UCLA
UCLA Previously Published Works

Title
Descent and Alliance: Cultural Meanings of Blood in the Baroque

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7b7375jq

Author
Sabean, D

Publication Date
2013

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Blood & Kinship

Titles of Related Interest

Transregional and Transnational Families in Europe and Beyond: Experiences Since the Middle Ages
Edited by Christopher H. Johnson, David Warren Sabean, Simon Teuscher and Francesca Trivellato

Sibling Relations and the Transformations of European Kinship, 1300–1900
Edited by Christopher H. Johnson and David Warren Sabean

Kinship in Europe: Approaches to Long-Term Development (1300–1900)
Edited by David Warren Sabean, Simon Teuscher and Jon Mathieu

Blood & Kinship

Matter for Metaphor from Ancient Rome to the Present

Edited by

Christopher H. Johnson,
Bernhard Jussen,
David Warren Sabean,
Simon Teuscher

Berghahn Books
New York • Oxford

Published in 2013 by

Berghahn Books

www.berghahnbooks.com

©2013 Johnson, Jussen, Sabean, Teuscher

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purposes of criticism and review, no part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system now known or to be invented, without written permission of the publisher.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Blood and kinship : matter for metaphor from ancient Rome to the present / edited by Christopher H. Johnson...[et. al.]. — 1st ed.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-85745-749-3 (hardback : alk. paper)
1. Kinship—Europe—History. 2. Family—Europe—History. 3. Blood—Symbolic aspects—Europe. 4. Europe—Civilization. I. Johnson, Christopher H.
GN575.B56 2012
306.83094—dc23

2012013692

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Printed in the United States on acid-free paper.

ISBN 978-0-85745-749-3 (hardback)
ISBN 978-0-85745-750-9 (ebook)

Contents

List of Figures viii

Preface ix

Introduction 1
David Warren Sabean and Simon Teuscher

Chapter One
Agnatio, Cognatio, Consanguinitas: Kinship and Blood in Ancient Rome 18
Ann-Cathrin Harders

Chapter Two
The Bilineal Transmission of Blood in Ancient Rome 40
Philippe Moreau

Chapter Three
Flesh and Blood in Medieval Language about Kinship 61
Anita Guerreau-Jalabert

Chapter Four
Flesh and Blood in the Treatises on the *Arbor Consanguinitatis* (Thirteenth to Sixteenth Centuries) 83
Simon Teuscher

Chapter Five
Discourses of Blood and Kinship in Late Medieval and Early Modern Castile 105
Teofilo F. Ruiz

Chapter Six
The Shed Blood of Christ: From Blood as Metaphor to Blood as Bearer of Identity 125
Gérard Delille

Chapter Seven
Descent and Alliance: Cultural Meanings of Blood in the Baroque 144
David Warren Sabean

Chapter Eight
Kinship, Blood, and the Emergence of the Racial Nation in the French Atlantic World, 1600–1789 175
Guillaume Aubert

Chapter Nine
Class Dimensions of Blood, Kinship, and Race in Brittany, 1780–1880 196
Christopher H. Johnson

Chapter Ten
Nazi Anti-Semitism and the Question of "Jewish Blood" 227
Cornelia Essner

Chapter Eleven
Biosecuritization: The Quest for Synthetic Blood and the Taming of Kinship 244
Kath Weston

Chapter Twelve
Articulating Blood and Kinship in Biomedical Contexts in Contemporary Britain and Malaysia 266
Janet Carsten

Chapter Thirteen
From Blood to Genes? Rethinking Consanguinity in the Context of Geneticization 285
Sarah Franklin

Bibliography 307

Contributors 334

Index 338

Chapter 7

Descent and Alliance

Cultural Meanings of Blood in the Baroque

David Warren Sabean

Alliance and descent are the two axes around which I want to think through the different configurations of kinship during the seventeenth century, as evidenced for the most part in literary texts from both the sacred and secular sides of French society. An examination of many such texts suggests that the treatment of blood theologically resonated with models of social circulation and with how people were or could be connected with each other. On the one hand, there is the question of descent, and its corollaries heredity, inheritance, and succession, the axis of relations that works downward from parents to children and over generations; on the other hand, the axis of connections set up through exchange, alliance, and affinity, which tend to configure relations within a generation or abstracted from time. While considerations of how blood works, both metaphorically and in reality, are part of thinking about relationships that we can broadly conceptualize as vertical or horizontal, each of these in turn is subject to a series of different ways of drawing connection: generation, engenderment, conception, substantiation, replication, incarnation, exchange, contagion, and incorporation. The images depended very much on what happens in sexual intercourse and on how generation, or conception, takes place. Blood could be thought of in the generic sense as a link between parents and their children, or in the specific sense, as the connection of children to *one* of the parents. And it

could be communicated through lactation as well as through gestation.[1] It could connect the generations, providing particular privileges, obligations, and rights, and it could connect allies in friendship, exchanging the substance of a line, lineage, or *race* with other similar entities. In any genealogy, each consanguineal link could be a conduit of blood, and each alliance, a sharing of blood. It was possible to think of maternal blood as in some way the intermediary or instrument for creating alliance, while conceiving the paternal principle as the agent for the direct sharing of substance, the replication of the line, the incarnation of the father in the son, the self incorporated, as both differentiated in person and substantially the same.[2] In such a model, the maternal principle is nourishing, caritative, cooperative, and indispensable to male continuity, and it can be grasped as a vector for solidarity between allies, a channel for social circulation. As we will see in many texts from the seventeenth century, a group of males, an agnatic line, a house, a *race* could express the marriage of one member with another house as a mingling of blood: an alliance could only be thought of (or could best be thought of) through a language of flows, channels, conduits, coursings, and circulations.[3]

Kinship in Seventeenth-Century Europe

Before I turn to the texts, I would like to adumbrate a broad argument about the dynamics of kinship in seventeenth-century Europe and suggest that a general and persistent trend toward an ever greater emphasis on lineal thinking, patrilineal practices, and vertical representations set in during the late Middle Ages.[4] Although the movement toward stronger agnatic relationships was *initiated* during the Middle Ages, recent scholarship is finding that thoroughgoing patrilineal systems of property devolution developed only at the passage to early modernity, crucially between 1400 and 1700. In many, but not all regions and social groups, daughters, and then younger sons, came to be excluded from succession in favor of transmission of property and/or status from fathers to one (usually the eldest) son.[5] And in both partible and impartible systems alike, the devolution of property came to be modeled as a downward movement, unaffected by marriage alliances.[6] This shaped perceptions of property as something that belongs to lines of descent and entails lasting legal obligations to members of the family of origin.[7] We find an ever-increasing organization of kinship relations structured vertically and hierarchically around restricted succession to office, rank, and privilege, and around ever more clearly regulated—and often more narrowly defined—inheritance practices.[8]

As verticality, lineality, hierarchy, and familial particularity became distilled from social and political processes, newly constituted agnatic groups reconfigured relationships among neighborhoods, circles of friends, and marriage partners, which themselves invited new kinds of social dynamics and systems of representation. *No family could reproduce itself without creating allies.* Thus while property and office increasingly came to be thought of as a vertical flow, still, complex patterns of circulation among different political and corporate groups and wealth strata also took place in practice.[9] Marriage had to be with "strangers," given the ever more narrowly defined understanding of the line or lineage and the wide circle of prohibited marriages.[10]

Biblical and Classical Sources for Flesh and Blood

In the seventeenth century, the understanding of how people might be connected to each other was informed by a series of Bible passages: Genesis 2:24, Matthew 19:5–6, 1. Corinthians 6:16, Ephesians 5:31. In Genesis and the New Testament texts, the basic principle is that a husband and wife become "one flesh."[11] More or less explicitly paralleling, underpinning, or overlaying biblical passages were ancient texts by Hippocrates, Galen, and Aristotle on generation, widely discussed during the period, which encouraged a semantic slippage from "flesh" to "blood." In the Galenic understanding of generation, both the male and the female generated sperm—a concoction of blood—that mixed to produce a child, and that model could lead to a description of marriage as a *commixtio sanguinis* or, as in Corneille's *Andromède*, a *mélange* of two bloods.[12] In the Aristotelian account, however, the male and female produce different things altogether—the female provides the matter, or blood, while the male provides form, or sperm.[13] Sperm acts upon blood as a carpenter acts on wood, giving it form, shaping according to idea, acting as a causal principle.[14] Neither of these ways of viewing generation suggests that a child is more apt to be a blood relative of the father than of the mother, and yet—as we shall see—there are writers who maintained precisely this notion.[15]

Bishop Bossuet and the Blood of Kinship

The Immaculate Conception and the origins of salvific blood

The writings of Jacques Bénigne Bossuet (1627–1704), the prominent court preacher and ecclesiastical administrator during the reign of Louis

XIV, offer an example of the way particular theological doctrines were reconfigured in the context of new social practices and discourses about family and kin. He represents nicely the recourse to a new language of blood, superseding the older language of flesh, for construing descent and alliance, the former subsumed in expounding the relationship of Christ to Mary, and the latter in explaining the nature of the Eucharist.

Bossuet was a strong champion of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, a central tenet of baroque Catholicism, erected as a bulwark against Protestant understandings of the faith. It had been adopted by the Council of Basel in 1439 after three centuries of development and had won over the majority of the Catholic establishment by the end of the fifteenth century, but, at Bossuet's time, had yet to be proclaimed an incontrovertible principle of the Catholic faith.[16] The central issue had to do with the physical relationship between the Virgin Mary and her son, that is, with the connection between her blood and His, between her flesh and His. The problem, of course, could only be imagined within the available frame of ideas of descent, consanguinity, generation, and the unity of the flesh, adapted to fit the constraints of the established theological doctrine of Original Sin. At the heart of the theological debate lay the notion that the conception and birth of a sinless Christ necessitated not just the miracle of a virgin birth but the purity of the flesh He assumed. His conception/birth also had to be a unique occurrence, meaning that His mother's had to have taken place in the normal way, through human sexual intercourse—otherwise there would have had to have been an infinite regression of miraculous conceptions. The "traditional" answer to the conundrum was to understand Mary's flesh to have been purified or sanctified sometime after her conception (the best idea being at the Annunciation, with the Holy Spirit as the vehicle), so that while subject to original sin like all humans she was actually sinless at the time of her son's conception. But, beginning in the twelfth century, the purification of Mary was slowly pushed back to the time of her conception, and with the debates over how to understand all of this, theologians and preachers had to discuss the nature of human sexuality, the physiology of generation, the unity of the human race, the implications of the Fall, the heritability of substance and sin, the dynamics of lineage, and the characteristics of both paternity and maternity.

Theologians following Augustine thought of the union of male and female seed as producing a matter that was itself sinful, *caro peccati*, subject to an *infectio carnis* or *qualitas morbida*, "imprinted quasi physically by the disorderly pleasure from the parents."[17] When God infused a not-yet-corrupted soul, they argued, it was contaminated at the precise moment of its union with the flesh.[18] In a very real way, the most vis-

ible expression of the corruption of spirit by unruly appetites, communicated over and over again in each subsequent generation, lies in the human sexual act, with each link in the chain recapitulating or transferring the original defect. In Bossuet's account, the language is of palpable materiality, a semantics of disease, illness, and contagion, and Bossuet's choice of words suggests flows, channels, the natural coursing of fluids: "By the channels of original sin, venom and plague (*peste*) circulate in our nature."[19]

Because Mary was conceived like all other humans, she by that very fact needs the salvation bought for all humans with the blood of her son. Yet she also has to be sinless to pass pure flesh on to her son. But how can she be both sinless (although conceived in the ordinary way) and needing salvation (the universal task of Christ), a gratuitous act where there is no sin? Duns Scotus—among other theologians—seems to have solved the issue for Catholic theology by developing the notion of "extraordinary grace," exercised at the moment of conception, which freed Mary from sin. Christ's sacrificial act is here inscribed backward, so to speak: He acts as a "prevenient Mediator."[20]

In the seventeenth century, blood enters the equation as the specific substance involved in the double miracle of sinless conception—both Mary's and her son's. But how does this framing of blood work? In two different ways: Christ's blood is necessary for the prevenient action that makes Mary pure, and the blood that Mary carries and gives to her son (from which He is made, that which makes Him man) has to be pure, in turn.[21] The purity is circular, like the flowing of blood itself, and this circulation is the essential communicating element between mother and Son, Son and mother. As Bossuet puts it, that blood of the Son that saves Mary is the very blood that was taken from her chaste body.[22] Jesus gives His blood to all the faithful, but He acquired it from her. In fact, the conception of Mary is the first source of the blood of Christ.[23] Bossuet uses the analogy of a fountain that sprays water into the air, which then falls back to rejoin its source. He also thinks of this blood as a running stream (the French verb is *couler*), which flows through our veins through the ingestion of the Eucharist. In fact, Bossuet considers that the blood that circulates among members of the Church and the flesh that unites its members, that embodies it, is in some essential way Mary's flesh and blood.[24] "Her blood flows [*est coulé*] in our veins through the sacraments."[25]

In this understanding of generation and alliance, it is blood that transmits the essential properties from parent to child and the same blood that links people together in alliance. In fact, Bossuet sees a parallel between ingesting the eucharistic sacrifice and sexual intercourse, which

derives from his understanding of the circulation of blood.[26] It is also closely tied up with the idea of a woman as the necessary instrument for the male strategy of transmission: in incarnation, uniting the substance of God with the substance of man, God's paternity is at heart an alliance through a particular woman that, in turn, is the center of a larger, more encompassing alliance. The central idea of circularity—whereby the blood of Jesus intervenes preveniently to purify Mary's blood at the moment of her conception—is similar to the Aristotelian notion that in the generative act male form acts in such a way on female matter that the blood of the child can be said to be that of the father. Jesus (the son) as God (the father) secures His own blood and determines His own succession.

From a language of flesh to a language of blood

A key problem in understanding the centrality of blood in Bossuet's representation of the descent and alliance problematics lies in a central shift in language, from flesh to blood, subsequent to the fifteenth century.[27] My hypothesis is that the ever-greater stress on lineage in the social and political lives of Europeans from the Renaissance onward paralleled the development of a semantics of blood both in cultural and theological discourses.[28] According to the detailed account by Marielle Lamy of the development of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception from the twelfth century onward, it appears that all the way into the fifteenth century the terms of discourse were of "flesh" not "blood."[29] There is almost a strictly *biological* necessity for the Word to assume an innocent flesh. And the fleshly unity of Mary and Jesus, mother and son, is modeled on the unity of spousal flesh—always already implicitly a sexual union: Jesus is "bone of her bone and flesh of her flesh"—the same language to be found in Gen. 2:24, when Adam claims Eve.[30]

It appears that well into the sixteenth century, flesh remained the central conceptual tool, giving way primarily to blood during the seventeenth century.[31] The interesting anonymous text from 1515, *Le Defensoire de la conception de la glorieuse Vierge Marie,* still considers the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and the relationship of Mary to Jesus in terms of "body" and "flesh," with practically no reference to blood.[32] The problem elucidated concerns the precise way in which original sin is transmitted from generation to generation and the relationship of parents to progeny. The emphasis on lineage and line that seems to motivate Bossuet's adoption of a language of blood is missing here. In fact, this Mary marks an abrupt break with the sinful *masse* of Adam and all those of his generation: she and her son have only one flesh, while her parents are not one flesh with her.[33] Here the key concepts are flesh,

body, *masse*, and seed. And seed is associated with *masse*—that is, with a substance that one can think of as solid or "doughy," not with blood, a fluid coursing down through the generations.[34] The accent is on the sexual act. The author imagines the body to be like a "whore," which corrupts the pure soul provided by God.[35] All flesh generated by male seed is corrupt, morbid, and susceptible to the *fomes peccati* once joined with a soul.[36] So Christ is excepted because he was not generated by seed, and Mary excepted through divine intervention and a disaggregation of her flesh from the seed (*masse*) of her parents.[37]

A slightly later consideration, a dialogue by Nicole Grenier, a canon regular of Saint Victor, published in 1549, dealt with many of the same issues, and here again, the discussion centers completely around flesh and shows no interest in blood. The late medieval notion of prevenient grace is central to the argument, but so also is a stress on the role of male seed in the propagation of original sin.[38] According to the law of human propagation, writes Grenier, a blot or stain (*macule*) is communicated to the newly constituted body.[39] This process is grasped in terms of a "contagion," which communicates to the newly generated human body a fetid quality, an inevitable stain (*tache*). This blemish (*souillure*) and corruption dwells in the flesh and infects the soul too when it is joined to the body, just as a pure liquid is corrupted by a soiled vessel.[40] In a sense, there are two conceptions, the first through the mixing of parental seed and the generation of a body, and the second when the rational soul is infused into the body.[41] Christ is unique in that he is not conceived through *male* seed—and the stress throughout the treatise is on male seed—but he is also not conceived through the action of female seed. The same point about male seed or the seed of Adam is part of orthodox Christian argument but reiterated in discussion of the Immaculate Conception doctrine; for example, the seventeenth-century saint, François de Sales, explained that Christ was of the *masse* of Adam but not of his seed.[42] And Grenier explains the action of the Holy Spirit on Mary as like the action of a dye on pure, white wool.[43] Mary, of course, was conceived in the ordinary way, but *her flesh* was preveniently preserved by the *flesh* of Jesus Christ, because His flesh was her flesh.[44] Once again, the spousal passage of Genesis 2:24 is brought to bear to explain the relation of Mary's flesh to that of her son.[45] The mother was destined as spouse.[46] Our redemption begins with the Immaculate Conception, the corporeal substance of Christ. [47]

Bishop Bossuet on descent and salvific blood

In a sermon on the Nativity, Bossuet quoted Saint Bernard to the effect that the finger of God composed the flesh of the Son from the pure

blood of Mary.[48] Here, it seems to me that Aristotelian categories work well, since in ordinary intercourse, according to them, the male sperm is thought of as producing form, as something spiritual, as mental, while the female provides the material substrate necessary for the formation of a child, the blood.[49] Form and matter together produce substance. Here Mary offers the same material conditions as other women, but the conception takes place outside the normal conditions of physical intercourse. In the process of fixing the maternal blood, the Holy Spirit drew into her chaste womb (*flancs*) that blood that washed away our sins. Once again, the blood that Christ sacrificed was Mary's blood—the pure distillate, given form and direction through the divine "germ," idea, or spirit, was actuated, made efficacious, by a male principle.[50]

At this point Bossuet went on to the issue of Mary's genealogy. Again it is a matter of blood. Mary is the conduit of royal blood but has the particularity of being the immediate source for Jesus. "She has the blood of kings and patriarchs in herself with a particular dignity, because she has it in order to pour (*verser*) it directly into the person of Jesus Christ."[51] Precisely the notion of channel is used here—Mary is the sacred channel through which the blood of kings and patriarchs reaches Christ.

Did Bossuet have some doubts?

In a late work, published only after his death, Bossuet discussed the relationship of the Son to the Father. God can only be *named* "Father," even though he carries the Son in His womb (*sein*) eternally. God conceives in Himself and carries in Himself His fruit, who is coeternal. "While He is uniquely father, and the name of mother, which is attached to a degenerate [*dégenérant*] sex, imperfect in itself, is not suitable for Him, still He has always a maternal-like womb [*un sein comme maternal*] where he carries His Son."[52] In this account, Bossuet seems to be following classic Aristotelian ideas.[53] The stronger the formative male principle, the more the offspring resemble the father. In the act of eternal generation, Christ is the same substance as God: "immaterial, incorporeal, pure, spiritual."[54] So when Christ is born in time, the act of the celestial father is to extend His eternal generation in Mary.[55] The Son receives from the Father the same substance, without any division. In fact, whenever we speak of a son and father, we understand the former to be another self (*lui-même*) of the latter. By the act of engendering, the child is made to be what its father is.[56] This account fits readily into contemporary representations of male lineage constructs that treated women as problematic intrusions, as deficient and "degenerate," but also mediate and instrumental, as vessels for the reproduction of male *soi-mêmes*. In this text, at least, Mary (as woman) is an ambivalent figure.

Bishop Bossuet, the Eucharist, and models of alliance

Bossuet's account of the Eucharist draws on material metaphors of marriage. The Eucharist celebration is a "consummation of sacred marriage," an act of incorporation, in which the celebrant becomes bone of Christ's bone and flesh of His flesh. Once again, as we have seen above, the blood that we receive is that of the Virgin: "Her blood flows (*est coulé*) in our veins through the sacraments."[57]

Bossuet's theological arguments resonate continuously with contemporary understandings of lineage and the transmission of paternal substance. The central problem in the management of property was to construe the line as the channel along which rights and obligations flowed. Bossuet finds the language of conduits and circulation useful to model the relationship of the *humanation* of the Son Jesus to the eternal paternity of God. The properties of the heir cannot be abstracted from the materiality of the actual flow of blood from parent to child. And that blood in the vessel of a woman could only be actualized, given form, or purified through agnatic intervention. In Bossuet's final thoughts on the subject, God Himself supersedes Mary as mother, since just as for a male lineage, the instrument by which the line is reproduced is of secondary importance, a threat to paternal transmission, a problem for continuous agnatic purity. The stronger the male power in the act of conception the more the image of the father is to be found in the son. And yet it is the blood of a woman that is essential to the construction of alliance. Without mediation, no line could reproduce itself, and without the wider set of allies connected through the blood of the spouse, no line could overcome its isolation.

Corneille and the Blood of Heredity and Alliance

Lines of blood: The question of legitimacy

In the Middle Ages, lineage and line, and kinship relations in general, were not modeled on and did not derive their metaphors from blood. The blood language is absent from both religious and civil discourses, except in the term *sang royal*, which is known from the fourteenth century.[58] But, by the seventeenth century, such a discourse was fully available, as we have already seen in our exploration of the logic of the Immaculate Conception doctrine. André Devyver has provided a great deal of evidence to show that a shift in vocabulary and in the symbolics of self-understanding within the French nobility took place in the decades after 1560, precisely around a notion of purity of blood.[59] And with that went a refusal by noble families of alliance by marriage with those bourgeois

families considered desirable during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Both nobles themselves and their self-conscious defenders began to talk about the blood of ancestors running in their veins, and about that blood being the receptacle for psychic and moral virtues.[60] Other key expressions of baroque noble culture made their appearance in the second half of the sixteenth century: "noble de race" by 1550, "lignage" in 1549, and by the end of the century "sang clair," "sang épuré," "sang ancien et illustre, "sang bleu."[61] And by the time one gets to Madame de Sévigné, we find an expression like "good blood does not lie" actually in use.[62] Devyver cites one writer, J. B. Nenna, who, writing on the nobility of race, explicitly tied the purity of noble blood and the purity of Christ's blood together as a conceptual pair.[63] What is important to understand in this new discourse of blood is that it stressed the male principle of devolution. After 1560, the primacy of the paternal line was no longer contested. And a memoirist like Gaspard de Saulx-Tavannes simply assumed male transmission of seed/blood, citing Aristotle about the degeneracy of the female. Taking the primacy of paternal principles for granted, he expressed the key idea that like engenders like.[64]

The argument here is that a consideration of kinship in terms of blood developed with the rise of lineal thinking and the adoption of ever-stricter agnatic forms of property devolution, restricted processes of inheritance or succession, such as found with primogeniture and genealogical constructs favoring male lineages. Blood became a metaphor for handling issues of purity and legitimacy but was also palpable matter; real blood flowing through the veins of fathers and sons distributed both privileges and moral obligations and formed the basis for political and social practices. There are many texts that I could take to explore these issues and to compare with the theological representations to be found in Bossuet and many of his fellow clerics. A good place to begin to examine secular texts is with the dramatic literature of Bossuet's contemporaries, precisely those plays staged for the entertainment of the nobles gathered around the French court. What follows is a systematic reading of the dramas of Pierre Corneille, a writer who continuously focused on the problematics of descent and alliance, more often adumbrating social dilemmas than providing particular solutions.[65]

In *Le Cid*, the conflict that will be explored through the action of the play begins when the royal counselor Diègue (a father) charges Rodrigue, le Cid (his son), with the task of avenging an insult that just happens to have been delivered by Rodrigue's father-in-law-to-be.[66] In obligating Rodrigue, Diègue uses the language of shared substance: "my blood." That people could actually talk this way is attested by a letter of Madame de Sévigné to her cousin, addressing him as "my blood," and

talking about the mutual blood circulating in their veins.[67] Chimène, Rodrigue's betrothed, uses the same construct when she remarks that her blood is her father's blood: indeed the blood on Rodrigue's sword that killed her father is hers. The construction resembles Bossuet's understanding of Christ's sacrificial blood being that of Mary. In both cases, the parent's blood is substantially the same as the child's.[68] Rodrigue makes the same point: as son, he is blood of his father.[69]

In *Horace,* Corneille uses an account of war between Rome and the city of Alba to intertwine issues of descent and alliance with patriotism, filial duty, allegiance to the state, and attachment to family. Each of the dramatic roles provides an occasion to think through different positions. Both Horace and his father see blood strictly in terms of agnatic succession and the in-marrying wife as incorporated into their family. Sabine, Horace's Alba-born wife, counters that marriage does not erase earlier ties and responsibilities; it does not abolish the profound character of attachment to origins. Nature establishes such ties as a matter of first right. Indeed, while anyone can choose a spouse, no one can choose siblings, and they continue to provide an essential identity—they are *nous-mêmes*.[70] The blood ties arising from common descent are ascribed, derived from the incontrovertible natural facts of procreation. One cannot choose one's family of origin.

Throughout the Cornelian oeuvre, having the same blood explains the action. Descent provides an identity of material substance to parents and children, siblings, and even members of the same nation, all considered as engendered, embodied, and incorporated through material sanguinary channels. The resemblance to Bossuet's arguments is marked: blood transmits essential properties from parent to child and constructs a material identity among individuals of the same lineage.

The material flows of blood are part of a complex transmission of material substance. Thus descent through proper bloodlines distributes rights and legitimizes claims to the possessions of the lineage. Corneille explores this theme frequently as it touches on matters of royal legitimacy and rights of succession. But blood even binds together people unconnected by direct descent. We will deal later with notions of marriage as the mixing of blood of two families or lineages. Here, it will suffice to note the presence of a sense of blood "passing" from a father to his sons-in-law. Agésilas, the eponymous hero of another of Corneille's dramas, for example, confronting his brother Lysander over the proposed marriages of the latter's daughters, says that Lysander's blood will pass entirely from him to his sons-in-law.[71] Thus while marriage, which involves contract, decision, and choice, is not inherently "natural," there is

a sense in the argument that the passage of blood it entails, just like that in descent, mediates ascribed obligations.

Sequence of birth and succession

In the mechanics of inheritance or succession, blood is key but not in itself sufficient to establish particular rights or claims; sequence of birth and gender also come into play.[72] In *Nicomède,* Queen Laodice of Armenia, who is living at the court of her guardian, King Prusias of Bithynia, is being courted by two of Prusias's sons—Nicomède, eldest and heir to the throne, and Attale, the younger half-brother, who has been raised in Rome, having been taken there as a hostage. Laodice treats the younger suitor with contempt, calling him a "mere bourgeois" and "subject" because he is not the first-born and presumed successor.[73] As a queen she will only contemplate marrying an equal, namely Nicomède, the royal heir: blood is one thing and rank another. Rank order of birth determines deference and life chances. Attale should be looking to lower ranks for an alliance—to the daughter of a tribune. The sequence of birth determines the order of respect, master and subject.[74] In a conversation with King Prusias and the Roman ambassador Flaminius, who is seeking to prevent any expansion of Bithynian power, Nicomède champions the notion of nature, namely that generation *and* birth order together determine claims and rights. He puts the political issue this way: "I have enlarged the realm of Bithynia, but Rome wants to divide up the power, and in this project, the prince [his half-brother Attale] is too well born to be my subject. And I ought to give up the goods of my ancestors or the price of my blood to put him in my rank."[75] When the ambassador says that Rome would be satisfied if Attale married Laodice, thereby preventing Bithynia and Armenia from being united under one crown, and urges King Prusias to command her to marry Attale, Nicomède protests that she has full freedom as queen. Prusias makes the point that love has nothing to do with alliances among princes, which must be concluded according to reason of state. Having been persuaded that Bithynian state interest is best sustained by accepting the Roman position, he goes on to threaten Laodice, telling her to decide between destruction of her country and deposition from her throne on the one hand, and marriage to Attale on the other.[76] To the Roman ambassador, Laodice insists that Attale is not of sufficiently high status: "I regard him as a common soul and a man better born for another fortune, more my subject than my spouse, and the conjugal knot would not be able to overcome the unequal rank."[77] Later, in a pique, Nicomède leaves everything to his brother, hoping this will persuade Attale to drop his suit of Laodice,

but repeats that Laodice is free to make her own decision. Prusias is incensed that his son Nicomède would abandon his estate for a woman, but Nicomède tells him that this act will not jeopardize his accession to the throne; that he will be recalled to the kingdom to assume the throne when Prusias dies: "The old right of the eldest is so strong that to fill a throne, it would recall the absent one. I will do for myself what I have done for you [reconquer rightful possessions]."[78]

Linking "houses," political groups, cultures, alliance, and circles of kin

A central aspect of the rhetoric in Corneille's representation of the dynamics of kinship has to do with blood as a vector of alliance. Although sometimes this can be understood metaphorically, the widespread assumptions about the exchange of fluids in intercourse always point to a substantial, carnal, physical link that carries moral weight. Blood binds together "houses," political and ethnic groups, circles of kin, lineages, clans, nations, and cultures through the strategic marriage of "strangers." Just as much as descent is understood as a passage of blood along generations, alliance is represented as a coursing of blood among horizontally positioned groups. The former implies the idea of an apical ancestor, whose substance is communicated through progeny, whose proximity and obligation to each other in turn are determined by the degree to which they share in that substance, while the latter involves the image of a nodal pair, whose substantial union also determines relationships of nearness and distance within the field of relationships.

Corneille also organizes dramatic action around such nodal pairs. In *Le Cid*, Don Rodrigue (the Cid) and Chimène are engaged to be married, the point being to link their houses by "sacred bonds" through a marriage arranged by their fathers.[79] Similarly, Lysander in *Agésilas* wants to unite his blood with that of a Persian nobleman by making the latter his son-in-law.[80] In *Polyeucte*, Félix, the Roman governor of Armenia, arranges a political marriage between his daughter, Pauline, and the high Armenian noble, Polyeucte. The alliance Félix aims at is meant to bring together two different nations, states, social orders, and cultures.[81] One marriage, of course, can be followed by many more. In yet another setting, Corneille has the Roman general Sertorius, in the tragedy bearing his name, consider marriage with the Spanish Queen Viriate. That would begin a series of marriages between the two nations—thousands would follow and "would chain one to the other, mixing so well blood and common interest that they would soon reduce two people to one."[82]

Blood exchanged or mingled between families, lineages, houses, and cities

Up to now, we have been looking at marriage as an exchange moment between different kinds of groups. Now the issue is to look at the way the texts reveal concerns about blood, mixed, exchanged, mingled. In a confrontation with her father, the Roman governor, Félix, who is caught in the dilemma between imperial law condemning Christians and paternal sentiment, Pauline, the wife of the convert Polyeucte, says that by marrying her Polyeucte *has become Félix's blood*.[83] Pauline's argument is a classic statement of alliance. Her marriage has made the two men so close that they are to be considered to be of the same blood: the daughter/wife conveys the father's blood to the son-in-law. She is the conduit or channel for the coursing of blood both between generations and between allies. In the last act, Pauline uses the terms *nature* and *love* to refer to her relationships with her father and her husband, respectively.[84] In this construction, nature, blood, and birth are ascribed characteristics, creating primary loyalties and duties crucial to the moral order. Love, in contrast, is negotiable, derivative, created, and dependent. It too is part of the moral order, but it is situational and follows from primary obligations. Still, it has two aspects, one related to the senses and passions, suspect, transient, creating no permanent attachment, and the other part of the rational order, derived from social facts or the consequences of primary allegiances, assumed and permanent. Alliance, in turn, can be viewed from different angles: the exchange relationship set up between two families, lineages, or houses, with all of its different in-law connections, hierarchies, intimacies, and distances; and the particular couple, the nodal point in the wider system of reciprocities, the individuals who are exchanged, whose marriage provides the structural permanency, and who are charged with the reproduction of the system through the bearing of children. All of the images of becoming one blood assume the exchange of fluids in intercourse. At the end of *Polyeucte*, in which both father and daughter are converted to Christianity following the martyrdom of the son-in-law/spouse, the blood of the spouse falls upon his wife with salvific effect: thus proclaims Pauline, "by the beneficial blood you see me baptized."[85]

Place of women in alliance

In almost all of Corneille's plays, alliance is a matter of agnatic lineages, royal houses, or parents arranging for the marriages of their children, with a strong sense that it is women who are exchanged between lines. Nonetheless, women are actors in their own right. They may have to

obey in the end, but when they consider a marriage problematic, they try to negotiate. In many situations, especially in the comedies, the trick is to get the parents to come around to support their children's inclinations. Nonetheless, without exception, the young women maintain that the ultimate decision is in the hands of their fathers (or failing them, their mothers or brothers charged with paternal responsibilities and powers). A clear distinction is made between love that is based on mutual attraction and the kind of love that makes for a settled marriage. The latter always is accompanied by reason—and, frequently, "reason" is understood to be what proceeds from paternal authority. Love based on sexual attraction is too unsteady and impermanent to be the foundation of a long-lasting marriage, and in the context of infrequent divorce, the decision is too important to leave to sentiment. Given these exigencies, it is still the case that women have claims (an expectation to a marriage of suitable status, for example) as well as obligations, and they are actors in their own right. They are frequently the key players in keeping an alliance alive and mediating between agnatic groups.

The factors that place women in mediating positions between different groups are explored in *Horace.* Sabine opens the play by observing that by virtue of her marriage to Horace, she has become Roman.[86] This suggests rules of patrilocality and the assumption of a new status through marriage. There is never any hint that Horace has become Alban through marriage. Sabine, as befitting the position of woman-as-connecting link, as the person who gets uprooted yet maintains sentiments, passions, and desires connected to her family of origin and her country of birth, is caught in the dilemma of loyalty to warring families and warring fatherlands. She is Roman because her husband, Horace, is Roman, but she nevertheless retains her sentimental attachments to the place of her birth. Birth matters and blood matters. By distinguishing her position from that of a slave, Sabine suggests that, marriage notwithstanding, she continues to have the rights and claims of a free person; her position, poised between two cities and two families, is an active one, one of mediation. She points out that Romulus came from Alba, and that Rome originated in Alba; that Roman blood stems from the Alban kings, and—with a shift in metaphor—that Rome now points its weapons at the breast of its mother. In any event, she finds herself suspended, hating whichever side wins and weeping for whichever one loses. Horace actually kills her three brothers in battle and then also his sister, who has dared suggest that *her* own sentiments are less tied to her Roman blood, and to Horace's glory, than to her hope for marriage, love of Curiace, and expected incorporation into another state. Sabine cannot cease lamenting her brothers. Horace, however, expects her to stop mourning, observing

that "if the absolute power of a chaste passion allows us both only one thought and only one soul, it is for you to raise your sentiments to mine and not for me to descend to the shame of yours."[87] While he expects her to be more a wife than a sister, her response is to make a distinction between the public and the domestic realms. In public, it is all right to celebrate Horace's victory, but at home she should be capable of mourning her brothers, though they were fighting on the losing side; she is not willing to forget the loss of her brothers. Corneille has the city of Alba play the female to Rome's male. It is the Alban king, not the Roman Horace, who stops the battle; and he does so on grounds that the two cities are allied, one blood. No Roman hesitates to pursue the conquest. Alba is sometimes portrayed as "mother" of Rome, at other times as the origin of its wives. Horace will not tolerate divided loyalties; he demands absolute loyalty and power. He even kills his sister over her suggestion that the alliance between the two cities is one of balanced reciprocity. Sabine is not prepared to give up the ties that come from her family of origin, which are rooted in nature and provide precisely the identity that distinguishes a wife from a slave. She continues to argue that she is responsible to both necessary ties (of birth) and voluntary ties (of marriage). In the end, however, she is clear that the blood of lineage trumps alliance.

The obligation of women to defend the family is crucial to the argument in *Pompée,* where the action is driven by the civil war that made enemies of the former triumvirs Pompée and Julius Caesar. Cornélie, the widow of Pompée, is destined forever to identify with her deceased spouse.[88] In fact, because he is not alive to release her from her obligations toward him, there is no possibility for her to act according to her own free will and make peace with Caesar. A chasm divides Cornélie and Caesar forever, she declares. Throughout, her interests and positions vis-à-vis other people are strictly tied to her husband. She has two stories to tell about herself—descent from a Roman hero and two marriages, both to Roman heroes. Her motivations are sorted out in such a way as to have the precepts of cultural Romanness dictate the solution to her conflicting loyalties. She acts most Roman when she acts in tandem with the house into which she married, where she can carry out her duty. Thus she must ally against Caesar, with Pompée's sons, as well as with the sons of Cato and other kin.[89] In some ways, the play suggests, the split in interests between Caesar and Pompée could have been overcome if the latter had lived to submit to Caesar and to be pardoned by him. But his death precludes forever submission by the wife. Cornélie can admire Caesar, find him honorable, and even support him against some of his enemies. There is a proper way to oppose him and an improper one—the former Roman, the latter un-Roman.

The transfer of loyalties to the family into which one has married is developed also in *Polyeucte*, with the further complication introduced by conflicting religious loyalties. When a confidante tells Pauline that by his conversion Polyeucte has become an enemy of the state and thus someone she must revile, Pauline replies that her love is from duty, and that her duty and virtue are not at all dependent on her husband's beliefs or actions.[90] Pauline embodies the ambiguous position of a married woman. She obeyed her father blindly and immediately when he commanded her to marry Polyeucte, in the act extinguishing a great love, in accord with the "laws of birth." Now married, her duty is to her husband, whose embrace of a proscribed religion has placed him, and her with him, in conflict with her father and the state. As the mediate character, the daughter/wife, she is not free, except to fulfill the duties of both offices, but being both daughter and wife, she can act as go between. Her marriage has made her father and husband so close that they are to be considered of the same blood. She has to balance between nature (attachment to father) and love (attachment to husband).[91] Unlike her first love, this love is based on "reason," as conveyed by paternal command.

This obviously pre-Kantian understanding of morality accepts that the "ought" can be derived from what "is," all of which, of course, is believed to have been ordained by God. But morality in seventeenth-century understanding cannot be detached from will. Corneille's voluntarism fits very well within the theological argument of the period, especially with the wide-ranging debate over the nature of law and of morality—whether law, and therefore moral action, proceed from the will of God or the king or the state, or whether there is a good in itself; that is, that God does the good, rather than that the good is what God wills. In a sense, this debate spills over into the one about the nature of the aristocracy or royalty, with the idea that blood carries inherent qualities, the blood of the highborn incarnating the most prized moral qualities. This debate, with its many ramifications, is carried on between Cleopatre and her brother, Ptolomée, in *Pompée*.[92] The king is of the opinion that the exercise of will governs moral and legal action and, furthermore, that the will of the king determines the justice or injustice of a specific act. His sister essentially argues against the voluntarist ethical position that establishes law as an expression of the will of God (the "gods" here) or the will of the prince. She clearly thinks that there is honorable or moral action as such and that it is beneath the highborn to act otherwise. Therefore, by implication, if a king acts unjustly, it is because of the counsel of base advisors. Ptolomée says explicitly that anything a king orders for the good of the state is just. Asked why she had supported Pompée when Caesar is in love with her and she can get

everything from him, Cléopatre answers: "Princes have something from their high birth; their soul receives impressions in their blood, which orders their passions under their virtue; their generosity submits everything to their glory."[93]

Ascriptive vs. negotiated obligations

Earlier I alluded to the distinction between ascriptive obligations that are established by nature and negotiated duties worked out in exchanges of friendship and alliance. *Le Cid* relates a story in which inherited blood has ascriptive power and takes priority over relationships based on negotiation and choice. The plot moves toward an aporia, where members of two families are honor bound to kill each other despite conflicting desires, and Chimène, finding no resolution for her ambivalent motives, plans to kill herself right after her lover's death.[94] In *Polyeucte,* Pauline distinguishes between "nature" and "love."[95] Nature, a matter of blood and birth, determines primary loyalties, obedience, and ascribed duties. And nature is the foundation of the moral order. For her, love is a derivative concept, a result of fulfilling primary obligations. When love is based on attraction or passion alone, it is transient and cannot be the foundation for permanent relationships. But when it is rooted in nature, in the natural order, in the facts of birth, or secondarily derived from an alliance based on the wishes of paternal authority, it also is fundamental for the moral order. In this Christian drama, the only challenge to the blood of families is Christ's salvific blood, the model for the blood of martyrs as the seed of the Church, a point made categorically by Polyeucte.[96] In this case, it is the specific blood of the martyr/husband that explicitly and suddenly leads to Pauline's conversion, and hence salvation—the image is at once drawn from the office of the lover/husband and the Christ/martyr. It is subsequent to this that Pauline announces her disobedience to her father, to the laws of birth. The rights over her have been transferred to the new alliance—to the husband/martyr and to the Christian faith.[97]

Even in a situation of moral failure, such as found in *Rodogune,* the mother expects the sons implicitly to share her rage—for them not to do so is to violate nature. In the debate between mother and son, Antiochus maintains that love and nature have separate, compatible rights, while the mother fears that love can snuff out nature. Among other aspects of the conflict within this family, the debate circles around duties transmitted by descent (nature) and obligations of contract (love).[98]

Recognition of a blood attachment—cousins, for example—evokes both claims to support and a moral obligation. In *Théodore*, a key figure in the plot is Cléobule, a blood relative of Théodore, who speaks of their

closeness as derived from "rights of blood."[99] Marcelle expects that he will support Théodore just because she is his kin.[100] In *Héraclius*, marriage, once accomplished, brings in its train the same kinds of sentiment one finds through blood: Pulchérie fears that if the marriage to the tyrant Phocas's son takes place while Phocas is alive, then she will inevitably shift her affective stance toward the father-in-law/tyrant. She would be united to his family; he would be her father and she his daughter. She would owe love, respect, and fidelity merely by such a connection: "My hate would no longer be impetuous and all my wishes for you [Martian] would be timid and weak when my wishes against him would be of parricide"[101]—thus her wish to see Phocas dead before the wedding. *Medée*, of course, portrays a tragedy that turns on love and passion breaking the power of primary loyalties, manifested as betrayal of father and country. Medée does not find any mediating position between ascribed loyalties and negotiated ones. She thinks her betrayal of all her duties to family and kin should bind Jason to her all the more securely.[102] But passions, especially Jason's, are a weak cement, unable to reproduce structure. In the *Toison d'or*, which looks at the Medée/Jason connection in an earlier phase, the same issues of choice (love) and nature (blood) are dealt with. The king, Aaete, after his daughter, Medée, has betrayed him and helped Jason get the fleece, says to his son: "you know too little how a wild love surpasses tyranny. It does not spare rank, country, father, modesty. Maybe you yourself are the enemy of your father. All my blood revolts and betrays my hopes. Everything becomes suspect. I do not know what to believe, only what to fear. Love keeps little respect for the rights of blood. Everyone can be innocent or culpable."[103] In the end, when Medée has helped Jason steal the fleece, she proclaims that "from the country of blood, love breaks the ties, and the gods of Jason are stronger than mine."[104]

Reproducing the Lineage

Images of blood in the seventeenth century offer models of social circulation. The relationship of a man to his progeny, the circulation of blood down the generations, follows the same conduits as property, status, and privilege. The coursing of blood derives from nature, and the connections it makes among those whose veins flow with the same juice are ascriptive, not subject to negotiation, choice, or contract. The key terms for grasping the group whose substance is shared constantly reappear in belles-lettres, legal discourse, and theology: *Geschlechter, lineages, cognationum, Freundschaften, races.* Such groups of kin are internally differen-

tiated and subject to hierarchies based on principles of age, gender, and birth order, but they are characterized by moral demands, sentimental attachments, and orientations of identity.[105] In baroque culture there was a palpability, substantiality, and corporality to the lineage. And the family was perceived on a vertical axis in terms of legitimate descent and succession, all emphasizing agnatic ties, the flow of vital substance through male lines, and an extreme egoism of familial identity.

It is just because each agnatic line could not reproduce itself without help from strangers that it had to enter into dangerous alliances with other groups, each, in turn, with their own sense of identity. Women were brought in to care for the line, and their "blood" was crucial for the success of father/son continuity. Maternal blood only becomes actuated by a male spark, concept, idea, or form, such that the blood of the children is, ironically, essentially paternal. The blood that ends up transmitted to the son is the father's blood even in this Aristotelian understanding of generation where sperm is robbed of its materiality and works its magic through spirit.

The link between two clans or lineages or descent groups or families had to be substantial enough to provide a foundation for continuous exchange. The alliance was so important that women of an allied family could no longer be available either as objects of sexual desire or for reproduction. The thesis I am trying to explore is that behind the force of this idea lay the many services that close allies provided. They could be guardians for children, gender tutors for sisters- and mothers-in-law, administrators of estates, curators for widows, legal representatives for married and single women, executors of wills, or underwriters and guardians of liens and contracts. Protecting property and reproducing the line made allied kin all the more necessary and all the more useful, precisely because they had no expectation to the property of an allied line. Commentators found the mutual exchanges between allied families and their responsibilities for each other to be so intimate that marriage back into the same family overlaid substance with substance, flesh with flesh.[106] The Jansenist theologian Antoine Arnauld maintained that conjugal love would degenerate into brutal passion and excessive ardor if close kin already linked by blood and familiarity added conjugal tenderness to such strong ties.[107] This seems to me to be a way of suggesting that obligation requires the right degree of distance and a systematically constructed set of roles with carefully maintained boundaries. In this construction, the set of rights, duties, obligations, and claims, the circulation of goods, the patterns of exchange, and the tensions between vertical and horizontal relationships, between consanguineal and affinal kin, between structure and change, and between identity and difference created considerable

unease in baroque culture about repeated marriage into the same family, symbolized through a set of scriptural and medical metaphors of flesh and blood—the subject for another essay.

Notes

For the plays by Corneille, I have consulted *Théatre complet de Corneille*, ed. Maurice Rat, 3 vols. (Paris, n.d. [1942]). In references to individual plays, the format I am using is 1.2.3:4 indicating volume, act, scene, page number in that order. All translations into English are mine.

1. On the fungibility of blood, see Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, MA, 1990), 35–43; Barbara Duden, *The Woman Beneath the Skin*, trans. Thomas Dunlap (Cambridge, MA, 1991), 124–26; see also Gianna Pomata, "Blood Ties and Semen Ties: Consanguinity and Agnation in Roman Law," in *Gender, Kinship, Power: A Comparative and Interdisciplinary History*, ed. Mary Jo Maynes et al. (New York and London, 1996), 43–64, here 56–57.
2. In *Idomenée*, P. J. Crébillon père has the son say to the father that he recognizes the blood that made him; see *Idomenée* (1706), in *Oeuvres* (Paris, 1831), 1:68. Molière lets a character speak of his father as the source of his blood and author of his being; see Molière, *L'etourdi* (1663), in *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. E. Despois (Paris, 1873), 235. And H. Racan has a man conceived of the *same blood* as his father *in the womb* of his mother; see H. Racan, *Les psaumes* (1660), in *Oeuvres complètes*, ed. P. Jannet (Paris, 1857), 2:181.
3. The image of mixing the blood of two lineages or families through the agency of a son or daughter is a recurring theme in the seventeenth century. I explore this theme both in Bossuet and Corneille in the present chapter. In Corneille's plays, a son-in-law becomes the same blood with his father-in-law (*Polyeucte*, 2.3.3:46); two noblemen become linked through the blood of their children (*Andromède*, 2.1.1:550); the union of a husband and wife is a union of blood (*Toison d'or*, 3.3.1:118); the union of husband and wife also becomes a union of two nations (*Sertorius*, 3.1.2:170); and a political marriage links the blood of two leaders (*Agésilas*, 3.1.2:367). Note that there is a more elaborate discussion of blood in the Corneille plays later in this chapter. Bossuet, in a funeral sermon for a noble woman, spoke of her uniting the blood of the Gonzagas, Cleves, Lorraine, and France; *Oraison funèbre de très haute et très puissante princesse Anne de Gonzague de Clèves* (1685), in *Oeuvres oratoires* (Paris, 1922), 6:291. And, finally, Jean de Routrou writes that a man gave his own blood to his son-in-law through his daughter; see Jean de Routrou, *Le veritable St-Genest* (1647), ed. E. T. Dubois (Droz, 1972), 62.
4. The core of familial ties was the set of vertical, descending relationships: those people who shared the same blood, diluted according to their distance from the stem. For blood to touch blood—killing, feud, intercourse—meant defilement and pollution. In fact the phrase "parricide and incest" is one that frequently occurs, and not just in the Orestes and Oedipus stories that saw a resurgence around the early eighteenth century. On this, see Christian Biet, *Oedipe en monarchie: Tragédie et théorie juridique à l'âge classique* (Paris, 1994). D'Aubigné in *Les tragiques* polemicizes against Philip II of Spain, who after marrying his son's fiancée had his son killed, as "incestueux & meurtrier" and as "parricide inceste"; see Théodore Agrippa d'Aubigné, *Les tragiques*, ed. A. Garnier and J. Plattard, vol. 3, bks. 4/5 (Paris, 1932), 53. I am drawing on

the introduction to *Kinship in Europe: Approaches to Long-Term Development (1300–1900)*, ed. David Warren Sabean, Simon Teuscher, and Jon Mathieu (New York and Oxford, 2007), by Simon Teuscher and myself. I have developed my understanding of the transition from the Middle Ages to the early modern period through discussions with Teuscher.

5. I discuss these issues in "From Clan to Kindred: Thoughts on Kinship and the Circulation of Property in Premodern and Modern Europe," in *Heredity Produced: At the Crossroad of Biology, Politics and Culture, 1500–1870*, ed. Staffan Müller-Wille and Hans-Jörg Rheinberger (Cambridge, MA, 2006). See Eileen Spring, *Law, Land, and Family: Aristocratic Inheritance in England, 1300–1800* (Chapel Hill, NC, and London, 1993), 144; Ute Essegern, "Kursächsische Eheverträge in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts," in *Witwenschaft in der frühen Neuzeit: Fürstliche und adlige Witwen zwischen Fremd- und Selbstbestimmung*, ed. Martina Schattkowsky (Leipzig, 2003), 116–34, here 123–25.
6. Bernard Derouet, "Territoire et parenté. Pour une mise en perspective de la communauté rurale et des formes de reproduction familiale," *Annales HSS* (1995): 645–86, here 675–76, 678, 685–86; Bernard Derouet, "Le partage des frères. Héritage masculin et reproduction sociale en Franche-Comté aux XVIIIe et XIXe siècles," *Annales ESC* (1993): 453–74, here 467; Bernard Derouet, "Pratiques de l'alliance en milieu de communautes [sic] familiales (Bourbonnais, 1600–1750)," in *Le choix du conjoint*, ed. G. Brunet, A. Fauve-Chamoux, and M. Oris (Lyon, 1998), 227–51, here 228–29. See the discussions of changes in inheritance during the sixteenth century in rural southern Germany in David Warren Sabean, *Landbesitz und Gesellschaft am Vorabend des Bauernkriegs* (Stuttgart, 1972); and most recently in Govind P. Sreenivasan, *The Peasants of Ottobeuren, 1487–1726: A Rural Society in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2004). Bossuet, in *De la connaissance de Dieu et de soi-même* (1704), speaks of rights being transmitted with blood, meaning transmission through the father; for this work see Bossuet, *Oeuvres complètes* (Paris, 1864), 23:201.
7. On the older synthesis see Karl Schmid, "Zur Problematik von Familie, Sippe und Geschlecht, Haus und Dynastie beim mittelalterlichen Adel. Vorfragen zum Thema 'Adel und Herrschaft im Mittelalter,'" *Zeitschrift für Geschichte des Oberrheins* 105 (1957): 1–62; Gerd Tellenbach, "Vom karolinigischen Reichsadel zum deutschen Reichsfürstenstand," in *Herrschaft und Staat im Mittelalter*, ed. Hellmut Kämpf (Darmstadt, 1956), 190–242; Georges Duby, "La noblesse dans la France médiévale: une enquête à poursuivre," *Revue historique* 226 (1961): 1–22; Georges Duby, "Lignage, noblesse et chevallerie au XIIe siècle dans la région maconnaise. Une révision," *Annales ESC* 27 (1972): 803–23. For overviews of recent contributions to the debate, see Martin Aurell, "La parenté en l'an mil," *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 43 (2000): 125–42; Dieter Mertens and Thomas Zotz, "Einleitung der Herausgeber," in *Karl Schmid. Geblüt, Herrschaft, Geschlechterbewusstsein: Grundfragen zum Verständnis des Adels im Mittelalter. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben*, ed. Dieter Mertens and Thomas Zotz (Sigmaringen, 1998), ix–xxxiii, here xviii–xxviii; Janet Nelson, "Family, Gender and Sexuality in the Middle Ages," in *Companion to Historiography*, ed. Michael Bentley (London and New York, 1997) 153–76, here 160–64. For recent critiques: Anita Guerreau-Jalabert, Régine Le Jean, and Joseph Morsel, "Familles et parents. De l'histoire de la famille à l'anthropologie de la parenté," in *Les tendances actuelles de l'histoire du Moyen Age en France et en Allemagne*, ed. Jean-Claude Schmitt and Otto Gerhard Oexle (Paris, 2002), 433–46; Anita Guerreau-Jalabert, "La designation des relations et des groupes de parenté en latin médiéval," *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevii* 46/7 (1988): 92f; Anita Guerreau-Jalabert, "Sur les structures

de parenté dans l'Europe médiévale (Note critique)," *Annales ESC* (1981): 1028–49, here 1030–31, 1043–44; Simon Teuscher, *Bekannte—Klienten—Verwandte. Soziabilität und Politik in der Stadt Bern um 1500* (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna, 1998) 75–84; Joseph Morsel, "Geschlecht Repräsentation. Beobachtungen zur Verwandtschaftskonstruktion im fränkischen Adel des späten Mittelalters," in *Die Repräsentation der Gruppen. Texte—Bilder —Objekte*, ed. Otto Gerhard Oexle and Andrea von Hülsen-Esch (Göttingen, 1998), 263–70, 308–10; Juliette M. Turlan, "Amis et amis charnels. D'après les actes du parlement au XIVe siècle," *Revue historique du droit français et etranger* 47 (1969): 645–98.

8. See for example Heinz Reif, *Westfälischer Adel 1770–1860. Vom herrschaftsstand zur regionalen Elite* (Göttingen, 1979); Christophe Duhamelle, *L'heritage collectif. La noblesse d'Eglise rhénane, 17e et 18e siècles* (Paris, 1998); Gérard Delille, "Kinship, Marriage, and Politics," in *Kinship in Europe*, ed. Sabean, Teuscher, and Mathieu 163–83.
9. A good example is offered by Pierre Lamaison and Elisabeth Claverie, *L'impossible mariage. Violence et parenté en Gevaudan, XVIIe, XVIIIe, et XIXe siècles* (Paris, 1982). There is a detailed review of this book in David Warren Sabean, *Kinship in Neckarhausen, 1700–1870* (Cambridge, 1998), 407–16.
10. This is discussed in detail in Sabean, *Kinship in Neckarhausen*, 64–72.
11. Genesis 2:23–4: "And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh." Matthew 19:4–6: "And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." These passages clearly refer to marriage, but biblical interpreters throughout the seventeenth century understood them to refer to any act of completed sexual intercourse.
12. In the seventeenth century, William Harvey would summarize the point this way: "But that neither the *Hen* doth emit any Seed in *Coition*, nor poure forth any blood at that time into the cavity of the Vterus; as also that the egge is not formed after *Aristoteles* way; nor yet (as *Physitians* suppose) by the commixture of Seeds, and likewise that the *Cocks* seed doth not penetrate into the hollow of the *womb*, nor yet is attracted thither, is most manifest from this one observation, namely, *that after coition there is nothing at all to be found in the Uterus, more than there was before*"; William Harvey, *Anatomical Exercitations Concerning the Generation of Living Creatures: To which are added Particular Discourses of Births, and of Conceptions*, &c. (London, 1653), 199. Compare the discussion in Pomata, "Blood Ties and Semen Ties," 51–57. In 1615, Benedict Wincler gave a Galenist interpretation of marriage as a *commixtio sanguinis*, i.e., explicitly a mixing of blood, and also spoke of a *reverentiam sanguinis;* see Benedict Wincler, *Principiorum iuris* (Leipzig, 1615), 267, 333. Johann Karl Naevius as late as 1709 saw sex with in-laws as a commixture of blood; see Johann Karl Naevius, *Jus conjugum, Oder das Ehe-Recht* (Chemnitz, 1709), 256–58. Not just consanguines come from one blood but also affines. Not just participation in the flesh as with blood relatives but also *commixtio sanguinis* as with in-laws; see Jean Pontas (Dr. en droit-canon, Fac. de Paris), *Dictionnaire de cas de conscience ou decisions des plus considerables difficultez touchant la morale et la discipline ecclesiastique, tirées de l'ecriture, des conciles, des decretales des papes, des peres, et des plus célebres théologiens et canonistes,* 2 vols. with supp. (Paris, 1715; with supp., 1718), in which the article on "empêchement de l'affinité," case 8, stresses the need for *commixtio seminum* to

establish affinity, and affinity once established does not end with death of either spouse. Breaking the hymen and withdrawing does not count as consummation and as establishing affinity. There actually has to be a mixture of seed. In criminal law, semen had to flow into the vagina to establish intercourse as mixing flesh. In 1752–53, Pierre Collett, writing on a case of conscience where a man wanted to marry the sister of a girl with whom he had had relations when he was twelve, notes that the flow of semen into the girl was necessary to create an impediment on grounds of incest to the proposed marriage; see Pierre Collett, *Traité des dispenses en général et en particulier, dans lequel on résout les principales difficultés, qui regardent cette matiere*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1752–53), 3:143–44. In J. Bertaut, *Les oeuvres poetiques* (Paris, 1611), a man refers to the strict tie of blood that unites him and his wife. In *Andromède* (1650), one of the characters talks about a man and woman linking their blood in a *mélange*; see Pierre Corneille, *Andromède*, 2.4.6:389.

13. Harvey describes the position thus: "For some conceive the *Seed* and *Blood* to be the *Matter* which doth *constitute* the *chicken:* Others conceive the *Seed* to be the *Efficient* and *producing cause*, or Artificer that *builds* the *fabrick* of it: when yet upon deliberate consideration it appears most infallible, that there is *no matter at hand at all, nor no menstruous blood*, which the *Seed* of the *Male* can fall to work upon, or coagulate: (as Aristotle would have it) *nor is the Foetus made of the Seed of the Male or Female, or any Commixture of them both*"; Harvey, *Anatomical Exercitations*, 79–80.
14. See the important account on Aristotle by Giulia Sissa, "Subtle Bodies," in *Fragments for a History of the Human Body*, ed. M. Feher (New York, 1989), 3:133–41. One of the writers in the Oettingen *Colloquy*—see *Hochangelegene / und bißhero vielfältig bestrittenen Gewissens-Frage / Nemlich: Ob Jemand seines verstorbenen Weibes Schwester / sonder Ubertrettung Göttlicher und Natürlicher Gesetze / in wiederholter Ehe zu heuraten berechtiget? Durch auff dem in der Fürstliche Residentz zu Oettingen den 10. Octobr. Anno 1681 gehaltenen* COLLOQUIO *Ergangene Wechsel-Schriften /* Responsa *und hochvernünfftige* Judicia*; Nach höchstes Fleisses überlegten beyderseitigen* Rationibus, *und hierüber gefaßten Grund-Schlüssen Erörtert: Und als ein Curiöses und ungemeines Zweiffel-Werck / Zu eines jeden genugsamen Unterricht in offentlichem Truck ausfertiget* (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1682), 293–94—arguing *for* the wife's sister and *against* the brother's wife, maintained that God did not sanction the confluence of seed in one vessel but did allow the communication of seed in different vessels. The wife does not cause blood to flow in the husband. How is one to understand the position in a juridical *consilium* reported in Brückner, which argued that *a man becomes one flesh with his brother* when his blood flows into the flesh into which his deceased brother's blood has flowed? Clearly here the man contacts something through intercourse and the ejaculation of semen is seen as a flow of blood. The flow of blood into a woman leaves something permanent, so that the next man who causes his blood to flow into the woman contracts something from the first man. For a brother to do so seems to redouble a substance in an illegitimate way: Hieronymus Bruckner [J.U.D., Consil. Saxo-Gothani aulici et consistorialis], *Decisiones iuris matrimonialis controversi* (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1692), 279. The great French court preacher Jean-Pierre Camus, in one of his homilies at the beginning of the seventeenth century, explained the generation of Christ in purely Aristotelian terms. The Virgin Mary provided the pure blood, while God provided the spirit for the conception: Jean-Pierre Camus, *Homélies des Etats Généraux (1614–1615)*, ed. Jean Descrains (Geneva, 1970), 259.
15. Molière, in *L'etourdi*, has a man speak of his father as the source of his blood and the author of his being, while in *Malade imaginaire*, he has a man refer to his daughter as

"his blood." In 1626, Johann Bechstad, a lawyer and consistory judge in Saxe-Coburg, revives the Roman law notion of consanguines being agnatic relatives and cognates being uterine ones; Johann Bechstad, *Collatio jurium connubalium, tam universorum et communium, quam municipalium quorundam, inter congnatos et affines* … (Coburg, 1626), 1–30. Brückner, in *Decisiones iuris matrimonialis controversi*, at page 312, distinguishes between blood siblings and uterine siblings: "German" sisters (progeny of a father) are blood relatives, with the same name and legal position, while uterine sisters (through the mother) are not the same. Marrying the father's brother's wife is marrying into the same family, but the mother's brother's wife involves a different family and a different name. All of this is thought through in terms of agnatic lineage assumptions. Compare Pomata, "Blood Ties and Semen Ties," 45–51.

16. The papal bull *Ineffabilis Deus*, which proclaimed the Immaculate Conception a dogma, was issued only in 1854. The best introduction to the medieval discussions and debates is the study of the texts by Marielle Lamy, *L'immaculée conception. Etapes et enjeux d'une controverse au moyen-âge (XIIe–XVe siècles)*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Moyen Age et Temps modernes 35 (Paris, 2000).
17. Lamy, *L'immaculée conception*, 41.
18. See Peter Lombard, *Sentences*, 1.II, d. 31, c. 4 (1981 ed.): "In concupiscentia igitur et libidine concipitur caro formanda in corpus prolis. Unde caro ipsa, quae concipitur in vitiosa concupiscentia, polluitur et corrumpitur; ex cuius contactu anima, cum infunditur, maculam trahit qua polluitur et fit rea, id est vitium concupiscentiae, quod est originale peccatum" (cited in Lamy, *L'immaculée conception*, 42).
19. Bossuet, "Premier sermon pour la Fête de la conception de la Sainte Vierge," in *Oeuvres complètes de Bossuet* (Paris, 1862), 11:1–20, here 11:4; this work cited hereafter as Bossuet, *Oeuvres complètes* (1862). See Lamy, *L'immaculée conception*. The basic theological problem facing the medieval theologians was how to understand the divine maternity of Mary. As Lamy puts it, Mary "is situated at the articulation of two categories of human nature, *natura vitiata* of the sons of Adam and innocent nature assumed by the Word. In her, one goes from the one to the other" (152). "The implication of divine maternity rests on the greatest equality between mother and infant, since the fleshes are linked organically up to birth" (154). What was implied here was that Mary needed purification or sanctification in order for her/Christ's flesh to be unsullied. For the earlier theologians this purification took place at the Annunciation, and the key figure in this act was the Holy Spirit (155). Even as late as the second half of the twelfth century, this was the position of the majority of theologians (156). The immaculist standpoint erased the period in which Mary was subject to original sin, positing an equality between mother and Son. In this later position, there is special attention to the flesh (158). Mary is the one in whom the Word acquires a human nature true and intact. Human nature is transmitted completely by flesh, in a theological and philosophical construction that refuses traducianism (the doctrine that some kernel of purity remained intact from Adam onward, which communicated purity directly to Mary). Rejecting traducianism has great consequences: it is flesh alone that carries the unity of the human race in linking the diverse generations and that makes of humanity a single human, identified with Adam. And at the same time, flesh is seen as the sole vehicle of sin, since the soul is created by God and good in itself. The rejection of traducianism was completed by the doctrine of the *infectio carnis*, which furnishes an explication of the transmission of original sin, without resolving in a satisfactory way the problem of culpability of the descendants of Adam for a hereditary fault. There is thus in the Augustinian tradition a tendency to assimilate, from the point of view of transmission, human

nature to flesh and flesh to sin. For the Incarnation, it is necessary to break the linkage of nature and sin in the flesh, the place where the tie is established. Virginal conception associated with a purification of Mary offered the condition of a generation without the propagation of original sin, generation which is a gift to the Word, his soul coming from God directly. The immaculists find this unsatisfactory (159). Pure flesh is not flesh cleansed of pollution but that which remains intact. Also, the idea that the flesh of the Word exists before the Incarnation suggests that Mary herself has to have never known sin.

20. For a standard view, see the *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 7:381. Lamy, *L'immaculée conception*, 345–78, looks at all the evidence for Duns Scotus being the "hero" of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and comes to the conclusion that his texts are at best ambivalent, even though they were soon received for the most part with an immaculist reading. The doctrine of "prevenient mediator" had been around for a while before Duns Scotus developed it at the beginning of the fourteenth century.
21. See the recent discussion by Caroline Walker Bynum, *Wonderful Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond* (Philadelphia, PA, 2007), for late medieval discussions of Mary's blood and Christ's body, 117–18, 158–59, 161.
22. Bossuet, "Second sermon pour la Fête de la conception de la Sainte Vierge," in *Oeuvres complètes* (1862), 11:20–42, here 28.
23. Bossuet, "Second sermon de la conception," 29. John of Capistrano in his treatise of 1440–42, *De sanguine*, argued that Christ's body was composed completely from Mary's blood. In the medieval theory of generation, the body was composed of menstrual blood. See Bynum, *Wonderful Blood*, 117–18.
24. Bossuet's contemporary, the influential Jesuit preacher Louis Bourdaloue, in a sermon on the Annunciation made a similar point: Louis Bourdaloue, "Second sermon sur l'annonciation de la Vierge," in *Oeuvres complètes de Bourdaloue de la compagnie de Jésus*, new ed., 6 vols. (Paris, 1905), 5:265–84, here, 5:268, 5:275. Mary is a cooptrice in human salvation, since she formed the Savior and gave the blood that was the price of redemption. He goes on to say that when the Word took on human flesh, that in itself constituted an alliance, and the flesh of man became the flesh of God. At the moment when the virginal flesh of Christ was conceived, all human flesh was penetrated by the unction of God. In this formulation, the alliance constituted by the united flesh of the Virgin and the son is a general alliance of divinity and humanity, and Mary's flesh and blood have cosmic significance. Bynum argues that in the fifteenth-century representation typical around Weingarten in South Germany, Christ's body almost becomes Mary's blood; see Bynum, *Wonderful Blood*, 158–59, 161. The hesitation is gone for Bossuet. See, for example, Bossuet, "Troisième sermon pour la fête de l'annonciation," in *Oeuvres complètes* (1862), 11:164–176, here 172; and Bossuet, "Troisième sermon pour la fête de la nativité de la Sainte Vierge," in *Oeuvres complètes* (1862), 11:100–21, here 119.
25. Jacques Bénigne Bossuet, "IIIe sermon pour la fête de la nativité de la sainte vierge," in *Sermons*, in *Oeuvres complètes de Bossuet* (Paris, 1846), 4:152–58, here 4:158.
26. Jacques Bénigne Bossuet, *Méditations sur l'évangile*, ed. critique M. Dreano, Études de théologie et d'histoire de la spiritualité (Paris, 1966), 184, 370–71, 376, 420, 431.
27. Bossuet, "Second sermon de la conception," 28.
28. Bynum, *Wonderful Blood*, 157, 256, suggests that older literature overemphasized lineage in the later Middle Ages. If she is right, the use of blood as a symbol of lineage and line postdates the fifteenth century.

29. See Lamy, *L'immaculée conception*. Of all of the writers that Lamy deals with, the only one who speaks of blood rather than flesh is Pope Benedict XII (Jacques Fournier), but he is concerned with blood, not in terms of inheritance or substance that connects families, lineages, or descent groups together, but rather as something equated with sin: "by blood one understands sins or inclination to sin derived from first sin or the corruption of the human body from the fault of sin" (447). All sin can be called blood, but it more properly means original sin. "Et sic per sanguinem peccata intelliguntur, vel inclinatio ad peccandum ex peccato precendenti causata, vel corruptio corporis humani introducta merito peccati. … Quamvis autem omne peccatum etiam actuale sanguis dici possit supradicto modo, tamen magis proprie peccatum originale et fomes vel inclinatio ad malum sequens ipsum et mors carnis que ex peccato originali in omnes homines venit. … Et sic emundari id est perfecte mundari sanguis id est originale peccatum dicitur, cum et ipsum tollitur et inclinatio eius absciditur et mors que ipsum consequitur in incorruptionem transmutatur, quod non potest fieri nisi per Deum" (447–48).
30. Lamy, *L'immaculée conception*, 164, 196. Bossuet, "Second sermon de la conception," 28. In the Genesis account of the creation of man, just after Eve has been formed from Adam's rib, Adam enunciates the first marriage compact: "And Adam said, This *is* now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of men. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh" (Genesis 2:23–24). The text clearly posits this union of flesh as the foundation of marriage.
31. For a time, the semantics of "flesh" and "blood" will run along parallel tracks. For example a predecessor of Bossuet, the French theologian, mystic, and cardinal, founder of the French Oratory, Pierre de Bérulle (1575–1629) remained totally with a semantics of flesh and rarely utilized the word *blood*. See his "Discours de l'estat et des grandeurs de Jesus," in *Oeuvres complètes de Cardinal Bérulle*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1644; repr. Montsoult, 1960), 1:364–66, 498–99. See also *Oeuvres complètes*, texte établi et annoté by Michel Dupuy, vol. 1 ([Paris], 1995–), pt. 1:219, and pt. 2:76, 385, 387. On the other hand, his contemporary, the court preacher Jean-Pierre Camus, in his *Homélies des Etats Généraux*, 259, put the relationship between Jesus and Mary as one of blood: "La Saincte Vierge est un autre calice et patente de ce Verbe incarné, car n'est-ce pas dans ses entrailles, et de son plus pur sang, que ce precieux corps a esté formé?"
32. Anon., *Le Defensoire de la conception de la glorieuse Vierge Marie, en forme de dialogue a Rouen chez Maistre Martin Morin, l'An de grace 1515*, in *Monumenta Italo-Gallica ex tribus auctoribus maternâ linguâ scribentibus pro Immaculata Virginis Mariae Conceptione. Scilicèt, P. Domenico de Carpane, Nicolao Grenier, et anonymo colloquio inter sodalem et amicum*. *Pars secunda*, 3 vols. in 2, ed. Pedro de Alva y Astorga (Louvain, 1666; repr. Bruxelles, 1967) ; cited hereafter as *Defensoire*.
33. *Defensoire*, 196.
34. *Defensoire*, 87, 90.
35. *Defensoire*, 35.
36. *Defensoire*, 8, 35, 39, 101.
37. *Defensoire*, 196, 200, 217.
38. Nicole Grenier, *Tome second du Bouclier de la foy contenant l'antidote contre les adversaires de la pure conception de la mere de Dieu* (Paris, 1549), in *Monumenta Italo-Gallica*, ed. Pedro de Alva y Astorga.
39. Grenier, *Bouclier*, 121.
40. Grenier, *Bouclier*, 121.

41. Grenier, *Bouclier,* 210.
42. Saint François de Sales, "Sermon LXVII, 'Sermon pour la fête de l'immaculée conception de la sainte vierge' (1622)," in *Oeuvres complètes,* ed. J Nièrat (Annecy, 1892–1932), 10:403.
43. Grenier, *Bouclier,* 125.
44. Grenier, *Bouclier,* 33.
45. Grenier, *Bouclier,* 34.
46. Grenier refers in several passages to the sermon on Mary's conception by Jean Gerson, who talks about the son of God taking on human flesh as a marriage of divinity to humanity. Mary was Christ's mother, sister, spouse, and lover (*mie*); see Jean Gerson, "Sermon de la concepcion nostre dame," *Six sermons français inédits,* ed. Louis Mourin (Paris, 1946), 387–429, here 387, 394.
47. Grenier, *Bouclier,* 226.
48. Bossuet, "Troisième sermon de la nativité," 106.
49. Lamy discusses the problem of Aristotelian and Galenic categories for twelfth-century theologians in *L'immaculée conception,* 159–60. Virginal conception supposes that the embryo is produced without male seed. How? The role of mother is different in different schools. For the Aristotelians, there is no female seed, and the role of the mother is purely passive—she provides simply a matter, the menstrual blood, while the male seed acts on this matter and gives it form, and life. In the Galenic tradition, there is a maternal seed, although inferior in quality and importance to the male seed, which unites with the latter to form the embryo, and maternal blood offers nourishment for the embryo (160). As for the virginal birth, in the Aristotelian tradition male seed acts, not as a material principle, but as form and spirit, and possesses *vis generativa*. It was not impossible to see divine power playing this role, unless the *vis generativa* was exceptionally given to the mother. In the Galenic perspective, the mystery seems impenetrable, because the material aspect, with the union of two seeds, does not allow a simple substitution of the divine power as the power carried by paternal seed. In either case, one could think that Mary has taken a part greater than other mothers in the generation of the flesh of her son. The absence of a male seed signifies in a certain way the non-separation between the body of the mother and of the child, between the *caro mariae* and the *caro Verbi*. This non-separation seems to have a decisive consequence—the attributes of the one are those of the other. This ambiguity linked to the idea of the virginal conception predates the discourse on the Immaculate Conception.
50. Note that the male sperm in the Aristotelian understanding is ultimately immaterial (see Sissa, "Subtle Bodies"), much in the way Harvey understood it to be.
51. Bossuet, "Précis d'un sermon pour la fête de la nativité de la Sainte Vierge," in *Oeuvres complètes* (1862), 11:121–29, here 11:125.
52. Bossuet, *Élévations sur les mystères,* ed. M. Dreano (Paris, 1962), 99.
53. Aristotle, *Generation of Animals,* trans. A. L. Peck, Loeb Classical Library 366 (Cambridge, MA, 1942). In Aristotle's account, the male sperm is the active principle that works on the passive, female material (395). If the male sperm "gains the mastery," then a male like itself is produced. If, on the other hand, it gets mastered, it changes over into its opposite and a female is produced. In general, males take more after their fathers and females after their mothers (401). Interestingly, here Aristotle argues that any deviation from the parents is formally a "monstrosity," and the "first beginning of this deviation is when a female is formed instead of a male." He speaks of the *logos* of the movement caused by the sperm: "if this movement gains the mastery it will make a male and not a female, and a male which takes after its father,

not after its mother" (403). It is possible that the sperm will not be able to master every "faculty" (defined as a particular characteristic of a parent), and where it fails, in that aspect the resulting child is "deficient." In this way, a male can be produced that takes after his mother, even though most males take after their fathers (407–9). "Gaining the mastery at one place but not at another, causes the embryo that is taking shape to turn out diversiform" (411–13). Aristotle clearly thought that form was superior to matter, male to female (133). In fact, the female is defined in negative terms, as the one who has an "inability" to "concoct semen" (103), that is, to give form, to instigate movement, to act as artificer.

54. Bossuet, *Élévations sur les mystères,* 106.
55. Bossuet, *Élévations sur les mystères,* 271.
56. Bossuet, "Sermon sur le mystère de la très-Sainte Trinité," in *Sermons,* 4:1–8, here 4:3.
57. Bossuet, "IIIe sermon de la nativité," in *Sermons,* 4:158.
58. On *sang royal,* see Gaddebusch. See especially Bynum, *Wonderful Blood,* 157–58, 187, 256. This exhaustive study of blood in religious discourse of the later Middle Ages found little interest in using blood as an idiom to grasp the salient features of genealogical connection.
59. André Devyver, *Le sang épuré. Les préjugés de race chez les gentilshommes français de l'Ancien Régime (1560–1720),* Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles (Brussels, 1973), 7–12. See also the article by Guillaume Aubert, "'The Blood of France': Race and Purity of Blood in the French Atlantic World," *William and Mary Quarterly,* 3rd ser., 61 (2004): 439–78.
60. Devyver, *Le sang épuré,* 31.
61. The semantics of "blood" can be traced in part through the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century French dictionaries. Significantly, in the early seventeenth century, blood as something ascribed to social forms has only to do with the royal family. By the end of the century, blood has spread to all social stations, but is particularly relevant to the nobility. In Nicot, *Thresor de la langue française* (1606), blood is said to be appropriated by antonomasia to the kin of the king. "Accordingly one speaks of being the Blood of France, that is, kin to the kings of France." The phrase "princes of the blood," then, refers only to kin recognized as able to succeed to the crown. In the 1694 first edition of the *Dictionnaire de L'Académie française,* however, *blood* has come to signify *race* or extraction in general, and there are various kinds: vile and abject, noble, illustrious, royal, the blood of France. One can say, "he is your son, he is your blood." Princes of the blood are those who belong to the royal family. Finally, the fourth edition, from 1762, of the *Dictionnaire de L'Académie française,* perpetuates pretty much the definitions and usages from the late seventeenth-century first edition but contrasts a little more clearly noble and vile (*vil*) blood. It adds the idea of two people being of the same blood and in a more restricted sense the children in relation to their *father.* It also adds a new notion about the right of blood, the right that birth bestows. Furthermore, one can speak of the "force of blood," the sentiments that one claims nature sometimes gives to people of the same blood. Note that Madame de Sévigné used this phrase in this manner; see Marie de Rabutin-Chantal, Marquise de Sévigné, *Correspondence,* 3 vols. ([1675–96]; Paris, 1972–8), 3:356. There is a further extension of meaning tending in the same direction of inherited substance in the phrase "good blood does not disappoint (*mentir*)," meaning that children normally retain the good qualities of their fathers and mothers. Again this is a usage to be found in Sévigné's seventeenth-century texts (*Correspondence,* 1:101).

62. Devyver, *Le sang épuré,* 31–37. The author sees the shift in language as an attempt on the part of the nobility to draw boundaries around themselves and to create a new consciousness of themselves as a class. The vocabulary of race became the point around which consciousness could be constructed (88).
63. Devyver, *Sang épuré,* 104, citing J. B. Nenna, *Traicté de la noblesse* (1583).
64. Devyver, *Sang épuré,* 167–71. The *Mémoires* by Gaspard de Saulx-Tavannes (1509–73) were published in 1653.
65. All references to the original plays are, as indicated at the beginning of the endnotes, from Pierre Corneille, *Théatre complet de Corneille,* ed. Maurice Rat, 3 vols. (Paris, n.d. [1942]), hereafter cited as Corneille, *Théatre complet.* The text is based on the edition of Corneille's works from 1682, and contains notes, variants, an introduction, and a glossary.
66. Corneille, *Le Cid,* 1.1.5:600.
67. Sévigné, *Correspondence,* 3:254; 1:459.
68. Corneille, *Le Cid,* 1.3.4:622.
69. Corneille, *Le Cid,* 1.2.2:605. Molière made fun of the notion that a child had the blood of the parent. In *Le médicin volant,* the doctor explains why he is examining the father when the daughter is sick—they are the same blood, so he can look at either one for his diagnosis.
70. Corneille, *Horace,* 1.3.4:691–2.
71. Corneille, *Agésilas,* 3.3.1:391.
72. The lieutenant general of Louis XIII, the comte de Souvigny, wrote: "Notre père et notre mère nous accoutumoient à avoir du respect et de la déférence les uns pour les autres. Mes frères m'obéissoient, et, après moi, mon frère Aignan, ensuite mon frère François, ainsi de l'un à l'autre jusque au dernier."; *Mémoires,* ed. Ludovic de Coutenson, 3 vols (Paris, 1906), 1:7.
73. Corneille, *Nicomède,* 2.1.2:688.
74. Qualities of blood according to station are central to Saint-Simon's picture of the world. In one case, he pointed out that authorities did not look too closely into a particular murder for fear of finding someone of highly respected blood culpable; see Louis de Rouvroy, duc de Saint-Simon, *Mémoires,* 20 vols. (Paris, 1691–1723). Pagination does not correspond to the original edition. Paginated by ARTFL: www.lib.uchicago.edu/efts/ARTFL/databases/TLF/; *Mémoires,* 2:103. In another passage, he attacks one M. Marsan as so low and avid a despoiler of church, widows, and orphans, as to be completely of the blood of the people; see *Mémoires,* 6:167.
75. Corneille, *Nicomède,* 2.2.3:704.
76. Corneille, *Nicomède,* 2.3.1:709.
77. Corneille, *Nicomède,* 2.3.2:711.
78. Corneille, *Nicomède,* 2.4.3:727.
79. Corneille, *Le Cid,* 1.1.3:595.
80. Corneille, *Agésilas,* 3.1.2:367.
81. Corneille, *Polyeucte,* 2.1.3:20.
82. Corneille, *Sertorius,* 3.1.2:170.
83. Corneille, *Polyeucte,* 2.3.3:46. In a passage that deals with the transference of blood to the son-in-law in a somewhat parallel fashion, Saint-Simon deals with the problem of whether inheritance and succession ceded to a sister (of the "second bed") at her marriage ought to revert to the senior line or whether the rights go over to the husband. The woman in question would lose her rank (duchess) and the associated honors upon remarrying. Saint-Simon argues that far from being communicable to her *second* husband, the rank and honors are fixed and transferable only to her son

from the "first bed." This latter argument is based on the idea, reported by Saint-Simon, that the original establishment was attached to the blood of the first husband of the duchess heir and extinguished for her with his death; *Mémoires,* 1:63.

84. Corneille, *Polyeucte,* 2.5.3:69–70.
85. "De ce bienheureux sang tu me vois baptisée"; Corneille, *Polyeucte,* 2.5.5:74.
86. Corneille, *Horace,* 1.1.1:666.
87. Corneille, *Horace,* 1.4.7:706.
88. Corneille, *Pompée,* 2.4.4:129.
89. Corneille, *Pompée,* 2.5.4:139–40.
90. Corneille, *Polyeucte,* 2.3.2:40.
91. Corneille, *Polyeucte,* 2.5.3:69.
92. Corneille, *Pompée,* 2.1.3:96–97; 2.2.3:106.
93. Corneille, *Pompée,* 2.2.1:100.
94. Corneille, *Le Cid,* 1.3.5:627.
95. Corneille, *Polyeucte,* 2.5.3:69–70.
96. Corneille, *Polyeucte,* 2.5.2:67.
97. Corneille, *Polyeucte,* 2.5.5:74.
98. Corneille, *Rodogune,* 2.2.4:345; 2.3.4:352–53; 2.4.1:360; 2.4.2:362; 2.4.3:365.
99. Corneille, *Théodore,* 2.1.1:393.
100. Corneille, *Théodore,* 2.1.2:395.
101. Corneille, *Héraclius,* 2.3.1:491.
102. Corneille, *Médée,* 1.1.4:454.
103. Corneille, *Toison d'or,* 3.5.2:147.
104. Corneille, *Toison d'or,* 3.5.5:153.
105. In his work on Christian morality, Moyse Amyraut, the well-known Huguenot theologian, made a careful distinction between descent and alliance; see Moyse Amyraut, *La morale chrestienne,* 4 pts. in 6 vols. (Saumur, 1652–60), pt. 2:247. No one would doubt that the kinship that comes from consanguinity is closer and more strict than the one that consists in alliance and affinity, which is like a copy and never as strong and clear as the original. The reason here is evident—consanguinity is "dans son propre siège." Affinity, argued Amyraut, arises from communication, while relations from consanguinity are immediate.
106. Johann Jacob Schudt, *Jüdischen Merkwürdigkeiten vorstellende was sich curieuses und denkwürdiges in den neuern Zeiten bey einigen Jahr-hunderten mit denen in all IV.Theile der Welt/ sonderlich durch Teutschland/ zerstreuten Juden zugetragen* (Frankfurt am Main and Leipzig, 1714), pt. 1:240–42; pt. 2:220–21.
107. Antoine Arnauld, *Lettres de Monsieur Antoine Arnauld,* 9 vols. (Nancy, 1727), 7:245.