Early modern English kinship in the long run: reflections on continuity and change

NAOMI TADMOR*

ABSTRACT. *The article highlights the significance of alliances of blood and marriage in early modern England and beyond, including both positive and negative relations among kin. Examining different historiographical approaches, it emphasizes the role of kinship in explanations of historical change and continuity. Rather than focusing on the isolated nuclear family or, conversely, on an alleged decline of kinship, it highlights the importance of enmeshed patterns of kinship and connectedness. Such patterns were not only important in themselves* (*whether culturally, socially, economically, or politically*), *it is suggested, but they also invite new comparisons with other early modern societies, and in the long run. Even patterns typical of present-day* '*new families*' *and* '*families of choice*', *or aspects of the present-day language of kinship may bring to mind some similarities with notions of kinship and related* '*household-family*' *ties characteristic of the early modern period, the article proposes.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Fifty years ago, an academic field specializing in the history of kinship and the family in early modern England barely existed, yet there was a shared understanding of what that history must have been; today there is a large body of research on English kinship c. 1550–1800, but there is considerable lack of clarity as to the long-term patterns of continuity and change.[1] This tension stands at the heart of this article. Its aim is to examine central trends in the history of English kinship with particular reference to the early modern period, to assess important traits, and to suggest new foci for inquiry. This is, I believe, significant in itself, for kinship ties comprise important social relations. However, this also calls for sustained

* Department of History, University of Sussex.

consideration – as I would like to propose here – because the history of English kinship plays a large role in broader explanations of historical continuity and change.

The next section of this article thus seeks to examine the historiography of kinship, starting from the 'master narrative', as it was formulated through the works of some of the founding fathers of social and historical thought in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and proceeding to the major revision of the 1960s to the 1980s. Discussion then turns to an array of findings, established mainly since the late 1980s, which may by now be said to form a 'neo-revision'. The third section raises five conceptual points, leading to assessments of evidence and debates on continuity and change. The final section presents concluding remarks as well as some possible foci for future investigation. Debates on English kinship, I suggest, currently converge at an important junction. Whereas the 'master narrative' highlighted the erosion of kinship in the processes of modernization, and whereas the powerful revision of the 1960s–1980s emphasized the restricted nature of English kinship as one of the pre-conditions for England's precocious growth as the first industrial nation; the cumulative impact of the 'neo-revision' has been to highlight the role of kinship in the network-oriented economy and society of the early modern period (on the basis of which commercial expansion and enhanced industrialization, among other developments, took off). Rather than discussing the ways in which kinship was shaped by the forces of modernity; or, conversely, rather than emphasizing the limited role of kinship in social and economic life, recent research thus highlights the merits of kinship for mobilizing social and economic capital and for facilitating or promoting social, economic, and political exchanges of various sorts. Taken this way, kinship ties are often also seen not simply as an historical feature of society, moulded by the forces of change, but as agents and facilitators of change in their own right.[2]

All this, however, raises anew important questions about the nature and pace of historical transitions over past centuries and about mani-festations of continuity and change, and enables me to revisit issues examined in the past and to take some matters forward. In a society in which notions of affinity and kinship are undergoing change (as they are indeed in contemporary Britain; see the final pages of this article), I believe it is particularly important to consider questions in the light of both long-term and comparative perspectives. This is significant not only for asses-sing the force of kinship, as explained here, but for suggesting potentially pertinent contexts for modern phenomena. Even patterns typical of present-day 'new families' and 'families of choice' (studied by historians and social scientists and noted below), may bring to mind some similarities

with notions of kinship and related 'household-family' ties that were current in the early modern period.[3] Aspects of the present-day language of kinship can also be examined over the long run. Bearing all this in mind, let us turn to a brief historiographical survey.

2. APPROACHES AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

The first and oldest approach to the study of English kinship was influenced by what is sometimes called 'the master narrative'.[4] This broad and influential approach, formulated most importantly in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, highlighted the link between modernization and a decline in the force of kinship beyond the nuclear core, not least in England. One can trace this 'master narrative' to key nineteenth-century thinkers such as Sir Henry Sumner Maine, Ferdinand Tönnies, Friedrich Engels, and Max Weber, and on to Emile Durkheim and twentieth-century social scientists such as Talcot Parsons. Obviously these thinkers differed greatly in their evaluation of the decline of kinship (and the concomitant rise of the nuclear family), but nonetheless – as I would like to suggest – they share a broad understanding about the outlines of this process of change. Broadly speaking, the history of kinship and family ties, from around the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to the nineteenth, is seen as a history of contraction, in which kinship ties diminished in force and in significance as a result of a process of modernization. Economic growth, industrialization, urban growth, growing individualism, and social and geographical mobility are among the main forces held responsible for the erosion in the scope and force of kinship. England, the first industrial nation, is often seen to have had a particular leading role in a broader European process. The English middling ranks – the active and increasingly capitalistic middle class – are also sometimes seen to have played a leading part in the historical march towards modernity, and towards kinship decline.

Thus, for example, nineteenth-century historian and jurist Sir Henry Sumner Maine argued that 'the movement of the progressive societies has been uniform in one respect. Through all its course it has been distinguished by the gradual dissolution of family dependency, and the growth of individual obligation in its place'.[5] The erosion of kinship, according to Maine, thus formed an integral and important part of a larger transformation from 'status' to 'contract', as kinship groupings dissolved into separate households and households into individuals.[6] Maine also saw England as playing a leading role world-wide in this general process of modernization and kinship fragmentation. Like Maine, Friedrich Engels described the contraction of extended kinship forms and the rise of the conjugal family, seeing this process as part of a general

transformation from feudalism to capitalism. Although his interpretative thrust was different, he drew on the work of Maine (as well as the writings of Karl Marx and anthropologist Lewis Henry Morgan).[7] For the German thinker Ferdinand Tönnies, the decline of kinship formed part of an historical transition from *Gemeinschaft* to *Gesellschaft*: from the realm of the blood, the family, and obligations to kin, community, and nation to the realms of commerce and modernity.[8] According to Tönnies, too, changes in property ownership and modes of production brought about familial change. This transition was also connected with a shift from status to contract, as previously explained by Maine and noted by Marx and Engels, as well as with the transition from feudalism to capitalism.[9] A similar developmental view is also embedded in Emile Durkheim's argument on the rise of the nuclear family and the concomitant erosion of broader kinship ties in leading centres in Europe; see, for example, his definition of the conjugal family: 'By "conjugal family" I mean the family as it evolved among societies descended from Germanic society or among the most civilised peoples of modern Europe.'[10] Similar ideas continued to be promoted in twentieth-century sociology.[11] The most important modern historian writing under the influence of this 'master narrative' was undoubtedly Lawrence Stone. His key argument on the 'rise of the nuclear family', first published in essay form in 1975, was expanded in a highly influential book, *The family, sex and marriage in England, 1550–1800* (1977), with an extremely widely selling abridged version first published in 1979.[12]

When a new generation of economic and social historians started their work around the 1960s, their intent was often to question some of the assumptions of this 'master narrative'.[13] The new evidence that they produced did indeed quickly transform the field. Whereas the 'master narrative' portrayed the history of kinship in terms of change, the new findings were employed to mount strong arguments of continuity. Whereas the 'master narrative' suggested the historical existence of broad kinship ties and their subsequent erosion, the emphasis now shifted to the nuclear family. Historians, demographers, and historical anthropologists – such as Peter Laslett, E. A. Wrigley, Alan Macfarlane, and Keith Wrightson – all argued forcefully, in a series of highly influential works, that the nuclear family was in fact typical of English society from at least the Middle Ages. A narrow universe of kin with rather shallow ties among its members, therefore, was not the result of a process of modernization in England. On the contrary, path-breaking studies now established that it was usual for young men and women early modern in England to create separate households upon marriage, rather than joining the household of kin.[14] It was found that most households included, at least at some point in the life

cycle, nuclear families or their relics, with or without servants.[15] Inheritance practices clearly also privileged near kin.[16] Even relief for the elderly poor, historians emphasized, was provided through parish support, rather than primarily through the support of kin.[17] At the same time, there existed strong neighbourhood ties, which were crucial both socially and economically in early modern English localities; it has been suggested that these networks thrived not least because of the relative attenuation of kinship ties. By the 1980s it had become widely accepted by scholars that, for most English people below the aristocracy in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and early eighteenth centuries, kinship ties beyond the nuclear family were of limited significance; indeed this was seen to have been the case since at least the late Middle Ages. Less than two decades after its emergence, therefore, the powerful revision had acquired the status of textbook orthodoxy.[18]

As opposed both to the 'master narrative' and the revisionist approach, however, an array of studies has appeared in the last two to three decades which by now can be said to form a third, 'neo-revisionist' approach. Many of these studies do not engage with debates about the long-term history of kinship.[19] Focusing on particular periods and places, however, they suggest the enduring vibrancy of kinship ties in England in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries and beyond. Thus, for example, Michael Anderson, Tamara Hareven, and David Cressy all suggest in various ways the role of kinship in processes of migration from the seventeenth century to the nineteenth century. For example, English people migrating to America, as Cressy shows, kept contact with relatives in the old country and certainly could activate their links and make claims asking relations to 'play the part of a kinsman', even if the relationships were very distant. Letters written by migrants to their relatives in England attest to such exchanges. Kin often also migrated in the footsteps of kin in processes recognized as 'chain migration'.[20] In neighbourhoods and localities such relations were often tied in with patterns of short- and long-distance mobility and migration.[21] In a similar way, Richard Grassby has shown extremely strong and dense kinship ties among overseas merchants. These networks of mercantile families existed among numerous relations by blood and marriage, and they extended over time and space. Ties were maintained and alliances fostered, marriages were negotiated with care, and credit and goods were exchanged throughout.[22] Focusing on England, Craig Muldrew highlights the significance of kinship in debt and credit relations; the early modern 'economy of obligation', he explains, was based on credit and was tied closely with exchanges among kin and 'friends' (the contemporary term employed for designating important allies, including, not least, kin).[23] Moreover, when the 'economy of

obligation' failed, kin and 'friends' could be mobilized to underpin trust and maintain social reputation. Thus, for example, when eighteenth-century sea surgeon Charles Hill fell into debt, he secretly asked a cousin to lend him funds and enlisted his father for surety.[24] Examining the urban 'middling sort', Margaret Hunt emphasizes the role of kin in raising capital for commercial investments.[25] Michael Muscuch and Keith Wrightson highlight the role of familial considerations in economic action more broadly: risk-minimizing among family and kin, they suggest, could be no less important than desire for economic advancement, if not more.[26] Margot Finn highlights the importance of similar considerations among colonial families in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[27] Local studies reveal how, in times of need, kin could also be helpful in providing relief (even if they did not actually house needy kin). Appeals to 'friends' or, conversely, piteous claims of 'friendlessness', thus played a role in the makeshift strategies of the poor.[28] Cumbrian pauper petitions studied by Steve Hindle, for example, manifest 'vivid tales of ongoing filial duty and sacrifice, involving relatives well beyond the narrow range of lineal kin stipulated in the welfare legislation'.[29]

At the same time, historians emphasize the role of kinship in political networks and patronage, from the Tudor nobility to eighteenth-century gentry and court circles (as recently studied, for example, by Elaine Chalus, Clarissa Campbell Orr, Hannah Smith, and Ingrid Tague).[30] 'In counties and boroughs, 'dynastic families' were prominent.[31] The same was true of occupational networks: the politics of kinship were evident among Northampton innkeepers from 1560 to 1760 and among Oxfordshire boatmen from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, while members of the seventeenth-century London guild of brewers recruited kin from as far away as Leicestershire.[32] More recently, Diana O'Hara has placed renewed emphasis on the importance of kinship in marriage negotiations. The support of kin and 'friends', she argues, was crucial for young men and women at the point of marriage.[33] 'Friends' acted as intermediaries and proposed candidates for a match, whereas kin and 'friends' negotiated with prospective partners to promote marriages, issue advice or warnings, and generally ensure the compatibility and economic viability of prospective alliances and households. When marriages broke down, 'friends' and kin intervened once more.[34] At the same time, single men and never-married women (whose numbers rose by the seventeenth century, amounting to roughly one in four or five), as well as childless couples (who normally could number roughly one in five of all married couples), very often cultivated attachments with lateral kin and 'friends'.[35] Finally, my own work, which belongs to this 'neo-revisionist' approach, also strongly emphasizes both the importance of familial

cooperation and solidarity among the middling sort of people in the eighteenth century, and the ways in which kinship ties were crucial for mobilizing economic and political resources. I have also identified and analysed the language of kinship, the social vocabulary that enabled people to designate an array of kinship relationships in order to claim and activate ties. A middling man such as the Sussex shopkeeper and diarist Thomas Turner, to name but one example, was thus typically linked to a web of relations and 'friends': near and distant kin, masters and teachers, patrons, and personally selected friends. His siblings and companions participated in the same networks. Marriage alliances were extremely important in consolidating and enlarging this pool of 'friends' and kin. Ties were cemented by godparenthood, close professional connections, and political alliances, as well as visits, exchanges, and periods of co-residence. While a man such as Thomas Turner was tied horizontally to an array of kin and 'friends', many of his relationships were also hierarchical. The political networks in his locality spun the webs of 'friendship' and patronage, from the Prime Minister of England to the level of ordinary villagers. Thomas Turner's alliances, however idiosyncratic, were not unusual. His experiences of kin and 'friends' – and the language of kinship he employed – were shared by many. Analysis of the diary of the seventeenth-century clergyman Ralph Josselin, for example, reveals many similarities (see below). A range of comparable personal, legal, prescriptive, and literary sources provide further examples.

What, then, are we to make of the 'master narrative', the 'revisionist approach', and the 'neo-revisionist' interventions? Can such diverse arguments be tied within a coherent interpretative framework? And what are we to make of individual historical actors such as Ralph Josselin or Thomas Turner? Can their kinship, family, and 'friendship' ties be described in an historical perspective as being part of an increasing or decreasing trend, as relatively extensive or narrowing down, as individually affective or instrumental, as changing or largely continuous? In Section, 3 five points are discussed which, it is hoped, can contribute towards a fruitful re-assessment of the debates on English kinship and family ties in the long run.

3. POINTS AND ASSESSMENTS

The first point to be raised concerns the basic similarity between the 'master narrative' and the revisionist approach. Although the revisionist approach emphasizes the enduring limitation of kinship ties in England in the early modern period and the eighteenth century, rather than their

declining importance (as suggested by the 'master narrative'), it is significant that scholars of the revisionist approach still adhere to a basic premise that highlights the connection between the nuclear family and modernity. According to the 'master narrative', the nuclear family was the result of a process of modernization. According to the revisionist approach, the nuclear family and the relative weakness of kinship ties beyond it were among the basic conditions that enabled modernization to take place in England. As Wrigley has argued, for example, the existence of a society composed of small conjugal families prior to the industrial revolution was 'strongly congenial to relatively high real incomes, adaptability and growth'.[36]

The most extreme hypothesis, which both traces the attenuated nature of English kinship ties back to the remote past and links it to modernity, has been advanced by Alan Macfarlane. As an anthropologist, Macfarlane realized that 'there is no necessary correlation between the predominance of the nuclear family and industrial growth'.[37] Nonetheless he argued that there is a special association between the nuclear family and modernity and economic individualism.[38] He thus discounts processes such as the Reformation, urbanization, and industrialization as agents of historical change. Instead, he sees the essentially individualistic and nuclear kinship pattern of England as a cultural genetic code, a unique molecular structure that has manifested itself again and again through centuries of great events, leading England to its early and successful capitalist development, economic growth, and industrialization.[39] His analysis of the kinship and family patterns of diarist Ralph Josselin provides him with a prime example for a revisionist argument: Josselin is depicted as an individualistic person, essentially modern in his kinship affiliations and focused mostly on his nuclear family.

If we looking more critically at this developmental perspective, however, it appears that there is no vast difference between the 'master narrative' on the decline of kinship and some of the premises of the revisionist approach. The main difference between them concerns not the salience of the developmental model but rather its particular chronological and causal features. According to one approach, the great changes in the English family and kinship took place together with the advent of modernity between the sixteenth century and the nineteenth. According to the other, these changes may have happened earlier and some of the causal relationships in the process may have been reversed. But whether it was the advent of modernity that brought about the erosion of kinship ties and the rise of the nuclear family, or whether it was the prevalence of the nuclear family that helped bring about the advent of modernity, the premises of the discussion remain similar: in either case 'extended' and

'nuclear' kinship and family patterns are understood as distinct structures, the former clearly associated with traditionalism and the latter with modernity. In either case they are placed in an inverse relationship: if the one is prominent, the other must surely be muted. This postulated opposition between the 'nuclear' and 'extended' kinship and family patterns, and their supposed inverse relationship, take me to my second point.

This concerns the problematic dichotomy between 'nuclear' and 'extended' kinship and family in England, particularly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. By discussing this problematic dichotomy we can also moderate in some of the debates between the different scholarly approaches discussed above. This, I suggest, also brings us closer to understanding the historical social universe of early modern kinship and its enmeshed social culture of relatedness.[40]

To start from the basics, it is important to remember that, as anthropologists emphasize, small kin-based domestic groups are virtually universal among human societies.[41] Absence of extended family residence does not necessarily indicate a lack of a possibly wide range of kinship relationships. At the same time, the labelling of these possible relationships as simply 'extended' is a rather crude form of differentiation.[42] At this basic level, then, a dichotomy between 'nuclear' and 'extended' kinship and family forms is highly problematic.

In the context of the English historiography, however, this dichotomy between 'nuclear' and 'extended' kinship and family forms is also problematic because the concept of the 'the nuclear family' is employed unsystematically, thus also clouding our understanding of the concepts of 'the extended family' and of 'kinship'. In studies of historical patterns of household residence, for instance, the nuclear family is defined most narrowly.[43] The addition to a household of any relation beyond the conjugal unit turns it into an 'extended family household'. If the parent of either spouse joins the household, for example, it is said to be extended upwards, or if a sibling joins the household it is defined as being extended laterally. As I have argued elsewhere, these definitions are important for comparative studies but they are also hair-splitting and too rigid for representing the frequent movement of people in and out of households, whether as servants, apprentices, boarders, lodgers, or long-term visitors. Such movement was particularly typical of households of the middling ranks in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England. When it comes to assessing the recognition and effectiveness of kinship ties in the period, however, these rigid yet systematic definitions of the nuclear family are generally not applied. In this context the 'nuclear family' is understood much more broadly to include the nuclear family of origin, the nuclear family of procreation, and sometimes also the nuclear family of origin of

one's spouse. Taken this way, the 'nuclear family' can stretch to include at least two sets of parents, a married couple, siblings, and siblings-in-law, sons and daughters, and sons and daughters-in-law; the addition of half-relations, step-relations, grandparents, and grandchildren further complicates the picture. In his seminal study of the kinship network of Ralph Josselin, for example, Macfarlane argued influentially that 'apart from the nuclear family there was no effective kin group in Josselin's world'[44] – but this was a rather extended notion of the nuclear family. Using the six nuclear-family terms 'father', 'mother', 'brother', 'sister', 'son', and 'daughter', Josselin was able to claim kinship with a wide circle of relatives by blood and marriage. At one point I counted that the number of people he recognized as members of his 'nuclear family' (using these six basic terms alone) amounted to at least 32. His mother, step-mother, and mother-in-law, for example, were all recognized by him as 'mothers', with his daughters marriages he gained 'sons', and as his sisters married he recognized their husbands' as 'brothers'. In addition he had servants, whom he also recognized as members of his 'family', as well as other individuals claimed by him as kin and important 'friends'.

Once we realize this unsystematic use of family definitions among historians – and, conversely, the rich and complex historical language of kinship – it is possible to resolve some of the apparent differences between the various scholarly approaches. Evidently, most English people since at least the Middle Ages did not have clear lineages and complex structured networks of cousinage. All the same their nuclear relationships had a considerable capacity for internal extension, for they could grow with marriages and other alliances to include many kin and 'friends'. These kinship ties were also maintained over time, thus stretching the generational span of what can be defined as 'extended-nuclear networks'. Beyond them there were uncles, aunts, and cousins of various degrees. Indeed, the contemporary vocabulary of kinship and 'friendship' enabled people to claim as kin not only a wide range of relations, half-relations, and relations-in-law, but also non-related individuals; one man nurtured by Ralph Josselin as 'cousin Josselin', for example, was either very distantly related by blood or marriage or not related at all. Moreover, the contemporary social framework of the household-family offered various forms of domestic affiliation and permitted a great degree of flexibility and mobility. In the household of the eighteenth-century shopkeeper Thomas Turner, for instance, there were at least eleven different individuals who came and went in the course of eleven years and who were all recognized by Turner as members of his 'family', including his wife, child, siblings, nephews, mother-in-law, and several non-related persons (although usually no more than three to five people lived in the 'family' at any point

in time).[45] With all this, it appears that the allegedly isolated nuclear family of early modern England was less structurally isolated than has sometimes been argued. There was no clear dichotomy between 'nuclear' and 'extended' kinship and family ties in early modern England, and therefore there could be no necessary inverse relationship between them such as various scholars have suggested.

This clarification opens a path to a less combative and more productive assessment of the role of kinship and household experiences in early modern England, as well as of changes over time. It also brings us closer to understanding the enmeshed social worlds of historical actors such as Thomas Turner and Ralph Josselin, and their notions of kinship, 'friendship', and household-family life. It now appears that, while in some respects kinship ties could be narrow and restricted, in others they could be wide, open, or diverse. Keith Wrightson's 'revisionist' suggestion that 'our current working hypothesis must be that kinship ties beyond those of the nuclear family were of limited significance in the social structure of village communities', therefore, does not necessarily contradict Cressy's 'neo-revisionist' argument that the English kinship system was 'valuable, versatile and wide-ranging', or Jeremy Boulton's point that it seems possible that kinship did operate as a significant social force in a neighbourhood.[46] Nor does it necessarily contradict my own claim that, although there were few unavoidable obligations, relatedness entailed important expectations of consideration, duty, and reciprocity among kin, as manifested in the culture of the time. The task, then, is not to formulate either/ or questions, but rather to investigate how diverse kinship and family patterns interacted in particular historical contexts. This takes me to my third point.

This concerns the problematic dichotomy between individualism and 'familism'. Economic individualism and enterprise are traditionally seen as hallmarks of modernity. At the same time, the middling ranks of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are often typified as driven by personal enterprise and economic ambition. This depiction obviously goes back to Marx and Weber, but it is also typical of more recent scholars who take the 'revisionist' approach. For example, Macfarlane has not only famously postulated a clear dichotomy between individualism and 'familism' but has also described England as a society uniquely characterized by economic individualism from a very early stage.[47]

There is now considerable evidence to show that, rather than being at opposite poles, individual and familial economic enterprise often went hand in hand in England and indeed they sustained one another, particularly among the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century middling ranks. The middling ranks – as can also be seen from the examples cited

above – used family connections in their economic enterprises; they also initiated and justified their economic actions on the grounds of familial requirements and needs. Familial reputation was important for maintaining credit, and familial considerations were very significant in calculating risks.[48] London businessmen, provincial farmers and tradesmen and overseas merchants and entrepreneurs all reveal some similar familial and economic patterns: shared responsibilities, primarily among parents, adult offspring, siblings, and siblings-in-law; individual enterprise alongside the pooling of familial labour and resources; and mutually calculated risks. Historical studies increasingly highlight the importance of social networks and social capital in early modern society. In such enmeshed social worlds, kinship could undoubtedly comprise a valuable asset. The provincial mid-eighteenth-century shopkeeper Thomas Turner (mentioned above), to name but one, was undoubtedly economically minded but he also traded in close collaboration with his mother, owned property together with his siblings, and had debt and credit relations with a range of kin and 'friends'.[49] It was not least thanks to his successful manoeuvring among the networks of family and friends that he managed to accumulate wealth and become upwardly mobile. In this he was far from unusual. The more we know about economic and social life in the eighteenth century (both in England but beyond), the more we realize how much it was enmeshed in networks of kinship and 'friendship' ties. This takes me to my fourth point.

This concerns the problematic dichotomy between 'interest' and 'emotion'.[50] In family and kinship relationships, interest and emotions were often closely bound, and in many cases the nearer the relationship, the greater was its instrumentality.[51] As parents and children, husbands and wives, sibling groups and other kin pulled forces together, their interests and emotions were often closely intermixed. I saw this in my work on eighteenth-century families, among whom material exchanges were expressed and negotiated from casual assistance to substantial help. Similar patterns are also identifiable in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos, for instance, discusses the ways in which close relations between parents and adolescent and adult children were bound together in a long-term economy of both emotional and material exchange.[52] O'Hara (as noted above) highlights the role of dowry in the processes of spouse-selection in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, showing how important were material considerations for both the young people and the families involved.[53] Between strategic marriage and love at first sight lay a broad terrain in which prudence and affection interplayed. When it came to commerce and credit, familial relations and interests often also had a role (as several of the examples

mentioned above suggest). The same applied to early modern politics. The work of Sir Lewis Namier has been both criticized and admired for its focus on eighteenth-century 'connexions'.[54] One does not need to be an ardent 'Namierite', however, to realize the importance of kinship in forging alliances in early modern political life. The role of kinship (again, as I have observed above) is widely recognized by scholars, from Tudor politics to the formation of loyalties during the English Civil War and on to the Whig and Tory interests of the eighteenth century.[55] Indeed, the duty of a political man, as eighteenth-century historian and politician Edward Gibbon maintained, was first and foremost to employ the 'weight and consideration' of office in the service of 'friends'.[56] There was, therefore, no necessary opposition between interest and emotion in early modern kinship relations, which brings me to my fifth and final point.

My last point concerns the limitations of narrow material approaches to the history of kinship and the importance of negative relationships among kin. Historical studies of kinship focus all too often on positive exchanges, such as manifestations of care and love. At their crudest, questions of family and kinship can focus on who lived together with whom and who gave money to whom. However, it is important to go beyond actual exchanges and to examine the expectations – and frustrated expectations – among kin. What people *expected* from their kin gives us insights into social and cultural life no less than what actually came about. This is particularly important because relationships among kin were often marked by negative tension and disappointment. For example, for an eighteenth-century woman such as Nancy Woodforde who left her parental home to keep her uncle's house, the tensions between expectations and reality were crucial in creating her experience of kinship and moulding her sense of her own identity.[57] For Thomas Turner, his frustration with his kin was a regular feature in his life. He continually saw himself as giving much and receiving little. To be sure, kinship for him implied obligation, but all too often, in his view, obligation was expected yet inadequately fulfilled. Ralph Josselin noted (years after the event) how, when he was in need, 'friends were not so kinde as I expected'.[58] Personal documents reveal numerous negotiations of anger.[59] Formal archives contain rich accounts of disputes among kin (indeed, a great many of the legal records in our possession, on which historians draw, were probably generated owing to family conflict). Lastly, while negative relations among kin were widely prevalent, it is important to remember that they could play positive roles too. As Sylvia Yanagisako has shown in her analysis of present-day Italian business life, kinship disruption can in fact be a factor in economic growth and diversification, as kin split away from family firms and establish businesses of their own.[60] Thus, in all these

ways, what kin did not do was as important as – and possibly more important – than what they actually did.

4. QUESTIONS OF CONTINUITY AND CHANGE

The five points raised above address core conceptual issues about the role of kinship, yet they also highlight questions of continuity and change. Once we appreciate the similarity between the 'master narrative' and the 'revisionist approach', and once we see the inadequacy of the concepts 'nuclear' and 'extended', it becomes clear that any exploration of change and continuity in terms of distinct and dichotomous 'extended' and 'nuclear' kinship and family ties must be problematic. What follows is that any developmental model that postulates an evolutionary relationship between 'nuclear' and 'extended' kinship and family ties is also problematic; this, in turn, has ramifications for studies of continuity and change. If we add in here the possible alignment of individual and familial strategies, it is possible to think further about the relationship between kinship and social and economic change, and indeed between kinship and 'modernity'.

It is thus possible to speculate on some long-term patterns. Evidently, there is by now very significant data to suggest that there was important continuity in kinship and family patterns in England throughout the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Patterns of kinship recognition and alignment, such as the extended-nuclear networks described here, were largely continuous over the period. So was the recognition of 'friends'. So also were the social and economic manifestations of these patterns in terms of credit relations, capital investment, or economic cooperation. Other continuing roles were matrimonial advice, guardianship, and patronage. Negative and positive sentiments among kin continued to exist. In addition, residential arrangements within the framework of the household-family remained broadly similar throughout the period, including mobility within and among households. Although most households contained nuclear families or their relics, significant minorities of households included wider kin, and the presence of kin in households also changed as needs arose, over time and in the course of the life cycle.[61] Evidently, then, there was no decline in the force of kinship ties in this period, as the 'master narrative' implied. On the contrary, kinship ties were routinely drawn upon in the period's vibrant social and economic networks; in certain sections of society, or in particular circumstances, they could be especially useful.

So much for the early modern period, but what about the succeeding centuries? Just as it was a mistake to argue in favour of an enduring

pattern of 'the nuclear family' in England from the early modern period to modernity, it would be unfortunate to slip into arguments about the unchanging force of kinship. Changes such as economic growth, mobility, urban growth, scientific advance, legal and state intervention, war, dislocation, and cultural transformation have surely had an impact on kinship ties, and in various ways may have been shaped by them. One important challenge, then, is to integrate more closely the diverse findings of the 'revisionist' and 'neo-revisionist' studies, and to work through them to create fuller syntheses of kinship and family ties in England over the long run. These are bound to converge not in any single lineal narrative but in diverse, partly overlapping – and undoubtedly also partly conflicting – shifts and processes. In the rest of this article, I highlight three points of focus that I believe merit further assessment: two chronological and one cultural and geographical.

My first chronological point of focus concerns the transitions from the early modern to eighteenth-century period and to the nineteenth century. While a great deal of work has been done on the Tudor and Stuart period and 'the long eighteenth century', and while the nineteenth century is widely researched, transitions from the early modern period and the eighteenth century to the nineteenth century are relatively little explored. To give but one example, we know of significant links between kinship, geographical mobility, and urban growth in the processes of industrialization in England. Future research may investigate some related patterns. Considering the fact that kinship relationships were so important for raising business capital and establishing credit, for instance, it would be interesting to know more about what impact the growth of banking had on kinship networks: did it serve to dissolve existing loyalties, or were they consolidated in new ways? Risk and debt facilities also changed, from the expansion of insurance in the eighteenth century to the introduction of limited liability in the second half of the nineteenth, thus potentially affecting the 'fear of ruination' that for centuries had haunted individuals, kinship groups, and joint stock companies.[62] Another possible process will be to explore further the changing patterns of education in the period: did they simply sever previous patterns of kin support and apprenticeship or did the growth of formal schooling and the extension of children's years at home interact with familial and kinship patterns in other ways?[63] It is only recently that researchers have also begun to understand more fully the effects of (arguably) the greatest structural change in English kinship in the long run: the increased practice of family limitation and fertility decline from around 1860.[64] Other processes of change from the early modern period to the nineteenth century that may be further examined with particular regard to kinship include geographical

and social mobility, changing transport and communication technologies, the growth of meritocracy, the impact of war, and developments in housing.

A second and broader chronological scope that is worthy of further investigation (and that also requires more extensive discussion here), concerns the even longer run, going from the early modern period to the middle of the twentieth century, especially the period from the 1960s and 1970s onwards, when changes in kinship patterns appear to be particularly marked. This period saw a rise in divorce and forms of co-habitation, increasing acceptance of flexible domestic arrangements, and the development of new forms of relatedness, whether through non-marriage, same-sex alliances, scientific intervention, or various forms of adoption, fostering, and partnership. At the same time, forms of family planning had also developed, longevity increased, and female education and employment patterns had undergone very significant changes. Some facts and figures can be mentioned briefly to illustrate these changes. More than one in three couples who marry in Britain nowadays divorce and a significant proportion remarry, thus leading to complex reconstituted and blended families.[65] Non-marriage is also an option that does not preclude parenthood. Figures issued by the Office of National Statistics confirm that more than one in three births in the UK currently occur outside marriage, compared with one in sixteen in 1960.[66] Notions of illegitimacy, which have segregated social and biological kinship for centuries, have thus also been transformed, as were possibly some notions of incest.[67] The headship of households has also changed. One in five families with dependent children in the UK is nowadays headed by a lone parent, for instance, compared with one in twelve in 1971. A national organization such as English Heritage now offers subscriptions for dual- and single-parent families as a matter of course. When one takes into account both heterosexual and same-sex alliances, as well as notions of queer kinship, the possible range of kinship variation increases. While most English people at the start of the twenty-first century therefore probably experience nuclear-family residence at some point in their lives, many also spend part or most of their lives in other kin and domestic arrangements.

Social scientists studying such transformations highlight the demise of the nuclear family and the emergence of 'new families' or 'families of choice'.[68] Taking an early modern historical perspective, however, one might wonder to what extent the 'post-modern family' of the late twentieth century also has some long-term antecedents. As Lawrence Stone remarked as early as 1977, there is structural resemblance between the reconstituted and 'blended' families created as a result of widowhood in the early modern period, and those established owing to divorce in

recent times. In both cases, the initial rate of family breakdown roughly amounts to about one in three.[69] Single-person families, widely current today, certainly also existed in varying forms throughout the early modern period and in the nineteenth century.[70] Moreover, if one looks at the 'household-family framework' of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, additional and potentially pertinent comparisons come to mind. Early modern household-families were domestic and residential units, whose members were bound together by a series of contractual, occupational, and affective relationships, yet they were not necessarily related by blood or marriage.[71] Household-families were often also marked by fluctuating populations of kin and non-kin, and were tied to networks of non-resident kin and 'friends'. To be sure, the internal relationships within such household-families changed over the course of time. Whereas the household-family framework of the early modern period was hierarchical, patriarchal, and often occupational, the organization of domestic units nowadays is more diffuse. Some long-term similarities and differences seem apparent, however, and they merit further investigation.[72] One might speculate, for example, as to whether, as well as witnessing as a crisis of the conjugal family, contemporary society is also experiencing a re-emergence of the household-family and associated kinship and family patterns.

Indeed, another aspect of kinship – one that seems suggestive in the long-run perspective – concerns the English language of relatedness. In a previous context I argued that, far from being constant (as some 're-visionist' historians have argued), the English language of kinship has undergone significant changes over time, in terms of both its terminology and its conventions of use.[73] If the vibrant and rich early modern language of kinship was important in negotiating the social alliances and networks of its period it appears that recent changes are also significant, however. The word 'partner', for instance, historically employed to describe those linked by business or marriage, is now increasingly used even in legal and contractual contexts 'to refer to a member of a couple in a long-standing relationship of any kind', thus often also intentionally giving equal kinship recognition to marriage, co-habitation, same-sex relationships, and so on.[74] Likewise, the terminology for designating step-relations has been significantly enlarged over time. In 1755 Samuel Johnson remarked that the only surviving usage of the compounds of *step-* was in the term 'step-mother'. Nowadays, as the *Oxford English Dictionary* states, '*stepfather* is hardly less frequently used', and '*stepson*, *-daughter*, *-child*, *-brother*, *-sister* are by no means rare'.[75] Other potentially suggestive changes concern the 'in-law' terminology, which manifests changing boundaries between relations by blood and marriage over the long run (in the early

modern period the 'in-law' terminology was also applied to step- and half- relations). At the same time, several conventions for claiming relations by marriage have become obsolete, such as the application of kinship terms on their own or together with names and surnames, which affects not only the recognition of kin but representations of age and gender hierarchies.[76] It would be unlikely for a present-day speaker to use the elementary kinship terms for inclusively naming diverse relations by marriage while also differentiating females by their marital status as, for example, Ralph Josselin had done when designating his 'extended-nuclear' network (for instance, 'my brother Jeremy' was in fact the brother of Ralph Josselin's wife; 'my sister Betty' was probably the wife of that same 'brother'; and 'my brother Worral' was the husband of Ralph Josselin's wife's sister, whereas 'sister Hodson' was Josselin's own sister by blood and marriage, identified by her married name[77]). In addition to all this, collective terms for naming kin and non-kin, such as 'friend' and 'connexion', have also largely fallen out of use, whereas Scripture-based terms (such as the use of the term 'nephew' to designate grandchild), have become entirely archaic.[78] Taking a 'Whiggish' view, it appears that between the early modern period and modernity, these and other changes had the cumulative effect of defining more clearly familial roles and relationships, restricting the number of kin recognized by naming, and highlighting biological kin while isolating the nuclear family. Collective terms became outdated, relationships by marriage were more clearly differentiated, and the inclusiveness and opacity of many terms and usages have been considerably reduced.[79]

Such changes can be especially discerned from around the early nineteenth century. By the middle of the twentieth century, it appears that English kinship terminology was considerably 'nuclearized'. Terminological shifts from the twentieth century and onwards, however, now seem to be heading in new ways. The current use of the term 'partner', for example, is indicative of the new inclusive definitions, and is not unlike those employed in the early modern period for both designating kin and obscuring their exact number, degree, or gender (like the terms 'relation' and 'friend'[80]). Definitions of 'family', too, are evidently undergoing diversity. And so, while in some respects the historical English language of relatedness clearly reveals continuity, both the terminology and conventions of usage suggest change, highlighting the need for further investigation of the language of kinship, with broad chronological perspectives in mind.

Lastly, my third point for focus and further investigation concerns geographical and cultural comparative scopes. Whereas discussions of the 'master narrative' took broad cultural and historical perspectives and

whereas key works of the 'revisionist' approach also developed with explicit and implicit comparative views (and often in close dialogue with scholars in continental Europe), many 'revisionist' and 'neo-revisionist' studies centre exclusively on England.[81] In view of the importance of networks and social alignments, however, comparative perspectives appear suggestive here too. European perspectives reveal many similarities. The networks of kinship, friendship, and patronage linking the French provinces to Paris and the court, for example, are not unlike those traced in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England, despite the many differences in political culture and inheritance patterns.[82] In the prosperous world of the Dutch Golden Age, connections with family and friends played a major role in trade and business, and were moreover closely entwined with other neighbourhood and community networks.[83] Kin were more likely to trade together than with one another, so as not to make a profit out of each other (thus often also manifesting dense webs of alliances by blood and marriage, as highlighted here). The family fortunes, as Anne Goldgar explains, were 'in some ways the responsibilities of all'.[84] Indeed, when it came to credit and commerce, English, Swedish, and Dutch trading companies evidently drew on similar economic and social resources and converged on the same global junctions – whether in India, China, the Middle East, or the Americas.[85] Some international networks were particularly kinship-based: from the seventeenth-century English Atlantic traders studied by Grassby and the Scottish and Swedish traders explored by Leos Müller to Dutch-based Jewish banking and trading networks or Italian and Chinese traders and manufacturers.[86] Beyond all this, global perspectives increasingly attract attention and again throw into focus England's story of economic growth. Whereas path-breaking investigations date a 'divergence' between England and China to the period around 1800, say,[87] other studies trace it through the early modern period to the Black Death, if not earlier. Future research may further examine the role of English kinship in stories of adaptability and growth, and open yet new comparisons with cultures worldwide.

The history of English kinship in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries thus highlights the importance of continued and renewed investigation. As well as the 'infinite variety of experiences that individuals encountered',[88] it is important to re-examine shifting social, economic, and cultural patterns, and pertinent manifestations of relatedness – both comparatively and over time. Moreover, if the 'master narrative' highlighted the demise of kinship in the processes of modernization, and if 'revisionist' critiques saw the limitation of kinship as a precondition for growth, recent research suggests that in the enmeshed society of early modern England economic, social, and cultural exchanges were often

propelled along kinship tracks. Thus they could be motivated, facilitated, promoted, and frequently disrupted and derailed by alliances of kin and 'friends'. Wide sections of early modern English society were thus typically marked by highly adaptable networks of relatedness: habitually 'nuclearly-extended', with existing and co-opted ties, expanding and contracting with life-cycles and life-events, enmeshed in credit and commerce, and closely tied to migration, mobility, and occupational ties. However effective they may have been (potentially or in practice), such networks were also volatile and easily splintered, for emotions blended with interests and interests were bound up with emotional ties. Going back to Wrigley's words quoted above, then, one wonders to what extent it was this pattern of enmeshed kinship and family, rather than just 'the small conjugal family' that was 'strongly congenial to relatively high real incomes, adaptability and growth', and that lay behind England's commercial and political expansion, both prior to industrialization and alongside it.[89] Future research may say more on that.

With a substantial body of existing research on kinship, and with renewed scholarly interest and clearer conceptual frameworks, we are now in a better position to address anew questions of continuity and change, which will not only contribute to English history, but will indeed strengthen comparative perspectives both in Europe, and beyond. As Fernand Braudel famously observed, in the end, it is the long run that always wins.[90]

ENDNOTES

1 K. Wrightson, 'The family in early modern England: continuity and change', in S. Taylor, R. Connors, and C. Jones eds., *Hanoverian Britain and empire* (Woodbridge, 1998), 2. See also N. Tadmor, *Family and friends in eighteenth-century England: household, kinship, and patronage* (Cambridge, 2001), and 'Revisiting the public sphere and the history of the family', in K. Johansson, K. Gerner, M. Lindstedt Cronberg, S. Oredsson, and K. Salomon eds., *Friendship across borders: a festschrift in honour of Eva Österberg* (Lund, 2007), 217–32.

2 For this point, see also Wrightson, 'Continuity and change', and T. K. Hareven, 'The history of the family and the complexity of social change', *American Historical Review* **91** (1991), 95–125.

3 See N. Tadmor, 'The concept of the household-family in eighteenth-century England', *Past and Present* **151** (1996), 111–40, and *Family and friends*, chs. 1 and 2.

4 See Wrightson, 'Continuity and change'; Tadmor, *Family and friends*, esp. 'Introduction' and ch. 4, and 'Revisiting the public sphere'; and R. M. Smith, '"Modernization" and the medieval village community', in A. R. H. Baker and O. Gregory eds., *Explorations in historical geography* (Cambridge, 1984), 140–79.

5 H. S. Maine, *Ancient law: its connection with the early history of society and its relation to modern ideas* (London, 1905; 1st publ. 1861), 149.

6 Maine, *Ancient law*, 240.

7 F. Engels, *The origins of the family, private property and the state*, intro. M. Barrett (Harmondsworth, 1985; 1st publ. 1884), 11. Influenced by Morgan, Engels also saw this as a transformation from matrilineal to patrilineal kinship; see Engels, *Origins*, 10–11.

8 F. Tönnies, *Fundamental concepts of sociology* (*Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*), trans. Charles P. Loomis, American Sociology Series (1940; 1st publ. 1887).

9 Engels, *Origins*, 110–11, and reference there to Marx, *The communist manifesto*. See e.g. p. 110: 'By changing all things into commodities [capitalist production] dissolved all inherited and traditional relationships, and in place of time-honoured custom and historic right, it set up purchases and sale, "free" contract.'

10 E. Durkheim, 'The conjugal family', in E. Durkheim, *On institutional analysis*, ed. and trans. M. Traugott (Chicago and London, 1978; 1st publ. *Revue Philosophique* **91** (1921), 1–14), 229.

11 See e.g. Parsons, 'The kinship system of the contemporary United States', and 'The social structure of the family'; T. Parsons and R. F. Bales, *Family, socialization and interaction process* (Glencoe, IL, 1955); W. Goode, *World revolution and family patterns* (London, 1963), esp. chs. I and II; W. F. Ogburn, 'Social change and the family', in R. F. Winch and L. W. Goodman eds., *Selected studies in marriage and the family* (3rd edn, New York, 1968; 1st publ. 1953), 58–63; Goode, 'The role of the family and industrialization', *ibid.*, 64–70, and compare R. F. Winch and R. L. Blumberg, 'Societal complexity and familial organization', *ibid.*, 70–92, and references there. See also T. K. Hareven, 'The history of the family and the complexity of social change', *American Historical Review* **91** (1991), 95–125; Wrightson, 'Continuity and change', esp. pp. 2–3; and Tadmor, *Family and friends*.

12 Stone's monumental thesis has been criticized in every way, from the thrust of its argument and social attitudes to its source base and documentation. It is remarkable, however, that it still provides a framework for discussion, particularly on continuity and change. See for example key reviews by Thompson and Macfarlane: E. P. Thompson, 'Happy families – review of Lawrence Stone, *The family, sex and marriage in England 1500–1800*', *New Society*, 8 Sept. 1977; A. Macfarlane, 'Review of Lawrence Stone, *The family, sex and marriage in England 1500–1800*', *History and Theory* **18** (1979), 103–26. See also key works such as R. Houlbrooke, *The English family 1450–1700* (London, 1984); D. Cressy, *Birth, marriage, and death: ritual, religion, and the life-cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford, 1997), and discussions by me (and further references) in 'The concept of the household-family' and *Family and friends*. See also, for example, the introduction and many of the contributions in H. Berry and E. Foyster, *The family in early modern England* (Cambridge, 2008).

13 See, e.g., programmatic statements and retrospective evaluations in P. Laslett, 'The character of familial history, its limitations and the conditions for its proper pursuit', in T. Hareven and A. Plakans eds., *Family history at the crossroads: a* Journal of Family History *reader* (Princeton, 1987), 277–81; A. Macfarlane, *The family life of Ralph Josselin: an essay in historical anthropology* (Oxford, 1978), *The origins of English individualism*, and *The culture of capitalism* (Oxford, 1987); and Wrightson, 'Continuity and change'. See also my discussions in Tadmor, *Family and friends*, esp. 'Introduction' and ch. 4, and 'Revisiting the public sphere'.

14 See esp. J. Hajnal, 'European marriage patterns in perspective', in D. G. Glass and D. E. C. Eversley eds., *Population in history* (London, 1965); P. Laslett, D. E. C. Eversley and E. A. Wrigley, *An introduction to English historical demography* (New York, 1966); Macfarlane, *The family life of Ralph Josselin*; P. Laslett and R. Wall eds., *Household and family in past time: comparative studies in the size and structure of*

the domestic group over the last three centuries in England, France, Serbia, Japan and colonial North America (Cambridge, 1972), esp. 'Introduction' and 125–8; Laslett, *The world we have lost* (New York, 1965), and 'Characteristics of the western family considered over time', *Journal of Family History* **2** (1977), 89–115, repr. in Laslett, *Family life and illicit love in earlier generations* (Cambridge, 1977); K. Wrightson and D. Levine, *Poverty and piety in an English village: Terling 1525–1700* (Oxford, 1995; 1st publ. 1979); K. Wrightson, *English society, 1580–1680* (London, 1982); and R. A. Houlbrooke, *The English family, 1450–1750* (London, 1984). For the labour and mobility of youths and families, see esp. P. Laslett and J. Harrison, 'Clayworth and Cogenhoe', in H. E. Bell an R. L. Ollard eds., *Historical essays, 1600–1750, presented to David Ogg* (London, 1963), 157–84 (repr. in Laslett, *Family life and illicit love*); Laslett, *The world we have lost*; R. S. Schofield, 'Age-specific mobility in an eighteenth-century English parish', *Annales de Démographie Historique* (1970), 261–74; R. Wall, 'The age at leaving home', *Journal of Family History* **3** (1978), 181–202; A. Kussmaul, *Servants in husbandry in early modern England* (Cambridge, 1981); V. Brodsky Elliot, 'Single women in the London marriage market: age, status and mobility, 1598–1619', in R. B. Outhwaite ed., *Marriage and society, studies in the social history of marriage* (London, 1981); D. Souden, 'Movers and stayers in family reconstitution populations', *Local Population Studies* **33** (1984), 11–28; M. K. McIntosh, 'Servants and the household unit in an Elizabethan English community', *Journal of Family History* **9** (1984), 3–23; P. Clark and D. Souden eds., *Migration and society in early modern England* (London, 1987); S. Rappaport, *Worlds within worlds: structures of life in sixteenth-century London* (Cambridge, 1989); P. Earle, 'The female labour market in London in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries', *Economic History Review* **42** (1989), 328–53; C. Brooks, 'Apprenticeship, social mobility and the middling sort, 1550–1800', in J. Barry and C. Brooks eds., *The middling sort of people: culture, society and politics in England, 1550–1800* (Basingstoke, 1994); I. K. Ben-Amos, *Adolescence and youth in early modern England* (New Haven CT, 1994); and P. Griffiths, *Youth and authority: formative experiences in England, 1560–1640* (Oxford, 1996).

15 For path-breaking studies on the size and structure of households, see esp. Laslett and Harrison, 'Clayworth and Cogenhoe', and Laslett, *The world we have lost*, and 'Size and structure of the household in England over three centuries', *Population Studies* **23** (1969), 199–223. For regional and chronological variations and variations resulting from industrialization, see esp. M. Anderson, *Family structure in nineteenth-century Lancashire* (Cambridge, 1971); Laslett, 'Characteristics of the western family'; G. Nair, *Highley: the development of a community 1550–1880* (Oxford, 1988); and R. Wall, 'Regional and temporal variations in English household structure from 1650', in J. Hobcraft and P. Rees eds., *Regional aspects of British population growth* (London, 1979), 89–113. Note, however, the consistent evidence on the presence of kin in family households, including more than a quarter of all gentry households, 17 per cent of yeomen households, and more than a tenth of the households of craftsmen and artisans, in Laslett's sample of 100 communities from 1599 to 1854 (Laslett, 'Mean household size in England since the sixteenth century', in Laslett and Wall eds., *Household and family in past time*, 154). Evidence such as this can also be interpreted to emphasize the importance of kinship and social networks alongside considerations such as life-cycle changes, mobility, cultural perceptions, and local and occupational variations (discussed below). An initial critique has been made, for example, by Lutz Berkner, who argues that 'simple' and 'extended' can be seen as different phases in the development cycle of the same family, rather than as different family types. Certain patterns of household and family extension, which can be socially significant, are moreover bound

to be represented in no more than a minority of cases. For instance, with a pattern of late marriage, continued labour, and relatively early mortality, there is only a limited period in which a mature couple can possibly accommodate an elderly parent. Berkner thus argues that 'the real change in family structure should not be sought in the size and composition of residential groups, but rather in the way in which kinship ties function in the society'; see L. K. Berkner, 'The use and misuse of census data', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* **4** (1975), 721–38, esp. pp. 729–31, and also Tadmor, 'The concept of the household-family', and *Family and friends*, esp. ch. 1 and p. 116.

16 The range of kin recognized in wills was generally narrow, highlighting the privileging of near kin, although women tended to bequeath assets to a relatively wide range of kin and single or childless testators were likely to favour lateral kin; see, for example, Wrightson, 'Kinship in an English village', in R. M. Smith ed., *Land, kinship and life-cycle* (Cambridge, 1984), specifically pp. 323–4; Wrightson and Levine, *Poverty and piety*, 91–9, specifically p. 92; R. T. Vann, 'Wills and the family in an English town: Banbury, 1550–1800', *Journal of Family History* **4** (1979), 346–67; and C. Howell, 'Peasant inheritance customs in the Midlands, 1280–1700', in J. Goody, J. Thirsk and E. P. Thompson eds., *Family and inheritance: rural society in Western Europe* (Cambridge, 1976), esp. p. 141. and *Land, family and inheritance in transition: Kibworth Harcourt* (Cambridge, 1983). For similar inheritance practices in the Middle Ages, see R. M. Smith, 'Some issues concerning families and their property', in Smith ed., *Land, kinship and life-cycle*, esp. pp. 56–8. For a discussion of kinship recognition in wills, see D. Cressy, 'Kinship and kin interaction in early modern England', *Past and Present* **113** (1986), 38–69; and K. Wrightson, 'Postscript: Terling revisited', in Wrightson and Levine, *Poverty and piety* (1995), esp. pp. 192–4. For a decline in kinship recognition in wills, see Vann, 'Wills and the family', esp. pp. 363–7, and Nair, *Highley*, 67–8, 155–8. For women, see A. L. Erickson, *Women and property in early modern England* (New York, 1993), esp. pp. 86, 212–16. Note also my discussion of primogeniture in N. Tadmor, 'Dimensions of inequality among siblings in eighteenth-century English novels: the cases of *Clarissa* and *The history of Miss Betsy Thoughtless*', *Continuity and Change* **7** (1992), 311–12, and references there. In this issue of *Continuity and Change* see L. Bonfield., 'Seeking connections between kinship and the law in early modern England'.

17 The Relief Act of 1601 obliged lineal relations to support one another and consequently there were demands at times for parents, grandparents, and children to relieve needy kin. However, such relations were often themselves not in a position to extend a great deal of support, or to do so consistently. Moreover, parish authorities could intervene, enforce removal, and even prevent inhabitants from harbouring needy kin so as not to increase the number of poor in the parish. This was the case especially after the consolidation of notions of parish settlement in 1662. See P. Slack, *Poverty and policy in Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 1988,) esp. pp. 84–5; P. Laslett, 'The family and the collectivity', *Sociology and Social Research* **63** (1979), 432–42; Wrightson, *English society*, 46–8; R. M. Smith, 'The structured dependence of the elderly as a recent development: some skeptical historical thoughts', *Ageing and Society* **4** (1984), 409–28; 'Some issues concerning families and their property', in Smith ed., *Land, kinship, and life-cycle*; N. Goose, 'Household size and structure in early Stuart Cambridge', *Social History* **5** (1980), 347–85; T. Wales, 'Poverty, poor relief and the life-cycle: some evidence from seventeenth-century Norfolk', in Smith ed., *Land, kinship and life-cycle*; and W. Newman Brown, 'The receipt of poor relief and the family situation: Aldenham, Hertfordshire, 1630–1690', *ibid.* More recently, see S. Ottaway, 'Providing

for the elderly in eighteenth-century England', *Continuity and Change* **13** (1998), 391–418. See also Tadmor, *Family and friends*, 109–10, and further discussion in S. Hindle: *On the parish? The micro-politics of poor relief in rural England c. 1550–1750* (Oxford, 2004), esp. ch. 1 and pp. 49–50, and 'Without the cry of any neighbours', in E. Foyster and H. Berry eds., *The family in early modern England* (Cambridge, 2005), and below n. 28.

18 See the critique of the 'new orthodoxy' in Cressy, 'Kinship and kin interaction', esp. p. 44. See also M. Chaytor, 'Household and kinship in Ryton in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries', *History Workshop* **10** (1980), 25–60, cf. K. Wrightson, 'Household and kinship in sixteenth-century England', *History Workshop Journal* **12** (1981), 151–8; D. O'Hara, 'Ruled by my friends: aspects of marriage in the diocese of Canterbury c. 1540–1570', *Continuity and Change* **6** (1991), 9–41; A. Mitson, 'The significance of kinship networks in the seventeenth century: south-west Nottinghamshire', in C. Phythian-Adams ed., *Societies, cultures and kinship 1580–1850* (Leicester, 1993); E. Lord, 'Communities of common interest: the social landscape of South East Surrey, 1750–1850', also in Phythian-Adams ed., *Societies, cultures and kinship*, esp. pp. 162–4; R. Grassby, 'Love, property and kinship: the courtship of Philip Williams, Levant merchant 1617–50', *Economic History Review* **113** (1998), 335–50; B. Reay, 'Kinship and neighbourhood in nineteenth-century rural England: the myth of the autonomous nuclear family', *Journal of Family History* **21** (1996), 87–104; L. Davidoff, M. Doolittle, J. Fink, and K. Holden, *The family story: blood, contract and intimacy, 1830–1960* (London, 1998), 31–3, 39, 86; and Tadmor, *Family and friends*, 112.

19 See also Wrightson, 'Continuity and change'.

20 See Cressy, 'Kinship and kin interaction', 44–9, esp. pp. 44–6 and discussion and references on pp. 40–1; Cressy, *Coming over: migration and communication between England and New England in the seventeenth century* (Cambridge, 1987), 263–91, esp. p. 263. Indeed, as Cressy argues, migration over the Atlantic may have had the effect of heightening the sense of membership in some extended families. For the role of kin in migration to America, see also E. S. Morgan, *The puritan family: religion and domestic relations in seventeenth-century New England* (revised edn, New York, 1996), 150–60; and R. Thompson, *Mobility and migration: East Anglia founders of New England, 1629–1640* (Amherst MA, 1994), esp. pp. 189–204. For the role of kinship in migration to industrializing Lancashire, North America, or Victorian London, see T. K. Hareven, 'The dynamics of kin in an industrial community', in J. Demos and S. S. Boocock eds., *Turning points: historical and sociological essays on the family* (Chicago, 1978); Anderson, *Family structure in nineteenth-century Lancashire*, esp. chs. 5 and 10; and L. H. Lees, *Exiles of Erin: Irish migrants in Victorian London* (Manchester, 1979). See also my discussions in *Family and friends*, esp. chs. 4 and 5, on kinship and friendship and geographical mobility, including negotiations of absence and distance. More recently, see S. M. S. Pearsall, *Atlantic families: lives and letters in the later eighteenth century* (Oxford, 2008).

21 See, for example, J. Boulton, *Neighbourhood and society: a London suburb in the seventeenth century* (Cambridge, 1987), 259–60; P. Clark, 'The migrant in Kentish towns 1500–1700', in P. Clark and P. Slack eds., *Crisis and order in English towns, 1500–1700* (London, 1972), 135–9; V. Brodsky Elliot, 'Single women in the London marriage market: age, status and mobility, 1598–1619', in Outhwaite ed., *Marriage and society*, esp. pp. 93–5; P. Clark and D. Souden eds., *Migration and society in early modern England* (London, 1987); Erickson, *Women and property in early modern England*; Ben-Amos, *Adolescence and youth*, 166–70; and Mitson, 'The significance of kinship

networks'. Note also the points made in Wrightson, 'Postscript', esp. pp. 194–7 and references there.

22 R. Grassby, *The business community of seventeenth-century England* (Cambridge, 1995); 'Love, property and kinship', and *Kinship and capitalism: marriage, family, and business in the English speaking world, 1580–1740* (Cambridge, 2000).

23 C. Muldrew, *The economy of obligation: the culture of credit and social relations in early modern England* (Basingstoke, 1998). Macfarlane famously calculated that only a tenth of Josselin's financial interactions were with kin. Considering the fact that Josselin was a migrant, with relatives mostly elsewhere and a clerical profession which tied him to his immediate locality, the fact that a tenth of his transactions were with kin seems remarkable (Macfarlane, *The family life of Ralph Josselin*, 149). See also earlier studies such as B. A. Holderness, 'Credit in English rural society before the nineteenth century, with special reference to the period 1650–1720', *Agricultural History Review* **24** (1976), 97–109; Wrightson and Levine, *Poverty and piety*, 100–1; M. Spufford, *Contrasting communities: English villagers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries* (Cambridge, 1974), 212–13; Mitson, 'The significance of kinship networks', 62–70; and M. Finn, *The character of credit: personal debt in English culture 1740–1914* (Cambridge, 2004). Scholars also emphasize the relation between financial and sexual credit. See, for example, L. Gowing, 'Gender and the language of insult in early modern London', *History Workshop Journal* **35** (1993), 1–21, and *Domestic dangers: women, words and sex in early modern London* (Oxford, 1996); E. Foyster, *Manhood in early modern England* (Harlow 1999); and A. Shepard, 'Manhood, credit and patriarchy in early modern England, *c*.1580–1640', *Past and Present* **167** (2000), 75–106, and *Meanings of manhood in early modern England* (Oxford, 2004). For the historical meanings of term 'friends', see N. Tadmor, '"Family" and "friend" in *Pamela*: a case study in the history of the family in eighteenth-century England', *Social History* **14**, 3 (1989), 289–306, 'The concept of the household-family', and *Family and friends*, esp. chs. 4–7.

24 Tadmor, *Family and friends*, 189–91. This hidden credit relationship went on for years, unknown even to the debtor's wife. In a similar way Ralph Josselin, for example, extended loans to his sister and brother-in-law, partly on account of their future legacy. Forgetting loans, as Muldrew explains, was a widespread form of charity. Its presence in wills highlights the practice among near kin; see Muldrew, *The economy of obligation*, 261; Cressy, 'Kinship and kin interaction', 51; and Tadmor, *Family and friends*, 128, 178.

25 M. Hunt, *The middling sort: commerce, gender and the family in England, 1680–1780* (Berkeley CA, 1996).

26 M. Mascuch, 'Social mobility and middling self-identity: the ethos of British autobiographers, 1600–1750', *Social History* **2** (1995), 45–61, and *Origins of the individualist self: autobiography and self-Identity in England, 1591–1791* (Cambridge, 1997); K. Wrightson, *Earthly necessities* (New Haven CT, 2000). On the importance and the fear of ruination, see J. Hoppit, *Risk and failure in English business, 1700–1800* (Cambridge, 1987), and B. Supple, *The royal exchange assurance: history of British insurance 1720–1970* (Cambridge, 1970).

27 M. Finn, 'The Barlow bastads: romance comes home from the empire', in J. Bourne Taylor, M. Lobbal, and M. Finn eds., *Legitimacy and illegitimacy in nineteenth-century law, literature and history* (Palgrave, forthcoming).

28 The support of kin and 'friends' – when available – could be invaluable and was utilized in combination with other forms of charity, the kindness of neighbours, and parish support. Evidence from rural communities in Essex, Dorset, Warwickshire, Middlesex, and Staffordshire, studied by Laslett and Smith, for example, reveals a high proportion

of the poor living with kin as elderly inmates. In Cartfield and Poslingford, Suffolk, as Lynn Botelho concludes (in *Old age*), family support was important in assisting the elderly, alongside charitable donations and variable levels of parish relief. As Hindle explains (*On the parish?*, ch. 1, esp. p. 51, and 'Without the cry of any neighbours'), at the poorest levels of the society, households could be extremely unstable and parish policies for child removal and against the harbouring of needy kin, coupled with labour migration, could easily fracture existing networks. Paupers' attempts to maintain alliances despite all this are therefore not only moving but also telling and suggestive; see Laslett, *Family life and illicit love*, esp. pp. 201, 204–5, and Smith, 'Families and their property', 79. See also Wales, 'Poverty, poor relief and the life-cycle', 384–5; Newman Brown, 'The receipt of poor relief', 406–7; T. Hitchcock, P. King and P. Sharpe eds., *Chronicling poverty: the voices and strategies of the English poor, 1640–1840* (Basingstoke, 1997); S. King, *Poverty and welfare in England, 1700–1850: a regional perspective* (Manchester, 2000). See also above, n. 17.

29 Thus, for example, Margaret Parke, an orphan of Tallentire, left work to care for her brother, and Elizabeth Birkett of Crosthwaite, who was bedridden, 'would have starved by now if her sister Susan had not helped her'. The case of Jane Coates reveals that her husband Thomas, afterwas orphaned, was brought up by an aunt (Cumbria Record Office (CRO), Carlisle, Q/11/1/107/10), and Mabel Grayson, a widow, resided with her married daughter and was partly maintained by her son-in-law, in conjunction with parish relief, since she had no means or other 'friends, or relations to help her'. Conversely, when a migrant worker, lost his money, he asked for support to 'carry him to friends' (CRO, Q/11/1/56/27, Q/11/1/116/23). See Hindle, *On the parish?*, 51, 93, 390. I am grateful to Steve Hindle for enabling me to consult his transcripts of the Cumberland Quarter Session petitions.

30 E. Chalus, '"To serve my friends": women and political patronage in eighteenth-century England', in A. Vickery ed., *Women, privilege and power* (Stanford, 2001), and *Elite women in English political life, c. 1754–1790* (Oxford, 2005); R. O'Day ed., *Cassandra Brydges, 1670–1735* (Woodbridge, 2007); C. Campbell Orr, 'Charlotte: scientific queen', in C. Campbell Orr ed., *Queenship in Britain, 1688–1837* (Manchester, 2002), and 'Mrs Delaney and the court', in M. Lard and A. Weisberg-Roberts eds., *Mrs Delaney and her contemporaries* (New Haven and London, 2009), 40–63; H. Smith, *Georgian monarchy: politics and culture, 1714–1760* (Cambridge, 2006); and I. Tague, *Women of quality* (Woodbridge, 2000), and 'Aristocratic women and ideas of family in the early eighteenth century', in Berry and Foyster eds., *The family in early modern England*. As Mears explains, successive Tudor monarchs relied more on social networks formed by kinship, friendship and patronage than on institutional bodies to govern the realm; see N. Mears, 'Court, courtiers and culture', *Historical Journal* **46** (203), 703–22, esp. p. 716. See also, for example, J. Daybell ed., *Women and politics in early modern England, 1450–1700* (Aldershot, 2004), esp. chs. 2 and 7; M. Questier, 'Catholicism, kinship, and the public memory of Sir Thomas More', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* **53** (2002), 476–509, and *Catholicism and community in early modern England* (Cambridge, 2006); Cressy, 'Kinship and kin interaction'; and Tadmor, *Family and friends*, for example p. 117 and ch. 6, and see below, nn. 55–6.

31 Phythian Adams ed., *Societies, cultures and kinship*. Mitson's study of eleven parishes in south-west Nottinghamshire reveals short-distance and extensive kinship networks, connecting members of diverse parishes in 'dynastic families', that permeated through the neighbourhood; see Mitson, 'The significance of kinship networks', 24–76, and also reference there to similar findings by A. Everitt and his definition of 'dynastic families' discussed on pp. 25, 71, and 73. Carter's study of St Ives (Huntingdonshire) shows

similar dense networks both within and around the town; see Carter, 'Town or urban society?', 127–30. In a similar manner, as Wrightson and Levine show, 24 per cent of all the kin mentioned in Terling wills from 1550 to 1699 lived more than 15 miles away from the parish, 32 per cent more than ten miles away, and 44 per cent fewer than ten miles away; see Wrightson, 'Kinship in an English village', 326, and Wrightson and Levine, 'Postscript: Terling revisited', esp. pp. 194–7. For kinship networks in larger urban setting, see e.g. Boulton, *Neighbourhood and society*, and below n. 46. Evidently, studies incorporating several parishes are more likely to reveal kinship networks, which are hard to perceive if the focus is on single parishes.

32 A. Everitt, 'The English urban inn, 1560–1760', in his *Landscape and community in England* (London, 1985), esp. pp. 193–8. These dynastic innkeepers, however, rarely continued in innkeeping for more than three or four generations, and they comprised only a minority of the innholders in the town; see M. Prior, *Fisher row: fishermen, bargemen and canal boatmen in Oxford, 1500–1900* (Oxford, 1982). See also the discussion and references in Cressy, 'Kinship and kin interaction', 44–53. Of the eight youths who left the village of Shepshed, Leicestershire, to be apprenticed in the Brewer's Company in London, four were related either through marriage or blood, with relations including brother, brother-in-law, and cousin; the remaining four were from the same parish (V. Brodsky Elliot, 'Mobility and marriage in pre-Industrial England', unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge (1979), 209–10). 'Apprenticeship was kept in the family, so to speak', as Brodsky Elliot concludes (p. 213).

33 D. O'Hara, 'Ruled by my friends', and *Courtship and constraint: rethinking the making of marriage in Tudor England* (Manchester, 2001). The significance of both affection and familial and material considerations in the choice of marriage partners is importantly discussed in M. Ingram, *Church courts, sex and marriage in England, 1570–1640* (Cambridge, 1987), and in D. Cressy, *Birth marriage and death*.

34 See esp. L. Stone, *Road to divorce: England, 1530–1987* (Oxford, 1992), and *Broken lives: marriage and divorce in England, 1660–1875* (Oxford, 1995); S. D. Amussen, 'Being stirred to much unquietness: violence and domestic violence in early modern England', *Journal of Women's History* **6** (1994), 70–89; J. Bailey, *Unquiet lives: marriage and marriage breakdown in England, 1660–1800* (Cambridge, 2003); E. Foyster, *Marital violence: an English family history 1660–1857* (Cambridge, 2005); and T. Stretton, 'Marriage, separation, and the common law in England 1540–1660', in Berry and Foyster eds., *The family in early modern England*.

35 For figures on celibacy, see E. A. Wrigley and R. S. Schofield, *The population history of England, 1541–1871: a reconstruction* (Cambridge, 1981), table 7.28, p. 260. Childlessness is harder to estimate. In modern societies, as Berry and Foyster discuss, sterility affects between 5 per cent and 13 per cent of all couples (H. Berry and E. Foyster, 'Childless men in early modern England', in Berry and Foyster eds., *The family in early modern England*, 158–86, esp. pp. 161–2; see also E. A. Wrigley, R. S. Davies, J. E. Oeppen, and R. S. Schofield, *English population history from family reconstitution, 1580–1837* (Cambridge, 1997), 354–62)). In particular social groups, such as the English gentry, the problem was evidently more severe: 19 per cent of all first the marriages and 48 per cent of the second or subsequent marriages between 1540 and 1660 are described as childless while in Yorkshire in 1558–1642, despite repeated marriages, nearly a fifth of the resident gentry families died out in the male line (L. Stone, *The crisis of the aristocracy 1558–1641* (Oxford, 1965); F. Heal and C. Holmes, *The gentry in England and Wales 1500–1700* (Basingstoke, 1994), 24). The effects of sterility

and decreased fertility (owing to late marriage) were moreover exacerbated by infant and child mortality which, according to Wrigley and Schofield, affected 17 per cent of infants under the age of one, 26 per cent of children under the age of five, and 38 per cent under the age of 25 around 1650. Laslett's figures for the late eighteenth century suggest that 27.7 per cent of females aged 33 lacked children, 17.7 per cent of those aged 44, 18.7 per cent aged 66, and 27 per cent aged 88, or an average of 22.77 per cent; see his 'Family, kinship and collectivity as systems of support in pre-industrial Europe: a consideration of the "nuclear hardship" hypothesis', *Continuity and Change* **3** (1988), 153–75, esp. p. 163, and 'La parenté en chiffres', *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* **1** (1988), 5–240. The number of parents who outlived their children and may have wanted to cultivate relations with lateral kin was therefore undoubtedly significant. In addition, 20 per cent of families (as Goody argues) were likely to have daughters only and no sons, leading to their often seeking property arrangements with relations by marriage and other kin (Goody, 'Inheritance, property and women: some comparative considerations', in Goody, Thirsk and Thompson eds., *Family and inheritance*, 10). On single women and men see also, e.g., Erickson, *Women and property in early modern England*; C. Peters, 'Single women in early modern England: attitudes and expectations', *Continuity and Change* **12** (1997), 325–45; J. M. Bennet and A. M. Froide, *Singlewomen in the European past 1250–1800* (Philadelphia, 1999); P. Sharpe, 'Dealing with love: the ambiguous independence of the single woman in early modern England', *Gender and History* **11** (1999), 209–32; B. Hill, *Women alone: spinsters in Britain 1660–1850* (London, 2001); A. Bray, *The friend* (Chicago, 2003); A. Froide, *Never married: singlewomen in early modern England* (Oxford, 2005); and Berry and Foyster, 'Childless men in early modern England'.

36 E. A. Wrigley, *People, cities, and wealth: the transformation of a traditional society* (Oxford, 1989), 13.

37 Macfarlane, *Individualism*, 146.

38 A kinship system that highlights the individual and the nuclear family is 'particularly well adapted to an industrial and individualistic system'; Macfarlane, *Individualism*, 146, 198–201; *The family life of Ralph Josselin*, 159, n. 4, and 'The myth of peasantry; family and economy in a northern parish', in Smith ed., *Land, kinship and life-cycle*, 344–5, n. 38. In contrast, other kinship systems are seen as typical of 'peasant societies'. Crucially, Macfarlane believes that the individual is 'symbolised and shaped by his … kinship system' (*Individualism*, 196). My approach, as demonstrated below and elsewhere, highlights rather the social and cultural meanings of kinship and the active appropriation of kinship, while investigating social relations and cultural perceptions in historical contexts.

39 'To have survived the Black Death, the Reformation, the Civil War, and the move to the factories and the cities, the system must have been fairly durable and flexible. Indeed, it could be argued that it was its extreme individualism, the simplest form of molecular structure, which enabled it to survive and allowed society to change. Furthermore, if the family system pre-dated, rather than followed on, industrialization, the causal link may have to be reversed, with industrialization as the consequence rather than a cause, of the basic nature of the family'; see Macfarlane, *Individualism*, 198; see also, e.g., p. 196, with regard to the individualistic Englishman and his kinship system: 'it is no longer possible to "explain" the origins of English individualism in terms of either Protestantism, population change, the development of a market economy at the end of the middle ages … Individualism, however defined, predates the sixteenth century changes and can be said to shape them all', and Macfarlane, *The family life of Ralph Josselin*, 159.

40 See also Tadmor, *Family and friends*, and J. Carsten, *Cultures of relatedness: new approaches to the study of kinship* (Cambridge, 2000).

41 See especially the discussions in J. Goody, 'The evolution of the family', in Laslett and Wall eds., *Household and family in past time*, 103–24, and Goody, *The development of the family and marriage in Europe* (Cambridge, 1983), as well as studies highlighting the universality of the nuclear family in its own right or as a component within other family types, and questioning the necessary correlation between it and industrial growth, such as G. P. Murdock, *Social structure* (New York, 1949), and S. M. Greenfield, 'Industrialization and the family in sociological theory'; *American Journal of Sociology* **67**, (1961), 312–32.

42 See Chaytor, 'Household and kinship', esp. pp. 29, 38, and the questioning of the category of the 'extended family' and 'the myth of the extended family' in Goody, 'The evolution of the family', esp. pp. 119 and 124; M. Segalen, *Historical anthropology of the family* (Cambridge 1986), 14; and Tadmor, 'The concept of the household-family', 133–4, and *Family and friends*, esp. p. 37 and ch. 4.

43 See the discussions in Tadmor, *Family and friends*, 163–4 and 273–4 and esp. pp. 133–6.

44 Macfarlane, *The family life of Ralph Josselin*, esp. pp. 126, 149; Tadmor, *Family and friends*, 138 and nn.

45 Tadmor, 'The concept of the household-family', 127–30, and *Family and friend*s, 31–4.

46 Wrightson, *English society*, 45; Cressy, 'Kinship and kin interaction', 53; Boulton, *Neighbourhood and society*, e.g. 260: 'it seems possible … that a substantial minority of Broughside households were involved in locally based kin networks', despite the low presence of kin within individual parishes. See also Tadmor, *Family and friends*, esp. chs. 4 and 5, e.g. pp. 140–1, 191, 274–6. In a similar way, for example, historians now emphasize the ways in which inheritance patterns, even when marked by primogeniture, entailed broader commitments on behalf of parents and siblings, for elder sons inherited not only assets but also obligations and the reputations of families also depended on junior or lesser kin.

47 Macfarlane, *Individualism*; see also his *The family life of Ralph Josselin*, 'The myth of peasantry', *Marriage and love in England: modes of reproduction 1300–1840* (Oxford, 1986), and *Culture of capitalism*.

48 See e.g. P. Earle, *The making of the English middle class: business, society and family life in London 1660–1730* (London, 1989); Grassby, *The business community*; D. Hancock, *Citizens of the world: London merchants and the integration of the British Atlantic community, 1735–85* (Cambridge, 1995); Hunt, *The middling sort*; Muldrew, *The economy of obligation*; Mascuch, 'Social mobility and middling self-identity'; Wrightson, *Earthly necessities*; Gowing, *Domestic dangers*; Tadmor, *Family and friends*; Shepard, *Meanings of manhood*; and Pearsall, *Atlantic families*. See also note 26, above.

49 See Tadmor, 'Family and friends', chs. 5 and 6.

50 See H. Medick and D. W. Sabean, *Interest and emotion: essays on the study of family and kinship* (Cambridge, 1984), esp. their chapter 'Interest and emotion in family and kinship studies: a critique of social history and anthropology'; K. Lynch, *Individuals, families and communities in Europe, 1200–1800: the urban foundations of Western society* (Cambridge, 2003), 9–11. See also M. Segalen, *Love and power in the peasant family: rural France in the nineteenth century* (Oxford, 1983).

51 Tadmor, 'The concept of the household-family', 124, and *Family and friends*, e.g. 28–9, 175–8, 191–2, 193–4, 259.

52 Ben-Amos, *Adolescence and youth*, and I. K. Ben-Amos, 'Gifts and favors: informal support in early modern England', *Journal of Modern History* **72** (2000), 295–338; note also her argument that kin support was 'simply indispensible' in facilitating the

apprenticeship of youths. Life-cycle mobility of youths thus tended to 'awaken kinship ties' and reinforce the special social and moral obligations associated with kinship (Ben-Amos, *Adolescence and youth*, 165–70).

53 See O'Hara, 'To be ruled by my friends', and *Courtship and constraint*.

54 L. B. Namier, *The Structure of politics at the accession of George III* (London, 1957; 1st publ. 1929).

55 See note 30 above, and also key works such as J. Walter, 'A rising of the people – the Oxfordshire Rising of 1596', *Past and Present* **107** (1985), 105; A. Fletcher, *A county community in peace and war* (London, 1975), 44–8, 52 (also cited in Wrightson, *English society*, 48); and L. Colley, *In defiance of oligarchy: the Tory party 1714–60* (Cambridge, 1982). As Cressy explains (also quoting important work by Everitt), '"Clan loyalty" and the "forces of kinship" often cut across political loyalties during the century of Charles I's reign, and, far from eroding, kinship ties of this sort often lay behind political alliances or commercial enterprises in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries' (Cressy, 'Kinship and kin interaction', 49). See also Chalus, 'To serve my friends'.

56 R. E. Prothero ed., *Private letters of Edward Gibbon* (*1753–94*) (London, 1896), vol. I, 23–4, quoted in Namier, *Structure of politics*, 18. This is discussed in Perkin, *Origins of modern English society*, 45, and Tadmor, *Family and friends*, 213–14.

57 Nancy was dependent on her uncle and clearly expressed her disappointment with her near kin. On one occasion, for example, she thanked her uncle for giving her some money and at the same time complained, 'I never have a farthing from any other of my Relations notwithstanding I have a Mother and Brother who have plenty of money'; see N. Woodforde, 'Nancy Woodforde: a diary for the year 1792', in D. Woodforde ed., *Woodforde papers and diaries* (London, 1932), 38–9 (9 January 1792), and Tadmor, *Family and friends*, 115, 123, 126.

58 Ralph Josselin, *The diary of Ralph Josselin, 1616–1683*, ed. A. Macfarlane, Records of Social and Economic History, new ser. 3 (Oxford, 1991), records for 1636–1639, pp. 5–6; however, note the help of his uncles.

59 See L. Pollock's innovative article, 'Anger and negotiation of relationships in early modern England', *Historical Journal* **47** (2004), 567–90. For negative relations and disputes, see also the discussion and references in Lynch, *Individuals, families and communities in Europe*, and J. Thirsk, 'The debate on inheritance', in Goody, Thirsk and Thompson eds., *Family and inheritance*. See Muldrew, *The economy of obligation*, on litigation following breaches of trust.

60 S. Yanagisako, *Producing culture and capital: family firms in Italy* (Princeton, 2002), e.g. 115, 143.

61 See Laslett's findings on the consistent presence of kin in family-households in a sample of 100 communities from 1599 to 1854, in his 'Characteristics of the Western family', 22–3, and also my comment above, n. 15 and critiques in 'The concept of the household-family' and *Family and friends*.

62 For the 'fear of ruination' and risk limitation in early modern England, see above, n. 23.

63 As Carol Dyhouse has shown with regard to the years between the First and Second World Wars, 'the networks of family obligation spread wide, and grandparents and godparents, aunts, uncles, and other relations frequently gave support' to enable children's education. Siblings also extended help, in particular elder brothers and sisters who were in employment and assisted their siblings: 'Going to university in England between the wars: access and funding, *History of Education* **31** (2002), 1–14, esp. p. 13. Compare, for example, Ben-Amos's findings concerning the 'indispensible' role of kin

in facilitating the apprenticeship and professional training of youths in early modern England, (see above, n. 52), and Thomas Turner's active interest in the education and professional training of his siblings and half-nephews, explored by me in *Family and friends*, 27, 31–3, 38, 180–1 and 186–8; see also Cressy, 'Kinship and kin interaction', 50.

64 S. Szreter, *Fertility, class and gender in Britain 1860–1940* (Cambridge, 1996); E. Garret, A. Reid, K. Scurer, and S. Szreter, *Changing family size in England and Wales 1891–1911: place, class and demography* (Cambridge, 2001); S. Szreter, *Health and wealth: studies in history and policy* (New York, 2005), esp. ch. 3.

65 For 2005, the Office of National Statistics reported that 45 per cent of couples divorced, with the highest rate of divorce in couples married for under ten years. By 2008 the rate had fallen and was the lowest number recorded since 1977 (possibly also reflecting a general fall in marriages), and 20 per cents lower than the peak of divorce cases recorded in 1993. In 2006, 39 per cent of all marriages were remarriages for one or both parties, whereas 61 per cent were first marriages. By comparison, in 1940, 91 per cent of all marriages were first marriages. Remarriages rose by about a third 1971–1972, following the introduction of the Divorce Reform Act of 1969, but have fallen thereafter; see figures provided by the Office of National Statistics at http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id = 322 and http://www.statistics.gov.uk/downloads/theme_population/Population_Trends_131_web.pdf (both accessed 9 January 2009). See also, for example, K. E. Kiernan, 'Cohabitation and divorce across nations and generations,' in P. L. Chase-Lansdale, K. Kiernan and R. Friedman eds., *Human development across lives and generations: the potential for change* (Cambridge, 2004), 139–70.

66 The census of 2001 recorded that 40 per cent of all live births occurred outside marriage. Figures for 2007 show 44 per cent (with 65 per cent of babies registered jointly by cohabiting parents, 20.1 per cent by both parents under a different address and 15 per cent by sole mothers). The figure for 1960 is 6 per cent. Such figures also attract public interest, as is evident, for example, in the *Daily Mail* headline for 13 December 2007 (*Daily Mail*, at http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-501865/More-half-British-babies-born-marriage.html), or a BBC report from 2004 (at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4733330.stm); see also the figures provided by the Office of National Statistics at http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id = 716 and http://www.statistics.gov.uk/downloads/theme_population/Population-Trends-134.pdf (all accessed 9 January 2009).

67 L. Davidoff discusses the change in legal and moral discourse away from notions of incest to notions of abuse; see 'The meanings and boundaries of kinship', paper delivered at the Ellen McArthur Fund workshop 'Kinship in Britain and beyond, 500–2000', Cambridge, 25–6 July 2005.

68 See, for example, discussions of the demise of the modern nuclear family from the 1960s and 1970s, leading to the creation of the post-modern family, in J. Stacey, *Brave new families: stories of domestic upheaval* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1998), esp. p. 6; F. K. Goldscheider and L. J. Waite, *New families, no families? The transformation of the American home* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1991); K. Weston, *Families we choose: lesbians, gays, kinship* (New York, 1992); and J. Weeks, B. Heaphy and C. Donovan, *Same sex intimacies: families of choice and other life experiments* (London and New York, 2001).

69 Stone, *Road to divorce*, 417. In early modern England, one marriage in three was broken prematurely by the death of one partner before the end of the wife's fecund period and mortality risks continued thereafter. 'It was only in the early 1770s', as Anderson notes,

'that half of any marriage cohort could have celebrated a silver wedding' (M. Anderson, 'What is new about the modern family', Occasional Papers of the Office of Population Censuses & surveys, *The Family* **31** (1983), reprinted in M. Deake ed., *Time, family and community: perspectives on family and community history* (Oxford, 1993), 76). In 1993/4, 36.2 per cent of those married for up to 20 years divorced, and in 2005 37.5 per cent; see Stone, *The family, sex and marriage*, 55–6; D. Levine, *Reproducing families: a political economy of English population history* (Cambridge, 1987), 79. For mortality and life expectancy, see Wrigley and Schofield, *The population history of England*, e.g. pp. 228–36, 248–53, 412–17, 452–3; for marriage, see e.g. pp. 189–91, 257–65, 421–30. For divorce figures, see http://www.statistics.gov.uk/downloads/theme_population/ Population_Trends_131_web.pdf (accessed 11 January 2009). Note, however, differences in the economic bases of families post-bereavement and post-divorce, and differences in the subjective and social understanding of such experiences. Note also changes in the age-specific context of family break-up when change over time is considered, as suggested in R. Wall, 'Historical development of the household in Europe', in E. van Imhoff, A. Kuijsten, P. Hooimeijer and L. van Wissen eds., *Household demography and household modelling* (New York, 1995).

70 See e.g. figures in Laslett, 'Characteristics of the Western family', 22–3, and also discussions of 'single person's families' in Tadmor, 'The concept of the household-family' and *Family and friends*, esp. chs. 1–2.

71 See Tadmor, 'The concept of the household-family', and *Family and friends*, chs. 1 and 2, and more broadly M. Anderson, 'The origins of the modern life cycle', *Social History* **10** (1985).

72 They are also attracting attention; see for instance 'The dynamics, networks and social capital of "the household-family", 1750–1850', topic of the sixth Gustav Wasa seminar, Department of History and Ethnology, University of Jyväskylä, Finland, 6–7 June 2008.

73 *Family and friends*, ch. 4 and 165.

74 See 'partner' in *OED online*.

75 *OED online*.

76 See Tadmor, 'Inequality among siblings', and an array of usages discussed in *Family and friends*, ch. 4.

77 See 'brother Jeremy' and 'sister Betty', in Josselin, *Diary*, 19 (4 September 1644) and 246 (19 May 1651). The same entry also includes a reference to 'Jeremy and wife'. For 'brother Worral', see 124 (2 May 1648), 543 (1 July 1668), and 593 (13 Sept. 1676). See also 'sister Hodson', 569 (14 September 1673). In a similar way, the Lancashire gentleman Nicholas Blundell wrote an account of his daughter's wedding, naming her by her new name: 'Gloves given at my Daughter Coppingers Marriage'. Similarly he re-named his second daughter (*The great diurnal of Nicholas Blundell of Little Crosby, Lancashire*, 3 vols. (1720–1728), The Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, ed. J. J. Bayley, transcribed and annotated F. Tyrer (Preston, 1968–1972), vol. III (1720–28), 259, 261)). Samuel Richardson was quick to refer to his married daughter by her new name, 'my daughter Ditcher' (*The correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, ed. A. L. Barbauld, 6 vols. (London, 1804), vol. II, 46.) James Woodforde's way of referring to his beloved sister changed over the years from 'sister Jenny' or 'sister Jane' to 'My Sister Pouncett' (W. N. Hargreaves-Mawdsley ed., *Woodforde at Oxford, 1759–76* (Oxford, 1969), 64 (15 Dec. 1761), 66 (22 Dec. 1761), 90 (30 Oct. 1762), 92 (8 Nov. 1762), 109 (5 Feb. 1763), 230 (9 June 1774), etc. See also I. Schapera, *Kinship terminology in Jane Austen's novels*, Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland Occasional Paper no. 33 (London, 1977).

78 See esp. *Family and friends*, ch. 4, and the principles of 'recognition and opacity', 'incorporation and differentiation', and 'plurality', which are characteristic of the early modern language of kinship.

79 Tadmor, *Family and friends*, ch. 4 and esp. pp. 165–6.

80 See the discussion of 'recognition and opacity' in Tadmor, *Family and friends*, ch. 4, 122–32.

81 The broad scope of 'revisionist' studies is evident, for example, in works by Hajnal and Laslett (see note 14 above). Note also the comparative dimension of Macfarlane's work, highlighting English exceptionalism.

82 See, for example, S. Kettering, *Patrons, brokers, and clients in seventeenth-century France: the Parlement of Aix, 1629–1659* (Oxford, 1986), 'Friendship and clientage in early modern France', *French History* **6** (1992) 139–58, and *Patronage in 16th- and 17th-century France* (Aldershot, 2004); R. Mettam, *Power and faction in Louis XIV's France* (Oxford, 1988); and P. Campbell, *The ancien régime in France* (Oxford, 1988), ch. 3.

83 See in particular the networks of family and the dense and overlapping webs of *vrunden*, explored by A. Goldgar, with particular focus on the 1630s, in her *Tulipmania: money, honour and knowledge in the Dutch golden age* (Chicago, 2007), e.g. pp. 18, 139–40, 151–3, 167–70, 182, 223, 292. More broadly, and with particular reference to the elite and the state, see J. Adams, *Ruling families and merchant capitalism in early modern Europe* (Ithaca NY, 2005).

84 Goldgar, *Tulipmania*, 167–9.

85 See, for example, Grassby, *The business community*, 'Love, property and kinship', and *Kinship and capitalism*; Hancock, *Citizens of the world*; L. Müller, 'The Swedish East India trade and international markets: re-exports of teas, 1731–1813', *Scandinavian Economic History Review* **51** (2003), 28–44, and 'Scottish and Irish entrepreneurs in eighteenth-century Sweden: East India trade and iron', in D. Dickson, J. Parmentier, and J. Ohlmeyer eds., *Irish and Scottish mercantile networks in Europe and overseas in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries* (Ghent, 2007); J. Price, 'The imperial economy, 1700–1770', in Marshall, *The Oxford history of the British empire*, vol. II: *The eighteenth century* (Oxford, 1998); H. V. Bowen, *Elites, enterprise, and the making of the British overseas empire, 1688–1775* (Macmillan, 1996); and Pearsall, *Atlantic families*.

86 See the works quoted in the above note and in note 83 and, e.g., S. Subrahmanyam ed., *Merchant networks in the early modern world* (Aldershot, 1996), and C. A. P. Antunes, *Globalisation in the early modern period: the economic relationship between Amsterdam and Lisbon, 1640–1705* (Amsterdam, 2004). Likewise, the 'associates' described by Hancock drew heavily on obligations among 'friends', made strategic marriages, extended strategic loans so as to create obligations, and combined blood relations with other ties in order to both cement relationships and spread risks. Thus, although they started their way as 'outsiders' in the London business world, they both drew on and further created networks of kinship and connectedness. In their London counting house, as Hancock describes 'almost all but the lowest were introduced to the firm by relatives, friends, or clients of partners'. Both success and failure were thus understood in familial terms and employed in cementing kinship and family ties; see Hancock, *Citizens of the world*, 58, 64, 106–7, 243–6, 250 and esp. p. 109. In a similar way, Irish and Scottish merchants, who found it hard to break into English networks, nonetheless established themselves in Sweden, where they eventually linked with local merchants through marriages and so on, and continued to play a major role in the Swedish iron trade for more than a century (Müller, 'Scottish and Irish entrepreneurs'). For Jewish networks, see F. Trivellato, *The familiarity of strangers: the Sephardic diaspora,*

Livorno, and cross-cultural trade in the early modern period* (New Haven, 2009) also emphasizing, however, the uniqueness of the Jewish networks.

87 K. Pomeranz, *The great divergence: China, Europe, and the making of the modern world economy* (Princeton, 2000).

88 Berry and Foyster, *The family in early modern England*, 'Introduction', 17.

89 Wrigley, *People, cities, and wealth*, 13, and above n. 36.

90 F. Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean world in the age of Philip II* (New York, 1973), vol. II, 1244.