MEDIEVAL MONOGAMY

Laura Betzig

ABSTRACT: *Was polygyny stopped by the Christian Church? Probably not. In the Middle Ages, as in other ages, powerful men married monogamously, but mated polygynously. Both laymen and church men tended to have sexual access to as many women as they could afford. But first-born sons were allowed a legitimate wife, on whom they got legitimate heirs. And latter-born sons were often celibate—that is, ineligible to sire heirs, though not chaste— that is, ineligible to sire bastards. Church men, like laymen, sought wealth to provide for their women and children. To get it, church men used canon law. Authorities like Gratian and Lombard insisted that "mutual consent" made a marriage. That undercut parents' ability to impose celibacy. And church bans against incest, divorce and remarriage, concubinage, wet nursing, and maybe even incontinence kept laymen from rearing heirs. That let the men who filled the monasteries come into their fathers' estates by default. In short, both church men and laymen practiced polygynous mating. At the same time, both approved of monogamous marriage. There was no conflict in either case. The conflict came when they tried to sow their seeds on the same finite plot. Neither wanted to get cut out of an inheritance.*

Laura Betzig is Co-Director of the Evolution and Human Behavior Program, Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. She is the author of Despotism and Differential Reproduction: A Darwinian View of History *(Aldine 1986), coeditor of* Human Reproductive Behaviour: A Darwinian Perpsective *(Cambridge 1988), and editor of* Human Nature: A Critical Reader *(Oxford in press). Her research interests include historical studies of political inequality as reproductive inequality.*

The Old Testament is full of many men with more than one woman. Take the patriarchs—like Abraham, who got sons by Sarah, his half-sister by a twice-mated father, and by Hagar, Sarah's Egyptian maid (Genesis 20: 12, 21: 2, 26: 4). Or take the kings—like Solomon, who kept a thousand women in his harem (1 Kings 11: 1-3). Throughout the Old Testament, powerful men are polygynous men.

In the New Testament seeds of discontent with polygyny are sown. The Gospels themselves have little to say about sex: Christ seems to have been fairly indifferent to the subject (Brundage 1987, p. 57). He disapproved of adultery; and he disapproved of divorce—except in the case of an adulterous wife (Matthew 19:9). More admonitions against polygamy are in Paul's epistles. Christians should not divorce; those who did should not remarry; and sex outside of marriage was not thought well of (e.g., 1 Corinthians 7:10-11). Early church fathers disassociated themselves from Jews who continued the long polygynous tradition; eventually, after the conversion of Constantine early in the fourth century, Christian Rome outlawed bigamy, restricted the legal grounds for divorce, and made it legally impossible to keep a wife and a concubine at once.

Is that all it took? Modern societies—those that have grown out of the Christian Middle Ages—are remarkably monogamous. They seem, in fact, so consistently monogamous that what was once the rule looks like an exotic exception. The vast majority of human societies has been polygynous (e.g., Murdock 1967; Low 1988; White 1988). In the family bands that foraged for plants and game over much of human history, a few men—elders, or the best hunters—kept two or, rarely, three women at a time. In small farming or herding groups, headmen and chiefs kept from two to a hundred women. And in the first "civilizations" on earth, as in every other empire that rose up outside of the Christian tradition, kings and emperors kept hundreds or even thousands of women in well-guarded harems (Betzig 1982, 1986, 1993).[1] What happened? Is "the chance conversion of a single powerful individual, the Emperor Constantine" all that was necessary to turn the tide of millions of years of human history away from polygyny toward monogamy (e.g., MacDonald 1990, p. 195)?

I try to answer that question here. There is no question that Christian theory and policy favored mongamous *marriage* in the Middle Ages. But did monogamous marriage mean monogamous *mating*, too? As it turns out, the most polygynous societies on earth in terms of mating have been among the most monogamous in terms of marriage: men with harems of hundreds or thousands of women have singled out one legitimate wife to bear legitimate heirs (Betzig 1993). How closely did medieval "monogamy" follow that pattern; and how closely did it resemble monogamy in our own society (e.g., Betzig and Weber 1993, 1995)? Did Christianity in the Middle Ages give rise to the relatively monogamous mating we live with now? Or did it just encourage monogamous *marriage* by polygynously *mated* men?

In *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex,* Darwin argued that men—like most other males—should have evolved to compete for access to the opposite sex (1871). The reason follows from men's higher potential reproductive rates: men, more than women, can raise their genetic representation in future generations by getting access to multiple mates (Bateman 1948; Trivers 1972; Clutton-Brock and Vincent 1991). As a rule, males do compete for females in fact

(Williams 1966). They fight to get access to fertile females themselves; and they fight to keep other males away.

A male's fighting success predicts his mating success in a number of species (e.g., Clutton-Brock 1988; Ellis 1995), including primates (e.g., Cowlishaw and Dunbar 1991). Again, in most human societies, men's political, economic, and reproductive success also correspond. But in modern societies, a man's success in competition—variously defined—does not appear to predict his success in reproduction (e.g., Vining 1986; Turke 1990; Pérusse 1993). The question is: Did the switch happen in the Middle Ages, under the influence of the church?

To answer it, I look at the evidence on medieval mating, and compare it with evidence on other polygynous cultures. I argue that powerful men in the Middle Ages, as in other ages, had sexual access to many women; at the same time, they tried to restrict their women's sexual access to just one man. Monogamy in the Middle Ages, as in other ages, was a form of *marriage* practiced by polygynously *mated* men. The contest between church and state had less to do with mating—i.e., with access to women, than with marriage—i.e., with access to wives. Polygynous mating died, or began its last gasps, after the Middle Ages were over; and the Church probably had little to do with its demise.

I want to end this beginning by pointing out that "monogamy"—that is, reproductive equality, interests me not just for its own sake but because it so often overlaps with "democracy"—that is, political equality. The most polygynous societies on earth have been despotisms (Betzig 1982, 1986, 1993, 1994). Men have used power to get sexual access to thousands of women, and they have killed thousands of men who stood in their way. Democracies, on the other hand, seem almost always to have been monogamous societies. I hope that understanding what has given rise to monogamy might help us, in some way, understand what has given rise—and what continues to give rise—to democracy.

MATING: MAKING CHILDREN

"Noble" men in most "civilized" societies have had exclusive sexual access to more than one woman in their own households; and they have had privileged sexual access to women in other men's households. They have preferred young, good-looking virgins; they have provided for them well, protected them well, and set them up with wet nurses, nannies, and other domestic help. They have probably sired and raised many children as a result. Again, until monogamy prevailed in modern society, these facts were constant across space and time (e.g., Betzig 1982, 1986, 1993). How closely do they match the medieval pattern?

The evidence—both quantitative and qualitative—is scarce; and it varies across sources, places and times. But it's surprisingly consistent. Women and children were concentrated in rich men's houses. In other words, variation in household size and composition fits a polygynous mating pattern. Women—especially unmarried women—tended to concentrate at the top; men—especially unmarried men—tended to concentrate at the bottom.

Some evidence comes from medieval monasteries. Irminon's early ninth-century census of the monastery at St. Germain des Prés lists, on dependent farms, 4857

men and just 3601 women, for a high overall sex ratio of 135. In every category, there are missing women. The sex ratio is especially high among "children": 141 boys for every 100 girls of stated sex. It is also especially high in families of the lowest status: 119 among *coloni,* people with the lightest obligations, 159 among *lidi,* people of intermediate status, and 266 among *servi,* people with the heaviest obligations. As David Herlihy (1985), who reviewed these figures, asks: Where are the missing lower-class girls? They might have been underreported—though that should have defeated the census-taker's purpose, to enumerate heads over whom the monastery had rights. They might have been killed—large fines should have mitigated female infanticide, though the penalty itself implies a practice to be stopped. Or, they might have been kept in the rich households left out of the survey—including the monastery. As Herlihy writes: "It seems likely that the monks of St. Germain...recruited women into their direct service, and likely also that the women were taken from the ranks of the *lidae* and *ancillae,* over whom they exercised full authority" (1985, p. 67). High status men may have taken young, low status women in, and later returned them to dependent farms. Two lists in Irminon's polyptych of landless, presumably unmarried, *homines votivi*—people apparently dedicated to the service of the monastery—show a complementary female sex ratio bias. The *capaticum* list includes 110 men and 129 women, the *votivi* list 21 women and 12 men. Overall, that makes 150 women and 122 men, for a low sex ratio of just 81 (p. 68).

Similarly, in the partial survey from the monastery at Santa Maria di Farfa redacted in the early ninth century and copied by Gregory of Catino in the late eleventh century, the sex ratio is skewed in favor of males. In the households on dependent farms, there are 324 male and just 238 female "children," defined by relationship to household head rather than age, for a high sex ratio of 136. Where, again, are the missing girls? Possibly underreported; but, given the equal numbers of grown men and women, unlikely to have been killed (Ring 1979). In this case, some women were certainly at the monastery. The list of servants at Forcone lists 73 women and just 23 men, for a very low sex ratio of 32. As Herlihy concludes, "Women tended to congregate in the households of the powerful, even on monastic estates" (1985, p. 67).

Powerless men, on the other hand, may have had to do without. The St. Germain survey lists 650 "solitaries," 616 male and just 44 female, for a "staggering" sex ratio of 1,400 (Herlihy 1985, p. 66). Some of the men nominally assigned to these solitary plots may actually have lived with families somewhere else; others are likely to have been bachelors in fact.

Demographic fragments from other places and times run along the same lines. Life-cycle service was common in Britain (e.g., Laslett 1969). Hajnal (1965, 1983) identifies frequent service as part of the northwest European marriage pattern; MacFarlane (1986) traces it back to the thirteenth century, and possibly before. In medieval England, late fourteenth-century poll taxes are a systematic source on the flow of servants in and out of households, though not a reliable one. At Kempsford, the tax was taken twice because of evasions: the first found 30 servants in a population of 118; the second found 39 more who had been hidden (Hanawalt 1985, pp. 163-164). Servants made up over 13 percent of the population of 63 parish

lists from 1574 to 1821; Kussmaul (1981) estimates that roughly 60 percent of the 15-24 year old population were in service. A majority were unmarried (e.g., Laslett 1977; Laslett, Öosterveen, and Smith 1980). Most "productive" servants—in apprenticeships or on farms—were boys; most "domestic" servants were girls (Kussmaul 1981, pp. 3-4, 173; cf. Wall 1983). Domestic servants have always concentrated in rich men's houses (e.g., Stone 1965; Trumbach 1978).

Other evidence suggests access to women and children might have varied with wealth or status *among* peasant men. In fourteenth-century Halesowen, the mean number of children ranged from about three-and-a-half in the richest families to about one-and-a-half in the poorest families. Richer children suffered lower infant and child mortality; and richer women married younger, lived longer, and bore more children. In short, "the wealthier a family was, the larger was the number of its children"—though their relatedness to the household head isn't clear (Razi 1980, p. 88). Similarly, in fourteenth-century Broughton, frequent office holders included about a third of the families, but accounted for over half of the village population; non-office holders included over half of the families, but only a third of the population. In short, poorer families "seem to have been much smaller" (Britton 1977, p. 14). In fifteenth-century Tuscany, the richest quartile of households held 30 percent of the married women and 37 percent of the youngest children (Herlihy and Klapisch-Zuber 1985).

Literary sources fill in some of the blanks. Compared to Latin sources on Roman emperors, sources on medieval kings tend to be thin on gossip; sources on lesser aristocrats are sometimes richer. Some of it comes from detractors. Among them Guibert, twelfth-century abbot of Nogent, describes one of his cousins as "a man conspicuous for his power and knowledge but so bestial in his debauchery that he had no respect for any woman's conjugal ties....The marriage net could not hold him," he says, "he never allowed himself to be entangled in its folds. Being everywhere in the worst odor through such conduct, but protected by the rank which his worldly power gave him, he was never prevented by the reproach of his own unchastity from thundering persistently against the holy clergy" (Guibert of Nogent 1970, i.7). Another lord, Enguerrand of Boves, was "so abandoned in his love of women that he kept all sorts around him, both the proper kind and mercenaries, and hardly did anything except at the dictation of their wantonness" (iii.3). Enguerrand's "reputed" son, Thomas of Marle, was similarly "unrestrained" by ties to his wives, who "could not keep him from the rivalry of harlots and the bodies of others" (iii.14).

Other gossips praise, rather than condemn. Among them Giselbert of Mons, in his twelfth-century *Chronique de Hainaut,* blasts his ex-benefactor for uxorious (exclusive) devotion to his wife: It seemed "risible" that a strong young count should stay "'attached to one woman'"—his own uncomplying wife. Giselbert's "hero," in contrast, "had clearly known many other women besides his wife whilst he was married." And they were (this is a common catalogue): Beautiful, noble, and virginal (cited in Duby 1994a, pp. 29-35).

In the same vein—and maybe richest of all accounts—is Lambert of Ardres' *Historia comitum Ghisnensium,* the early thirteenth-century pean to his benefactor, Count Baudouin. Marc Bloch calls Baudouin "hunter, toper, and great wencher"

(1961, p. 104), and Georges Duby has made a lot of the last. As he puts it: "Life in a noble household was a hotbed of sex" (1983, p. 70). Or, as Lambert says: "'From the beginning of adolescence until his old age, his loins were stirred by the intemperance of an impatient libido...; very young girls, and especially virgins, aroused his desire'" (Duby 1978, p. 93). Baudouin and his kinsmen are said to have preferred pretty women; no matter how casually sexually encountered they are all described as "beautiful." And, evidently, fruitful: This count was buried with twenty-three bastards in attendance, besides ten living legitimate daughters and sons (p. 94).

Even these might have been just the fruits of the family tree's primary limbs. As Lambert notes, Baudouin by no means kept account of all his bastards. These were usually scattered far and wide. And, as Duby notes, noble men would just as soon have the ignoble women—the servants, slaves, and whores—who begot so many of them. The lovers noble men did remember may have included their vassals' daughters, "but there is more evidence that they were the family's bastard daughters, who formed a kind of pleasure reserve within the house itself" (Duby 1978, p. 94). This kind of sex was, then, endogamous. Noble or half-noble women begat noble or half-noble children, *ad infinitum*. "Illegitimacy was a normal part of the structure of ordinary society—so normal that illegitimate children, especially males, were neither concealed nor rejected" (Duby 1983, p. 262). They always had the right, at least, to bed and board in their father's house. "That house was always open to them" (p. 263). Bastards like these, the cream of the illegitimate crop, are most likely to have made up the twenty-three who watched when Baudouin was interred.

He may have had opportunities to sire more. Baudouin's bedroom was in the "most inaccessible part of the house, the 'family womb'" (Duby 1988a, pp. 60, 63). It was probably a very comfortable place. In an inventory of the property of a near contemporary, an eleventh-century Catalonian lord, there are mattresses, feather cushions, covers, rugs, and tapestries: "The vocabulary takes on a special richness in describing the bedroom's many accessories" (Duby 1988a, p. 60). In rooms like these the main lines of the great family trees would be drawn. So might their offshoots. Baudouin's bedchamber, for instance, had access to the servant girls' quarters, and to the rooms of adolescent girls upstairs. It had access, too, to the warming room, "a veritable incubator for the suckling infants" (Duby 1978, p. 87). To Lambert, the aristocratic house was a "birthing place" (Duby 1978, p. 87). To Duby, arrangements like these assured that the "genetic vigour" of noble males was "widely disseminated" beyond the lineage itself. He goes on: "The paterfamilias thus occupied the place of God: within his house all life seemed to emanate from him....Reproduction meant expansion....Everything, especially the authority of the paterfamilias, was arranged so as to maximize this vital outward thrust" (Duby 1988a, p. 68).

English sources are often specific about sexual access to servants. William of Malmesbury complained that, on the eve of the Norman Conquest, the English nobility had been "given up to luxury and wantonness....There was a custom, repugnant to nature, which they adopted; namely, to sell their female servants, when pregnant by them and after they had satisfied their lust" (1847, p. 279). Gentlemen's

diaries from modern England suggest a similar pattern. Simon Forman, Robert Hooke, Sylas Neville, James Boswell, and especially Samuel Pepys accessed their servants sexually, and occasionally married them off after an accomplished pregnancy. As Lawrence Stone concludes his survey of these diaries: "Finally, there were the poor amateurs, the ubiquitous maids, waiting on masters and guests in lodgings, in the home, in inns; young girls whose virtue was always uncertain and was constantly under attack." He adds: "These last were the most exploited, and most defenceless, of the various kinds of women whose sexual services might be obtained by a man of quality" (1977, p. 601). Bridal pregnancy was high in early modern England (Hair 1966, 1970); parish records suggest masters were sometimes bastards' fathers (e.g., Quaife 1979; Laslett, Öosterveen, and Smith 1980; cf. Hollingsworth 1964, p. 48). Other evidence suggests masters' subordinates, including servants and other men in their employ, occasionally assumed paternity for their superiors' children in return for various kinds of compensation (e.g., Stone 1977; Smout 1980).

Women outside the house could be sexually available as well. In Lambert's account a dependent mother, unable to pay her tax of an Easter lamb, was asked to give up her little girl instead (Duby 1983, p. 260). Peasants paid a lecherwite for being "deflowered" before marriage, a childwite for bearing a child as a result, and a merchet on marriage. Merchets arguably bought off *jus primae noctis,* a lord's or cleric's right to pass the night with dependents' brides. That possibility is suggested, among other things, by terms like *culage, cuissage, jus cunni,* and so on, for which *droit du seigneur* became a "colorless euphemism" in the eighteenth century (Hovarth 1971; also Westermarck 1921, I: pp. 166f; Litvack 1984); alternatively, merchets might have amounted to something as innocuous as a dowry tax (Searle 1979, 1983; Faith 1983).

The medieval *pastourelle*—short poems penned by gentlemen like Henri II, the thirteenth-century Duke of Brabant, Juan Ruiz, fourteenth-century Archpriest of Hita and, in the fifteenth century, Hermann von Sachsenheim—are all about the seduction of lower-class women (Paden 1987). As John Baldwin observes, they "centered on the theme of a knight who rides through the countryside and discovers a solitary shepherdess (hence the title) whom he attempts to seduce by deceit, gifts, money, force, or other persuasions" (1994, p. 201).

Even among the nobility, rank was associated with cuckoldry—at least in the stories. Boccaccio's *Decameron* is filled with examples. For instance, King Philippe Le Borgne makes advances with impunity to the Marquis of Montferrat's "beautiful and worthy" wife; Ricciardo Minutolo, an "immensely rich and blue-blooded" patrician, gets away with fornicating with the most beautiful woman in Naples by pretending to be her husband; the "sprightly young gallant," Giannello Scignario—like many young gallants and middle-aged priests—makes a mistress of a poor man's wife, having offered her "large sums of money;" and, having slept with the daughter of the house, rich and noble Ricciardo averts virtuous and reputable Messer Lizio da Valbona's wrath by taking the lady to wife (i.5, vi.6, vii.2, v.4). On the other the other hand, when Pietro, Messer Amerigo's freedman, gets Amerigo's daughter with child, he's sentenced to get whipped and hanged; when the poor Count of Antwerp is loudly but wrongly accused of having ravished the daughter-in-law of

the King of France, he spends a lifetime in exile; and when Guiscardo, a valet, makes love to the daughter of the Prince of Salerno, his master, his heart is ripped out of his chest and delivered to his lover (v.7, ii.8, iv.1). As far as Andreas Capellanus was concerned, noble men in "love" with peasant women should "be careful to puff them up with lots of praise," and then, at a convenient spot, "embrace them by force" (i.11). He adds in his notes on "The Love of the Clergy," that a priest ought to make love "in accordance with the rank or standing of his parents" (i.7). From the woman's point of view, in *Roman de la Rose,* a poor man was good for nothing (l. 11223-11406).

Lords of the house weren't the only men who weren't chaste. Otto of Friesing, contrasting the eternal nature of spiritual life with the ephemeral nature of life on earth, liked to think his friends in the church abstained from sex. "Why should I speak of their celibacy?" he asked. "The custom of marriage, a custom common to the whole human race and everywhere permitted, they have so completely renounced that certain of them guard not only the inner but even the outer barriers with such care that they never admit any woman to their presence for any reason— not even for the purposes of prayer" (*The Two Cities,* vi.35).

Other sources suggest otherwise (e.g., Lea 1884). Gregory of Tours says of sixth-century bishops Salonius and Sagittarius, for instance, that they spent nights "feasting and carousing," days in an "oblivion of sleepiness and liquor..., usually in the arms of some woman or other" (*History of the Franks,* v. 20). In the twelfth century, Gerald of Wales complained of the Irish clergy that, "dividing the day of twenty-four hours into two equal parts, they devote the hours of light to spiritual offices, and those of night to the flesh" (*Topography of Ireland,* iii.27). He was distressed that on both "this side of the water and across the Channel," sons succeeded to church offices, "not by election, but as if they held these beneficies by hereditary right" (*Description of Wales,* ii.6). According to Orderic Vitalis, an eleventy-century synod complained that "archdeacons, who ought to enforce discipline," kept handmaids and concubines and had women "smuggled in" (*Ecclesiastical History,* iv.10). Liudprand of Cremona, for his tenth-century benefactor Otto the Great, lists the adulterous offenses of "so-called" Pope John, conceived in an affair between Pope Sergius and "the harlot" Marozia, wife of Tuscany's marquess (*Antapodosis,* iii.43; also ii.48). "Witness the women he keeps, some of them fine ladies who, as the poet says, are as thin as reeds by dieting, others everyday buxom wenches. It is all the same to him whether they walk the pavement or ride in a carriage and pair"(*Liber de Rebus Gestis Ottonis,* iv). Pilgrims to Rome he took by force, "wives, widows and virgins alike," and got his father's mistress with child. As far as John's accusers were concerned, he had in short "turned the holy palace into a brothel and resort for harlots"(*Liber de Rebus Gestis Ottonis,* x). Three centuries later, as Innocent IV left Lyons, Cardinal Hugo cynically apologized to the crowds: "Friends,...since we arrived in this city we have done much good and largely bestowed alms; for when we first came here, we found three or four brothels, and now at our departure we leave behind us only one; but that extends from the eastern gate of the city to the western one" (Matthew Paris, *English History,* AD 1251).

Flesh mortification wasn't easy. For adolescent Augustine, "The single desire that dominated my search for delight was simply to love and to be loved....Clouds of muddy concupiscence filled the air" (*Confessions,* ii.2). Origen and a few others put an end to them: "Both to fulfill the savior's saying, and also [to] prevent all suspicion of shameful slander," they castrated themselves (Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecclesiastical History,* vi.8.2). But, for the vast majority, what bothered the fathers kept on bothering the sons. As Martin Luther put it a millennium later: "When he was quite old, Augustine still complained about nocturnal pollutions. When he was goaded by desire Jerome beat his breast with stones but was unable to drive the girl from his heart. Francis made snowballs and Benedict lay down on thorns" (*Table Talk,* 3777).

Many succumbed. Peter de Dalbs, thirteenth-century abbot of Lézat monastery, was "Don Juan in a cassock." Thirty-three of the 36 witnesses who spoke at the inquest—run by Peter's adversary, William de Bessencs, abbot of the monastery at Moissac—testified to his promiscuity. One insisted Peter had "had IT with" more than a thousand women, some that he'd fornicated with women related by marriage or blood, others that he'd copulated on Palm Sunday and Good Friday. He slept long-term with his mistress, Munda; he slept, short-term, with women procured for him by other men—and many others. In John Mundy's words: "The witnesses in the roll tell that 45 women, including young girls, crossed the abbot's path at one time or another during the dozen or so years he was abbot of Lézat. Of these, three or four had no relationship with him" (1990, p. 53). In these affairs, "his prelatry was generally an advantage;" he "used his power and wealth to get his way"; he "leaned on" women. Sometimes, he paid them off directly; sometimes, he paid off their providers. When, in particular, he finally put Munda away, one prospective husband was offered an oblate's pension, another who declined to marry her was stripped of his pension, and a third—the "successful" candidate—was made public notary and given a pension of bread and wine. As Mundy sums up: "The abbot's tastes were catholic. He pursued noblewomen, the solid middle classes and prostitutes, an indifference that is good proof that, in the opinion of the witnesses, a Don Juan was a man who chased anything in a skirt" (p. 57). And was chased? Mothers are said to have brought their daughters to the abbott, asking "for the recipe of his sexual magic" (p. 63). Nor was Peter the only incontinent man in his monastery. At least 11 monks were said, at the inquisition, to have had issue; and 20—out of at least 42 in the monastery—were admitted to have had sex (p. 49).

Just a few miles away, in early fourteenth century Montaillou, there was another "Don Juan"—the priest, Pierre Clergue, of the powerful Clergue clan. In Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie's words, "Pierre was a swashbuckler. Cathar, spy and rake—he was everywhere" (1975, p. 154; cf. Boyle 1981). In particular, he was wherever women were: "He coveted all women....Hunting was his vocation." The Fournier Register—of the inquisition run by Jacques Fournier, Bishop of Pamiers—lists a dozen "authenticated" mistresses, "but the list is certainly incomplete." As one Montaillou shepherd put it to another, "priests formed a sort of equestrian class, who finally bestrode anyone they fancied" (p. 156). As in Peter de Dalbs' case, ecclesiastical office helped, rather than hurt, Pierre Clergue's pursuits. Clerical office came with carrots and sticks: With favors, for willing complicitors; with threats,

for the unwilling. Clergue gave a fifteen-year-old virgin, whom he had deflowered in a barn, to a husband who benignly turned a blind eye to their affair for four years, and then died. At the inquisition, the same woman said she'd been afraid to denounce her lover earlier since "'If I had denounced them, the priest and his brothers would have killed me or ill-treated me" (p. 159).

Bernhard Schimmelpfennig, in his study "Ex Fornicatione Nati," addressed what he called the "question of support." If men in the church often conceived children in sin, then who raised them? Where the mother was a parish priest's housekeeper, she seems to have been able to count on collegial assistance. Secular canons, who also lived in their own households, may have used income from their prebends (church stipends) to buy land for their illegitimate children. Men of higher rank—bishops and canons—used their *ex officio* right to grant dispensation so that bastard sons might receive lower orders themselves. These are the ranks from which the Pierre Clergues and Peter de Dalbses were drawn. Hundreds of papal dispensations concern clerics' illegitimate children. In the archdiocese of Cologne, for instance, more than sixty priests' sons got dispensations from 1310 to 1352; in the twelfth century, Pope Paschalis II said that "almost all the larger and the better part of the clergy" were sons of priests in England, while in Spain, the marriage of priests "is a general practice"; Innocent VIII, in the fifteenth century, married his own children off in public—with pomp (Schimmelpfennig 1974). In short, whether ecclesiastical bastards were fathered by men of high or low rank, parishioners paid for their support.

The abolition of marriage and the suppression of sexual activity among clergy were consistent aims of reform. Church canons penalized promiscuity early. At the Council of Nicaea in AD 325, "sensual sins" confirmed by two or three witnesses prompted expulsion from office; deacons, priests, and bishops were forbidden even to house "strange women," excepting mothers, sisters and aunts (Canons ii, iii, in Lambert 1868, p. 5); similar admonitions were made for more than a milennium (Lea 1984; Brundage 1987). Secular laws concurred. In the *Theodosian Code,* "consorting with extraneous women" was forbidden to clergy (xvi.2,44); in the *Bavarian Laws,* priests, deacons and ecclesiastical servants were allowed to reside with mothers, daughters, and full sisters, but "cohabitation with strange women is forbidden" (i.12); in the *Visigothic Code* priests, deacons, or sub-deacons who commited adultery or fornication with wives, widows, or virgins were "compelled to do penance according to the holy canons of the church"—and might be made to pay two pounds of gold to the royal treasury (iii.4.18). Evidently, such sanctions were not enough. St. Boniface, in an eighth-century letter to Pope Zacharias, complained that priests and deacons kept four or five concubines at once, and still advanced in clerical rank; according to Huguccio, eleventh-century Bishop of Ferrara, even a clerk who kept a thousand concubines would be eligible for promotion. As late as the fourteenth century, Henry of Gelders, Bishop of Liége, bragged he'd begotten fourteen sons in just twenty-two months. References to ecclesiastical dynasties were common (Brundage 1987; Lea 1884); even Lambert of Ardres was proud father to a pair of bastard sons (Duby 1994a, p. 18). And the numbers add up. Again, both the censuses at St. Germain and at Farfa suggest a surplus of women—especially young, unmarried, low-status women—lived in

medieval monasteries. Adelard, abbot of Corbie, said he settled widows and single men on his estates; "presumably he kept the young unmarried women in his direct service" (cited in Herlihy 1985, p. 67). As Bernard of Clairvaux put it, "To be always with a woman and not to have sexual relations with her is more difficult than to raise the dead" (*Sermones in Cantica Canticorum* lxv.2.4, cited in Brundage 1987, p. 251).

The French fabliau, "The Priest Who Pecked," ends with the epigram "Many a fool by God is fed" (in DuVal and Eichmann 1982, p. 46). Fabliaux are full of sexually active clerics: "The preferred lover of the peasant or bourgeois wife was the local priest who is ever ready to make pastoral house calls" (Baldwin 1994, p. 67). So are Boccaccio's hundred stories; in one Tedaldo degli Elisei (having been jilted by his lover on the advice of her priest) complains: "They denounce men's lust, so that when the denounced are out of the way, their women will be left to the denouncers....They consider themselves acquitted from every charge, however serious, simply by replying 'Do as we say, not as we do'....If we were to go pursuing the ladies, the friars would be put out of business" (*Decameron,* iii.7). So are the *Canterbury Tales:* As the Wife of Bath points out, "The clerk, when he is old, and unable to do/ Any of Venus' work worth his old shoe,/ Then sits down and writes in his dotage/ That women cannot keep their marriage vows!" (l. 708-711). Verse writers complained. An anonymous fourteenth-century poem called "The Wily Clerk" reads (in Robbins 1952, p. 19):

> Ser Iohn to me Is proferyng
>   for his pleasure ryght well to pay
> & in my box he puttes his offryng
>   [I have no powre to say hym nay.]

To sum up: Census data on medieval mating are few, sometimes demonstrably unreliable, and generally incomplete (e.g., Herlihy 1985). Literary evidence on mating in the Middle Ages, as in other ages, amounts to no more than "gossip" (cf. Syme 1939; Saller 1980). But they are the best sources available, and both are consistent with a polygynous bias. Higher status men, inside and outside their households, seem to have had sexual access to more women. Those women were often supposed to be young, unmarried and explicitly "pretty"; they and their children were often provided with good food, good protection and good care.

All these patterns match evidence on other cultures (e.g., Dickemann 1979a, 1979b, 1981; van den Berghe 1979; Betzig 1982, 1986, 1993). Like the medieval evidence, it's almost purely descriptive. On the other hand, like the medieval evidence, it's surprisingly consistent. Arguably, the first six civilizations likely to have arisen more or less indigenously are: Sumer, later Babylon and Assyria, in Mesopotamia; ancient Egypt; India; China; Aztec Mexico; and Inca Peru (Fried 1967; Service 1975; cf. McNeill 1963). Census data on all six are scarce, but literary evidence suggests that sexual access to women paralleled a man's power. The evidence from nearly six thousand years ago in Sumer is most sketchy; but kings at Sumer, Assyria, and Babylon are supposed to have had children by wives, concubines, and many slaves. Rich homes were filled with hundreds of slave women;

slaves were obliged to yield both their labor and themselves (e.g., Contenau 1954).
Evidence from Egypt, around the second millennium BC, is better. Amenophis III,
Akhenaten's father, is supposed to have kept one "Great Wife," Tiy, plus two Syrian
princesses, two Babylonian princesses, one Arzawa princess, "droves" of Egyptian
women, and two princesses from Mitanni. One of the Mitanni princesses alone,
according to a temple relief text, added 317 ladies-in-waiting to his harem (Redford
1984, pp. 36, 134). In India, the history of polygyny is notorious. Harem size
estimates range from 16,000 in the royal seraglio in the fifth century BC, to 332
in the twentieth-century harem of His Highness Maharaja Sir Bhupinder Singh
(Saletore 1978, p. 10; Dass 1970, p. 78). In China, by the eighth century BC, texts
had established that kings should keep one queen, three consorts, nine wives of
second rank, 27 wives of third rank, and 81 concubines, besides other women who
might—as in the "Yellow Emperor's" case—number in the thousands; typically,
"palace agents used to scour the entire empire for beautiful and accomplished
women, and apparently took them wherever they found them" (van Gulik 1974,
pp. 94-95, 184; cf. Zhisui 1994). In the New World, according to several sources,
Aztec nobles' consorts numbered from dozens to thousands, and their children
sometimes numbered in the hundreds (e.g., Bandelier 1880, p. 613; Motolinía 1951,
pp. 202, 246; Padden 1967, pp. 20, 98). Inca lords are said to have kept reservoirs
of virgins, with seven hundred women in each of them; and the number of consorts
an official might keep was supposedly linked to his status by law (e.g., Garcilaso
de la Vega 1961, p. 86; Poma de Ayala 1936, p. 184). Other evidence suggests these
nobles had sexual access to women outside their households. In India, Brahmins
are said to have had the right, by "ancient custom," to sex with married woman
of subordinate caste (e.g., Saletore 1974, pp. 84, 109). In China, kinsmen of an
emperor of the second century BC are supposed to have "debauched every married
woman that took their fancy" (van Gulik 1974, p. 61). And for ancient Egyptian
Pharaohs, "according to ancient ideas, all the wives of his subjects were his" (Erman
1971, p. 73). That "idea" recurs (e.g., Betzig 1986).

Medieval nobles' polygyny might have paralleled other nobles' in several
particulars, as well. They seem to have preferred women ready to conceive. Both
the quantitative and qualitative evidence suggests they filled their households with
young women—though men might have been better laborers by virtue of greater
strength, and older women might have been better workers by virtue of greater
experience. The reproductive advantages of young women are obvious; on the other
hand, female fecundity is clearly tied to age (e.g., Wood and Weinstein 1988). Virgins
were sometimes explicitly preferred. Again, Lambert points out that "very young
girls, and especially virgins," appealed to Baudouin. Besides being young, virgins
have at least two advantages with respect to fitness: They are unlikely to be carrying
sexually transmitted diseases, and they are unlikely to be carrying other men's
children. Attractivenes may have been another criterion. Again, according to
Lambert, all of Baudouin's women were "pretty"; in *The Courtier,* to Castiglione,
beauty "informs a countenance which is well-proportioned and composed of a
certain joyous harmony of various colours enhanced by light and shadow and by
symmetry and clear definition" (iv.52). "Pretty" women arguably bear marks of
good health. "Clear eyes, firm muscle tone, sound teeth, luxuriant hair, or a firm

gait," as well as unblemished and unwrinkled skin, and average or "regular" features, may be generally attractive in women (Symons 1979, p. 187; Jones and Hill 1993). New theory and data from several species suggest that attractiveness—specifically, facial and body symmetry—reflects developmental health, and arguably heritable fitness as well (e.g., Zuk 1992; Thornhill and Gangestad 1993).

The comparative record is consistent. Bhupinder Singh, a twentieth-century Indian Maharaja, is said to have had his women brought to the palace as children, kept in a "harem nursery," and brought up to suit his tastes (Dass 1970, pp. 39, 78). In Sui Dynasty China, a nobleman was advised to select, for sex, "young women whose breasts have not yet developed and who are well covered with flesh. They should have hair as fine as silk and small eyes in which the pupil and the white are clearly separated. Face and body should be smooth and speech harmonious" (van Gulik 1974, p. 149). In Aztec Mexico, as in many other empires, "pretty" women are said to have been requisitioned as tribute; in Inca Peru, any girl entering a "house of virgins" was supposed to be of good lineage, good looking, and under the age of eight (Padden 1967, p. 20; Garcilaso de la Vega 1961, pp. 85, 88). In Egypt, Amenophis III is supposed to have requisitioned "beautiful" women for his harem, while Ramses III is depicted in reliefs with women young enough to have been thought, by some scholars, to be his daughters (Erman 1971, p. 76; Redford 1984, p. 37).

Once they had chosen women, medieval noblemen often provided good protection, good food, and good caretakers for their children. Wet nurses are mentioned many times: they should be clean, healthy, and young themselves; at best, they should take mother's place (e.g., Trotula, *Diseases of Women,* p. 26). These nurses may have helped raise high-ranking women's fertility substantially. In a number of recent studies, lactation has been shown to suppress ovulation, and to increase interbirth intervals in natural fertility populations (e.g., Wood 1990). Lambert was explicit: At Ardres, "governesses took care of the mistress' offspring so that the lady herself could get on as quickly as possible with the business of conceiving the next child" (Duby 1988a, pp. 68-69). In medieval Europe, as in later Europe, an infant's survival might have been directly related to its nurse's cost (Hrdy 1992). Aristocratic parents may have taken advantage of surrogates long after their children were weaned. While poor children often were paid to work as servants in rich houses, servants were often brought in to rear children of the rich at home.

Aristocratic men in the Middle Ages also provided their families with superlatives of food. Medieval parks commonly included game reserves; courts were filled with orchards; ponds were stocked with fish. In *Morte Arthure,* the New Year at the Round Table starts with "bristling boars' heads brightened with silver," followed by: peacocks, pheasants, plovers, hawks, herons, cranes, curlews, swans and barnacle geese; beefs pies, boar shoulders, pork brisket and rabbits; and Cretan, Osay, Algarve, Rhenish, Rochelle and Venetian wines—all brought in in gemmed goblets or on gold and silver platters by sixty trained nobles (l. 171-218). The contrast with peasant fare is stark. People commonly acknowledged a "hierarchy of bread": peasants made theirs of peas and beans; servants got brown bread; and monks, nobles, scholars, and urban and country elites ate white. Protein was relatively rare in peasants' diets (e.g., Bullough and Campbell 1980). Meat was often

poached from aristocratic parks and eaten on the spot; that means women and children most often went without. There has been a protracted debate about how much female fertility depends on fat reserves (e.g., Frisch 1987; Bailey et al. 1992). Though there is no consensus, it is generally agreed that a well-fed woman will outreproduce a starved one. The same should be true of children.

Rich medieval women and children might have had less mortality risk for another reason. They lived in forts. As Lambert and others point out, women and children were kept in the innermost recesses of an aristocratic house. An idle life in a castle may have been safer than a laborer's life in the fields on two counts: Less risk of intentional and accidental death. Peasant infants sometimes suffered from reluctant neglect on the part of busy parents. In fourteenth-century English coroners' rolls, nearly half of all fatal infant accidents took place during four summer months, when all able-bodied adults were at work in the fields; babies and infants often died unattended in their cradles, or ill-tended by brothers and sisters (Hanawalt 1985, p. 176).

A few more comparisons may be in order. Rich parents used wet nurses at Sumer, if not before (Fidles 1988). There are references to wet nursing in the Code of Hammurabi; important persons' wet nurses were honored at the Egyptian court (see Hrdy 1992 on the history of delegated mothering; Driver and Miles 1955, p. 77 on Hammurabi; Redford 1984, p. 22 on ancient Egypt). Food was superabundant in aristocratic houses. Garcilaso de la Vega describes the temple garden attached to the Inca's imperial palace, stocked with fruit trees and vegetables, wild and domesticated animals, stalks of corn and grain, piles of wool, and statues of men, women, and children, "all very faithfully reproduced" in silver and gold (1961, p. 20). Indian Maharajas ate what New World goldsmiths wrought. In Bhupinder Singh's court high queens, or Maharanis, were served a hundred different dishes on gold platters; lower ranking Ranis got fifty dishes served on silver platters; other women in the harem got twenty on brass; the Maharaja got a hundred and fifty on gold studded with precious stones (Dass 1970, pp. 78-79). Finally, very much like nobles in the Middle Ages, other nobles lived in redoubtable houses (e.g., Betzig 1993).

MISOGYNY: MAKING RELATED CHILDREN

Polygyny is double pronged: A man must compete for sexual access to women; and he must compete to keep other men away from his women. To the latter end, powerful men in the Middle Ages—as in other ages—segregated their women, guarded them, and severely punished those who went astray anyway.

Both church and lay conventions found medieval women more prone to "sexual excess" than medieval men. To nip bad inclinations in the bud, well-to-do girls were well brought up. Church fathers, from the first texts, advised that girls and boys be kept apart. At Ardres, girls spent their infancy at the heart of the house, in its nursery, and were from then on kept apart from everyone else. "As soon as children attained the age of reason they were strictly segregated: girls were carefully watched to protect their virginity until the moment when they were conveyed in solemn cortège to the castle of their future spouse" (Duby 1988a, p. 69). Meanwhile,

boys were advised to range for wealth, women, and wives. Little girls were escorted each night to their common dormitory on the highest and least accessible floor, opposite the room to which their brothers might or might not come home. The point seems to have been generally clear. As Chrétien de Troyes put it of Cligés' faithful lover, Fenice: "She intended to save her maidenhood to preserve his inheritance" (*Cligés,* 3228-3229). Tertullian was even plainer: "Purity is the flower of virtue....It preserves blood untainted and guarantees parentage" (*De Pudicitia,* i).

Inside the house and out, rich women were hidden and watched. Proper ladies kept their locks tied up; law codes fined men for uncovering women's heads (e.g., *Alamannic Laws,* lvi; *Bavarian Laws,* viii.5; *Pactus Legis Salicae,* civ.1-2, cf. lxlvii). Less elaborate habits were worn in other places and times; Petrarch speaks of Laura's "veil" (e.g., *Rime Sparse,* 11, 199, 319). In fiction, women are escorted to their baths; they are escorted on trips; they are escorted into their nuptial chambers (e.g., Régnier-Bohler 1988, p. 364). Even Charlemagne's celibate (but not chaste) daughters, who rode behind him while his sons rode at his side, were watched by "hand-picked guards [who] closed the line of the march" (Einhard, *Vita Caroli,* iii.19). Often a girl would be watched over by other women; sometimes an incapacitated man might do—in *Morte Arthure,* virgins are escorted by dwarfs. Women were often kept in towers and forts. Chrétien de Troyes' *The Knight of the Cart* has Guinevere securely obscured, "safe from the lusts of men," in a tower, and guarded by Arthur's trusty seneschal, Kay; in Marie de France's *Guigemar,* the old man keeps his pretty, highborn wife behind a wall of green marble with one entry point "guarded day and night;" even Christine de Pizan's liberated *City of Ladies* is housed behind the usual fortified walls. In the *Niebelungenlied,* "troops of lovely maidens"—sometimes tens, sometimes more than a hundred—are constantly watching from the windows; and when Kriemhild is finally introduced to Siegfried, "she has never addressed a knight before" (v). Isabel, William Marshal's seventeen-year-old bride, had been kept in the Tower of London for thirteen years (Duby 1985, p. 121).

Lesser women's honor could be protected as well. The *Alamannic Laws* levy a fine on men who lie with others' chambermaids, and textile maids, against their will (lxxv). The *Bavarian Laws* fine men who lie with virgin maidservants—the fines being paid to their lords (viii.11-13). The *Visigothic* and other laws also fine freemen and slaves who sleep with other men's slave women (*Visigothic Code,* iii.4.15-16; *Pactus Legis Salicae,* xxv.1,2,6). Free Franks who touched the hand or arm or finger of a free woman "or any other woman" paid heavily (*Pactus Legis Salicae,* xx).

Punishments weren't always pecuniary. According to Hincmar, ninth-century archbishop of Reims, injured husbands might lead wives to their butchers asking that they be carved up like cattle; or they might "cut them to pieces" themselves (*De Divortio,* v, cited in Wemple 1981, p. 104; also Brundage 1987, pp. 208, 307, 388). Even suspicion of fornication could lead a woman, like Isolde in *Tristan,* to an ordeal which could produce pain or permanent harm. As for men, references to castration are fairly common. In tenth-century Italy, Dominic—a rough, shaggy, uncouth and unwashed priest—was castrated "for having whinneyed after his lady's maids," or rather, after his lady herself (Liudprand, *Antapodosis,* v.32). In Peter Abelard's case, the punishment similarly fit the crime. Fulbert (his lover's uncle)

had him castrated in bed. In Abelard's words, "they cut off the parts of my body whereby I had committed the wrong of which they complained" (*Historia Calamitatum*).

Physical controls like these were matched by moral controls. St. Jerome, in his twenty-second letter, wrote "I praise wedlock, I praise marriage; but it is because they produce me virgins" (*Letters,* xxii). Lambert typically praised "all the pious, obedient daughters" in an aristocratic house, juxtaposed with "a eulogy of the rampaging sons" (Duby 1983, p. 279). Feminine virtue was, in a word, virginity. The model medieval mother was the Virgin Mary, who conceived her son intact. And good virgins were mentally, as well as physically, meek. Heloise, who "makes rings around" Abelard in their letters, is incessantly deferential (quote from Brooke 1991, p. 461). Asking for tips on how to lead the celibate life, she concedes (among other things) that "the necks of bullock and heifer should in no sense be brought under the same yoke of a common Rule, since those whom nature created unequal cannot properly be made equal in labor" (*Letters,* v).

Controls on female chastity, of course, have been common in other polygynous cultures. Sanskrit texts advised Hindus to construct harems in concentric circles, with many compartments one within another, ringed by a parapet, ditch, and fire (e.g., Saletore 1978, pp. 10-11). Eunuchs and other harem guards—*vadhri* is the Sanskrit term—were probably employed in all six of the first "civilizations," and in many later states as well (e.g., Dickemann 1981; Betzig 1986, 1993). The worst tortures on record have been reserved for adulterers, or would-be adulterers, with powerful men's women. Castration, other kinds of mutilation, and death were common; and penalties might extend beyond the culprits themselves. The Inca, for instance, had an adulterer's wives, children, extended family, friends, and flocks put to death; his village was pulled down; and the site was strewn with stones (Garcilaso de la Vega 1871, p. 298).

MARRIAGE: MAKING AN HEIR

If we take "monogamy" to mean not monogamous *marriage,* but monogamous *mating,* then medieval laymen were polygynous—sometimes highly polygynous—men. So, often, were church men. Throughout the Middle Ages noble men fathered successors by their wives, church men fathered successors by their concubines, and both fathered bastards by other women.

The conflict between state and church was not about *mating,* but about *marriage.* Noble men in the Middle Ages, as in other ages, found three means to funnel wealth onto a single heir. One was patrilateral inheritance—which cut that field in half; another was unigeniture—which singled out one, usually the first-born, son; the third was monogamous marriage—which limited the field of potential heirs to children by one "legitimate" wife (e.g., Goody 1973; Betzig 1993; Bergstrom 1995). Again, all three strategies were common in other artistocracies.

Westermarck, in his *History of Human Marriage,* wrote: "The general rule is undoubtedly that one of the wives holds a higher social position than the rest or is regarded as the principal wife; [with] the children or sons or the eldest son of the first wife taking precedence over those of the later wives in inheritance or

succession or otherwise" (1921, volume 3, pp. 29, 34). So it was in Babylon, where "in theory monogamy was the rule;" and scholars since have inferred monogamous mating when, in fact, some Babylonians may have had sexual access to hundreds of slaves (e.g., Conteneau 1954, pp. 15-18). In the same way, Egyptian Pharoahs kept one "Great Wife" among the the hundreds of women in their harems (Redford 1984, p. 37). In the New World, Aztec and Inca nobles assigned just one legitimate wife to raise legitimate heirs (Carrasco 1971, p. 370A; Garcilaso de la Vega 1961, p. 92). In India, harem women were ranked, with a "chief queen" at the top; in China women were similarly arranged—maids, concubines, and wives were all subordinate to the first Lady, the principal wife to the father or the eldest son (Saletore 1974, pp. 22, 25; van Gulik 1974, pp. 19, 106). By mating with many women, noble men produced many children; by marrying one woman, they produced heirs in a position to produce many grandchildren (Betzig 1993).

When a legitimate wife's brood numbered more than one, the bulk of the inheritance went to her sons (see Trivers and Willard 1973; Hartung 1982). In Egypt, where the empire devolved upon the eldest daughter, her incestuous marriage to her brother ensured that "the eldest son of the Pharaoh by his principal consort became his heir" (Aldred 1988, p. 166). Daughters were otherwise disinherited in many ways. Some might have been killed at birth; some might have been married off with dowries of various sizes; some might have been consigned—like their younger brothers—to a celibate, unmarried and uninheriting, life (e.g., Dickemann 1979a; Goody 1976; Boswell 1988). Noblewomen lived and died as chaste Entu, or "gods' wives," in Babylon (e.g., Saggs 1988, pp. 239, 304), as virgins in the cult of Amun in Egypt (Redford 1984, p. 162; Aldred 1988, p. 138), and as cloistered "wives of the Sun" in Inca Peru (Garcilaso de la Vega 1871, p. 86).

Finally, unigeniture, along with monogamous marriage and patrilateral inheritance bias, has been common in other aristocracies (e.g., Hrdy and Judge 1993). In Mesopotamia, Aztec Mexico, Inca Peru, India and China, fathers were succeeded preferentially by first born sons (Betzig 1993). It is interesting to add that disinherited sons might have followed parallel careers—fighting or praying, as priests or knights (Goody 1973). In Egypt, for example, military commanders were sometimes called "king's-son;" and in Aztec Mexico, lords were slated for three careers—the priesthood, the military, or the bureaucracy, with most sons "choosing" the military (Redford 1974, p. 14 on Egypt; Padden 1967, p. 21 on Aztecs).

In spite of Paul's and others' rhetoric: *neither the medieval church or state effectively sanctioned against polygynous mating. At the same time, both approved of monogamous marriage.* There was no conflict in either case. The conflict came when church and state tried to sow their seeds on the same finite plot. Neither wanted to get cut out of an inheritance.

The problem was primogeniture. Eldest sons married and succeeded; younger sons were often consigned to celibacy as priests or knights. In eleventh-century France, for instance, "one male only took over the entire patrimony. This was made possible by the elimination of his brothers, who were shunted toward the clergy or a monastery, toward adventures in the Holy Land or in England, or toward the deadly hazards of military apprenticeship and practice" (Duby 1978, p. 102).

Consistent examples include the well-documented genealogy of the Vivas family, which suggests that its policy of allowing only one son to marry made possible its rise in status in eleventh-century Spain (Hughes 1978); among the twelfth- to fourteenth-century Poitou nobility, as revealed in ecclesiastical cartularies, 77 percent of eldest sons were able to marry, compared to just 39 percent of their younger brothers (Hajdu 1977); and in the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Portuguese *Peditura Lusitana,* more than 80 percent of first-born sons are listed as married, compared to just 30 percent of fourth-born sons (Boone 1986). Gerald of Wales, son of the noble William de Barri and maternal great-grandson of a Welsh prince, was the fourth of four legitimate sons. While the other three built castles in the sand, he made monasteries. His loving father called this baby "the Bishop" (*De Rebus a Se Gestis,* i.1).

But neither group of bachelors—knights or priests—took their disinheritance lying down. Given that genetic posterity hinges on economic prosperity, family conflict over impartible plots was predictably fierce (e.g., Johnson and Johnson 1991; Dunbar, Clark, and Hurst 1994; cf. Kroll and Bachrach 1989). Other things being equal, closer kin should be more cooperative kin (Hamilton 1964). Other things were not equal in this case. Fratricide was a younger son's most obvious solution to the primogeniture problem. Failing that, there were other means to the same end. For knights, one of the most common was abduction. Church men used canon law.

The true grail at the end of every knight's quest was an heiress. She might be won honestly—by marriage, or dishonestly—by abduction or "courtly love." The best of bachelors won the best of wives: this is the stuff medieval romances are made of. In *La Chanson de Roland,* for instance, the battle ends with offers of fiefs, honors, lands "and beautiful wives" (251); in *Parzifal,* the hero (like his father before him) wins queens (and so, kingdoms); and through all of Malory's *Le Morte D'Arthur* knights win wives for their valor—like Alice, Duke Ansirus' daughter, who "was passing fair and of great rents" (x.38). So it worked, at least occasionally, in real life. Passing up other offers, William Marshal—England's twelfth-century "flower of chivalry"—held out, until the age of nearly fifty, for a grand prize. He took the seventeen-year-old daughter of Richard Fitzgilbert de Clare, Isabel, the second richest heiress in England, as his legitimate wife (Duby 1985).

Failing such luck—failing being offered an heiress—a knight might try abducting one. Abduction was severely punished in secular legal codes (*Pactus Legis Salicae,* xiii; *Lex Gundobada,* xii, ci; *Pactus Legis Alamannorum,* xxxii; *Alamannic Laws,* l, li, liii, xcvii; *Bavarian Laws,* i.11, viii.6-7,16; *Visigothic Code,* iii.1.3, iii.3, iii.5.2). And it was strongly condemned by the lords of houses: "Desire, hypostasized, constitute[d] a menace to the aristocratic house" (Bloch 1983, p. 129). It was, on the other hand, "placed among the foremost acts of valor in the codes of bachelors" (Duby 1988, p. 82). The *Queste del Saint Graal* and other stories enjoined virginity, or at least chastity, on bachelor men. But continent men were genetic dead-ends. Abductors, on the other hand, won wives and households of their own; they earned the right to become the polygynous fathers of polygynous sons.

Failing outright abduction, a knight might try cuckoldry. By another name, call it "courtly love." The object was to seduce the lady of the house. *The Art of Courtly*

Love insists that, in its "pure" form, love must be unconsummated—kisses and caresses in the nude were okay, but the final act of Venus was not (Andreas Capellanus 1990 vi.8). In that case, courtly love must often have been "mixed" with acts of insemination (e.g., Bornstein 1984). Willing or not, the lady of the house was undoubtedly coveted for a reason: She alone was eligible to bear an heir. And access to wealth, in the end, meant access to women. It seems significant that Gottfried von Strassburg's Tristan, who had spent months being comforted by a beautiful young woman, Isolde, failed to fall in love with her until she was *en route* to Cornwall to marry his uncle, King Mark. That love was explicitly sexual. It might have ensured, if Isolde had conceived as a result, that Tristan's son would have become what Tristan himself was to have been—his uncle's heir.

Men in the church used another set of strategies. As Goody (1983) contends, they used canon law to object protractedly and prolifically to means by which married men might get heirs. First, they objected to divorce and remarriage—and, to a lesser extent, to other heirship tactics which might legitimize an heir by a woman other than the first legitimate wife. Second, they objected to "incest," defined eventually to include inbreeding within seven canonical degrees—which might have made it hard even to find a legitimate wife. As a result, Goody suggests, the church might have come into the heirless' estates by default. At least two other aspects of church law might be understood in the same terms. One is its objection to wet nursing, and to incontinence during long stretches of the liturgical cycle—both of which might have raised the probability that the first legitimate wife would herself bear an heir. The other is its obsession with defining marriage as an act of mutual consent that might have freed would-be celibate sons from their parents' insistence that just one son, the first-born, should leave legitimate heirs.

Divorce was among the most obvious means of getting rid of a barren woman, and getting another to bear an heir (Goody 1973; Betzig 1989). Notable examples include: Lothar II, who in the ninth century dismissed his barren wife, Theutberga, in favor of Waldrada, the mother of his son; Philip I, who, in the eleventh century, took a legitimate wife, Berthe, had just one child by her in twenty years, then had her incarcerated in her own castle in favor of Bertrade, who bore him two more sons; and Henry VIII, after an heir by six legitimate wives. As Goody put it, "The search of Henry VIII for...wives was not a demonstration of the lusty sexuality of an English hero, it was a quest for an heir, a male heir, to perpetuate the newly confirmed royal line" (1983, p. 185). The point of marriage was not sex but succession. But the point of succession may have been to put an heir, a son, in a position to show off his lusty sexuality to anybody.

Church law, in any case, stridently disapproved of such substitutions. In the first three centuries, it reluctantly allowed divorce for adultery, but forbade subsequent remarriage altogether; remarriage was discouraged even after a wife had died. In 796, the Council of Friuli forbade remarriage as long as the first spouse was alive. Significantly, church authorities explicitly excluded sterility as a just cause for divorce; so was impotence excluded, so long as the marriage had been consummated even once. Eventually, even adultery by a wife was insufficient grounds for divorce. And in the end, all adjudication on remarriage and divorce fell to church rather than to secular courts. Secular courts still had jurisdiction over many inheritance

matters—including dowry, marital property, and succession. "But by 1100 the church had secured virtual supremacy in the adjudication of issues relating to the formation of marriage and the separation, divorce, and remarriage of those whose marriages failed" (Brundage 1987, p. 223).

To a lesser extent, church law may have stood in the way of concubinage and adoption—two other back-up strategies of heirship (Goody 1973, 1983). Concubinage, too, was conspicuously common among Merovingian and Carolingian kings; it outlasted the Middle Ages among the aristocracy (e.g., Wemple 1981, pp. xii-xv; Brundage 1987, p. 516). When legitimate wives failed, these women made heirs (Goody 1983,, p. 77; Ross 1985). The task, then, for the church would be to bar concubines' children from legitimacy. "Under Christianity, the concubine became the mistress and her children bastards" (Goody 1983, p. 77). In imperial Rome, where divorce and remarriage were legal and common, a concubine's children were generally without legal right to their father's estate (e.g., Saller 1991). But, as Goody maintains, the advantage of concubinage—like other strategies of heirship—is one's ability to legitimize their children, *or not*. For men without legitimate children, a concubine's children could serve as stand-in heirs. As John Crook observes, in his study of Roman law, it is "pretty certain" that Roman concubines and wives "exercised their respective functions concurrently" (1967, p. 102; cf. Watson 1987, p. 13). Or, as Juvenal put it, "Wives loathe a concubine's offspring/ ...to murder your stepson/ Is an old established tradition" (*Satires,* vi.626-632). Just as divorce and remarriage became a difficult solution to the heirship problem, the law began to take greater notice of "natural" children. In other words, two back-up strategies—getting an heir by a second wife, and getting an heir by a concubine—were barred at about the same time. Canonical opinion classed a concubine's children as bastards, who must be legitimized by a formal act in order to inherit. And that formal act had to take place in an ecclesiastical, *not* a secular, court (Brundage 1987, pp. 102-103, 118, 300, 344).

A third back-up "strategy of heirship" was adoption. Adoption, like divorce and concubinage, was legal in imperial Rome, if not common: Keith Hopkins estimates its incidence at around 4 percent (1983, p. 49). In theory, as Goody remarks, "the church could only benefit by excluding 'fictional' heirs" that might keep it from coming into wealth itself (1983, p. 75). But evidence that church canons did prohibit adoption is thin; and where adoption became less common, alternatives like settlement might have taken its place (Shehan 1991; Bonfield 1991). The church might have found it less crucial to ban adoption, than to ban concubinage and divorce, since heirs most likely to be adopted in any culture include brothers and brothers' sons (e.g., Silk 1980; Champlin 1991).

Prohibitions against divorce and remarriage, against concubinage, and against adoption should make it hard for men to get heirs by more than one woman. Another prohibiton—the one Goody makes the most of—might have kept men from finding wives at all. That was the "incest" ban. This prohibition, too, lacked a Biblical sanction (e.g., Mitterauer 1991); and some precedents for marrying kin were strong (Goody 1983; but see Shaw and Saller 1991). There are notable examples of incest among the early medieval aristocracy: Constantine married his children four times to his brothers' children; centuries later, Charlemagne is

supposed to have begotten his son Roland by his sister. In the end, though, ecclesiastical—and secular—objections seem to have had an effect. By the tenth and eleventh centuries, the aristocracy apparently made a concerted effort to avoid marrying within the prohibited degrees (Bouchard 1981).

The church's ban on marriage with first cousins was extended in the sixth century to include second cousins; eventually, at the height of the Middle Ages, when the seigneurial system was firmly established and younger sons were often sloughed off as celibates, Pope Alexander II in 1076 extended the prohibition to the seventh degree—that is, to all blood, affinal, and even fictive kin up to and including sixth cousins. Any children born to couples more closely related would be illegitimate, i.e., ineligible to inherit. The Fourth Lateran Council, early in the thirteenth century, reduced the number of prohibited degrees to four; still "these restrictions, even to the fourth degree, were constantly challenged by the laity" (reviewed in Goody 1983, p. 145; also Flandrin 1979; Brundage 1987).

It is important to note that church and state law did not always conflict in this case (e.g., Bonfield 1991). The *Alamannic Laws* prohibited marriage to a mother-in-law, daughter-in-law, step-daughter, step-mother, brother's daughter, sister's daughter, brother's wife, wife's sister, or first cousin; the property of violators went to the public treasury (xxxix; see also *Theodosian Code*, iii.12,1-4; *Pactus Legis Salicae*, xiii.11; *Bavarian Laws*, vii.1-3; *Burgundian Code*, xxxv). The *Visigothic Code* prohibited "incestuous relations" with kin—by blood or marriage—up to the "sixth degree;" offenders were put away in monasteries (iii.5.1). Incest of various kinds was common in the families of Roman emperors; at the same time, Roman law and custom discouraged marriage to blood, affinal, and fictive kin (see Suetonius, *Augustus,* 63-64, *Tiberius,* 54, *Claudius,* 1, 26, and Dixon 1985, Corbier 1991, Treggiari 1991 on endogamy in practice; see Csillag 1976, pp. 184, 199 and Gardner 1986, p. 35 on exogamy laws). Elites, as a rule, have married endogamously themselves and prescribed exogamy for everybody else (Thornhill 1991).

Two other prohibitions—against wet nursing and liturgical incontinence—could have made it harder for a man's one, legitimate wife to bear children in the first place. From early on, the church protested against wet nursing. An effect may have been to keep a wife's fertility down: To make her less able to bear an heir. Evidence from "natural fertility" societies, again, suggests that frequent and prolonged lactation suppresses ovulation (e.g., Wood 1990). Even if child mortality was raised somewhat as a result, a wife with a nurse was probably more likely to rear an heir than one without (see Hrdy 1992).

Some bans on marital sex might have had similar results. Sex was banned with infecund—menstruating, pregnant, and lactating—women. It also banned on holy days, including: three Lents—three weeks at Easter, roughly four weeks at Christmas, and one to seven weeks at Pentecost; plus Sundays, Wednesdays, Fridays and Saturdays—days for penance or sermons; plus miscellaneous "feast days" and "fast days." On the order of 93 days were left (Flandrin 1983; Brundage 1987, p. 162). It is unlikely that such prohibitions were adhered to or enforced with any rigor. But to the extent that married people did pay attention to them, they might have been less likely to get heirs, and more likely to leave their estates to the church. Overall, these strategies seem to have worked. In documents from Cluny

and other monasteries, "bachelors and other childless individuals appear most often...simply because they were more generous to the church" (Duby 1977, p. 63).

For Goody, the church's motivations were economic. It had to have property, "so that it could assume responsibility for the maintenance of those orphans and widows who, under the pre-existing arrangements, would have been cared for by their kin" (1983, p. 95). He says this, in effect, again and again (e.g., 1983, pp. 46-47, 74, 85, 97, 221). In other words, the church strove to grow as an altruistic cultural institution. For Goody, both members of church and state, even if they acted as individuals, acted as altruists. The church, as a *witting* altruist, strategically disinherited selfish laymen in order to grow as a philanthropic institution. Laymen, as *unwitting* altruists, gave away their estates to the church.

What evidence is there that the medieval church was, after all, altruistic? The church might have made concerted charitable efforts; but they seem, in many respects, to have fallen short. Neither the sick, the orphaned or the poor—all supposed to have been benficiaries of church care—were at all well provided for. In late medieval England, for instance, men and women with little or no land, who had lived by their own labors, often show up in coroner's inquests after having died of accident or exposure. Then, as now, "charity...left much to be desired" (Hanawalt 1985, p. 255). Secular codes severely punished lay thefts of church property—including cattle, maids and slaves; they also punished failure to render tribute to the church, often in substantial amounts (e.g., *Bavarian Laws*, i.1-4,13; *Visigothic Code*, v.1). Sales of offices and indulgences were persistent scandals (e.g., Lynch 1976; Luther, *Ninety-Five Theses*). As Bernard of Clairvaux apologized, "The walls of the church are aglow, but the poor of the church go hungry. The stones of the church are covered with gold, while its children are left naked. The food of the poor is taken to feed the eyes of the rich, and amusement is provided for the curious, while the needy have not even the necessities of life" (*Apologia to Abbot William*, xii.28). Or, as Virgil explained to Dante in hell: "They whose pates boast no hairy canopies/Are clerks—yea, popes and cardinals, in whom/Covetousness hath made its masterpiece" (*Inferno*, vii.46-48). Or as Piers Ploughman, displeased at being reduced to Minor Orders, said in his long, sanctimonious whine: "Look at this great glutton of God here, with his fat cheeks—he has no pity on the poor, and his life is an abomination; he preaches one thing, and practices another" (viii).

Evidence, on the other hand, that church men used their wealth to mate and to father families themselves abounds. As Goody points out, the church treasury was constantly under assault by its own bishops: "A major problem was to prevent the property the church had accumulated from being taken over by its own priesthood" (1983, p. 117; see Lea 1884). An early canon from the Council of Antioch asked bishops to be content with food and raiment, "but if he be not content with these, but convert the church revenue to his own use...[and] give license (the power) to his own domestics and relations, or brethren or sons, so that by such men the accounts (or 'revenues') of the church are privately damaged," he would be asked to explain himself to the local synod (canon xxv, in Lambert 1868, p. 145). Much later Otto, legate to Henry III of England, continued to complain that,

"owing to the clergy being occupied with their marriages or unlawful connections with women, the destruction of souls ensues, their salvation is neglected, and the goods of the church are plundered" (Matthew Paris, *English History,* AD 1237). Holy men, like laymen, tried to provide for their women and children. In short, the church may have been a collection of individuals after all; and their motivations may have been not just economic, but genetic.

Church men may have come into family property in two ways. One was indirect. A man without issue might leave the bulk of his wealth to kinsmen comfortably housed—with or without their own families—in monasteries. One cartulary from Cluny names four sons: three joined the monastery; the fourth "held in fief for life all the shares of the inheritance" which, after his death, passed wholly to Cluny. In tenth- and eleventh-century charters from Cluny, property is passed back and forth from the monastery to nearby noble families (Duby 1977, p. 72; Rosenwein 1989). Other evidence from, for instance, Saint Vincent in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, suggests gifts were often "timed so as to coincide with the entrance of the donor or his close relative" into the abbey; those relatives tended to be close kin— nephews, brothers and especially sons (White 1988, pp. 165, 279). The "intimate" ties that bound nobility and clergy in eleventh- and twelfth-century Burgundy made them "socially and biologically one" (Bouchard 1987, p. 247). Generous patrons wanted more than burial, masses or prayers. They wanted relationships: Charles the Bald—lay abbot of Saint-Denis—asked the monks to pray for him "like a brother," as well as a king (McLaughlin 1994, p. 157). The proliferation of monasteries, and gifts to monasteries, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries—especially by families farther and farther down in the hierarchy, from kings to princes to lesser nobles to mere castellans—coincides with the proliferation of primogniture in feudal society, and the consequent proliferation of celibate, younger sons. It seems fair to guess that many gifts to the church wound up in celibate, that is, disinherited, blood kinsmen's hands. The size of those gifts grew when givers were left without heirs.

More directly, celibate men might have left their monasteries to take over family patrimonies. Early canons referred to men "called by grace," who later "returned like dogs to their vomit," and advised that clergy who reverted to a "civil dignity" be anathematized (Council of Nicaea Canon xii and Council of Chalcedon Canon vii, in Lambert 1868, pp. 15, 57). Among others, Pope Gregory the Great decreed that clerks who took up secular lives, and publicly took wives, should be forcibly returned to the church—though offenders of rank, like Venantius, Patrician of Syracuse, were handled with kid gloves (Lea 1884, p. 113). John of Salisbury, in the twelfth century, complained that bishops, abbots, priests, deacons, sub-deacons, regular canons, monks and so on "have been unfrocked, or have fled from the cloister and, returning to worldly affairs either amongst their own people or elsewhere, have brought injury and scandal on the church by contracting so-called marriages, and trying to make the children...heirs of their relatives" (*Historia Pontificalis,* iii). After the first two of William Marshal's legitimate sons died without heirs, the next-in-line, Gilbert, a cleric, left the church, "buckled on the sword," and took his father's titles and lands (Duby 1985, p. 31). In short, medieval monasteries were reservoirs of reserve heirs. "It sometimes happened that the death of an elder brother forced an ecclesiastic to abandon his clerical status in order

to take charge of a lordship" (Duby 1994a, p. 164). And, should an elder brother fail to rear a son, a younger brother stepped in.

All this fits with the fact that the timing of church laws inhibiting heirship coincided neatly with the period of clerical celibacy. Divorce and remarriage, wet nursing and marital sex, and aristocratic "incest" all seem to have been relatively easy until the fourth century, when celibacy was imposed. It was not until the church started to fill up with the celibate, read disinherited, younger brothers of men of state that the struggle over marriage, read inheritance, between them began. Again, it was at the height of the Middle Ages, in 1076, when unigeniture—and so celibacy—was most firmly established, that the incest prohibition was most widely extended. "It is impossible not to be impressed by the analogy between the evolution of the impediments and what we can observe of the evolution of the ties of lineal solidarity" (Flandrin 1979, p. 25).

Last but not least, it fits that canonists—Gratian, Lombard and others— consistently defined marriage in terms of mutual consent on the part of husband and wife (see Noonan 1973; Sheehan 1978; Donahue 1983). That "seriously undercut paternal authority within the family" (Brundage 1987, p. 265). It also ran contrary to secular laws that punished wayward children who married against their parents' wishes (e.g., *Visigothic Code* iii.1.3, 2.8, v.1.7). Of the three main recruitment tactics into religious life—adult conversion, entry *ad succurrendum,* and child oblation— the third was by far the most common (Lynch 1976; Brooke 1981). Parents, mostly from local communities, were putting away their supernumerary sons and other disinherited kin. Celibacy was not always a matter of choice. It was the flip side of unigeniture. If an estate was to end up in a single son's hands, then that son alone would be eligible to sire legitimate heirs (Goody 1973; Duby 1977; Betzig 1993). In the West, celibate sons had fought for the right to marry since imperial Rome, at least; and fathers had done what they could—in Rome, in the face of emperors' "moral legislation"—to disinherit all but a single son (e.g., *Digest,* 23.2.19; Dio, *History,* lvi.4-5; especially Betzig 1992b). In the end, with the Reformation, younger sons finally won. And, in the end, if Martin Luther and other reformers found that clerical marriage and secular callings went together; if Protestants overwhelmingly outpaced Catholics in business enterprise; it may not have been because the "spirit of capitalism" was brought on by a "Protestant ethic" (Weber 1904-1905). Capital made inheritance partible. As younger sons gained the option to support themselves through trade, they gained the option to support legitimate heirs by legitimate wives.

It is worth pointing out that few if any of the church's prohibitions on heirship ever had much effect on how peasants behaved. Divorce, remarriage and inbreeding were probably more common, and more commonly ignored, among the uninheriting poor (e.g., Sheehan 1971). The struggle between church and state seems to have been confined mostly to the aristocracy, and to the period when church men were the disinherited kin of inheriting laymen.

CONCLUSIONS

I began with a question: Was the work of the Christian Church, after Constantine's conversion, all it took to turn human history away from polygyny toward

monogamy? Whether "monogamy" means mating, i.e. the production of children, or marriage, i.e. the production of heirs, the answer is "no" on both counts. What evidence exists—qualitative or quantitative—suggests that mating throughout the Middle Ages was polygynous, whether practiced by clerks or by castellans. And monogamous marriage—to one legitimate, heir-bearing, wife at once—was in practice both before the Middle Ages and after; during the Middle Ages it served the interests of both church men and laymen.

Both of these conclusions contradict the common ones. Duby began his study of medieval marriage by contrasting the "aristocratic" and "ecclesiastical" models. The lay model was designed to "protect the patrimony," in short, to produce heirs. To that end it advocated inbreeding, female fidelity, and serial polygyny. The church model, on the other hand, was designed to "curb the carnal impulses." It advocated exogamy, sexual equality, and lifelong monogamy. Duby started out, then, with the argument that "the entire history of marriage in Western Christendom amounts to a gradual process of acculturation, in which the ecclesiastical model slowly gained the upper hand....The fact is that the lay model was gradually infiltrated and eventually absorbed" (Duby 1978, p. 17).

But was it? Monogamous *mating* was conspicuously absent throughout the Middle Ages. Duby's work as much or more than any other makes it clear that neither the church nor state had much success in curbing the carnal impulses in that respect. Neither, contrary to what Duby and so many others suggest, did the church have much lasting effect on monogamous *marriage*. Most of the strides it did make—toward preventing divorce, remarriage, and concubinage—were repealed in the long run. With the Reformation, serial polygyny was okayed, just as the clergy were allowed to marry. Other features of the "ecclesiastical" model— its toothless lipservice to sexual equality, and its biting ban on endogamy—had nothing to do, strictly speaking, with monogamy (Schulenberg 1978). They had nothing to do with keeping more than one spouse, or more than one mate, in sequence *or* at once. Instead, as Goody insists, they had to do with the struggle of celibate men to keep married men from making heirs. Endogamy bans were repealed too, of course, in the end. The prohibition was reduced from seven to four degrees in 1215, and to the second degree for South American Indians in 1537, for blacks in 1897, and for the rest of the world in 1917 (Goody 1983, p. 144).

Like Duby, Herlihy credits the church with giving medieval, and eventually modern, men more equal access to women. Herlihy's explicit concern with laymen's access to women is remarkably Darwinian; what he lacks is a suspicion that church men may have shared the same concern. He concludes: "A great social achievement of the early Middle Ages was the imposition of the same rules of sexual and domestic conduct on both rich and poor. The king in his palace, the peasant in his hovel; neither one was exempt" (1985, p. 157, see also pp. 61-62, 83-86, 135, 158-159 and Herlihy 1983, 1987). Rich men might "cheat," but women were no longer their "right." "Poor men's chances of gaining a wife and producing progeny were enhanced" (1985, p. 157). In the long run, of course, that "achievement" was approximated (Betzig 1994); but the evidence briefly reviewed here suggests it wasn't in the Middle Ages. Men in the Middle Ages did not mate monogamously; neither was the rise of monogamy in modern societies brought on by Christian ideology.

But if we are at least becoming more monogamous, why? Now *that* is the question!

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

NOTE

1.   On the incidence of polygyny in premodern societies see Murdock 1967, Low 1988, and White 1988. For studies of wealth, status, or power and polygyny in premodern societies, see Irons 1979; Chagnon 1980, 1988; Faux and Miller 1984; Kaplan and Hill 1985; Mealey 1985; Turke and Betzig 1985; Boone 1986; Flinn 1986; Hughes 1986; Betzig 1988a; Borgerhoff Mulder 1987, 1988; Hewlett 1988; Low 1990; Bailey 1991; Cronk 1991; Roskaft et al. 1992; and Hill and Hurtado 1994. For comparative studies of power and polygyny, see Dickerman 1979a, 1979b; van den Berghe 1979; and Betzig 1982, 1986, 1993. For a recent demographer's survey of studies in 38 pre- and 276 post-demographic transition societies, see Retherford 1993.

REFERENCES

Abelard and Heloise. *Letters* including Abelard's *Historia Calamitatum,* translated by Betty Radice. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974.

Aldred, Cyril. 1988. *Akhenaten: King of Egypt.* London: Thames and Hudson.

Augustine. *Confessions,* translated by Henry Chadwick. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Babylonian Laws, translated by Driver and Miles. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.

Bailey, Robert. 1991. *The Behavioral Ecology of Efe Pygmy Men in the Ituri Forest, Zaire.* Ann Abor: University of Michigan Musuem of Anthropology.

Bailey, Robert, Mark Jenike, Peter Ellison, Gillian Bentley, Alisa Harrigan, and Nadine Peacock. 1992. "The Ecology of Birth Seasonality Among Agriculturalists in Central Africa." *Journal of Biosocial Science* 24: 393-412.

Baldwin, John. 1994. *The Language of Sex: Five Voices from Northern France Around 1200.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bandelier, A. F. 1880. "On the Social Organization and Mode of Government of the Ancient Mexicans." *American Archeology and Ethnology* 2:557-699.

Bateman, A. J. 1948. "Intrasexual Selection in *Drosophila." Heredity* 2:349-368.

Bede. *A History of the English Church and People,* translated by Leo Shirley-Price. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968.

Bergstrom, Ted. 1995. "Primogeniture, Monogamy, and Reproductive Value in a Stratified Society." University of Michigan, Department of Economics Working Paper No. 94-10.

Bernard of Clairvaux. 1947. *Apologia to Abbot William,* translated by Michael Casey. Spencer, MA: Cistercian Publications.

Betzig, Laura. 1982. "Despotism and Differential Reproduction: A Cross-Cultural Correlation of Conflict Asymmetry, Hierarchy, and Degree of Polygyny." *Ethology and Sociobiology* 3: 209-221.

————. 1986. *Despotism and Differential Reproduction: A Darwinian View of History.* Hawthorne, NY: Aldine.

————. 1988a. "Redistribution: Equity or Exploitation?" Pp. 49-63 in *Human Reproductive Behaviour: A Darwinian Perspective,* edited by Laura Betzig et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

————. 1988b. "Adoption by Rank on Ifaluk." *American Anthropologist* 90:111-119.

————. 1988c. "Mating and Parenting in Darwinian Perspective." Pp. 1-20 in *Human Reproductive Behaviour: A Darwinian Perspective,* edited by Laura Betzig et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

————. 1989. "Causes of Conjugal Dissolution: A Cross-Cultural Study." *Current Anthropology* 30: 654-676.

————. 1991. "History." Pp. 131-140 in *The Sociobiological Imagination,* edited by Mary Maxwell. Albany: SUNY Press.

————. 1992a. "Roman Polygyny." In, Laura Betzig, ed. *Darwinian History.* Special issue of *Ethology and Sociobiology* 13:309-349.

————. 1992b. "Roman Monogamy." In, Laura Betzig, ed. *Darwinian History.* Special issue of *Ethology and Sociobiology* 13:351-383.

————. 1993. "Sex, Succession, and Stratification in the First Six Civilizations." Pp. 37-74 in *Social Stratification and Socioeconomic Inequality,* edited by Lee Ellis. New York: Praeger.

————. 1994. "The Point of Politics." *Analyse & Kritik* 16: 20-37.

Betzig, Laura and Samantha Weber. 1993. "Polygyny in American Politics." *Politics and the Life Sciences* 12: 45-52.

————. in press. "Presidents Preferred Sons." *Politics and the Life Sciences* 14.

Bloch, Marc. 1961. *Feudal Society,* translated by L. A. Manyon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bloch, R. Howard. 1983. *Etymologies and Genealogies: A Literary Anthropology of the French Middle Ages.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

————. 1991. *Medieval Misogyny.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Boccaccio. *The Decameron,* translated by G. H. McWilliam. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.

Bonfield, Lloyd. 1991. "Canon Law and Family Law in Medieval Western Christendom." *Continuity and Change* 6: 361-374.

Boone, James. 1986. "Parental Investment and Elite Family Structure in Preindustrial States: A Case Study of Late Medieval-Early Modern Portuguese Genealogies." *American Anthropologist* 88:859-878.

Borgerhoff Mulder, Monique. 1987. "On Cultural and Reproductive Success: Kipsigis Evidence." *American Anthropologist* 89:617-634.

————. "Reproductive Success in Three Kipsigis Cohorts." Pp. 419-435 in *Reproductive Success: Studies of Individual Variation in Contrasting Breeding Systems,* edited by Tim Clutton-Brock. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bornstein, Diane. 1984. "Courtly Love." *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* 3: 668-674.

Boswell, John. 1988. *The Kindness of Strangers.* New York: Pantheon.

Bouchard, Constance. 1981. "Consanguinity and Noble Marriages in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries." *Speculum* 56: 268-287.

————. 1987. *Sword, Miter, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Boyle, Leonard. 1981. "Montaillou Revisited: Mentalité and Methodology." Pp. 119-140 in *Pathways to Medieval Peasants*, edited by J.A. Raftis. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies.

Britton, Edward. 1977. *The Community of the Vill: A Study in the History of the Family and Village Life in Fourteenth-Century England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Brooke, C. 1981. "Marriage and Society in the Central Middle Ages." Pp. 17-34 in *Marriage and Society: Studies in the Social History of Marriage*, edited by R.B. Oathwaite. London: Europa.

Brundage, James. 1987. *Law, Sex, and Christian Society in Medieval Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bullough, Vern and Cameron Campbell. 1980. "Female Longevity and Diet in the Middle Ages." *Speculum* 55: 317-325.

Burgundian Code (*Liber Constitutionum sive Lex Gundobada and Constitutiones Extravagates*), translated by Katherine Fischer Drew. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

Capellanus, Andreas. *The Art of Courtly Love*, translated by John Jay Parry. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.

Carrasco, P. 1971. "Social Origin of Ancient Mexico." Pp. 349-375 in *Archeology of Northern Mesoamerica*, edited by G. Edkholm and 1. Bernal. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Castiglione, Baldesar. 1967. *The Courtier*, translated by George Bull. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Chagnon, Napoleon. 1980. "Kin Selection Theory, Kinship, Marriage and Fitness Among the Yanomamö Indians." Pp. 545-571 in *Sociobiology: Beyond Nature/Nurture*, edited by George Barlow and James Silverberg. Boulder: Westview Press.

————. 1988. "Life Histories, Blood Revenge, and Warfare in a Tribal Population." *Science* 439: 985-992.

Champlin, Edward. *Final Judgements: Duty and Emotion in Roman Wills*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Chanson de Roland, translated by Glyn Burgess. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1990.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Canterbury Tales*, translated by A. Kent Hieatt and Constance Hieatt. New York: Bantam, 1964.

Chrétien de Troyes. *Cligés*, translated by William W. Kibler. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991.

————. *The Knight of the Cart*, translated by William W. Kibler. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991.

Cieza de Leon, P. 1959. *The Incas*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Clutton-Brock, Tim. 1988. *Reproductive Success: Studies of Individual Variation in Constrasting Breeding Systems*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clutton-Brock, Tim and Anne Vincent. 1991. "Sexual Selection and the Potential Reproductive Rates of Males And Females." *Nature* 351:58-60.

Conteneau, G. 1954. *Everyday Life in Babylon and Assyria*. London: Edwin Arnold.

Corbier, Mireille. 1991. "Constructing Kinship in Rome: Marriage and Divorce, Filiation and Adoption." Pp. 127-144 in *The Family in Italy from Antiquity to the Present*, edited by David Kertzer and Richard Saller. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Cowlinshaw, Guy, and Rubin Dunbar. 1991. "Dominance Rank and Mating Success in Male Primates." *Animal Behaviour* 41:1045-1056.

Cronin, Helena. 1992. *The Ant and the Peacock: Altruism and Sexual Selection from Darwin to Today.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cronk, Lee. 1991. "Wealth, Status, and Reproductive Success Among the Mukogodo of Kenya." *American Anthropologist* 93:345-360.

Crook, John. 1967. *Law and Life of Rome.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Csillag, Pál. 1976. *The Augustan Laws on Family Relations.* Budapest: Akadémai Kiadó.

Dante Alighieri, *The Divine Comedy,* translated by Dorothy L. Sayers. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1949.

Darwin, Charles. 1859. *On the Origin of Species.* London: John Murray.

_____. 1871. *The Descent of Man and Delection in Relation to Sex.* London: John Murray.

Dass, Diwan Jarmani. 1970. *Maharaja.* Delhi: Hind.

Dickemann, Mildred. 1979a. "Female Infanticide, Reproductive Strategies, and Social Stratification: A Preliminary Model." Pp. 321-367 in *Evolutionary Biology and Human Social Behavior: An Anthropological Perspective,* edited by Napoleon Chagnon and William Irons. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press.

_____. 1979b. "The Ecology of Mating Systems in Hypergynous Dowry Societies." *Social Science Information* 18:163-195.

_____. 1981. "Paternal Confidence and Dowry Competition: A Biocultural Analysis of Purdah." Pp. 417-438 in *Natural Selection and Social Behavior: Recent Research and New Theory,* edited by Richard Alexander and Donald Tinkle. New York: Chiron Press.

Dio, Cassius. *History,* translated by Earnest Cary. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1925.

The Digest of Justinian. 1987. translated by Alan Watson. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Dixon, Suzanne. 1985. "The Marriage Alliance in the Roman Elite." *Journal of Family History* 10: 353-378.

Donahue, Charles. 1983. "The Canon Laws on the Formation of Marriage and Social Practice in the Latter Middle Ages." *Journal of Family History* 8:144-158.

Driver, G. and J. Miles, eds. 1955. *The Babylonian Law.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Duby, Georges. 1953. *La Sociétéaux XIe et XIIe siècles dans la région maconnaise.* Paris: Armand Colin.

_____. 1978. *Medieval Marriage: Two Models from Twelfth-Century France,* translated by Elborg Forster. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

_____. 1977. *The Chivalrous Society.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____. 1980. *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined,* translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____. 1983. *The Knight, the Lady, and the Priest,* translated by Barbara Bray. New York: Pantheon.

_____. 1985. *William Marshal: The Flower of Chivalry,* translated by Richard Howard. New York: Pantheon.

_____. 1988a. "The Aristocratic Households of Feudal France: Communal Living." Pp. 35-85 in *A History of Priavte Life: Revelations of the Medieval World,* edited by Georges Duby. Cambridge: Belknap.

_____. 1988b. "Solitude: Eleventh to Thirteenth Century." Pp. 509-533 in *A History of Private Life: Revelations of the Medieval World,* edited by Georges Duby. Cambridge: Belknap.

_____. 1994a. *Love and Marriage in the Middle Ages,* translated by Jane Dunnett. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

————. 1994b. *France in the Middle Ages 987-1460,* translated by Juliet Vale. Oxford: Blackwell.

Dunbar, Robin. 1988. *Primate Social Systems.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Dunbar, Robin, Amanda Clark and Nicola Hurst. 1994. "Conflict and Cooperation Among the Vikings: Contingent Behavioural Decisions." *Ethology and Sociobiology* 15.

DuVal, John and Raymond Eichmann. 1982. *Cuckolds, Clerics, & Countrymen: Medieval French Fabilaux.* Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press.

Einhard. *Life of Charlemagne,* translated by Lewis Thorpe. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969.

Ellis, Lee. in press. "Dominance and Reproductive Success: A Review." *Ethology and Sociobiology* 15.

Erman, Adolf. 1971. *Life in Ancient Egypt.* New York: Dover.

Eusebius of Caesarea. *Ecclesiastical History,* translated by Kirsopp Lake. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Faith, Rosamond. 1983. "Debate: Seigneurial Control of Women's Marriage." *Past and Present* 82: 3-43.

Faux, S. and Miller, H. 1984. "Evolutionary Speculations on the Oligarchic Development of Mormon Polygyny." *Ethology and Sociobiology* 5: 15-31.

Fideles, Valerie. 1986. *Breasts, Bottles, and Babies.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Fisher, Ronald. 1958. *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection,* second edition. New York: Dover.

Flandrin, Jean-Louis. 1979. *Families in Former Times,* translated by Richard Southern. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

————. 1983. *Un Temps Pour Embrasser.* Paris.

Flinn, Mark. 1986. "Correlates of Reproductive Success in a Caribbean Village." *Human Ecology* 14: 225-243.

————. 1987. "Mate Guarding in a Caribbean Village." *Ethology and Sociobiology* 9: 1-29.

Fried, Morton. 1967. *The Evolution of Political Society.* New York: Random House.

Frisch, Rose. 1987. "Body Fat, Menarche, Fitness and Fertility." *Human Reproduction* 2:521-533.

Galbert of Brughes. *The Murder of Charles the Good,* translated by James Bruce Ross. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1982.

Garcilaso de la Vega. 1961. *Royal Commentaries on the Inca.* New York: Orians Press. Also 1871. Hakluya Society: London.

Gardner, Jane. 1986. *Women in Roman Law and Society.* London: Croom Helm.

Gaulin, Steve and Boster, James. 1990. "Dowry as Female Competition." *American Anthropologist* 92: 994-1005.

Geoffrey of Monmouth. *History of the Kings of Britain,* translated by Lewis Thorpe. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966.

Gerald of Wales. *Autobiography,* translated by H. E. Butler. London: Jonathan Cape, 1937.

————. *The Description of Wales,* translated by Lewis Thorpe. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978.

————. *The Journey Through Wales,* translated by Lewis Thorpe. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978.

————. *The Topography of Ireland.* 1863. Translated by Thomas Forester. London: H. G. Bohn.

Goody, Jack. 1973. "Strategies of Heirship." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 15:3-20.

————. 1976. *Production and Reproduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

————. 1983. *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gottfried von Strassbourg. *Tristan,* translated by A. T. Hatto. Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1960.

Gregory of Tours. *History of the Franks,* translated by Lewis Thorpe. Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1974.

Guibert of Nogent. 1970. *Self and Society in Medieval France,* translated by C. C. Swinton Bland, revised by John F. Benton. New York: Harper and Row.

Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun. *Roman de la Rose,* translated by Charles Dahlberg. Hanover: University Press of New England.

Hair, P. E. H. 1966. "Bridal Pregnancy in Rural England in Earlier Centuries." *Population Studies* 20: 233-243.

————. 1970. "Bridal Pregnancy in Rural England Further Examined." *Population Studies* 24: 59-70.

Hajdu, Robert. 1977. "Family and Feudal Ties in Poitou, 1100-1300." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 8: 117-139.

Hajnal, John. 1965. "European Marriage Patterns in Perspective." Pp. 101-143 in *Population in History,* edited by D.V. Glass and D. Eversley. London: Edward Arnold.

————. "Two Kinds of Pre-industrial Household Formation System." Pp. 65-104 in *Family Forms in Historic Europe,* edited by R. Wall, J. Robin, and P. Laslett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hamilton, William D. 1964. "The Genetical Evolution of Social Behavior." *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 7: 1-52.

Hanawalt, Barbara. 1985. *The Ties that Bound: Peasant Families in Medieval England.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hartung, John. 1982. "Polygyny and the Inheritance of Wealth." *Current Anthropology* 23: 1-12.

Helmholz, Richard. 1974. *Marriage Litigtion in Medieval England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Herlihy, David. 1983. "The Making of the Medieval Family: Symmetry, Structure, and Sentiment." *Journal of Family History* 8: 116-130.

————. 1985. *Medieval Households.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

————. 1987. "The Family and Religious Ideologies in Medieval Europe." *Journal of Family History* 12: 3-17.

Herlihy, David and Christiane Klapisch-Zuber. 1985. *Tuscans and Their Families.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hewlett, Barry. 1988. "Sexual Selection and Paternal Investment among Aka Pygmies." Pp. 23-276 in *Human Reproductive Behaviour: A Darwinian Perspective,* edited by Laura Betzig, Monique Borgerhoff Mulder, and Paul Turke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, Kim and A. Magdalena Hurtado. in press. *Demography/Life History of Ache Foragers.* Hawthorne, NY: Aldine-de Gruyter.

Hollingsworth, T.H. 1964. "The Demography of the British Peerage." *Population Studies* 18, Supplement No. 2.

Hopkins, Keith. 1983. *Death and Renewal.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hovarth, W. D. 1971. "'Droit de Seigneur': Fact or Fantasy." *Journal of European Studies* 1: 291-312.

Hrdy, Sarah Blaffer. 1992. "Fitness Tradeoffs in the History and Evolution of Delegated Mothering, with Special Reference to Wet-Nursing, Abandonment, and Infanticide." In, Laura Betzig, ed. *Darwinian History.* Special issue of *Ethology and Sociobiology* 13: 409-442.

Hrdy, Sarah Blaffer and Debra Judge. 1993. "Darwin and the Puzzle of Primogeniture."
    Human Nature 4: 1-45.
Hughes, Austin. 1986. "Reproductive Success and Occupational Class in Eighteenth-
    Century Lancashire, England." *Social Biology* 33: 109-115.
Hughes, Diane Owen. 1978. "From Brideprice to Dowry in Mediterranean Europe." *Journal
    of Family History* 3:262-296.
Irons, William. 1979. "Cultural and Biological Success." Pp. 257-272 in *Evolutionary
    Biology and Human Social Behavior: An Anthropological Perspective,* edited by N.
    A. Chagnon and W. Irons. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press.
————. 1980. "Is Yomut Social Behavior Adaptive?" Pp. 417-473 in *Sociobiology: Beyond
    Nature/Nurture?,* edited by G. Barlow and J. Silverberg. Boulder, CO: Westview
    Press.
Jerome. 1885. *Select Letters of St. Jerome,* edited by T. E. Page. London.
John of Salisbury. *Historia Pontificalis,* translated by Marjorie Chibnall. Oxford:
    Clarendon, 1986.
Johnson, S.B. and R. C. Johnson. 1991. "Support and Conflict of Kinsmen in Norse
    Earldoms, Icelandic Families and the English Royalty." *Ethology and Sociobiology*
    12: 211-220.
Joinville, Jean de. *Memoirs,* translated by Ethel Wedgwood. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1906.
Jones, Doug, and Kim Hill. 1993. "Criteria of Facial Attractiveness in Five Populations."
    Human Nature 4:271-296.
Juvenal. *Sixteen Satires,* translated by Peter Green. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974.
Kaplan, Hillard and Kim Hill. 1985. "Hunting Ability and Reproductive Success among
    Male Ache Foragers." *Current Anthropology* 26:131-133.
Kroll, Jerome and Bernard S. Bachrach. 1990. "Medieval Dynastic Decisions: Evolutionary
    Biology and Historical Explanation." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 21: 1-28.
Kussmal, Ann. 1981. *Servants in Husbandry in Early Modern England.* Cambridge:
    Cambridge University Press.
Lambert, William. 1868. *The Canons of the First Four General Councils of the Church,
    and Those of the Early Local Greek Synods.* London: R. D. Dickinson.
Langland, William. *Piers Ploughman,* translated by Frank Goodridge. Harmondsworth:
    Penguin, 1959.
Laslett, Peter. 1977. *Family Life and Illicit Love in Earlier Generations.* Cambridge:
    Cambridge University Press.
————. 1969. "Size and Structure of the Household in England Over Three Centuries."
    Population Studies 23:199-234.
Laslet, Peter, Karla Öosterveen, and Richard Smith, eds. 1980. *Bastardy and its
    Comparative History.* Cambridge: Harvard.
Laws of the Alamans and Bavarians, translated by Thoedore John Rivers. Philadelphia:
    University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.
Laws of the Salian Franks, with the *Pactus Legis Salicae* and *Lex Salica Karolina,* translated
    by Katherine Fischer Drew. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991.
Le Roy Ladurie, Emmanuel. 1979. *Montaillou,* translated by Barbara Bray. New York:
    Vintage Books.
Lea, Henry C. 1884. *An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church,*
    second edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Leyser, Karl. 1968. "The German Aristocracy From the Ninth to the Early Twelfth Century."
    Past and Present 61: 25-53.
————. 1979. *Rule and Conflict in an Early Medieval Society.* London: Edward Arnold.

Litvack, Frances. 1984. *Le Droit du Seigneur in European and American Literature.* Birmingham: Summa Publications.

Liudprand of Cremona. *Antapodosis, Liber de Rebus Gestis Ottonis, and Relatio de Legatione Constantinopolitana,* translated by F. A. Wright. New York: Dutton, 1930.

Low, Bobbi. 1988. "Measuring Polygyny in Humans." *Current Anthropology* 29: 189-194.

———. 1990. "Occupational Status, Landownership, and Reproductive Behavior in 19th-century Sweden: Tuna Parish." *American Anthropologist* 92: 457-468.

Luther, Martin. 1517. *Ninety-Five Theses,* translated by C. M. Jacobs, revised by Harold Grimm. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1957.

———. *Table Talk,* translated by Theodore Tappert. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

Lynch, Joseph. 1976. *Simoniacal Entry into Religious Life.* Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

MacDonald, Kevin. 1990. "Mechanisms of Sexual Egalitarianism in Western Europe." *Ethology and Sociobiology* 11: 195-237.

MacFarlane, Alan. 1986. *Marriage and Love in England.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Malmsbury, William of. 1847. *Chronicle of the Kings of England,* translated by J. A. Giles. London: Henry Bohn.

Malory, Thomas. *Le Morte D'Arthur,* edited by Janet Cohen. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969.

Marie de France. *Lais,* translated by Glyn S. Burgess and Keith Busby. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986.

Matthew Paris. *English History,* translated by J.A. Giles. London: Henry Bohn, 1852.

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

McNamara, Jo Ann. 1983. "A New Song: Celibate Women in the First Three Christian Centuries." *Women and History* 6/7: 38-140.

McNeill, William H. *The Rise of the West.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mealey, Linda. 1985. "The Relationship Between Social Status and Biological Success: A Case Study of the Mormon Religious Hierarchy." *Ethology and Sociobiology* 6: 429-457.

Mitterauer, Michael. 1991. "Christianity and Endogamy." *Continuity and Change* 6: 293-333.

Morte Arthure, translated by Brian Stone. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969.

Motolinia, J.P. 1951. *History of the Indians of New Spain.* Translated by F.B. Steck. Washington, D.C.: Academy of American Franciscan History.

Mundy, John. 1990. *Men and Women at Toulouse in the Age of the Cathars.* Toronto: Pontifical Institue of Medieval Studies.

———. 1991. *Europe in the High Middle Ages: 1150-1309,* second edition. New York: Longman.

Murdock, Goerge Peter. 1967. *Ethnographic Atlas.* New Haven: HRAF Press.

Niebelungenlied, translated by A.T. Hatto. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969.

Njal's Saga, translated by Magnus Magnusson and Hermann Pálsson. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1960.

Noonan, John T. 1973. "Power to Choose." *Viator* 4:419-434.

Otto, Bishop of Freising. *Deeds of Frederick Barbarosa,* translated by Charles Christopher Mierow. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953.

———. 1928. *The Two Cities,* translated by Charles Christopher Mierow. New York: Columbia University Press.

Orderic Vitalis. *The Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy,* translated by Thomas Forester. London: Henry Bohn, 1853.

Paden, William. 1987. *The Medieval Pastorelle*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc.

Padden, R. 1967. *The Hummingbird and the Hawk*. Columbus: Ohio State University.

Pérusse, Daniel. 1993. "Cultural And Reproductive Success in Industrial Societies: Testing the Relationship at The Proximate and Ultimate Levels." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 9: 267-322.

Petrarch. *Lyric Poems*, translated by Robert Durling. Cambridge: Harvard, 1990.

Pizan, Christine de. 1982. *The Book of the City of Ladies*, translated by Earl Jeffrey Richards. New York: Persea Books.

Poma de Ayala, F. 1936. *The First New Chronicle of Good Government*. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files.

Quaife, G. R. 1979. *Wanton Wenches and Wayward Wives*. London: Croom Helm.

Queste del Saint Graal, translated by Pauline Matarasso. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969.

Razi, Zvi. 1980. *Life, Marriage, and Death in a Medieval Parish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Redford, Donald. 1984. *Akhenaten: The Heratic King*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Régnier-Bohler, Danielle. 1988. "Imagining the Self: Exploring Literature." Pp. 311-393 in *A History of Private Life: Revelations of the Medieval World*, edited by Georges Duby.

Renart, Jean. *L'escoufle: roman d'aventure*, translated into modern French by Alexandre Micha. Paris: H. Champion, 1992.

Ring, Richard. 1979. "Early Medieval Peasant Households in Central Italy." *Journal of Family History* 2:2-25.

Robbins, Rossell Hope. 1952. *Secular Lyrics of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rosenthal, Joel T. 1984. "Aristocratic Marriage and the English Peerage, 1350-1500: Social Institution and Personal Bond." *Journal of Medieval History* 10: 181-194.

Rosenwein, Barbara. 1989. *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909-1049*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Røskaft, Eivin, Annelise Wara, and Åslaug Viken. 1992. "Human Reproductive Success in Relation to Resource-Access and Parental Age in a Small Norwegian Farming Parish During the Period 1700-1900." In, Laura Betzig, ed., *Darwinian History*. Special issue of *Ethology and Sociobiology* 13:443-461.

Ross, Margaret Clunies. 1985. "Concubinage in Anglo-Saxon England." *Past and Present* 108:3-34.

Saggs, H. W. F. 1988. *The Greatness that Was Babylon*, second edition. London: Sidgwick and Jackson.

Saletore, R. 1974. *Sex Life Under India Rulers*. Delhi: Hind.

_____. 1978. *Sex in Indian Harem Life*. Delhi: Orient.

Saller, Richard. 1980. "Anecdotes as Historical Evidence for the Principate." *Greece and Rome* 27: 69-83.

_____. 1991. "European Family History and Roman Law." *Continuity and Change* 6: 335-346.

Schimmelpfennig, Bernhard. 1979. "Ex fornicatione nati: Studies on the Population of Priests' Sons from the Twelfth to the Fourteenth Century." *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 2: 2-46.

Schulenberg, Jane. 1978. "Sexism and the Celestial Gynaceum." *Journal of Medieval History* 4:117-133.

Searle, Eleanor. 1979. "Seigneurial Control of Women's Marriage: The Antecedents and Function of Merchet in England." *Past and Present* 82:3-43.

_____. 1983. "A Rejoinder." *Past and Present* 90: 149-160.

Service, Elman. 1975. *The Origin of the State and Civilization*. New York: Norton.

Shaw, Brent and Richard Saller. 1984. "Close-Kin Marriage in Roman Society?" *Man* 19:432-444.

Sheehan, Michael. 1971. "The Formation and Stability of Marriage in Fourteenth Century England: Evidence of an Ely Register." *Medieval Studies* 33:228-263.

_____. 1978. "Choice of Marriage Partner in the Middle Ages: Development and Mode of Application of a Theory of Marriage." *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 1: 2-33.

_____. 1991. "The European Family and Canon Law." *Continuity and Change* 6: 347-360.

Smout, Christopher. 1980. "Aspects of Sexual Behavior in 19th-century Scotland." Pp. 194-217 in *Bastardy and its Comparative History*, edited by Peter Laslett, Karla Öosterveen, and Richard Smith. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Stone, Lawrence. 1965. *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

_____. 1977. *Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*. London: Wiedenfield and Nicholson.

Suetonius. *The Twelve Caesars*, translated by Robert Graves, revised by Michael Grant. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979.

Suger, *The Deeds of Louis the Fat*, translated by Richard Cusimano and John Moorhead. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of American Press, 1992.

Syme, Ronald. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Symons, Donald. 1979. *The Evolution of Human Sexuality*. New York: Oxford.

Tertullian. *On Penance and On Purity*, translated by William P. Le Saint. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1959.

Theodosian Code, translated by Clyde Pharr. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952.

Thornhill, Nancy Wilmsen. 1991. "An Evolutionary Analysis of Rules Regulating Human Inbreeding and Marriage." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 14:247-293.

Thornhill, Randy, and Steve Gangestad. 1993. "Human Facial Beauty: Averageness, Symmetry, and Parasite Resistance." *Human Nature* 4:237-269.

Treggiari, Susan. 1991. *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges From the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Trivers, Robert. 1972. "Parental Investment and Sexual Selection." Pp. 136-179 in *Sexual Selection and the Descent of Man*, edited by Bernard Campbell. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine.

Trivers, Robert and Dan Willard. 1973. "Natural Selection of Parental Ability to Vary the Sex Ratio of Offspring." *Science* 179: 90-92.

Trotula of Salerno. *Diseases of Women*, translated by Elizabeth Mason-Holt. Los Angeles: Ward Richie Press.

Trumbach, Rnadolph. 1978. *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family*. New York: Academic Press.

Turke, Paul. 1990. "Which Humans Behave Adaptively, and Why Does it Matter?" *Ethology and Sociobiology* 11: 305-339.

Turke, Paul and Laura Betzig. 1985. "Those Who Can Do: Wealth, Status, and Reproductive Success on Ifaluk." *Ethology and Sociobiology* 6:79-87.

Van den Berghe, Pierre. 1979. *Human Mating Systems*. New York: Elsevier.

Van Gulik, R. H. 1974. *Sexual Life in Ancient China*. London: E. J. Brill.

Vining, Paul. 1986. "Social Versus Reproductive Success." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 9: 167-187.

Visigothic Code (*Forum Judicum*), translated by S. P. Scott. Littleton Colorado: Fred Rothman & Co, 1982.

Wall, Richard. 1983. "The Composition of Households in a Population of Six Men to Ten Women: South-East Bruges in 1814." Pp. 421-474 in *Family Forms in Historic Europe*, edited by R. Wall, J. Robin and P. Laslett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weber, Max. 1904-1905. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, translated by Talcott Parsons. New York: Rougledge, 1992.

Wemple, Suzanne. 1981. *Women in Frankish Society: Marriage and the Cloister 500 to 900*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Westermarck, Edward. 1921. *A History of Human Marriage*, 5th edition. London.

White, Douglas. 1988. "Rethinking Polygyny: Co-wives, Codes, and Cultural Systems." *Current Anthropology* 29: 529-558.

White, Stephen D. 1988. *Custom, Kinship and Gifts to Saints*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Whitelock, Dorothy. 1930. *Anglo-Saxon Wills*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, George. 1966. *Adaptation and Natural Selection: A Critique of Some Current Evolutionary Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Williams, George and Dorris Williams. 1957. "Natural Selection of Individually Harmful Social Adaptations Among Sibs with Special Reference to Social Insects." *Evolution* 11: 32-39.

Wolfram von Ehrenbach. *Parzifal*, translated by A.T. Hatto. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1980.

Wood, Jim. 1990. "Fertility in Anthropological Populations." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 211.

Wood, Jim, and Maxine Weinstein. 1988. "A Model of Age-Specific Fecundability." *Population Studies* 42: 85-113.

Yost, John K. 1981. "The Reformation Defense of Clerical Marriage in the Reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI." *Church History* 50: 152-165.

Zhisui, Li. 1994. *The Private Life of Chairman Mao*. New York: Random House.

Zuk, Marlene. 1992. "The Role of Parasites in Sexual Selection: Current Evidence and Future Directions." *Advances in the Study of Behavior* 21: 39-68.