In general, the social and economic transactions associated with the reception of the religious habit were accepted without comment before the twelfth century. However, there had been one relatively isolated period in which the open demand for money from new monks was criticized, although it was not explicitly condemned as simony. Charlemagne and his son Louis the Pious forbade, or placed limits on, the demand for money from entrants at least three times between 789 and 819. The texts were brief, as Carolingian legislation tended to be, and their exact interpretation is not entirely secure because their context is obscure.

The first text was in a series of instructions to royal inspectors, the missi. The instructions are designated as the *Duplex legationis edictum* and were probably issued on 23 March 789. The document reflected the general concern felt by Charlemagne and his advisors about greed on the part of abbots and other church officers. Chapter 3 warned such churchmen not to give more attention to earthly profit than they expended on the souls entrusted to them.\(^1\) Chapter 15 ordered the missi to make sure "that no abbot should require a reward for the reception of a monk."\(^2\)

In 794 Charlemagne held an empire-wide council at Frankfort to deal with the heresy of Adoptionism in Spain and the treatment of icons at Byzantium. Canon 16 of the council was probably a response to the findings of the missi of 789.
For we have heard [presumably from the *missi*] that some abbots, motivated by greed, demand gifts for those entering a monastery. Therefore it pleases us and the Holy Synod that money never be demanded for receiving brothers in the holy order [of monks], but rather they should be received according to the Rule of Saint Benedict.

Benedict's *Rule*, chapter 58, allowed the entrant a choice in the disposition of his property. He could give his goods to the poor or to the monastery. In calling for a return to Benedict's practice, the Council of Frankfort was not criticizing gifts as such, but was attempting to reestablish their free-will character.

Louis the Pious supported the monastic reforms proposed by Benedict of Aniane. Between 816 and 819 the emperor translated into legislation the main features of the reform program at a series of imperial meetings. The monastic legislation issued in August 816 and that of July 817 did not refer to payments for entry. When the two sets of legislation were combined for an imperial assembly in 818-19, the anonymous compiler added this text: "That no one should be received for a gift, except him whom good will and merits commend." This text apparently permitted gifts for an entrant, provided that he was acceptable on other grounds as well. In effect the criticism of forced gifts was narrowed to include only bribes for the acceptance of those who could not be accepted otherwise. I have found no similar direct criticisms of forced payments for entry in Carolingian capitularies or church councils either before 789 or after 819.

It is not entirely clear why Charlemagne and his son chose to attack these practices in the first place. Certainly the Carolingian rulers were deeply concerned about good order in the church, and such forced payments may have struck them as inimical to good order. However, there is evidence that one source for the legislation lay outside the Carolingian realm itself, in the Carolingian emulative rivalry with their Byzantine neighbors to the east. At Nicaea in 787 the Byzantines had convoked a great council, ecumenical in their view, to which Frankish representatives had not been invited. In canon 19 the council criticized in specific terms, for the first time in the history of the church, the requirement of a payment from an entrant to religious life.
Scholars have long recognized that Charlemagne had a serious interest in the council, both because it was a calculated snub to him and because of its decrees on the veneration of icons or holy images. He and his advisers took great exception to the Byzantine promulgations on images and rejected them as heretical. The Carolingian court had received a Latin translation of the acts of the second Nicaean council, and the nineteenth canon on monastic entry payments was no doubt included. This explicit Byzantine attack on entry payments was probably the stimulus to the Carolingian condemnations. Within seventeen months after Nicaea, Charlemagne issued his instructions to the missi, warning abbots not to require gifts. The borrowing entered the Carolingian legislation without acknowledgement of its source for two reasons. Carolingian relations with the Eastern Empire were strained; the Carolingians had vehemently attacked the council in which the prohibition first appeared, and consequently there was little incentive to make an open reference to the source for concern about payments.

The Carolingian efforts against required entry payments spanned about thirty years. The issue failed to take root as a major or, indeed, a minor concern of the later Carolingian church. The prohibitions of payment were not repeated in subsequent royal capitularies or church councils, nor were they incorporated into important canonical collections, probably because the Carolingian church reformers of the ninth century were reluctant to use recent texts as canonical authorities. The legislation of 818-19, with its qualified prohibition of required payments, did serve as an addition to the False Capitularies of Benedict the Levite. However, that was not an exception to the reformers' reluctance to use recent texts, because the False Capitularies were by design a collection of recent secular texts favorable to reform. Because of this neglect by ninth-century church councils and compilers of canonical collections, the issue of forced payments disappeared from active interest. When canonists began to concern themselves with entry payments in the second third of the twelfth century, the Carolingian texts played no significant role. Indeed, aside from some biblical and patristic citations, the oldest directly relevant text used by twelfth-century opponents of payments for entry was canon 7 of the...
Thus in spite of Carolingian foreshad­­owings, the issue of the legitimacy of payment for entry into religion was a new one in the twelfth century.

**Simony**

The dissolution of the Carolingian Empire in the later ninth cen­­­­­tury had grave consequences for all aspects of society, including the church. The decay and eventual disappearance of the relatively firm Carolingian power, which had generally protected the church even while exploiting it, left it at the mercy of localistic, centrifugal powers. Especially in West Francia and in the Kingdom of Italy, effective social and political power generally fell into the grasp of the Carolingian bureaucracy and other regional strongmen who used the relative anarchy to consolidate their power. The Scan­­dinavian, Magyar, and Saracen invasions of the ninth and tenth centuries intensified the social disorganization left in the wake of the collapse of the Carolingian order.

Among the consequences of that disorder were that preexisting problems of the church were aggravated and new problems arose. Much of the property accumulated by ecclesiastical institutions during the Carolingian era was alienated de jure or de facto into the grasp of the new regional rulers. Along with the property, actual control over parishes and monasteries gravitated into lay hands. The dislocation and disruption of church life were severe. Indeed, a number of monasteries and dioceses ceased to exist in the most badly disorganized areas, such as Normandy and England. Where ecclesiastical institutions continued to function, they were absorbed to a greater or lesser degree into the system of proprietary churches. The property and offices of the church often became, for practical purposes, part of a lay lord’s patrimony. Ecclesiastical revenues, offices, and sacraments were treated by their lay and clerical holders as personal possessions that could be bought, sold, and used, like virtually any other form of property. In the vivid phrase of Emile Amann, the church was “au pouvoir des laïques.”

The net result of these developments in the life of the church
was serious decline, especially when judged against the standard of the relatively orderly Carolingian church. Many of the economic, administrative, intellectual, and moral achievements of the ninth century were eroded during the times of troubles in the late ninth and tenth centuries.

However, the late tenth and first half of the eleventh centuries witnessed recovery and regeneration in many areas of Latin Christendom, coinciding with a general demographic and economic recovery. There were stirrings of reaction within the church against the disorganized state of affairs. Lorraine, Burgundy, Rome, and other areas were the sites of spontaneous and generally uncoordinated reform movements, which often worked for different ends and, indeed, sometimes at cross-purposes. In their attempts to attack the abuses in the feudalized and lay-dominated church, the reform movements created or revived intellectual tools. The abundant polemic literature produced by proponents and opponents of particular reforms was the forum within which such intellectual tools were employed and refined. These tools were intellectual techniques, attitudes, and value judgments that served to undermine and discredit conditions offensive to the reformers. They included a renewed interest in, and cultivation of, the canon law; a stress on the hierarchical nature of the church that placed it beyond the legitimate control of laymen; an emphasis on the papacy as the center and arbiter of ecclesiastical affairs; and a concern for the moral reform of the clergy, including the enforcement of clerical celibacy.

There was one further intellectual tool that is of central importance for this study. The full-blown concept of simony was a product of the struggle by the reformers to break lay control over the church. The reformers saw in the buying and selling of sacred things, especially holy orders and church offices, a hateful crime, indeed, a heresy, that was a root cause of the other problems facing the church. They sought to end the commerce in sacred things because they saw in it a source of profit and of encouragement to the lay and clerical exploiters of the church.

To be sure, the Carolingian church had also opposed the buying
and selling of the sacraments and ecclesiastical offices. The term *simonia* and the constellation of ideas it connoted were relatively common in Carolingian documents. However, when the reformers of the eleventh century sought to elaborate the concept of simony as a weapon with which to attack economic dealings in sacred things, they apparently could find little help or, more to the point, little prestige and authoritative weight in the writers of the Carolingian age. They turned instead to the texts of Christian antiquity, particularly to the writings of Pope Gregory I. His letter collection and sermons provided hints, comments, and key ideas that formed the elements for the fully developed concept of simony. In addition to the texts of Pope Gregory, the eleventh-century polemicists drew on certain striking biblical texts for support. First and foremost, frequent use was made of the account of Simon Magus in the Acts of the Apostles, in which the Apostle Peter rebuffed his attempt to buy the power of the Spirit. The punishment of Giezi with leprosy because he had demanded money for a cure wrought by his master, the prophet Elisha, was also cited often, and Giezi became the literary symbol of the simoniacal seller as Simon Magus was that of the buyer. Christ’s driving of the money-changers and dove-sellers from the temple also served the reformers well as a proof text. Finally, Christ’s admonition to the apostles to give freely what they had received freely completed the set of much-used biblical texts. The reformers also cited the second canon of the Council of Chalcedon (451) and the accounts of Simon Magus in the Apocrypha to work out a concept of simony that was an effective ideological weapon in the struggle to loosen the grip of laymen on the church and to purify the relations of bishop to priest and of priest to people. The concept of simony has been treated often by scholars, especially from the viewpoint of its implications for the validity of sacraments performed or received simoniacally. However, for the men of the eleventh century the term *simonia* had far richer connotations than those to be found in it by a primarily canonistic treatment. *Simonia* was a term that evoked a theological-historical myth of complexity and fascination for contemporaries. A charter of
the monastery of Saint Victor at Marseilles, written about 1060, placed simonia in the broad context of the history of God’s dealings with men. The charter recounted the story of the Creation of Man, the Fall of Man through sin, and his salvation by Jesus Christ. Then it continued:

... And they [the apostles] were witnesses of the truth, and as long as they lived in the present life they strongly resisted the simoniaca heresy, obeying their Saviour who had commanded them, saying “Freely you have received, freely give.” From among all of them there was one in the primitive church, the most blessed Peter, ... who fought Simon Magus, from whom this unspeakable heresy took name and deed, by means of different arguments of word and act from Jerusalem all the way to great Rome. Peter acted in such a way that, having prayed to God, he cast down to earth his [Simon’s] wicked body, which he saw flying in the air by magic arts; and not much later he subjected that body to a horrible death. That detestable heresy has spread so much that in modern times ... there are scarcely any to be found in the ecclesiastical order who are not bound by the chain of this execrable evil.\(^37\)

The view that was reflected in this charter depicted Simon Magus as a colorful anti-hero, the very first heretic, and his heresy the very worst of all.\(^38\) Simon Peter, the first pope, was a rival and foil to Simon Magus, the first heretic.\(^39\) The charter of Saint Victor also reaffirmed the note common to many reform-minded men of the eleventh century: that in their day simony had gained the upper hand and threatened to corrupt the church from top to bottom. Simony was visualized as a contagion, a filth that contaminated all it touched.\(^40\) The frequency and seriousness of simony raised questions in some minds about the very survival of legitimate priesthood in the church.\(^41\) Only when the deep disgust with which many reformers approached simony is understood can the reaction against it be comprehended and the often extreme forms which that reaction took.\(^42\)

The simonia myth, with its biblical, canonical, and historical roots, was a potent and emotional force in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. There were disputes even within the camp of the reformers about the punishment appropriate for simoniacs and about the
effects of simony on the sacraments. There were also attempts by some lay apologists to deny that certain practices were, in fact, simoniacal. But it is a clear index of the myth's acceptance that no one dared defend buying and selling of holy things in a theoretical way, as some did defend clerical marriage.\textsuperscript{43}

By the middle of the eleventh century, the concept of simony had been defined and consequences had been drawn from it by the reformers that would have required a social revolution to realize in practice. To eliminate simony, as it was defined by the more extreme reformers, would have necessitated the severing of most of the customary ties by which laymen of high social station controlled and also supported the church.\textsuperscript{44}

Concepts, once created and endowed with emotive force, persist. They are often transferred by intellectuals from one context to another with unexpected—sometimes unwanted—results. So it was when the concept of simony was applied to entry into religious life. The idea of simony had been elaborated to deal with gross and specific abuses, such as the outright sale of sacraments and ecclesiastical offices. In the course of attacking such practices, a vigorous antisimoniaclal propaganda program was pursued, and conscientious churchmen and laymen were sensitized to the principle that a \textit{res spiritualis}, "a spiritual thing," ought not to be sold, with the term \textit{sold} being understood in a broad sense to mean given for money, favor, or services rendered.\textsuperscript{45} Thus, in a strictly logical sequence, anything included in the category of \textit{res spiritualis} could be bought or sold only at the peril of simony. However, in human affairs it is often true that logical deductions from principles are not drawn immediately, if at all. It is one of the main conclusions of this study that it was a relatively long period of seventy-five years before the conclusion was firmly accepted that the religious habit and status were \textit{res spiritualis} and their sale simoniacal.

The last major extension of the concept of simony was completed in the twelfth century, when economic dealings revolving about the entry into religion were perceived as potentially simoniacal.

It is clear that payment to become a monk was not one of those gross abuses against which the concept of simony was originally
directed. To be sure, eleventh-century reformers were convinced that monks could and did commit simony. But there was nothing unique about their simony, which consisted in purchasing offices, e.g., an abbacy, and sacraments. Their offenses were not different from those that any Christian could commit, so there was nothing "monastic" in their simony. The reformers apparently did not think that when a man gave a large gift or negotiated an agreement to become a monk he was thereby committing simony. I have found no eleventh-century list of simoniacal acts that included the purchase of the religious habit. At the very most, one may surmise that the vague terms that concluded such lists contained an implicit reference to entry into religion. But such a surmise hardly seems justifiable. In the eleventh century simony was a common topic for conciliar legislation and for pamphleteering, and to find no explicit statement about the simoniacal nature of many entry agreements creates a strong presumption that contemporaries did not draw a connection between entry gifts and simony. Indeed, the first church council of the eleventh century that criticized the association of payment and monastic entry was that held at Melfi in 1089 by Pope Urban II, who was a former prior at Cluny. For the first time since the early ninth century, a church council forbade the requirement of a gift from those coming to be monks: "Let no abbot presume to demand a price from those who come to conversion, on any occasion of agreement." The canon was repeated in a Roman council of 1099, held under the same pope. This brief text did not use the term simonia to describe the practice that it criticized, and it is not absolutely certain that the canon was conceived within the framework of the simonia myth. It was only about thirty years later, in the 1120s, that clear, explicit criticism of required entry payments as simoniacal can be found in the sources. Before that time criticism was based on other grounds. The fact that gifts at entry were customary and normal did not shield them from unfavorable judgments in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries. Scrupulous churchmen perceived problems when the custom was abused, and two patterns of criticism of entry gifts appear in the sources. First, it was alleged that a gift obtained
under dubious circumstances might be a form of "filthy gain"; second, it was argued that any gift might endanger the humility of the entrant.

"Seekers after Filthy Gain"

In his First Letter to Timothy, Saint Paul warned Christians against choosing men as bishops who were sectantes turpe lucrum, "seekers after filthy gain." By the fifth century the phrase "filthy gain" was becoming an ecclesiastical commonplace that encompassed all modes of gaining income that were perceived as incompatible with the dignity of a cleric or a monk, such as usury or business. The phrase took on a life of its own, and in the ninth century Carolingian capitularies and councils reiterated frequently the ban on clerics seeking turpe lucrum as businessmen (negotiatores), agricultural agents or foremen (vilici, conductores), usurers, slick dealers, and speculators in food-stuffs. The prevailing canon law of the eleventh century perpetuated the view that particular forms of income were "filthy" for clerics, monks, and even all Christians. The Decretum of Ivo of Chartres, a canonical collection composed about 1094, repeated the earlier tradition by forbidding to the clergy a whole series of practices on the grounds that they represented filthy gain. Ivo's work included under the ban usury, buying crops cheaply at harvest and selling them dearly during famine, and managing a business. Monks in particular were warned to avoid all secular business in which profits were made. In general, the category of turpe lucrum included any sort of greedy or shady dealing in which the clergy ought not to be involved. In a common literary antithesis, filthy or earthly gains were contrasted with the profit of souls, lucrum animarum.

Since the category of turpe lucrum was firmly established in eleventh-century canon law, it was only natural that churchmen concerned about abuses of the custom of gifts at entry into religion should invoke it. Indeed, the Carolingian Council of Chalons in 813 set a precedent when it condemned bishops and abbots for
inviting men to religious life on account of their money or property. The council specifically called the abuse a form of *turpe lucrum*.  

Eleventh-century churchmen also found in the category of filthy gains a means to express disapproval of certain aspects of monastic entry gifts. When Abbot Warin of Saint Arnulf wrote to John of Fécamp about the case of a wealthy Jewish convert who had become a monk, he declared that if the convert left the monastery and took his considerable fortune with him, he should be allowed to do so because it was better for an abbot to save souls than to seek gold.  

Peter Damian, citing directly the canon of Chalons (813), criticized monastic officials who enticed entrants to join their community in order to get their property. He declared that those officials do not love God, nor are they found to seek the profit of souls [*lucrum animarum*], but fired up by the pricks of filthy gain [*turpe lucrum*], they deceive some simple folk with their oily persuasions so that they may draw them by empty promises to the monastery.  

In a letter dated 1104-5, encouraging a hermit to send him recruits, Abbot Geoffrey of Vendôme expressed his uneasiness about venal receptions:

Concerning the other one . . . whom you mentioned, if he seems to you to be of good life, take care to send him to us; and do not delay sending to us whatever clerics of upright life you find. We love in men honest poverty more than their proud riches. If they possess them, the riches ought not to be scorned; for they have their place. We seek nothing for making monks, but if something is offered we accept, since the Rule requires it to be accepted. Indeed, our order requires that we be such who give effort not for temporal gain [*lucris temporalibus*] but for gaining souls [*lucrandis animabus*].

Geoffrey clearly hesitated about too close a connection between a man's wealth and his encouragement by monks to enter religion. He openly defended gifts, but he criticized the prelate who violated the norms of his order and whose excessive interest in wealthy recruits made him a "seeker after filthy gain."
SIMONIACAL ENTRY INTO RELIGIOUS LIFE

Gifts as a Threat to Humility

Thus in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries, abuses of entry gifts were criticized as a base and unworthy means for a cleric to gain money, with no reference to simony. There was a second reason, rooted in an ancient tradition of monastic psychology, that prompted certain thinkers to have reservations about receiving any gift from an entrant. In a sermon delivered to monks about 1126–27, Peter Abelard criticized some religious houses for their venality in receiving new members:

“If you wish to be perfect, sell all that you have, and give to the poor and come follow me.” He did not say, “Come and bring what you have to us,” but rather, “First offer your possessions to others and thus afterwards receive our possessions.” But we, on the contrary, since we seek not so much the profit of the soul as of money, exhort anyone coming to conversion to bring what he has, and we do not so much give him our support as sell it.67

Abelard’s sermon was a lengthy attack on monastic ambition and greed, which contradicted the ideal of withdrawal from the world. In the sentiments expressed and in its vocabulary, it stood in the long tradition of condemning forms of turpe lucrum. However, in his specific references to entry gifts, Abelard sounded another criticism as well:

In which [procedure] we give him [the novice] a large occasion for temptation. Easily becoming proud about the things that he brought, he may grow angry and murmur when he lacks for anything; and he may complain that he is miserable and betrayed, since he sees himself equated with those who brought less or nothing at all. Cutting away all these excuses [for complaint], Christ therefore ordered [a man] to be taken naked rather than rich. He who ordered his disciples, “Freely you have received, freely give,” wished to exhibit this first in himself, desiring not so much by his words as by his example to incite us to this. And it would have been much better and more upright for him [the convert] to have kept his goods so that he might have the fruit of charity from his own property, than by begging for others’ goods to incur detriment of his reputation and to injure in a large way the dignity of the religious state.68
This opinion that a novice who brought a gift was particularly prone to the vices of pride and complaining was not original with Peter Abelard. Some of the monastic rules of late antiquity and of the early Middle Ages, especially in the Latin West, reveal a marked reluctance to accept gifts from new members. John Cassian, who was one of the earliest and most influential writers on monasticism in the West, spelled out the reasons for this reluctance in his *Institutes*, written at Marseilles about 420-24. Cassian said that the monks of Egypt refused to take a single coin from those who joined their group. The Egyptian monks had learned by bitter experience that the memory of a gift made the monk restless, insubordinate, and ready to abandon the monastic life when difficulties appeared.

Therefore they refuse to receive from him money which is going to be put to the uses of the monastery; first, lest inflated by confidence in that gift he may not deign to equal himself to the poorer brethren; second, lest on account of this pride not descending to the humility of Christ, when he is unable to tolerate the discipline of the monastery, he may flee from it.69

When such monks left the monastery, they often sought the return of their gift, which led to litigation and distraction for the house. Thus Cassian expressed a tradition that saw in the gift at entry a direct danger to the humility of the monk and an indirect threat to the tranquility of the house. The *Regula monastica communis*, attributed to Fructuosus of Braga, a Visigothic abbot and bishop of the mid-seventh century, voiced a similar view. The *Regula* painted a gloomy verbal picture of the problems and scandals caused by men who left a monastery and sought the return of their entry gift. Its solution was a simple one: “When anyone requests to enter, let the monastery receive nothing from his resources, not even a single coin; but rather let him give all to the poor with his own hand. . . .”70 The *Regula* thus interpreted literally the text of Matthew’s Gospel that said, “If you would be perfect, go and sell all that you have, and give to the poor and come follow me.” The prospective monk was obliged to give everything to the
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"poor of Christ," and he risked expulsion from the monastery if he gave anything to his immediate family, other relatives, the church, the ruler of the region, or his slaves.

. . . since we see him not in the number of the apostles, but a follower of Ananias and Saphira. May you know that such a person is unable in the monastery to come up to the standard of a monk, or to stoop to the poverty of Christ, or to acquire humility, or to be obedient, or to persevere there forever; but when any reason for punishment or correction of the monastery by the abbot shall arise, immediately he arises in pride and puffed up by the spirit of distaste, he leaves the monastery in flight.\footnote{71}

Such an absolute rejection of gifts from entrants was not feasible economically for most religious houses. But even the more moderate monastic rules, such as that of Saint Benedict, which allowed the prospective monk to offer his goods either to the poor or to the monastery, were careful to insist that, whatever he did with them, the man was cut off from them.\footnote{72} The essential concern was the personal humbling of the new monk, the fostering in him of a psychological state befitting his new life. The \textit{Regula monasterii tarnatensis} held that if a gift impeded the growth of the inner virtues of humility and poverty, then it would have been better for there to have been no gift at all:

If they have offered a little part of their property to aid the expenses of the group, let them not be puffed up on account of this; from that action whence at first they desired to ascend they may afterward fall. What good is there in distributing wealth and in being made poor by giving to the poor, if the wretched soul is made more proud in scorning riches than it was in possessing them?\footnote{73}

Thus it was the consideration of pride on the part of the giver and of scandal or litigation if he reneged on his gift that made some monastic legislators reluctant to receive gifts from novices. Fear of simony was in no way an element of this thought pattern. The reluctance to receive gifts was embodied in authoritative texts, especially the \textit{Institutes} of Cassian, whom Benedict recommended as reading matter for his disciples.\footnote{74} Therefore Abelard could criticize the gifts of entrants on the basis of this monastic psychology,
with no reference to simony. Indeed, it would probably falsify its meaning to see a reference to simony in the sermon, which stated clearly that a gift at entry was dangerous because,

   easily becoming proud about the things which he brought, he may grow angry and murmur when he lacks for anything; and he may complain that he is miserable and betrayed, since he sees himself equated with those who brought less or nothing at all.  

**Conclusion**

In the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, monastic thinkers accepted the basic legitimacy of gifts at entry into religious life. When the admission of a new member was motivated by mercenary considerations, the critics attacked it as the search for "filthy gains" and as an incitement to pride in the novice, who was supposed to be abandoning worldly pride. In spite of their willingness to criticize payments on those grounds, monastic thinkers before the mid-twelfth century seem to have been reluctant to admit that simony in the reception of new members was a danger, or even a significant possibility. The Paris theologian Peter the Chanter attributed an opinion to Bernard of Clairvaux, who was active from 1115 to 1153: "Abbot Bernard said that there could never be simony in the giving of a gift for making a monk, particularly when the monastery was poor." The editor of Peter the Chanter's *Summa de sacramentis* was not able to find this opinion in the extant works of Bernard. However, whether or not Bernard himself said this, the opinion expressed was widely held among the religious. The entry gift, with all its implications of negotiations and pacts, was an all but unquestioned element of their tradition, open to criticism when abused, but not perceived as fundamentally wrong.
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