repeatedly represented as exemplary behaviour by means of various political rituals. This happened, for instance, by way of symbolic services of the electors towards the king at the Imperial Diet[84] as well as by the strator service demanded by the popes from the emperors as a sign of recognition since the High Middle Ages.[85] This also applies to the service of bearing the sword of the king. It was often willingly accepted by foreign princes to receive the king's recognition by this honourable service.[86] Furthermore, such symbolic services aimed at honouring the person who was served, and in this way they ensured that honour, as a central value of society, was repeatedly maintained and substantiated.[87] Last but not least, the ritual exchange of gifts performed, for example, during encounters of rulers contributed to the circulation of honour as well.[88]

These different rituals reflect and confirm the fundamental ideals of the medieval society. But some rituals open up new ideals and therefore support their implementation. Thus, the knightly ideal, which had spread in Europe since the eleventh century, found its way into the ritual of the ruler's consecration. In France, the order of the rituals was changed so that handing over the sword was performed before the anointing and the coronation. In this way, the French king, who was donned with spurs, received some sort of accolade at the beginning of his inauguration.[89] In England, a ritual purgatory bath was introduced before the ruler's consecration, which was clearly inspired by the accolade.[90] In the fifteenth century, the new king of the Holy Roman Empire presented himself as a knight by knighting more than 100 aristocrats after his enthronement.[91] However, such changes should not obscure the fact that the political rituals tended to promote awareness of traditional values. The values claimed in the context of a coronation, a submission or an encounter of rulers in the early Middle Ages did not differ from those referred to in the late Middle Ages.

The political rituals did not only tie the present to traditional values; they also linked the respective current political order to historical or biblical examples. Thus, they created traditions that became normative. For example, the story of the prodigal son represented an important reference in the context of earlier submissions and legitimized the actions of the ruler by tying to the biblical example.[92] In the same way, the anointing explicitly committed the new king in the tradition of the Israelite kings David and Saul, and the queen to the Old Testament's role model of Esther.[93] The rituals also connected the historical past to its present. In the Holy Roman Empire, the enthronement of a new king on the supposed throne of Charlemagne formed an important ritual act bound by tradition, which placed the Empire and its rulers in the succession of the King of the Franks.[94] Similarly, the anointing with oil from the Holy Ampulla in France established a link between the new king and the Merovingian dynasty, as it was Clovis who had been baptized with this oil brought by a dove from heaven.[95] This memory was then kept alive at every coronation of a new king. Finally, the importance of creating traditions in this manner manifests itself in the connection of the rituals to the site from where the traditions were believed to have come. Aachen did not without reason develop from a former residence of Charlemagne into a permanent site for the king's anointing and coronation, as Reims did from the place of

Clovis' baptism. Thereby, both sites became an important element of the respective political order.[96]

Performing rituals evoked certain values, recalled the past and thereby addressed traditions. Thus, rituals did not only establish future obligation for those participating in them but also justified the political order created during the ritual act. Therefore, rituals appeared as a sort of preamble. The mentioned and symbolically expressed values displayed this effect even more since the political order was simultaneously represented in the ritual or in connection with the ritual act. Thereby, however, a further manner in which rituals influenced the political order comes into view.

Representing order

Even though political rituals initially appeared as performative acts, their political impact arose from their ability to display the political order in the participants' and spectators' minds as well. The rank and power structures were mirrored in the participants' actions, which demonstrated their relationships to each other, e.g. proximity and detachment as well as precedence, subordination or equality by their spatial positioning and their appearance. The ceremonial dimensions of the ritual acts were accompanied by particular ceremonial acts which aimed to represent the social and political order. The seating arrangements during the banquets, the welcoming ceremony before encounters of rulers or processions of citizens during the *adventus* of the ruler or the princely lord of the town conveyed particularly well an image of the respective order of rank and class.[97]

The great significance attributed to this function of the rituals by contemporaries is revealed in the written records. Many detailed descriptions of rituals in historiography are as much an indication as the illustrations in manuscripts. Especially the great differences in descriptions of the very same ritual show to what extent the role an individual played in the context of a ritual could say something about the individual's political significance. An example of this is the Visegradian chronicler, which describes the events at the *Hoftag* in Magdeburg in 1135, when the Holy Roman Emperor Lothair III entered an alliance with the Polish duke Boleslaw III and appointed him as his sword bearer, as if the Pole was humiliated and degraded to a semi-free servant, who was supposed to keep the path clear for the emperor. Moreover, the Polish duke was depicted as a culprit who had to sit opposite the emperor, whereas the Bohemian duke, his own lord, was allowed to sit at the right-hand side of the emperor.[98] For the very reason that rituals represented the balance of power, one had to adjust the respective image, if necessary.

Accordingly, it comes as no surprise that conflicts arose repeatedly concerning the involvement in rituals. Thus, two bishops fighting over the right for the anointing and coronation can be seen in England, in the developing kingdom of France and in the Holy Roman Empire in the decades during which the anointing had gradually been established.[99] Especially such fighting for particular interests indicates to what extent the visible participation in rituals influenced one person's own standing. This is even more relevant as rituals tended to perpetuate all that had been shown by the use of repetition. Therefore, since the twelfth century, the English bearers of certain offices at court, the earls and the barons, as well as the great lords who were

permitted to carry the insignia, let their rights be certified to be allowed to take part in the processions to Church.[100] This is similar to the way in which the electors in the Holy Roman Empire displayed their exclusive standing by having their so-called services of honour at the coronation feast defined by the Golden Bull. Such services of honour included saying grace, the services as a constable and the provision of a towel, a chalice and food.[101]

The events, which were rituals that served to change the existing balance of power, emphasize the fact that the image of the political order transported by rituals supported the order itself. In this respect, those acts representing hierarchies, such as occupying one's rightful seat and attending the procession, played a decisive role, since they frequently became the scene of usurpation attempts. If somebody had not been satisfied with his position within the hierarchy, he simply would have occupied his favoured seat to demonstrate his claims. This often led to violent conflicts as those who were deprived of their seat knew that relinquishing their former seat would result in a loss of honour and power.[102] Similarly, conflicts on the proper order arose repeatedly during municipal processions, because participating in the procession represented one's rank in the respective community.[103] Furthermore, processions in the cities were used to overthrow the old order by leading it away from the traditional course and by using new routes to demonstrate that the balance of power had shifted.[104]

Although the king's inauguration mirrors the political structures most sweepingly by representing the king as head, and the princes, councillors and office bearers who participated in the execution of power as limbs of the political order, other political rituals from the *adventus* and the grant of a fief to the submission also add to represent it. The fundamental relationship between the king and a magnate or a princely lord and his town was even represented by the sole granting of a fief or one public entry. Such acts conveyed how these relationships were supposed to be. Although arranged as exceptional as possible, the ritual act itself referred to all former granted fiefs or entries as well as to those that were still about to happen. Thereby, it provided the idea of the interdependencies established by such ritual acts.[105]

At both the *adventus* and the encounter of rulers, the ceremonial element played an important role from the very start. Even though the primary aim of these rituals was to establish new obligations between the protagonists, the participants used the various ritual acts to represent themselves in a good light and to express their own position either by the size of their entourage or by impressing their counterparts by means of gifts or feasts.[106] This tendency seemed to have become more important during the late Middle Ages. The entries, and especially the *Joyeuses Entrées* which had developed in Flanders and Brabant, aimed at involving all important political forces. This was true for both sides, as the princes would be accompanied by their court and the cities would not only be represented by their aldermen but also involve their brotherhoods, guilds and ecclesiastical communities to represent themselves as a whole.[107] At this point, the rituals elements which marked a transition overlapped with those ceremonial acts that primarily aimed at mirroring the political order as it should have been. In the late Middle Ages, this development affected almost all political rituals. Even the anointing and the coronation lost their status–altering character and were then predominantly used to display the divine order with the king as its secular head designated by God on one side, and the Church supporting the king and

being supported by him in return on the other.[108] Extravagant banquets with seating arrangements, services of honour which were rendered by princes, barons and counts, as well as processions and parades left their mark on the character of the rituals. The lavish feasts at the Burgundian court with fanciful banquet tableaux, which accompanied a wedding as much as the encounters with other rulers, raised the stakes of a tendency, which could also be found in other countries and realms.[109] However, not every potentate had to adhere to the growing ceremonial arrangement. Thus, the French king Louis XI intentionally behaved like a ruler to whom ceremonies and representation meant little.[110] Looking at the overall situation, the increasing ceremonialization of political rituals may be based on the growing social differentiation in terms of estates and ranks in the late Middle Ages.

Although rituals were occasionally disrupted to protest against them, they were essentially aimed at demonstrating the consensus of the participants.[111] In most cases, these demonstrations were successful since those being dissatisfied expressed their discontent by staying away. At the same time, the consensus, which had been documented in the ritual, was supposed to deter these people from questioning the newly established order. The picture and message of this consensus was proclaimed by the fact that everyone had apparently participated in the rituals.

All things considered, rituals influenced the political order in a variety of ways. Most political rituals had an impact on all levels, allowed individuals or groups of people to achieve a new status and new rights, created binding obligations, evoked fundamental values regarding both the new relations and the political order as a whole and reflected the balance of power. Their force, which became apparent by the fact that rituals were considered to be necessary for all fundamental changes, emerged from the combination of these different effects. Their impact on the political order meant that they were frequently the result of negotiations.

Accordingly, their influence was at the same time limited since rituals eventually only represented changes and relationships that had been developed previously because of other factors.[112] A submission mainly occurred if one side had emerged victorious from a military conflict. However, the political circumstances did not only determine the potential effectiveness of a single ritual. It was due to the rise of the princes and electors that the rituals of granting a fief in the Holy Roman Empire were arranged more lavishly at the end of the Middle Ages. The changing significance of the anointing in the Holy Roman Empire was a result not only of theological and canonical developments, but also of the common efforts of the king and the princes to increase the value of the election and to repel the claims of the papacy.

At least, the rituals remained limited in their effect at first glance because many of them only took place sporadically. Occasionally, the time between the coronations in the individual kingdoms ranged from 30 to 40 years. The ceremonial entries of the princely lords into their cities remained the exception. Besides, the submissions received by the kings or other princes can mostly be counted on the fingers of one hand. The encounters of rulers in the Carolingian period took place rather frequently, yet they were only regarded as sparse highlights in the kings' daily events of government during the following centuries. Also, the granting of fiefs was not carried out daily. As a result, political rituals remained something special. In this way, their power was restricted, but at the same time, an extraordinary aura was bestowed on them

due to which they gained a special impact, of which one frequently made use in the Middle Ages to renew, strengthen or change the political order.

Notes

1 Cf. G. Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale. Symbolik und Herrschaft im Mittelalter*, Darmstadt: Primus-Verlag, 2003, 10–14; S. Patzold, 'Wirkreichweite, Geltungsbereich, Forschungsperspektive: Zu den Grenzen des Rituals', in A. Büttner, A. Schmidt, P. Töbelmann (ed.), *Grenzen des Rituals. Wirkreichweiten – Geltungsbereiche – Forschungsperspektiven*, Köln: Böhlau, 2014, 350–2. On the various options of definition and their use in modern historiography see B. Stollberg-Rilinger, *Rituale*, Frankfurt: Campus-Verl., 2013, 7.

2 See K. Leyser, 'Ritual, Zeremonie und Gestik. Das ottonische Reich', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 27, 1993, 1–26, 2f., and B. Stollberg-Rilinger, 'Symbolische Kommunikation in der Vormoderne. Begriffe – Forschungsperspektiven – Thesen', *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung* 31, 2004, 489–527, 504. Regarding the development of political rituals in the late Middle Ages (see below, p. xx), it appears to be useful to differentiate more strongly between ritual and ceremony in terms of terminology.

3 See G. Althoff, 'Rituale als ordnungsstiftende Elemente', in W. Pohl (ed.), *Der Frühmittelalterliche Staat. Europäische Perspektiven*, Wien: Verl. der Österr. Akad. der Wiss., 2009, 391–8.

4 See Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale*, 21 and 31.

5 See ibid., 20 and Stollberg-Rilinger, *Rituale*, 233f.

6 See Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale*, 189ff. and more explicitly G. Althoff, 'Die Veränderbarkeit von Ritualen im Mittelalter', in ibid. (ed.), *Formen und Funktionen öffentlicher Kommunikation im Mittelalter*, Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2001, 157–76.

7 See S. Weinfurter, 'Die Welt der Rituale: Eine Einleitung', in C. Ambos, S. Hotz, G. Schwedler, S. Weinfurter (eds), *Die Welt der Rituale. Von der Antike bis heute*, Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 2006, 1f.

8 See H. Fuhrmann, '"Willkommen" und "Abschied". Über Begrüßungs- und Abschiedsrituale im Mittelalter', in W. Hartmann (ed.), *Mittelalter. Annäherungen an eine fremde Zeit*, Regensburg: Univ. Verl., 1993, 111–39; C. Garnier, *Die Kultur der Bitte. Herrschaft und Kommunikation im mittelalterlichen Reich*, Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 2008; G. Koziol, *Begging Pardon and Favor: Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France*, Ithaca, NY, London: Cornell Univ. Press, 1992.

9 See J.L. Nelson, 'Rituals of Power: By Way of Conclusion', in J.L. Nelson, F. Theuws (eds), *Rituals of Power: From Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, Leiden: Brill, 2000, 477–86, here 478 and 480, and Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale*, 199f.

10 See G. Althoff, 'Symbolic Communication and Medieval Order: Strength and Weakness of Ambiguous Signs', in W. Jezierski, L. Hermanson, H.J. Orning, T. Småberg (eds), *Rituals, Performatives, and Political Order in Northern Europe, c650–1300*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2015, 63–75, 68ff. and Koziol, *Begging Pardon and Favor*, 289f.

11 See esp. P.E. Schramm, *Geschichte des englischen Königtums im Lichte der Krönung*, Weimar: Böhlau, 1937; P.E. Schramm, *Der König von Frankreich. Das Wesen der Monarchie vom 9. zum 16. Jahrhundert*, 2 Bde., Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 1960, and the various contributions in J. Bak (ed.), *Coronations. Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Ritual*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, CA, Oxford: Univ. of California Press, 1990.

12 On the development of the historic research on rituals with lots of literature see most recently G. Schwedler, 'Ritual und Wissenschaft. Forschungsinteressen und

Methodenwandel in Mittelalter, Neuzeit und Zeitgeschichte', in A. Büttner, A. Schmidt, P. Töbelmann (eds), *Grenzen des Rituals. Wirkreichweiten − Geltungsbereiche − Forschungsperspektiven*, Köln, Wien: Böhlau, 2013, 229−68, esp. 253ff., and F. Rexroth, 'Rituale und Ritualismus in der historischen Mittelalterforschung. Eine Skizze', in H.W. Goetz, J. Jarnut (eds), *Mediävistik im 21. Jahrhundert, Stand und Perspektiven der internationalen und interdisziplinären Mittelalterforschung*, München: Fink, 2003, 391−406.

13 See P. Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual: Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory*, Princeton, NJ, Oxford: Princeton Univ. Press, 2001, 8−11, 21, 248. See also A. Büttner, 'Vom Text zum Ritual und zurück − Krönungsrituale in Quellen und Forschung', in A. Büttner, A. Schmidt, P. Töbelmann (eds), *Grenzen des Rituals. Wirkreichweiten − Geltungsbereiche − Forschungsperspektiven*, Köln, Weimar, Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 2014, 287−306, esp. 291ff. and Patzold, 'Wirkreichweite, Geltungsbereich, Forschungsperspektive', 353 and 355.

14 See Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale*, 187f. Thereby, the analysis of literary texts, which frequently reflect upon themselves regarding their representation of rituals, can prove to be extremely helpful. On this see esp. C. Witthöft, *Ritual und Text. Formen symbolischer Kommunikation in der Historiographie und Literatur des Spätmittelalters*, Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 2004.

15 See Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual*, 6, and Stollberg-Rilinger, *Rituale*, 15f. and 181.

16 See Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale*, 23f.

17 See J.L. Nelson, 'Inauguration Rituals', in ibid., *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe*, London: Hambledon, 1986, 283−307, first in P. Sawyer, I. Wood (eds), *Early Medieval Kingship*, Leeds: Univ. of Leeds, 1977, 50−71 and R. Giesey, 'Inaugurial Aspects of French Royal Ceremonials', in J. Bak (ed.), *Coronations: Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Ritual*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, CA, Oxford: Univ. of California Press, 1990, 35−45.

18 See J. Le Goff, 'A Coronation Program for the Age of Saint-Louis: The Ordo of 1250', in J. Bak (ed.), *Coronations. Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Ritual*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, CA, Oxford: Univ. of California Press, 1990, 46−57, 47f. and 52.

19 On this and on the following see R. Schieffer, 'Die Ausbreitung der Königssalbung im hochmittelalterlichen Europa', in M. Becher (ed.), *Die mittelalterliche Thronfolge im europäischen Vergleich*, Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2017, 43−79.

20 Most recently on Aragon see S. Péquignot, 'Die Krönung der aragonesischen Könige. Überlegungen zu Ergebnissen und Grenzen einer performanzorientierten Interpretation', in K. Oschema (ed.), *Die Performanz der Mächtigen: Rangordnung und Idoneität in höfischen Gesellschaften des späten Mittelalters*, Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2015, 165−93.

21 See Schieffer, 'Die Ausbreitung der Königssalbung', 78f.

22 See F.R. Erkens, *Herrschersakralität im Mittelalter. Von den Anfängen bis zum Investiturstreit*, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2006, and E. Boshof, *Königtum und Königsherrschaft im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*, München: Oldenbourg, 1993, 78f, 112f.

23 See 1. Samuel, 10,6, and Wipo, Gesta Conradi (MGH SSrG 61), ch. 3, 23.

24 See Boshof, *Königtum und Königsherrschaft*, 77 and 112f.

25 See Schramm, *Der König von Frankreich*, 110.

26 See Schramm, *Geschichte des englischen Königtums*, 78 and 164.

27 See ibid., 166f.

28 See ibid.; J. Rogge, '"Tum quia regalis unctio in anima quicquam non imprimit …" Zur Bedeutung von Königskrönungen und Königssalbungen in England und im römisch−deutschen Reich während des Spätmittelalters', in L. Pelizäus (ed.), *Wahl und Krönung in Zeiten des Umbruchs*, Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, 2008, 41−64, 46f.

29 See J. Rogge, *Die deutschen Könige im Mittelalter. Wahl und Krönung*, Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 2006, 109, and most recently F.R. Erkens, 'Thronfolge und Herrschersakralität in England, Frankreich und im Reich während des späteren Mittelalters: Aspekte einer Korrelation', in M. Becher (ed.), *Die mittelalterliche Thronfolge im europäischen Vergleich*, Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2017, 349–448, 400.

30 See Erkens, 'Thronfolge und Herrschersakralität', 370f.

31 See Schieffer, 'Ausbreitung der Königssalbung', 45.

32 See A. Fößel, *Die Königin im mittelalterlichen Reich. Herrschaftsausübung, Herrschaftsrechte, Handlungsspielräume*, Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2000, 48; A. Büttner, *Der Weg zur Krone. Rituale der Herrschererhebung im spätmittelalterlichen Reich*, 2 vols, Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2012, 692, on the Holy Roman Empire; E. v. Houts, 'Queen in the Anglo-Norman/Angevin Realm (1066–1216)', in C. Zey (ed.), *Mächtige Frauen? Königinnen und Fürstinnen im europäischen Mittelalter (11.–14. Jahrhundert)*, Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2015, 199–224, here 200, on England; Schramm, *Der König von Frankreich*, 127ff., on France; E. Hoffmann, 'Coronation and Coronation Ordines in Medieval Scandinavia', in J. Bak (ed.), *Coronations. Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Ritual*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, CA, Oxford: Univ. of California Press, 1990, 125–51, here 132, and C. Rock, *Herrscherwechsel im spätmittelalterlichen Skandinavien. Handlungsmuster und Legitimationsstrategien*, Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2016, 396f., on Scandinavia.

33 See Schramm, *Der König von Frankreich*, 203.

34 See Fößel, *Die Königin im mittelalterlichen Reich*, 47ff.; B. Kasten, 'Krönungsordnungen für und Papstbriefe an mächtige Frauen im Mittelalter', in C. Zey (ed.), *Mächtige Frauen? Königinnen und Fürstinnen im europäischen Mittelalter (11.–14. Jahrhundert)*, Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2015, 249–306, here 270; Houts, 'Queen in the Anglo-Norman', 200ff.; Rock, *Herrscherwechsel*, 397. On the loss of significance of the coronation and the anointing for the status of the queen in the Holy Roman Empire in the late Middle Ages accompanied by a loss of political influence see S. Dick, 'Die römisch-deutsche Königin im spätmittelalterlichen Verfassungswandel', in M. Becher (ed.), *Die mittelalterliche Thronfolge im europäischen Vergleich*, Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2017, 341–58, here 346.

35 On rituals concerning investiture and coronation see M. Steinecke, S. Weinfurter, *Investitur- und Krönungsrituale. Herrschaftseinsetzungen im kulturellen Vergleich*, Köln, Weimar, Wien: Böhlau, 2005, and G. Althoff, H. Basu (eds), *Rituale der Amtseinsetzung. Inaugurationen in verschiedenen Epochen, Kulturen, politischen Systemen und Religionen*, Würzburg: Ergon-Verlag, 2015.

36 See R. Schneider, *Königswahl und Königserhebung im Frühmittelalter. Untersuchungen zur Herrschaftsnachfolge bei den Langobarden und Merowingern*, Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1972, 219; J. Petersohn, 'Über monarchische Insignien und deren Funktion im mittelalterlichen Reich', *Historische Zeitschrift* 266, 1998, 61–5; H. Keller, 'Die Investitur. Ein Beitrag zum Problem der "Staatssymbolik" im Hochmittelalter', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 27, 1993, 51–86, 56ff.

37 See on the Holy Roman Empire Peterson, 'Über monarchische Insignien'; on Scandinavia Hoffmann, 'Coronation and Coronation Ordines', 128, 132f., 139, on Poland A. Giesywztor, 'Gesture in Coronation Ceremonies of Medieval Poland', in J. Bak (ed.) *Coronations: Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Ritual*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, CA, Oxford: Univ. of California Press, 1990, 152–64, 158f., on France Le Goff, 'A Coronation Program', 54f.

38 See on enthronements recorded in the Merovingian Frankish Empire and its succeeding kingdoms Schneider, *Königswahl und Königserhebung*, 213ff., Boshof, *Königtum und Königsherrschaft*, 118; on stone settings in Scotland and Sweden Hoffmann, 'Coronation

and Coronation Ordines', and Rock, *Herrscherwechsel*, 29 and 390. On the occasional raisings of shields in the early Frankish Empire see M. Hardt, 'Art: Schilderhebung', in *Reallexikon für Germanische Altertumskunde* 27, 2005, 106–8.

39 See Peterson, 'Über monarchische Insignien', 56.

40 See ibid., 54, 71.

41 See P. Depreux, 'Investitures et destitutions aux temps carolingiens', in W. Falkwoski, Y. Sassier, *Le monde carolingien. Bilan, perspectives, champs de recherche*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2009, 157–82, 167.

42 See V. Rödel, 'Lehnsgebräuche', in *Handwörterbuch zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 3, Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 2016, 747–50; P. Depreux, 'Lehnsrechtliche Symbol-handlungen. Handgang und Investitur im Bericht Galberts von Brügge zur Anerken-nung Wilhelm Clitos als Graf von Flandern', in J. Dendorfer, R. Deutinger (eds), *Das Lehnswesen im Hochmittelalter. Forschungskonstrukte – Quellenbefunde – Deutungsrelevanz*, Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2010, 387–99, 389; Keller, 'Die Investitur',71.

43 See R. Schmidt, 'Die Einsetzung der böhmischen Herzöge auf den Thron zu Prag', in H. Beumann, W. Schröder (eds), *Aspekte der Nationenbildung im Mittelalter*, Sigmarin-gen: Thorbecke, 1978, 436–63.

44 See most recently Witthöft, 'Ritual und Text', 106–16.

45 See P. Töbelmann, *Stäbe der Macht. Stabsymbolik in Ritualen des Mittelalters*, Husum: Matthiesen, 2011, 119f.; Keller, 'Die Investitur'.

46 On this and on the following see C. Zey, *Der Investiturstreit*, München: C.H. Beck, 2017, 30f.

47 See ibid., 106.

48 See ibid., 88–91.

49 See K. Schreiner, 'Wahl, Amtsantritt und Amtsenthebung von Bischöfen: Rituelle Handlungsmuster, rechtlich normierte Verfahren, traditionsgestützte Gewohnheiten', in B. Stollberg-Rilinger (ed.), *Vormoderne politische Verfahren*, Berlin: Duncker & Hum-bolt, 2001, 73–117, who points out that the entry into the bishop's city emerged as a political ritual during the late Middle Ages.

50 On the rituals at the entrance of vassalage see J. Le Goff, 'Les gestes symboliques dans la vie sociale. Les gestes de la vassalité', in Centro italiano di studi (ed.), *Simboli e simbologia nell'alto medievo*, Spoleto: Presso di Sede del Centro, 1976, 679–779; K. Eickels, *Vom inszenierten Konsens zum systematisierten Konflikt. Die englisch-französischen Beziehungen und ihre Wahrnehmung an der Wende vom Hoch- zum Spätmittelalter*, Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2002; Depreux, 'Lehnsrechtliche Symbolhandlungen'.

51 See Peterson, 'Über monarchische Insignien', 75.

52 On this and on the following see O. Auge, 'Lehnrecht, Lehnswesen', in: *Handwörter-buch zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte,* vol. 3, Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 2016, 717–36, 729f.

53 See D.W. Poeck, *Rituale der Ratswahl. Zeichen und Zeremoniell der Ratssetzung in Europa*, Köln, Weimar, Wien: Böhlau, 2003, esp. 314ff.

54 See K. Schreiner, 'Gregor VIII., nackt auf einem Esel. Entehrende Entblößung und schand-bares Reiten im Spiegel einer Miniatur der Sächsischen Weltchronik', in *Ecclesia et Reg-num. Beiträge zur Geschichte von Kirche, Recht und Staat im Mittelalter. Festschrift für Franz-Josef Schmale zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, Bochum: Verlag Dr. Dieter Winkler, 1989, 155–202; F. Rexroth, 'Tyrannen und Taugenichtse. Beobachtungen zur Ritualität europäischer Königsabsetzungen im späten Mittelalter', *Historische Zeitschrift* 278, 2004, 27–54.

55 See Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale*, 53ff.; Depreux, 'Investitures et destitutions aux temps carolingiens', 165ff.

56 See below, p. 19.

57 See H. Zimmermann, *Papstabsetzungen des Mittelalters*, Graz, Wien, Köln: Böhlau, 1968, 47–76.

58 See H. Kamp, 'New Masters and Old Rituals: Edward I, Robert the Bruce, Philipp the Fair and the Role of Rituals with Conquest', in G. Schwedler, E. Tounta (eds), *State, Power and Violence*, vol. III, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010, 485–503, 489ff.

59 See Büttner, *Der Weg zur Krone*, 111.

60 See Rödel, 'Lehnsgebräuche'; Depreux, 'Lehnsrechtliche Symbolhandlungen'; L. Kolmer, *Promissorische Eide im Mittelalter*, Kallmünz: Michael Lassleben, 1989, 89ff. On the homage see Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale*, 171ff. and A. Holenstein, *Die Huldigung der Untertanen. Rechtskultur und Herrschaftsordnung (800–1800)*, Stuttgart: Fischer, 1991, 278ff. On the oaths of the aldermen and on the journeys for swearing the citizen oaths see Poeck, *Rituale der Ratswahl*, 65.

61 See Depreux, 'Lehnsrechtliche Symbolhandlungen', 399; Holenstein, *Die Huldigung der Untertanen*, 321ff.; Kolmer, *Promissorische Eide*, 95f.

62 See Schramm, *Geschichte des englischen Königtums*, 67ff. on England; Le Goff, 'A Coronation Program', 54, and M. Kintzinger, 'Sakrale Repräsentation bei der Thronsukzession der König von Frankreich im Spätmittelalter', in L. Pelizäus (ed.), *Wahl und Krönung in Zeiten des Umbruchs*, Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, 2008, 23–39, 35 on France; Hoffmann, 'Coronation and Coronation Ordines', 132f. on Denmark; and on Aragon Péquignot, 'Die Krönung der aragonesischen Könige', 184–6, where, because of the tradition of the self-coronation, the consecrated archbishops had to be unintentionally satisfied with touching the crown.

63 See G. Schwedler, 'Dienen muss man dürfen oder: Die Zeremonialvorschriften der Goldenen Bulle zum Krönungsmahl des römisch-deutschen Herrschers', in C. Ambos, S. Hotz, G. Schwedler, S. Weinfurter (eds), *Die Welt der Rituale. Von der Antike bis heute*, Darmstadt, 2005, 156–66, and Büttner, *Der Weg zur Krone*, 687f. who relativized the significance of the coronation feast and the services which were to be rendered in the Holy Roman Empire. In France the coronation meal did not play an important role either – Schramm, *Der König von Frankreich*, 203 – unlike in England – Schramm, *Geschichte des englischen Königtums*, 71.

64 See P. Johanek, A. Lampen (eds), *Adventus. Studien zum Herrscherlichen Einzug in die Stadt*, Köln, Weimar, Wien: Böhlau, 2009; G. Schenk, *Zeremoniell und Politik. Herrscheinzüge im spätmittelalterlichen Reich*, Köln, Weimar, Wien: Böhlau, 2003; G. Kipling, *Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy, and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998; P. Arnade, *Realms of Ritual: Burgundian Ceremony and Civic Life in Late Medieval Ghent*, Ithaca, NY, London: Cornell Univ. Press, 1996. On the *adventus* of the bishops see most recently A. Bihrer, 'Einzug, Weihe und erste Messe. Symbolische Interaktion zwischen Bischof, Hof und Stadt im spätmittelalterlichen Konstanz. Zugleich einige methodische Ergänzungen zu den Ergebnissen der aktuellen Adventusforschung', in G. Deutschländer (ed.), *Symbolische Interaktion in der Residenzstadt des Spätmittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit*, Halle: Akad.-Verlag, 2013, 65–88.

65 For an ideal schema of the entry see Schenk, *Zeremoniell und Politik*, 238–42.

66 See L. Bryant, 'The Medieval Ceremony at Paris', in J. Bak (ed.), *Coronations. Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Ritual*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, CA, Oxford: Univ. of California Press, 1990, 88–118 on France; Kipling, *Enter the King*, on England, and A. Hack, *Das Empfangszeremoniell bei mittelalterlichen Papst-Kaiser-Treffen*, Köln: Böhlau, 1999, on Rome.

67 W. Blockmans, E. Donckers, 'Self Representation of Court and City in Flanders and Brabant in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries', in W. Blockmans, A. Janse (eds), *Showing Status: Representation of Social Positions in the Late Middle Ages*, Turnhout: Brepols, 1999, 81–111.

68 See Arnade, *Realms of Ritual*, 127ff.

69 See on this and on the following Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale*, 68–84.

70 See C. Garnier, 'Zeichen und Schrift. Symbolisches Handeln und literale Fixierung am Beispiel von Friedensschlüssen im 13. Jahrhundert', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 32, 1998, 263–87; J.M. Moeglin, 'Pénitence publique et amende honorable au Moyen Age', *Revue Historique* 298, 1997, 225–69 and J.M. Moeglin, 'Harmiscara – Harmschar – Hachée. Le dossier des rituels d'humiliation et de soumission au Moyen Age', *Archivium Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 54, 1996, 11–65.

71 See H. Kamp, *Friedensstifter und Vermittler im Mittelalter*, Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 2001, 137f. and 252ff.

72 See J.M. Moeglin, S. Péquignot, *Diplomatie et « relations internationales » au Moyen Âge (IXe–XVe siècle)*, Paris: puf, 2017, 511ff; J. Benham, *Peacemaking in the Middle Ages: Principles and Practices*, Manchester: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2011, 145ff.; G. Schwedler, *Herrschertreffen des Spätmittelalters: Formen, Rituale, Wirkungen*, Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2008, 275ff.

73 See Schwedler, *Herrschertreffen des Spätmittelalters*, esp. on the oath 125ff., and with an exemplary representation of the individual acts from 331. See for the early Middle Ages K. Schreiner, '"Gerechtigkeit und Frieden haben sich geküßt". Friedensstiftung durch symbolisches Handeln', in J. Fried (ed.), *Träger und Instrumentarien des Friedens im hohen und späten Mittelalter*, Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1996, 37–86; W. Kolb, *Herrscherbegegnungen im Mittelalter*, Bern: Lang, 1998 and I. Voss, *Herrschertreffen im frühen Mittelalter*, Köln, Wien: Böhlau, 1987.

74 See N. Offenstadt, *Faire la paix au Moyen Age. Discours et gestes de paix pendant la guerre de Cent ans*, Paris: Jacob, 2007, esp. 176.

75 See Schwedler, *Herrschertreffen des Spätmittelalters*, 412.

76 See Moeglin, Péquignot, *Diplomatie,* 498ff.

77 See Schwedler, *Herrschertreffen des Spätmittelalters*,134ff., 271ff., 292ff.

78 See on the feudal system S. Patzold, *Das Lehnswesen,* München: Beck, 2012, 117–19, and on the friendship alliances and the expiatory records Garnier, 'Zeichen und Schrift', 267.

79 See on this and on the following C. Vogel, R. Elze (eds), *Le Pontifical romano-germanique du dixième siècle*, vol. 1., Cittá del Vaticano: Bibl. Apostolica Vaticana, 1963, LXXII, c7–9, 248ff.

80 Ibid., c21, 256.

81 See ibid., c19, 256.

82 See Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale*, 84.

83 See ibid., 151, and T. Broekmann, *Rigor iustitiae. Herrschaft, Recht und Terror im normannisch-staufischen Süden*, Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 2005.

84 See B. Schneidmüller, 'Die Aufführung des Reichs. Zeremoniell, Ritual und Performanz in der Goldenen Bulle von 1356', in E. Brockhoff, M. Matthäus (eds), *Die Kaisermacher. Frankfurt am Main und die Goldene Bulle 1356–1806*, Frankfurt am Main: Societäts-Verlag, 2006, 76–92, 82ff.

85 See Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale*, 138ff.; Hack, *Das Empfangszeremoniell*, 434ff. and 504ff.

86 Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale*, 95, and G. Althoff, C. Witthöft, 'Les services symboliques entre dignité et contrainte', *Annales Histoire, Science Sociale* 58, 2003, 1293–318.

87 See K. Bourré, *Dienst, Verdienst und Distinktion. Fürstliche Selbstbehauptungsstrategien der Hohenzollern im 15. Jahrhundert*, Köln, Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 2014, 50f. On the relationship of ritual and honour K. Görich, *Die Ehre Barbarossas. Kommunikation, Konflikt und politisches Handeln im 12. Jahrhundert*, Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 2001; G. Althoff, *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter. Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde*, Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 1997, 252–7.

88 Schwedler, *Herrschertreffen des Spätmittelalters*, 380ff.; C. Garnier, 'Gabe, Macht und Ehre: Zu Formen und Funktionen des Gabentauschs in den Beziehungen zwischen Mongolen und Europäern im 13. Jahrhundert', *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 63, 2015, 47–68.

89 See Le Goff, 'A Coronation Program', 54.

90 See Schramm, *Geschichte des englischen Königtums*, 77.

91 See Rogge, *Die deutschen Könige im Mittelalter*, 108.

92 See Althoff, *Spielregeln der Politik*, 119.

93 See Erkens, *Herrschersakralität im Mittelalter*, 28; Fößel, *Die Königin im mittelalterlichen Reich*, 49.

94 See Boshoff, *Königtum und Königsherrschaft*, 118; N. Gussone, 'Ritus, Recht und Geschichtsbewußtsein. Thron und Krone in der Tradition Karls des Großen', in M. Kramp (ed.), *Krönungen: Könige in Aachen – Geschichte und Mythos*, Mainz: Zabern, 2000, 35–47.

95 See J. Ehlers, *Die Kapetinger*, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000, 64, 191.

96 On Reims see J. Le Goff, *Reims: Krönungsstadt*, Berlin: Wagenbach, 1997; on Aachen Rogge, 'Die deutschen Könige im Mittelalter', 94.

97 See H.W. Goetz, 'Der "rechte" Sitz. Die Symbolik von Rang und Herrschaft im Hohen Mittelalter im Spiegel der Sitzordnung', in G. Blaschitz (ed.), *Symbole des Alltags – Alltag der Symbole. Festschrift Harry Kühnel*, Graz: Akad. Dr.- und Verl.-Anst., 1992, 11–47; Schwedler, *Herrschertreffen des Spätmittelalters*, 341ff.; and profoundly on the last point A. Löther, *Prozessionen in spätmittelalterlichen Städten. Politische Partizipation, obrigkeitliche Inszenierung, städtische Einheit*, Köln: Böhlau, 1999.

98 See Z. Dalewski, 'Lictor imperatoris. Kaiser Lothar III., Sobeslav I. von Böhmen und Boleslaw III. von Polen auf dem Hoftag in Merseburg im Jahre 1135', *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropaforschung* 50, 2001, 317–36. Fundamentally on the problem also Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual*, esp. 15ff., and H. Kamp, 'Tugend, Macht und Ritual. Politisches Verhalten beim Saxo Grammaticus', in G. Althoff (ed.), *Zeichen – Rituale – Werte*, Münster: Rhema, 2004, 179–200.

99 This was done by the archbishops from Canterbury and York, cf. Schramm, *Geschichte des englischen Königtums*, 40f., as well as by those from Sens and Reims, cf. Le Goff; *Reims*, 22–31 and also by those from Mainz and Cologne, cf. Rogge, *Die deutschen Könige im Mittelalter*, 92.

100 See Schramm, *Geschichte des englischen Königtums*, 68ff.

101 See Schneidmüller, 'Die Aufführung des Reichs'.

102 See Goetz, 'Der "rechte" Sitz'.

103 See Löther, *Prozessionen in spätmittelalterlichen Städten*, 281ff; 334f.

104 See H. Skoda*, Medieval Violence: Physical Brutality in Northern France 1270–1330*, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013, 173ff.

105 See Keller, 'Die Investitur', 56 and 72.

106 This has already been pointed out by Schramm, *Geschichte des englischen Königtums*, 90ff.

107 See Blockmans, 'Self Representation of Court and City', 84–7, 110.

108 See E.D. Hehl, 'Die Erzbischöfe von Mainz bei Erhebung, Salbung und Krönung des Königs (10.–14. Jahrhundert)', in M. Kramp (ed.), *Krönungen. Könige in Aachen,*

Geschichte und Mythos. Katalog der Ausstellung, vol. 1, Mainz: Zabern, 2000, 97–104, 101f.; Erkens, *Herrschersakralität im Mittelalter*, 26ff.; Erkens, 'Thronfolge und Herrschersakralität', 370f.

109 See W. Paravicini, 'The Court of the Dukes of Burgundy: A Model for Europe', in ibid., *Menschen am Hof der Herzöge von Burgund. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2002, 507–34, first in R. Asch, A. Birke (eds), *Princes, Patronage and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age*, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1991, 207–63, 512ff., 523f.

110 See W. Paravicini, 'Schlichtheit und Pracht: Über König Ludwig XI. von Frankreich und Herzog Karl den Kühnen von Burgund', in C. Nolte, K.H. Spieß, R.G. Werlich (eds), *Principes. Dynastien und Höfe im späten Mittelalter*, Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2002, 235–76, 76ff.

111 See Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale*, 201f.

112 See Patzold, 'Wirkreichweite, Geltungsbereich, Forschungsperspektive', 357, and Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale*, 203.

2

CULTURES OF CONFLICT

Jackson W. Armstrong

The problem of conflict

Conflict encompasses at one extreme the great political clashes of kings, popes, and emperors, and at the other the quotidian minutiae of social relationships negotiated among the humblest peasants or townspeople. Along this broad spectrum of phenomena the sort of conflict to which this overview is primarily addressed is not strife and war of the high order that played out on battlefields such as Crécy or Tannenberg in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but rather it is the 'several kinds of inter-personal or inter-group tension' which, as Brown and Górecki have summarized, might include 'threats, promises, negotiation, ritual, use of force', related emotions, and disputing.[1] And it is especially about the latter – disputing – a type of conflict that could very much be about politics, and could involve power-holding kings, magnates, bishops, town governments, or groups of nobles, clergy, or of townspeople or others of lower social status who gained a political voice by coordinating their actions. This sort of conflict has come to be much better understood in recent decades as a result of attention to cultural patterns, ideas, and norms, and as such it comprehends disputes originating among kinsmen, neighbours, or political or business relations which could expand in scope to include other more powerful parties, or to activate various social and jurisdictional frameworks.[2]

The problem of conflict, and in particular the ideas and expectations about how it should be pursued, managed, and resolved, is that it is intimately tied up with ideas and expectations of government, especially with regard to justice and law. In his magisterial synthesis on late medieval political life, Watts has convincingly argued that across the fourteenth century and up to about the middle of the fifteenth century the prevailing pattern in the growth of government was the increased provision and assertion of jurisdiction by kings, princes, towns, and other ruling authorities. This was part of a process of the articulation and defence of various rights which often led to clashes of jurisdiction and in many cases to war and unrest, but a process also partly in response to demand from subjects (of lesser and greater status) who saw in the assertion of jurisdiction by rulers a means to articulate and defend their own rights as well.[3] As Watts puts it, governmental growth was an uneven and 'ambivalent process' and, furthermore, it 'has been underestimated as a cause of conflict' in its own right.[4]

Another writer, on the related topic of violence in medieval Europe, has framed that matter in terms of an ebb and flow of competing norms, chiefly between norms that allowed rulers to claim an exclusive right and duty to regulate violence, and those that recognized the right of individuals or groups (especially among the nobility) to wield violence on their own behalf.[5] With this in mind, our focus of attention here is on approaches to the expected and accepted patterns of behaviour associated with disputing as a form of conflict, or in other words the norms by which conflict was managed. These norms might be expressed formally through laws and institutions, or informally through custom and usage, and be reflected in accompanying forms of social organization.[6]

Bound up as it is with expectations of governmental regulation of social tensions, conflict has often been understood as a symptom of disorder, the antithesis of good order.[7] Some initial examples will help to illustrate the problem. In 1435 Jehanne la Hardie, a 'receiver, counsellor and supporter of the Brigands' of Normandy, was seized and delivered to justice at Falaise. Condemned for her offences, she was put to execution by being placed in a gibbet, lowered into a pit, and buried alive. The 'Norman Brigands' whom la Hardie aided were peasant bands who self-organized in resistance to the English occupation and more particularly in response to the countryside raiding conducted by English soldiers and deserters in France.[8] The phenomenon of social groups whose members acted with violence contrary to governmental authority is also to be found elsewhere in Europe. For instance, the example of the Norman Brigands suggests comparison with the so-called 'Surnames' of the Anglo-Scottish borderlands. These 'surnames or clannes' (as they were described in a judicial bond of 1506) focused on identification of an extended kin group with a particular family name, such as Nixon, among several others.[9] They were implicated in an illicit culture of livestock raiding and 'feud' in the region known as the marches. The question of how to understand such phenomena – in this case of certain social structures and the conflict associated with them, sometimes in 'frontier' areas such as these – is usually answered by turning the question into one about the strength of governmental structures. A received interpretation is that if local people identified readily with groups like the Brigands or Surnames, they did so of necessity because governmental organization was impaired.[10] Claims like this have been made about local societies in the various English borderlands facing Scotland, Wales, and Gaelic Ireland, and as such they have been about forms of social organization as much as patterns of conflict.[11] But all the same, comparable illustrations of conflict may be found in other social and political contexts. For instance, in the Portuguese town of Evora, the killing of a Muslim man named Ahmad Caeiro in about 1440 precipitated a protracted sequence of reprisal killings which lasted until 1466. We know of these killings because of the documents of protection which those involved sought and secured over time, and one historian has shown these connected episodes to constitute a dispute between family groups in a struggle over office-holding.[12] This further illustration of self-directed activities by groups (in this case, groups also defined by apparent kinship solidarities) entailed violence not to subvert governmental authority but to compete over aspects of its control. The familiar conjecture is that if people acted in such ways, driven by motivation to seek vengeance to remedy wrong, they did so for mutual protection because government failed to offer them adequate security.[13] All this can

lead quickly to questions of the role of authority, law, and the 'state', and from thence to the anthropological study of 'stateless' societies, and sociological conceptions of so-cial and political power.[14] But if the state is now recognized by some to be a distorting concept when applied to the later Middle Ages,[15] still Evora, Normandy, and the An-glo-Scottish borderlands were hardly places devoid of the apparatus of government, even if their particular local circumstances presented complexities. The challenge is then how to understand the phenomenon of conflict as it occurred within medieval polities, and within the culture of medieval politics.

The phenomenon of conflict has been closely linked to the question of how to understand apparently disorderly behaviour within political society. In urban north-ern Europe, for instance, particularly with reference to Flanders, recent decades have seen significant attention directed at examining rebellion and challenges to civic authorities, particularly patterns of urban revolt and more generally the vocabularies of political subversion. This work has also noted the extent to which personal dis-putes, including claims to the right to vengeance, could be expressed in ways that challenged the authority of governing bodies, including, for instance, craft guilds.[16] The French kingdom after *c.* 1350 was a realm where monarchical power could seem tenuous, but historians have come to locate the assertion of royal power in the exer-cise of clemency, and recent work on violent seigneurial conflicts among the nobility of southern France argues for the 'accommodating authority' of the crown and royal officials in limiting or seeking to pacify these conflicts through 'collaborative prac-tices', rather than by 'coercive compulsion'.[17] In England the topic of late medieval aristocratic 'lawlessness' generally has long occupied historians' attention. The present paradigm of understanding turns upon the view that English kings were successful in asserting their jurisdictional dominance when they recognized their own reliance upon the private power of landowners to execute and fulfil their commands. Histo-rians of England have come to view political power as built as much and more upon compromise, consent, and consensus than upon coercion or force.[18] These few exam-ples demonstrate the ways in which conflict has been integral to the interpretation of different political societies in western Europe.

Violence, crime, and war

Three subjects, violence, crime, and war, are intimately linked with some of the ideas about conflict just set out. Each has developed its own specialist literature, and deserves some specific comment in this context. As a universal human experience violence has been the subject of considerable scholarly attention, often through studies which privilege cultural interpretations.[19] Violence answers to a range of defi-nitions, but the conventional understanding of physical force exercised against per-sons or property has been retained in a number of studies.[20] All the same, the scope for overt physical violence to act as a 'language of social order'[21] highlights violence's symbolic and 'ritual' potential, sometimes viewed as a mechanism for the constraint and canalization of aggressive behaviour. And it has been observed that formulaic ritual lends violent acts a measure of predictability, even where hot-blooded passion is mixed with rational calibration.[22] In no small part it is from attempts to legitimate, regulate, and categorize violence that the related notions of crime and war emerged

over time. Early modernists have favoured crime and the records of criminal justice for the investigation of social order and discipline as negotiated through everyday life, and as achieved through the autonomy exercised by officials in the local administration of government.[23] Similar agendas have been applied to the later Middle Ages, although with varied emphasis on political considerations.[24] The terminology adopted for this second subject is telling. 'Crime', albeit an expression often wielded freely by many medievalists, is nevertheless a shorthand term, freighted with the unambiguous modern-day division between criminal and civil law. It is a notion widely accepted that public criminal justice, akin to our modern understanding of the idea as concerning offences against 'public order', was administered in an intensively governed realm such as late medieval England.[25] On the one hand, this is a helpful and constructive way to make sense of the copious legal records which survive from the period in that kingdom.[26] On the other, it projects deceptively finite categories onto an indefinite reality – categories that may be clearer to historians than to the medieval offenders, victims, and litigants. Altogether it seems preferable to avoid speaking of 'crime' wherever possible in favour of a less loaded terminology of offences, reflecting situations and allegations of fact that could and did enter the courts in a number of ways.[27] Circumvention of the word 'crime' altogether may be helpful to assist us in better understanding the nature of conflict and its official regulation. The English common law writ of trespass *vi et armis* was a popular means to bring cases into the court of King's Bench from the fourteenth century. It was useful because of its flexibility, being deployed to initiate litigation between private parties concerning a wide range of offences including violence to the person, threats, and damage to property and goods – all of which might fundamentally relate to disputes about title and possession of land.[28] To take an example from another jurisdiction, consider the Scottish offence of 'strublance' (Latin *perturbatio*) which certain urban courts in fifteenth-century Aberdeen were competent to hear and determine. This encompassed a wide range of possibility: including personal injury or harm to property, verbal assault, the deforcement of town officials, and more general peace-breaking misdeeds. Strublance's very breadth allowed the town courts to assert jurisdiction over a wide array of matters, for which a modern criminal–civil distinction was not relevant.[29]

The third subject, war, is perhaps even more multifarious. Whereas its anthropological definition turns on questions of organization and social sanction, its historiographical legacy is to be both cause and symptom of apparent disorder in the later Middle Ages.[30] For medievalists, the categorization of war (with its accompanying complexity of related legal and customary issues) is a problem that concerns both scale and authority.[31] Interpretations of war in late medieval France and Germany have come to avoid the familiar binary distinction between 'public' and 'private' war, encumbered with assumptions about modern nation-states.[32] Indeed, linking violence, crime, and war has been the modern expectation that sole legitimate authority over these matters is the ambition and test of the state.[33] Narratives of the 'rise' of the state in pursuit of this aspiration for sole legitimacy often rely on ideas about the transition from the primitive to the developed, from the archaism of medieval decline to the sophistication of modern progress.[34] The role of law and war in the development of the English 'state' in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (in terms of the crown's scope to assert itself through judicial intervention, or to yield such judicial

responsibilities to landowners when faced with the pressures of military over-exten-sion) has been the subject of significant attention in recent decades,[35] but any division between a 'law state' and a 'war state' has been shown to be misleading, not least in that war helped to integrate English political society and also served as a 'catalyst for government growth'.[36] Legislative efforts in different realms to 'criminalize' the use of violence in the form of 'private' (or seigneurial, or sub-princely) war – through restrictions enacted in France in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, in England through the Great Statute of Treasons of 1352, and in the German-speaking lands at the Imperial Diet of 1495 – may seem blunt measures but they were significant mile-stones achieved by maturing 'states'.[37] Still, what these French, English, and German enactments have in common is that they are attempts by late medieval rulers and assemblies to recognize and regulate aspects of a culture of conflict, to some extent a shared one, at the point where violence, crime, and war intersect.

Justice and redress

England, Germany, France, and Scotland provide illustrations of another important aspect of conflict: notions of justice, and the redress of injury. In England the mon-arch's duty was to guarantee his law and see justice dispensed according to it, but in order to achieve this the king required the consent and cooperation of landown-ers, because they implemented his authority and governed his subjects as the law's primary administrators. It was landowners also who, with a reliance on specialist common lawyers, shaped the growth and use of the law in pursuit and defence of their own rights, especially in property.[38] All the same, England's localities were self-policing, and while pressure from social peers and superiors could steer a disputant towards pursuing a claim in court, self-help involving the use of force remained not just an outside option but at times a necessity. No longer are violent disputing and extra-judicial peace-making understood simply to demonstrate governmental failure to preserve public order. Studies of conflict among English local elites have come to view 'private' power as amalgamated with 'public' authority. Landowners had the right and means to use violence but, while it was intended that force should be used to maintain authority, if violence was misused, the access and means to use it, and the undermining of authority from such abuse, were highly destabilizing.[39] In this regard the gentry and nobility of England shared an aversion to the use of inter-personal violence which risked undermining established authority as anything other than a last resort.[40] Redress was to be found particularly in 'private' processes of dispute res-olution, typically through arbitrations conducted either under the auspices of a great lord, or by the cooperative networks of local gentry. This has come to be considered an adjunct to, not an aberration from, the system of royal justice. Most arbitrations can be shown to have happened in conjunction with the use of the legal system.[41]

Beyond England, other patterns emerge in relation to the ways that the powerful approached justice, and the redress of wrong. In the German-speaking lands the prac-tice of 'feud' (see further below) among late medieval and early modern noblemen and princes is a well-attested phenomenon. What this entailed was a range of violent actions (small-scale raiding, burning, looting, cattle rustling, kidnapping) which were 'regulated by accepted rules of conduct and by a more or less fixed repertoire of

sanctioned methods'.[42] One significant set of rules was introduced in 1356 by the Golden Bull of Emperor Charles IV, which required that attacks on opponents be preceded by formal announcement, publicly witnessed, in order to render them legitimate. Thus documents known as 'cartels of defiance' came to be accepted as formal declarations of hostilities, allowing time for enemies to prepare for an assault and warn their allies. Yet there was less clarity to all this than might at first be assumed. In the words of one authority on the subject, German feud 'was neither a generally undisputed legal institution, nor a legally prohibited practice'.[43] It involved as disputing parties not only noblemen – who might both offer 'protection and safeguard' to their inferiors and seek the same from their superiors – but also prelates and princes, and towns as corporate bodies. Even peasants might become engaged as principal parties in disputes. In all cases the practice of feuding was an important means for the 'activation of the law' in the jurisdictionally fragmented territory of the Holy Roman Empire.[44] The practice served as a framework through which to assert and defend rights.

France has furnished enriching studies touching on justice and redress which offer another point of comparison.[45] Recent work on late medieval Languedoc, already noted above, has examined the phenomenon of 'seigneurial warfare' among noblemen, and has found that this 'remained a vigorous local tradition' in the period at least up to 1380, involving sieges, raiding, burning, kidnapping, and other violent actions. Although offering a rather less fragmented jurisdictional landscape than did the Empire, the kingdom of France posed for its rulers the difficulty of asserting sovereignty against the claims of greater lords and prelates to their own jurisdictional rights. One way in which French royal officials sought to insert the power of the crown into conflicts arising between local parties was through the extension of royal letters of safeguard which promised protection and marked it out with public proclamation, the display of *fleur-de-lis* pennants, and the assignment of a *gardiator* to the safeguarded person. In this way the French crown asserted, albeit in an incomplete manner, its own claims to prohibit violence and protect its subjects.[46] A similar view of the extension of royal power has been taken in the study of royal grace. Mercy, in the form of royal pardons granted in response to petitions from parties, was a means by which the crown and its agents could affirm the supremacy of kingly jurisdiction.[47] It is helpful to note that the fluctuating scope of English political control over French territory in the period makes it difficult to draw clear 'national' boundaries around the experience of justice. References to the '*maxima inimicica*' noted in an English grant in favour of the lord of Garro in Gascony in 1378 suggest the relevance of the language of seigneurial warfare.[48] Similarly, the range of options considered by one party in a suit between Englishmen in northern France in 1426 is suggestive of the fluidity of ideas of the legitimacy of revenge. There the relevant court recorded that one litigant '*en fu mal content et pensa comment il s'en vengeroit, et mist x ou xij homes armes […] pour le grever*'.[49]

A further comparative gesture may briefly be drawn with Scotland. Historians of Scotland have discarded an earlier emphasis on a purported antagonism between crown and nobility, and now appreciate the cooperation required between rulers and magnates for the successful governance of the kingdom.[50] Justice and legal development in the Scottish kingdom in the period have been understood to be bound up with the phenomenon of 'feud', as a form of dispute that could be destructively

violent and also aimed at the construction of peace, but the focus and emphasis of that work has tended to be on the period after 1500. Scottish feuding has been understood to be both a legal phenomenon and one that underwent a transformation and challenge through the growth of 'public' justice and legal culture in the period and, eventually, through the rhetoric of the reformed church.[51] For the later Middle Ages, the emphasis has been on the degree to which feuding among landowners served to link local and national politics and shape crown–nobility relations. A major study of the topic relies heavily on the surviving evidence in the form of arbitration awards between parties, and emphasizes the degree to which contractual bonds between noblemen often served to recruit supporters in the course of disputes.[52] And examination of the itinerant court of the justice ayre has underscored the importance of mercy and pardon and points to a more than passing resemblance to the 'French' practices noted above. It also shows the extent to which mercy was interlinked with the payment of compensation (Scots 'assythement') in redress of wrong. In Scotland royal pardon frequently *preceded* the payment of compensation to the offended party, and upon the acceptance of this redress the offended party might issue a written receipt or an even more formal document, which was in effect a 'private' pardon mirroring that which was purchased from the crown.[53] Royal justice in Scotland was thus more compensatory than retributive in its emphasis.

'Feud'

'Feud' has unavoidably entered into the preceding discussion of conflict, particularly as it relates to ideas and practices of justice, and feud merits dedicated comment in its own right. This elusive concept and its processes of public, customary violence and peace-making are well explored by scholars across a range of fields. Just as conflict was once understood as destructive disorder, so feud has carried a negative reputation. The two seminal statements on the subject were to turn this reputation on its head. Familiar to historians working in the English language is Max Gluckman's anthropological treatment of feud as a functionalist mechanism for peaceful equilibrium in 'stateless' societies, first published in 1955.[54] For scholars working in German the major interpretative advance came from Otto Brunner in his 1939 study of the feud in late medieval Austria.[55] Brunner's understanding of feud emphasized its legal, political, and constitutional dimensions. In his conception it was a legitimate mechanism for the assertion and defence of noble rights, a modality of justice that had its own formulas and rules.[56] In the words of his translator, Brunner's feud had a 'constitutionally creative role', which has stood in stark contrast to the monarchist emphasis of French historiography, and the story of the advancing common law in the English tradition.[57] Feud is a sprawling and fascinating subject, and scarcely more can be done here than to highlight some aspects pertinent to cultures of conflict generally.[58] First, feud is as much a tool for peace and the binding of the social fabric as it is a pretext for violence. Second, in aiming to dispel the idea of feud as antithetical to the state, some have argued that feuding was integrated – however problematically and with mixed results – into processes of governmental growth in the Middle Ages and later. In Germany, this was through the assertion of rights and jurisdictions, even by princely 'state-builders'.[59] In France and Scotland, as noted already (and indeed

also in the Burgundian Low Countries), this was through pardon as a mechanism of royal grace, whereby rulers aspired to harness and regulate peace-making processes.[60] Third, and perhaps most significantly in the context of cultural history, it should be observed that feud is a category of analysis which refers to a contested array of words describing behaviours recorded in historical sources.

Here is a prime example of the trouble identified by Susan Reynolds when scholars 'tend to confuse words, concepts and phenomena'.[61] Frequently blurring together words and concepts, writers have assigned various distinctions between feud words (the English term 'bloodfeud' is one such variant) to describe underlying phenomena of social behaviour. These distinctions have hinged on questions of social status, of individual or group action and liability, or of whether what is described in the record is a single hostile episode or an interminable chain of retaliatory acts.[62] Yet one durable view, first expressed by Brunner, has been of the essential difference between knightly feud (*Fehde*, as the prerogative of the nobility) and all the rest.[63] Even so, recent work on Germany, France, and Denmark has challenged this idea, breaking down the distinction between the knightly or noble feud and similar customary practices found among the lower orders, notably among townspeople and peasants.[64] The result of all this is a cacophony of interpretation, which leads to a fourth point: that a broadly agreed definition of feud continues to elude scholars.[65] Early medievalists have been the most severely sceptical, suggesting that feud was more fiction than fact, or that it should be dispensed with altogether in favour of more precise terminology.[66] With these challenges in mind, it is useful to think in terms of a descriptive concept of feud, rather than a restrictive definition.[67] Scholars working along these lines have tended to give feud a 'light' working definition, and from there identify and look for what may be termed feud-like elements in their sources.[68] What is still required is a clearer understanding of the differences (and overlaps) between words and concepts. Such an approach has recently aspired to think not

> about a concept as a single entity, but as a network of value-laden terms that constitute a conceptual field, a network that is constantly changing both in the composition of terms and in the meanings of some of those terms.[69]

In such a way medieval historians have, for instance, homed in on French *guerre*.[70] Other words that have drawn attention in a comparable lexicographical approach include 'enmity' or 'hatred', related words like 'malice' or 'anger' or *odium*, the Latin antonyms *amicus/inimicus* and *amicitia/inimicita* and their vernacular equivalents, and those to do with love and friendship.[71] A maturing history of emotions has assisted some of this work, putting the focus on the patterns of emotion shaping feud-like behaviours, including the seeking of vengeance to right a wrong. This comes with the recognition of emotion as an instrumental aspect of human social behaviour. Work on the late medieval Italian context has advanced the idea of a 'culture of vengeance', shaped significantly by the focus of analysis on the language of friendship and enmity.[72] In a comparable study, with the idea and language of vengeance as the focus of attention, one scholar has traced a vibrant 'enmity culture' in England up to the end of the thirteenth century.[73] The idea remains underdeveloped that such a culture of enmity might have existed also in late medieval England, involving the patterned behaviours that might be identified under the rubric of 'feud', although new work is addressing that question.[74]