Love in Families (Joanne Begiato)

120 word contributor's bio

Joanne Begiato is Professor of History at Oxford Brookes University. She specialises in the history of masculinities, emotions, material culture, family, and marriage. She has published three books to date: *Unquiet Lives: Marriage and Marriage Breakdown in England, 1660-1800* (2003), *Parenting in England 1760-1830: emotion, identity, and generation* (2012), and *Manliness in Britain, 1760-1900: bodies, emotion, and material culture* (2020). She has co-authored with William Gibson *Sex and the Church in the Long Eighteenth Century: Religion, Enlightenment and the Sexual Revolution* (2017) and co-edited volumes on early modern law and litigation, and military and maritime masculinities.

150 word abstract for online system

This chapter traces how love was a factor in creating, sustaining, and curtailing family-household relationships, shaping who was included or excluded. It shows that numerous intersecting hierarchies, determined by patriarchal and colonial societies and cultures, influenced how love in families operated. In relationships structured by power differentials, for example, love was used to rationalise or justify unequal authority, to prevent the abuse of power, and as a means for those in the 'inferior' position to negotiate, ameliorate, or mediate relationships. Family members also used love, often in a material or symbolic form, to remember and memorialise relatives and advance a family's social, economic, and political interests. Furthermore, familial love was one way in which individuals constructed public identities and was used as a concept to define human identities collectively, whether at the level of community, nation, or even species.

c. 8 keywords for online system

love, family, affection, power, patriarchy, empire

List of key terms/words for the index

(10,009 words excluding this front material)

Love in Families

Introduction

Innumerable letters between family members ended in a declaration of love. Many follow a familiar format. In 1779 the schoolboy, John Forth's short note home ended: 'So I must conclude with Duty to you and my Mother and love to all my Brothers & Sisters. I am your most Dutiful son' (Forth 1779). When the teenager William Shaw wrote to his brother John thanking him for walking from Stafford to visit him in Wigan, he closed: 'Please to Give my Duty to Papa & mama & love to Dear Sis[t]ers except [sic, meaning accept] the same yourself' (Shaw, 1801). Love was often collective, sent from one family to another. In 1782, Elizabeth Taylor ended her letter to her father reporting on a failed courtship: 'All our Family send their kindest wishes to you & yours & Dan joins with me, in Duty to your self, & Love to the rest of the Family' (Taylor 1782: 15). Other expressions of love were specific to spouses, such as the term 'sweetheart' (Barclay 2011: 105). For all their ubiquity, sometimes mundanity, such expressions of love offer important insights into family dynamics across time (Bruce 2014: 247, 252). Even in their most declamatory and formulaic versions, they reveal the varied nature of familial love and its function in the age of Enlightenment, simultaneously a commodity to be exchanged, a rhetorical gesture to bridge distances, a means to seek support and approval, a pledge and reminder of affection, and a philosophical concept to ponder.

To understand how central love was to constructions of family life in the British Isles, Western Europe, Colonial North America, the Caribbean, and Colonial India in the age of Enlightenment it is first vital to acknowledge the multiplicity of family forms and familial love. Families and family membership were extensive, incorporating

spouses, parents and children, grandparents, siblings, step relations, who might be co-resident or live apart, non-normative unmarried partners who set up homes together, resident household members contracted or coerced into providing labour, such as servants, apprentices, and slaves, and non-human family members, such as domestic pets. Love in families is also a deceptively simple term that encompasses numerous cognate emotions, including romantic feelings, bonds of duty and obligation, affection, and devotion, as well as compassion and pity, grief and loss. Though most often visible when expressed and symbolised in written and visual forms, love also had physical and material characteristics, which are less easily detected in the archival record. It was expressed through bodies, as desire and sexual contact. For eighteenth-century society, children were 'pledges' of spousal love (Bailey 2012: 22-26). Still, sex acts should not be read universally as indicators of love. It was also embodied in actions, including caring for children and the elderly, nursing the sick, nurturing minds and souls through teaching, feeding family members, keeping a house and its objects well-tended and clean, and petting domestic animals. It might, in some cases, be traced in bequests, though this is difficult to determine when the testator did not use words of affection, or in cases where beneficiaries were illegitimate offspring or mixed-race children and an attachment of love can only be inferred (Donington 2020: 6). Attempts to assess familial love are made more complex when contemporary commentators considered love to be instinctive or natural, yet also condemned it as artificial and instrumental in certain circumstances.

For all its ambiguities, what is evident is that the feelings and acts clustering around love are historicisable, refracted as they were through moral teachings and unequal power structures shaped by gender, race, social rank, and sexuality in a period driven by rapid social, economic, political, and cultural change, and new global

encounters. The sentiment of love, furthermore, was inflected by legal, social, and cultural trends specific to the long eighteenth century, rooted in natural law, the cultures of sensibility, and nascent romanticism. As this chapter shows, numerous intersecting hierarchies determined by patriarchal and colonial societies and cultures influenced how love in families operated, since they defined concepts of love, as well as who was permitted to show, receive, and give it (Donington 2020: 180). Identified as the point of entry into family life, love was thus a factor in creating, sustaining, and curtailing various types of family-household relationships, and a guide to who might be included or not. Family members also used love, often in a material or symbolic form, to remember and memorialise relatives and advance a family's social, economic, and political interests. In relationships so structured by power differentials, love was also used to rationalise or justify unequal authority, to prevent the abuse of power, and as a means for those in the 'inferior' position to negotiate, ameliorate, or mediate relationships. Furthermore, in an age of feeling, familial love was one of the ways in which individuals constructed public identities; through it, they defined their sense of self and anchored themselves in a rapidly changing world. Finally, love in families also helped to define human identities collectively, whether at the level of community, nation, or even species.

The role of love in creating, sustaining, and ending family ties

Love generated and sustained happy families. A writer on the subject of 'domestic happiness or misery' in the *Lady's Magazine* defined the successful family as the 'virtuous and well-regulated family of love, where peace and harmony, health and happiness, create and are created by every passing action of the day'. Like many commentators, this writer saw the exemplary family as flowing outwards from a marriage made for reasons of affection rather than wealth accumulation (*Lady's*

Magazine 1790: 351-3; Tague 2001: 81, 84). In May 1782, the Reverend Henry Taylor wrote to the widowed Mrs Courtauld about his son's hopes to marry her daughter. He acknowledged that several factors threatened marital success, like lack of money, or dissipation; but when a couple 'have a real love to one another, as I hope these have, they will expect their happiness IN one another' (Mordecai 1782: 19).

Just as people were advised to marry for love, family members were instructed that reciprocal love was essential to orderly and dutiful family life. It would help wives to obey their husbands and support spouses navigating difficult times (Bailey 2003: 135; Barclay 2011: 60-1, 107, 119; Tague 2001: 85-6). For example, Hugh, Earl of Marchmont, writing in 1750 to his wife Elizabeth, defined their love as a union of minds and souls. Nonetheless, his love was channelled through his husbandly authority, and, perhaps, her wifely compliance, as he explained:

> you reign my Eliza alone in mine (heart), & every sentiment of it, is subservient to you ... as long as you love me, the most endearing word to my thoughts is wife, because it implies my possession & enjoyment of you[r] whole love for all my life ... I must be first, & superior, in your heart & thoughts (Barclay 2001: 117).

Family members implored their relations to be loving, since this would sustain them in challenging periods. George Hearne (1648-1723), parish clerk of White Waltham, wrote to his son Thomas Hearne (1678-1735) on 1 May 1722:

> I feare a very sickly summer aproching—God prevent it! The [Lord] Bless you all, my poor dear Children,— I pray for you night & day,— and be Loving to one another after I am laid in my Grave; and pray be Kind to my poor d[e]are wife, and God will bless you.' [PS.] 'Son, my Wife gives her true love to you, and

> prays for you, and will love you for my sake, for, I thank God, wie [sic] live lovingly, and so, I hope, we shall Die, and the Lord grant us a happy death and a joyfull Resurrection. Amen. Amen. (Hearne 1722)

While love was central to the formation and maintenance of family life, cultural commentators insisted that it should be felt and practised within bounds, subject to regular monitoring and calibration. Physical love for a spouse, for example, could risk the heat of uncontrolled lust, which undermined conjugal chastity. This was a term that not only distinguished licit from illicit sex, but described 'good' sex within marriage, that is carried out with restraint, here framed as chasteness. In some respects, marital love was a way to regulate sexual desire, which was seen as a law of nature (Gibson and Begiato 2017: 173-5, 178, 192). Where parental love was concerned, writers on childcare called on scripture to warn that love for offspring ought to be equitable, since either its surfeit or deficit was harmful. 'A Mother's Failings' published in the *Lady's Magazine*, in 1784, warned: Parents cannot be too cautious of being partial to one child more than to another, or of loving one child above the rest of their children, lest it should prove, as it often has done, in times past, the ruin and destruction of the beloved object, and planting of a thorn in their dying pillows' (*Lady's Magazine* 1784: 86). Love should be measured, or it would cause children to suffer materially, emotionally, and psychologically, due to their parents' caprice and through no fault of their own.

As these examples indicate, love 'was a social product, framed and shaped by and through the social, economic, and legal networks' of a particular location and time (Barclay 2019: 113). One illustration of this is the way in which marriage's economic functions translated the legal obligations of husbands' provision and wives' housekeeping into acts of love for a spouse and offspring (Barclay 2015: 582, 586).

This could have unintended consequences, since the same framework could be applied by those involved in non-conforming relationships, such as unmarried couples, to seek access to financial or emotional support (Holloway 2016; Gibson 2020). When Gilbert Innes' (1751-1832) mistresses wrote to him, for instance, they positioned their sexual availability and his economic provision as an affective exchange, akin to spouses' roles (Barclay 2015: 583). Another instance where love might be traced through acts of care is when biological family members other than parents, such as grandparents, took on the rearing, education, and training of illegitimate children. Given unmarried women's inability to financially provide for their offspring, and the shame that was attached to bearing illegitimate children, their care was often dispersed across other members of the community, raising questions of how they experienced love (Barclay 2019: 107-110, 112, 117). Familial obligation could create love, and vice-versa. After eight of his illegitimate children were left motherless, when his mistress Effie Burnet died in 1793, Innes told his sister: 'I never thought I cared much for them till they had nobody else to take Charge of them' (Barclay 2015: 586). Even so, love for illegitimate children was, as will be explored later, constructed and limited by notions of class and race.

As this shows, love was not mapped solely onto relationships legally formed through 'blood' or marriage. Societies saw love as an active agent that could create and bind non-biologically related individuals in families and generate fictive kinship from which emotional, economic, and political connections and loyalty emanated. Continuing into the eighteenth century in European, Asian, and Islamic cultures, fostering and wet-nursing were thought to establish quasi blood links and, thus, affection, between the children and their nurse or foster parents, and between foster-siblings or 'milk-brothers'. As the Englishman Thomas Dineley, noted in his journal in

1680, Irish nurses were ‘very tender and good to the children of others of high degree, and most commonly their love is more to them than their own, this begets a relacion & kindred without end’ (Tait 2020: 2, 4, 11). As this indicates, such relationships did not end in childhood, with love cultivated through the exchange of gifts, loans, favours, and bequests between foster and birth families (Tait 2020: 18). Love in these instances did more than facilitate child-rearing and training, it also created political alliances between families.

<Insert Figure 2.1. around here>

<Caption/> Wet nursing??</Caption>

Love had a similar centripetal force when families were fluid, varying across the life-course with periods of separation as well as co-residence, comprised of connections that were biological and household, and often blended due to family breakdown and bereavement. In the latter forms, it could offer security for members of reconfigured families. It was, for instance, at the heart of cultural and legal representations of step-parenting. Step and blended families following remarriage were common across Europe (Warner 2016: 480-1). As part of the practices of child wet nursing, fosterage, and training noted above, children did not always live in the same household as their full, half, or stepsiblings (Warner 2016: 486). Even while this may have alleviated tensions between offspring of successive marriages, step-parents were still viewed as problematic figures who threatened progeny from previous unions (Bailey 2012: 239; Wilson 2014: 45-7, 49-52). Remarriage had manifold repercussions for the transmission of property across generations and was likely to divert inheritances away from the children of a previous union. Along with the law, love was therefore a potential guard against such challenges to lineages. Labouring and

merchant widows in late eighteenth-century Austria, for example, sought new husbands with two key qualities in mind: their economic contributions and their ability to care for and show affection towards step-children (Lanzinger 2018). Moreover, in the age of sensibility, step-family bonds were expected to be loving. Step-mothers in Britain and America defined themselves in their life-writing as loving mothers and used the language of love in their correspondence with their step-children; in turn step-children accepted new family arrangements with the same affectionate rhetoric (Bailey 2012: 240; Wilson 2014: 22). When Elizabeth Byles' first step-mother died in 1787, while living in Nova Scotia, she wrote to her aunts in Boston:

> What a scene of distress, I have experience'd. The loss of a valuable Mother … I miss my poor Mother greatly, every Day I meet with something or another that brings her fresh to my Mind. She was an Amiable Character, & was Exemplary in her Conduct to us: She deserv'd every Mark of Gratitude, & filial Affection that we could possibly shew her (Wilson 2014: 63-64).

Love in the family could extend beyond affinity or consanguinity to bind people who periodically resided in the household. Un-related servants and apprentices were, in their master and mistresses' eyes, at least, family members ('household-families', Tadmor 2001). This could result in longer-term relationships between employers and servants defined as loving ones. The Reverend John Murgatroyd's love for his household servant, Phoebe Beaston, and her illegitimate daughter, so beautifully told by Carolyn Steedman, offers such an instance. Murgatroyd (1719-1806) was a clergyman who resided in Slaithwaite, in the West Riding of Yorkshire. Beaston joined his service in 1785, tending to his home and his wife and sister in their dying years. In 1802, she bore a child, fathered by a man who refused to marry her. Now in his eighties, Murgatroyd did not berate his servant or turn her out; he cared for her, got

help for her around the house during her pregnancy, and called her and her little girl ‘my small Family’. His love for ‘beloved Elizabeth’ was expressed in his writings, and in his will when he died at 87 years old. Beaston and her daughter received the greater part of the £1000 he had amassed, along with furniture from his home (Steedman 2007: 2-3, 51-2, 183, 188-91). Yet there was slippage in the reading of love into physical care. Servants were often remembered in memoirs as sources of love for the children for whom they cared, but these accounts could be ambivalent. Thomas Wright (1736-1797) reported that his grandmother’s maid, Mary Moore, who she employed ‘chiefly for the sake of nursing and waiting on me’ sometimes paid more attention to her sweetheart when tasked with caring for him. Still, he also conceded,

> though I believe her to have been blameable with respect to her freedoms with my grandmother’s property, yet as I have reason to believe she repented of this, and always manifested a parental love and regard for me to the day of her death, common gratitude requires from me this little tribute to her memory. (Wright, 1864, 23-24).

While servants who cared for children were often recalled with fondness for their loving duty, they were sometimes left unnamed, identified solely by their socially inferior position of nurse (Bailey 2012: 214-18).

A queer approach to eighteenth-century families, which challenges heteronormative binaries and includes people in non-normative relationships within the definition of family, provides further evidence of the ways in which love was central in forging family relationships that extended beyond consanguinity or affinity. The young gentlewoman Dorothea Maunsell and the Italian Castrato Guisto Ferdinando Tenducci (1735-1790), for example, underwent two wedding ceremonies in 1766 and

1767, both of which were of dubious legal status in canon law due to his debated capacity to consummate the marriage. Yet, the couple's public declarations of affection and family played a part in securing their social acceptance among some British elite individuals (Berry 2012: 36, 37, 40). Same-sex couples who shared homes with companions and servants also perceived themselves to be families, forged by and expressed through love and care for each other, even though their relationships were not formed around a conventional marriage and the parenting of offspring. In these cases, familial archives are unavailable or unhelpful, so material culture helps instead to show the way love could be expressed and sustained through objects. Cousins Mary and Jane Parminter, for example, who had a private income following their parents' deaths, lived together at A la Ronde, Exmouth, Devon, from 1796 to 1811. Their home, a space they decorated together, furnished from objects collected and found in their locale and on their Continental tour as well as inherited from their wider family, self-consciously embodied feminine and 'familial bonds' (Gowrley 2022: chap 3 xx). When unrelated same-sex couples cohabited, their deep affection for each other could similarly be expressed and sustained through their material environs. Lady Eleanor Butler (1739–1829) and Sarah Ponsonby (1755–1831) lived together for half a century. Their affectionate relationship was expressed through the setting up of their home at Plas Newydd in Llangollen, North Wales, and its interior decoration and gardens. Objects, such as drawings of the local historical monuments that hung in the drawing room, created for themselves and visitors a narrative of intimacy and affection (Gowrley 2022: chap 4 xx).

Objects, rituals, and practices also show how love in families was sustained, conveyed, and memorialised, since material culture and the behaviours around it are repositories for emotions (Downes et al 2018: 7-23; Scheer 2012). Exchanging rings

and tokens, wearing and touching them, symbolised love between courting couples, but also demonstrated spouses' union through marriage and its endurance (Holloway 2019: 67-92). Children were welcomed into the family and the world with objects like worked pincushions and quilts, or ceramic keepsakes of cradles, which were printed with the words 'The Gift is Small But Love is All' (Holloway 2018: 162-3, 166). Portrait miniatures served as emotionally invested substitutes for relatives during separation (Gowrley 2022: chap 4 xx). Family members who were absent were also remembered through more generic commercially available objects such as ceramics that bore the words 'forget me not' (Begiato 2020: 143-7). They did similar affective work when exchanged as gifts. In 1774, Ann Ambler thanked her cousin Thomasin Ibbetson for a needlework gift, which 'so strongly and elegantly express'd' 'attention and remembrance' and, along with other presents, were 'indisputable marks of that affection on such I shall ever set the highest value' (Gowrley 2022: xx) The collection and sharing of sentimental albums materialised familial love. Catherine Fraser compiled a commonplace book, for example, in which she pasted a rose painted by her mother in 1799 and labelled as 'Emblem of Affection' (Gowrley 2018). Portraits, jewellery, tables, and textiles also memorialised love for deceased family members. So too did the tokens left by mothers with foundlings, objects through which they sought to symbolise and sustain maternal love in the face of its rupture (Holloway 2018: 154-6, 161-2, 166-71; Gowrley 2022: chap 3 xx).

<Insert Figure 2.2. around here>

<Caption/> Object</Caption>

Family members were often separated by life's circumstances and letters were crucial communicators of words of affection from childhood onwards, sustaining affection in difficult conditions. In 1788, the five-year-old Emil Herder wrote to his

father: ‘dear father! Come home soon, and be fond of me, and tell me about the chamois [antelope] and there [then] I want to climb on you again. and I ulso want to [say I] love you, and if you com, bring some of the nice appricotts with you’ (Bruce 2014: 252). Missives did further work too. A study of elite German children’s letters from the later eighteenth century shows that such correspondence built relationships within kin networks (Bruce 2014: 247, 260-1). Letters were also objects to be handled, smelled, and cherished during separation which could be more absolute in a time pre-dating swift transportation and communication technologies (Holloway 2019: 63-66; Lindblom 2016: 421). At the turn of the eighteenth century, the Swedish Gjorwell family used pressed flowers in their correspondence to express, remember, and maintain love for each other (Lindblom 2016: 411-2). One of the daughters of the family, Stafva Lindahl, wrote to her husband when he was on a trip: ‘See here a little flower, it carries a little tender kiss, it has been pressed to my lips. Therefore you will do the same, and never forget your little Stafva, who with all her heart and soul is your little friend and wife’ (Lindblom 2016: 416). Recipients replied that they, too, kissed the pressed flower when it arrived and family members emphasised that they touched them regularly (Lindblom 2016: 414, 416-7). Parent-child love was also exchanged through the flowers. Stafva sent a violet to her father, which she said had been ‘tenderly pressed to my lips with all the feeling that alone belongs to my Papa’ and he reflected that the flowers that she sent lifted his mood (Lindblom 2016: 16, 419).

Creative acts also helped people mark and navigate the savagery of a loved one’s death, remember that love, and articulate the pain of a severing of emotional bonds (Bailey 2012: 39-42, 49-50). Thomas Wright’s son, John, died age eight years and six months, in July 1783. For many years thereafter his father reflected on this loss, recording John’s sudden illness and demise in detail in his memoirs, where it

also showed that he was a loving and loved tender father (Bailey 2012: 40-1). As he noted thirteen years later:

> Farewell, my son, my son by dearly beloved John! Very pleasant hast thou been unto me; thy love to me was wonderful, surpassing the common instances of filial affection. I am distressed, I am exceedingly distressed for thee, my darling child! Thou shalt no more play around thy daddy, and entertain him with thy engaging and affectionate prattle! Thou shalt no more be at a loss for comparisons and numbers to express the greatness of thy love to me! (Wright 1864: 181-2)

He regularly returned to his boy's death by writing poetry. On one of the anniversaries of John's death he wrote a poem in which John consoled him that they would meet again and revisit 'the tender love that pass'd between/Your darling child and you' (Wright 1864: 314). As Wright's writing indicates, of course, grief is itself a form and expression of love.

Regular declarations of familial love in correspondence, rituals of gift-giving, and practices around child-care also bridged the vast distances and lengthy separations that resulted from families engaged in colonial and imperial domination (Donington 2020: 162, 176-7). This is seen in the correspondence between Eliza Davidson (1750-1791), Lydia Falconar, and Mrs Chitty from 1778-1791, members of a merchant capitalist family whose activities extended from Scotland and London to Jamaica and Madras. Their loving communications not only facilitated family life, they contributed to their family's wealth, status, and power (Finn 2019: 8-10). Lydia and Eliza were sisters-in-law and the unmarried Mrs Chitty was Eliza's cousin. From 1786, Eliza's younger children resided with Mrs Chitty who cared for them while Eliza lived

with her husband in Madras. In 1788 Eliza wrote from Madras to her cousin, Mrs Chitty, 'the satisfaction you always express in receiving my letters ever makes my eyes sparkle with joy; and my heart feels a kind of united sensation of pain and pleasure … Could you but see my throbbing heart, you would pity its palpitations' (Finn 2019: 12). In the same decade, Eliza worked to secure her nephew, Lydia's son, a post in the East India Company. When she wrote to William Devaynes seeking his support for the young Falconar's advancement, she declared him 'an amiable Young man whom I love like my own son' (Finn 2019: 19). Indeed, Lydia had previously thanked her cousin Eliza for her 'unbounded generosity to my Son, whome you have now made your own by a Costly adoption . . . [which] excite[s] a Gratitude, a Love too big for utterance' (Finn 2019: 13). Such heated expressions of love did more than ensure effective childcare and legitimate the circulation of children in European colonial families, they underpinned and contributed to familial advancement through sociability, patronage, and marriage.

Some forms of love had a termination point, whether through romantically involved couples no longer feeling love for each other, or when relatives fell out or were rejected. Perhaps this is most apparent with the end of marriage. The legal capacity to separate or formally divorce and legitimately remarry varied by country in the eighteenth century, and thus those who parted from spouses often framed their justification for doing so within the law's grounds, namely desertion, cruelty, or infidelity. The law did not formalise the dissolution of a marriage on the grounds of absence of love, yet, in the discursive comments in surviving documents, its lack was cited. A Yorkshire clergyman reported to his Church Court that he had attempted and failed to get John Laughton to cohabit with his wife, remarking: John 'fell into a violent passion and said God Damn her he neither would nor could lead his Life with her

adding that he did not Love her' (Bailey 2003: 28-9). Similarly, while love offered access to privileges, both could just as easily be withdrawn. Thomas Hibbert (1710-80), a guinea factor in Kingston, Jamaica, did not marry, forming instead an 'outside' family with a mixed-heritage woman, Charity Harry, with whom he had three daughters. Thomas only acknowledged them privately, though he gave Charity sufficient freedoms to access some privileges, property, and an inheritance. In 1771, the eldest daughter Jane, born in 1756, was sent to England with her sister Margaret to be educated. They lived not with Hibbert's family, but with a former business partner in Surrey where Jane had access to a sociable, wealthy lifestyle. Following Margaret's death in 1775, Jane converted to Quakerism, having first sought her father's support. Thomas withheld his approval, ending his financial support for Jane who left his partner's home to work as a governess in Birmingham. When Thomas died in 1780, nonetheless, he bequeathed Jane £2000. Jane disputed the share, since it was substantially less than other white, male members of his family received. However, her Hibbert relatives closed ranks against her, rejecting her claims with some degree of spite, severing and denying any further familial obligations or, even, connections (Donington 2020: 162-172). For Jane Harry, of illegitimate and mixed race status, a father's love provided only conditional access to position and privilege during his lifetime; on his death his metropolitan family quickly denied Jane any ties of love or the obligations with which they were associated.

The role of love in justifying inequality in familial forms

As this chapter has shown, love was a complex and ambiguous emotion in patriarchal families because they were sites of unequal power holding and distribution. Men, as husbands, fathers, and masters, possessed the most formal power. Some women, as spouses, mothers, or mistresses, gained access to certain types of circumscribed

authority. Those who held positions deemed inferior due to being less financially autonomous, unmarried, immature, or because of their birth order, illegitimacy, or perceived race, had far more circumscribed access to power. In the global, imperial context, male power was further racialised, with white men holding authority over white women and native women, as well as native men (Ghosh 2006: 12). People in the household-family whose familial position was insecure due to their employment or because they were chattel property held least power. Although political, legal, religious, and social structures provided the framework for these family-based hierarchies, love was not incompatible with them. For instance, the discourse of familial love was a component of 'quasi-family' institutions that were loosely based on family structures, such Scottish clans (Cathcart 2008).

Love, or its semblance, was integral to the advancement of colonial power across the globe since colonising authorities deployed the 'intimate arrangements' of the family, to use Ann Laura Stoler's term, to regulate and extend empire (Stoler 2006; Wulf 2010: 242). Even though some interracial sexual unions in the British, Dutch, French, and Iberian colonial Americas and Indias were coercive, they were often framed as romantic attachments and most advanced colonial interests (Ghosh 2006: 26-30). For instance, French traders and English frontiersmen took native wives in their respective North American territories, which helped broker interchange and enabled colonisers to tap into native trade economies (Livesay 2015: 123, 125). The most documented and romanticised examples of inter-racial unions occurred between elite couples, such as those between high status white British men in India and Indian noblewomen in the eighteenth century. For European officials, loving an Indian female companion and marrying by 'the custom of the country' offered access to native political support and knowledge of princely courts and local affairs, enabled them to

enter alliances and diplomatic cooperation, and forged bonds between the European men (Ghosh 2006: 69-70, 72, 79). In 1800, for instance, James Achilles Kirkpatrick (1764-1805), East India Company resident to the Nizam of Hyderabad from 1798, was united with Khair-un-nissa, a court nobleman's granddaughter. The Company investigated Kirkpatrick's marriage, an initiative informed by later eighteenth-century colonial concerns around local political corruption and anxieties about interracial marriages, both of which were seen to threaten the Company's access to governance and diplomacy (Ghosh 2006: 91-2). During the investigation, both British officials and members of the nizam's court described the relationship as simultaneously a romance but also of state importance (Ghosh 2006: 92). Khair-un-Nissa's female relations had presented her to Kirkpatrick alleging that she had fallen in love with him and wished to escape an arranged marriage with the 'old man' to whom she was betrothed. Though Kirkpatrick already had illegitimate children with women who resided in his harem, his account of the union followed the era's fictional, romantic conventions wherein he had rescued the lovely young woman from her family obligation. In a letter to his brother, he explained that on spending time with her at night, 'She declared to me again and again that her affection had been irrevocably fixed on me for a series [sic] of time that her fate was linked to mine and that she should be content to pass her days with me as the humblest of handmaidens' (Ghosh 2006: 93).

Even while love between colonisers and colonised peoples caused tensions for European men around status and respectability in the eyes of the colonial state, it had the capacity to embed and facilitate colonialism (Ghosh 2006: 26-30, 70, 79). Indeed, thanks to Kirkpatrick's effective diplomatic negotiations between the Nizam and the Company, the investigation concluded in 1801 with him keeping his post. The union was and continues to be framed in the west as a great love affair that crossed

boundaries (Ghosh 2006: 97). In 1823 Thomas Carlyle wrote about Kirkpatrick's and Khair-un-nissa's daughter, 'Kitty' Kirkpatrick: 'her birth, as I afterwards found, an Indian Romance, mother a sublime begum, father a ditto English official, mutually adoring, wedding, living withdrawn in their own private paradise, Romance famous in the East' (Ghosh 2006: 69). Even those unions rooted in romantic and affectionate feelings were, however, still skewed to the European coloniser, who could abandon the indigenous woman, and who often only partially acknowledged 'outside' or 'shadow' wives and families (Livesay 2015: 126; Ghosh 2006: 3, 25, 79). Wealthy British colonisers, for example, sent their mixed-race children to be educated in Britain and made efforts for their heritage to be obscured (Ghosh 2006: 70). Kirkpatrick, for instance, sent his two children with Khair-un-nissa, Sahib Allum and Saheb Begum, renamed James George and Catherine Aurora, to England once they reached five years old. Their mother was left with a portrait of them painted by George Chinnery. (Ghosh 2006: 101-4). Moreover, at a societal level, colonisers harnessed 'love' between European men and native women by imposing racialised categories on their offspring in order to secure further power over colonised people (Stoler 2006: 2, 4; Wulf 2010: 243).

<Insert Figure 2.3 around here>

<Caption/>Portrait?</Caption>

In many cases, such relationships do not fit easily into a romantic narrative. Indeed, untangling or even identifying love in unions and families that are so egregiously unequal is difficult and made more so when relationships were between enslaved people and white enslavers. The latter used violence and force in their

unions, rendering it problematic for historians to talk about love or affection (Livesay 2015: 127). Some apply a descriptive language of love and affection while still acknowledging that the relations were rooted in the violence of plantation slavery in which enslaved women's sexual agency and capacity to feel affection was restricted (Burnard 2004: 169, 190). Thomas Thistlewood (1721-1786), variously a plantation overseer, owner, and slaver in Jamaica, is a notorious example. He raped enslaved women across four decades of his life, though he sustained a more enduring relationship with Phibbah. Assessing his feelings towards this enslaved woman who bore his children is challenging, given the nature of the evidence. Thistlewood noted in his diary the occasions on which he had sex with Phibbah, and the frequency of their sexual contact has been interpreted as 'an obvious manifestation of the bond between them'. His tending Phibbah for a night when she was ill and for showing some affection to her when her son died have also been identified as evidence that 'they had a warm and loving relationship, if such a thing was possible between a slave and her master' (Burnard 2004: 190). What is less invidious a conclusion, perhaps, is that affection was a language and a practice that was also expressed by both parties in coercive relations.

It is intimate relations that are rooted in structural violence but that also create familial bonds which show, perhaps most effectively, that love is at once an emotion and a currency. It is proposed that even where relations were instrumental, 'benefit' could extend to the subordinate partner. Ghosh advises that we avoid seeing non-white women 'either as slaves or as romantic figures' and explore their strategies for survival (Ghosh 2006: 24). Scholars have shown, for instance, that enslaved women or freed women of colour in the Caribbean were able to gain advantages from enslavers' affection for them and their offspring such as increased security or status,

or access to economic benefits or 'associational whiteness' (Burnard 2004: 169; Livesay 2015: 127-8). It is wise, however, to avoid positioning the women in longer-term relationships with white enslavers as manipulating their position for gain (Burnard: 2004, 185). This is perilously close to ignoring the coercive power of their male masters and overlooks women's trauma. Similarly, it is simplistic to interpret native women's maximising of opportunities through intimate relationships with colonisers as benefiting them; all such relations did was provide limited mobility within positions of relative powerlessness. Without the formal legal and social structures provided by marital contracts, love meant little for native, enslaved, or mixed-race freed women who were barred from access to spousal or maternal rights (Ghosh 2006: 16, 23-4, 30).

One of the challenges scholars face in researching expressions of love and its practices in subjugated peoples in eighteenth-century colonies is the intractability of the official colonial and family archives (Donington 2020: 16; Browne et al 2021: 19). As Sasha Turner observes, the colonial record focuses on making people into marketable commodities, which limits any insight into their intimate lives; moreover, 'being enslaved shaped the experience, expression, and suppression of emotions' (Turner 2007: 234). Still, there are some glimpses into enslaved people's experiences of love as an emotion and their use of it as a rhetorical device. Sensitive investigation reveals that the death of enslaved mothers' infants in Jamaica 'wrought emotional pain amplified by spiritual liminality, separation from ancestors, and uncertainty of community support' (Turner 2007: 245). Enslaved people did form romantic relationships, of course, as well as love their children. The opportunities for eighteenth-century enslaved people to record such emotions were few, however, although acts which indicate familial love do survive. In 1832, the enslaved woman Rebecca brought

a freedom claim to the Protector of Slaves in Demerara. She rooted this in the promises of the Captain of the Dutch slave ship on the Middle Passage on which she was forced to travel over forty-five years earlier in 1785 when she was probably between 11 and 13 years old. He had singled her out from the other captives, raped, and impregnated her, and informed her that he would ensure that whoever bought the cargo would manumit her and her child (Browne et al 2021: 1-6). Informed by West African presumptions about enslavement, pregnancy, and kinship, where bearing a child to a master might mitigate the social disabilities of slavery, she unsuccessfully sought to uphold this claim in 1811 and again 21 years later (Browne et al 2021: 7). The claims show that a further white man, a plantation manager, sexually exploited Rebecca, but following his death in 1790 she entered a long-term relationship with an enslaved man with whom she had a family of four more children. These records are not spaces for declarations of familial love, but they offer evidence that enslaved people raised families who they cared for and sought to protect. It was in her sixties, and accompanied by John, the Dutch Captain's son, that Rebecca sought to secure freedom for him and the children she bore after him (Browne et al 2021: 11-13).

Love in the family was also a rhetorical device, with both anti- and pro-slavery writers using the discourse of familial love. Ex-slave narratives in the abolitionist era, for example, deployed idealised gendered family roles as affectionate parents and offspring to show how enslaved people's loving relationships were destroyed by slavery. In Antebellum America, these publications talked movingly of reconciling the pursuit of freedom with their reluctance to leave family to achieve it (de Schweinitz 2020). This responded to a racist discourse that denied the enslaved and Africans the capacity to love (Robinson 2007: 40-1). In later eighteenth and early nineteenth century Jamaica, pro-slavery writers portrayed enslaved women as incapable of love

and manipulative seducers of white men. They did so for instrumental purposes, to defend white Jamaican men from accusations of debauchery and coercion and to justify control of the enslaved (Altink 2005: 276). Other pro-slave writers portrayed the enslaved as childlike and, therefore, in need of paternalist 'care' and affection. Edward Long, for instance, described the enslaved thus in his *History of Jamaica* (1774):

> Their attachment to the descendants of old families, the ancestors of which were the masters and friends of their own progenitors, is remarkably strong and affectionate. This veneration appears hereditary, like clanships in the Scottish Highlands; it is imbibed in their infancy, or founded perhaps in the idea of the relation which subsisted between, and connected them in, the bond of fatherly love and authority on the one side, and a filial reverence and obedience on the other (Burnard 2004: 143).

Here the group that held dominion justified their mastery, and the status it afforded them, through a concept of 'love' that was, supposedly, not exploitative, rather reciprocal, because it was paternal and bound the 'inferior' to their 'superior'.

Coloniser, state, church, law, and culture determined the pyramid of power, but love also played a significant part in justifying and ameliorating its effects. This is most clear in commentary around men's role as husbands and fathers. Moral commentators informed men that their potential to be tyrannical, defined as the unbound exercise of rule, would be tempered by their love for their dependents. Treating loved ones with kindness, would in turn secure dependents' obedience to their superiors (Barclay and Carr 2018: 181). In 1760, the *Newcastle Journal* advised men to love and cherish a wife, and govern her gently, so she 'will cheerfully obey so endearing a husband' (Bailey 2003: 135). In this vein, women were instructed to choose a spouse wisely,

one whom they could love and was worthy of love, since this protected them from severe or uncaring treatment. As a study of Enlightenment Scotland shows, prevailing notions of femininity restricted women from 'active' expressions of love in courtship, since their role was to inspire rather than offer love. Under their husband's control in marriage, however, their articulation of love became more permissible (Barclay and Carr 2018: 181-3, 185). In this sense, love was a form of surrender for wives, which maintained patriarchal authority.

Love was also central to the concept of filial duty. Parents were to provide love in the form of care, provision, and preparation for adulthood, while in return children owed them duty for their affection, labours, and investment and offered support in their old age. This was rooted in scripture and retained force in shaping the relationship of adult children and parents to the end of the century. Even so, this exchange of love tended to advantage the parent. Perhaps this is best seen in the special pleading and responses of Sir Richard Newdigate to allegations that his adult children made against him in the early eighteenth century. They collectively alleged that Newdigate was insane and unfit to manage the family property and had attempted to sexually abuse one of his daughters in 1701 (Wynn Smith 2020: 35, 39). Newdigate responded by publishing a defence, which emphasised that he treated his ten surviving children equitably, was an indulgent father, and that his natural affection meant he could not act unnaturally towards them (Wynne Smith 2020: 36). In his version, he was a loving father abandoned by his children in his sick old age. In their telling, he was a father who ruled his children through monetary rewards to secure good behaviour and, perhaps, love. Between 1701 and 1702, for example, he withheld funds from his 34-year-old son, who accused him of mishandling the portion from his first marriage. In the ensuing dispute, Newdigate declared, 'If my Son returns to his Duty & Filiall

Affection, I design him 3000 £ per annum' (Wynne Smith 2020: 40-2). Indeed, love was so central to the ideals of parent-child relations, especially once sensibility became the foremost language of family life, that by the later eighteenth century it was often not the tyrannical father who was most feared, but the indifferent one who felt no affection for his offspring (Bailey 2010: 278). All in all, love in families was seen as a glue, uniting disparate members into family 'units' and acting as a prophylactic against disorder; in societies that viewed the family as the source of societal order, love was thus hugely significant.

The role of family love in shaping identity

The centrality of family to understandings of society and status and the increasing prioritisation of intense feeling as a marker of personal and social value meant that love also offered people the means to construct and understand their personal identity and self-worth. The literate elite learned this from childhood. Children forged a 'socially situated self' through their familial relationships in the eighteenth century. A study of bourgeois German children shows how some fashioned selves through letter writing, a practice which linked their self-development to being worthy of their parents' love (Bruce 2014: 262). In the last decade of the century, one German father published his six-year-old son's letter as an exemplar of a child's 'letter style'. For Matthias Claudius, his boy Fritz's declarations of love for him not only demonstrated his natural child-like expression, but they also showed he had been well trained in sensibility too (Bruce, 2014, 259). Memoirists located themselves in lineages of ancestors who had the capacity to love as well as pass on admirable character traits and property. Writing in the mid eighteenth century, Simon Mason remembered his father as a scholar and a citizen: sober, honest, religious, and benevolent, as well as 'a loving Husband, and tender Father' (Mason 1754: 9). Mason was an apothecary who had failed in business

and whose marriage and family life had consequently suffered. His eulogy for his father played its part in a narrative that sought to improve estimations of his character as well as raise support for him at a time of personal economic failure. Love was not only a way to identify personal virtue in the present, it indicated future behaviour. In the 1790s, Thomas Wright noted of his eldest daughter: 'Betty was always a feeling, affectionate child towards her father; and, I doubt not, will make a feeling, affectionate wife to her husband, and mother to her children' (Wright 1864: 207).

In the still developing autobiographical genre, accounts of familial love enabled life-writers to defend their actions and offer their audiences and themselves insights into their subjectivities. Like many other memoirists, Wright recorded the love his parental figures held for him and his affection for them, partly to note gratitude and obligations, but also to demonstrate his own capacity to inspire love. Thus, he reported that he was taken to his grandmother's bedside as she lay dying:

> She turned her head on the pillow and looked at me with a look of inexpressible love, affection, and concern, and had just strength to exclaim, "Poor bairn!" deeply pierced, no doubt, with the sorrowful reflection of the forlorn, comfortless, and deserted state she was leaving the darling of her heart exposed to. She then stretched herself out in the bed and expired. Thus did I lose the nearest, dearest, and only disinterested friend I had left in the world. Farwell, my honoured, beloved, and affectionate grandmother; great was your maternal care, love, and fondness for me (Wright 1864: 27-8).

Wright had a conflictual, unhappy first marriage to Lydia Birkhead, whose parents disapproved of their union, and who died at 30 years old in 1777. In 1781, now in his mid-forties, he married Alice, daughter of a local farmer who was born in 1766 and

was still short of sixteen years old when they wed. This age gap clearly prompted local censure and Thomas used love as his key defence for the union. He commented that though he was advised to marry someone who would not bear children, he sought instead ‘a young woman I thought I could fancy’. He confirmed his satisfaction with his choice: ‘I have got a house full of fine children, and straitened circumstances; and I had a thousand times rather chose this situation, than be bound for life to a person I could not love, though in the midst of affluence and worldly prosperity’ (Wright 1864: 145-9). Similarly, Alice’s capacity to love his three children from his first marriage was a marker of her good value and his excellent decision. As a very recent bride, recovering from rheumatic fever, she helped him care for her stepchildren who were suffering with smallpox ‘with the greatest tenderness and assiduity’ (Wright 1864: 153). Throughout his memoir, he identified his relatives’ capacity to love as signifying their individual or familial worth.

The loving family was thus a marker of social status. As part of changing portrait fashions from the second half of the eighteenth century, wealthy families commissioned portraits that displayed their uxorious and familial love for one another. This was intended for more than dynastic purposes, indicating a family’s identity as sensible and feeling (Retford 2006; Lovell 1987). By the end of the century, the rise of companion animals, such as lapdogs and songbirds, meant that pets were also included in elite family portraiture, now essential elements of the affectionate domestic scene (Tague 2015: 192). Similarly, fictional or visual portrayals of girls and women with pets in the later century illustrated not only their capacity for maternal care; loving motherhood being, of course, central to feminine identity (Tague 2015: 183, 187-90). To love a pet was increasingly acceptable over the century. From the 1740s to ‘80s, Horace Walpole was devoted to three dogs, Patapan, Rosette, and Tonton; all gifts

from female friends on the continent. He was not embarrassed to express his affection. After he took ownership of Tonton, he wrote to a friend: 'I have gotten a new idol, in a word, a successor to Rosette and almost as great a favourite … it is incredible how fond I am of it (Tague, 2015: 220-7).'

<Insert figure 2.4 around here>

<Caption/>IMAGE 5: FAMILY PORTRAIT WITH PET </Caption>

Indeed, demonstrating 'fellow feeling' for pets was part of a wider discussion about the relationships between human- and non-human animals (Cole 2019, 6). This debate clustered around several issues, which overlapped with discussions around emotions. Love played a part in the conversations around non-human animals, but most pertinently for our purposes, in the discussion of the place of pets within the family and the nature of their owners' affection for them. Love for domestic pets and their incorporation into the family as an object of affection, took on different moral connotations. Early in the century, male writers used women's love for their lapdogs to attack their virtue. By its end, love for a pet could be a sign of moral virtue rather than corruptness or gender nonconformity (Cole 2919: 4; Tague 2015: chapter 3, 183, 224). Philosophers considered whether animals possessed a soul and began to include some animals into the category of subjects deemed worthy of sympathy and, therefore, protection from cruelty, (Cole 2019: 2, 4, 5-6; Tague 2015: 68-72, 182). In doing so they extended the definition of who was permitted to receive and give love in a family, thereby redefining notions of kinship (Cole 2019: 6; Tague 2015: 195, 201-4, 206). The shifting position of non-human animals in terms of the capacity to feel, to love, and to deserve humane treatment also had broader ramifications for human identity and the treatment of humans. Associating oneself with affection for pets and

petkeeping was a way to show one's worthy qualities (Tague 2015: 198-200). It defined the human by categorising the distinction between humans and non-human animals (Tague 2015: 232-4). In its colonial context, such thinking enabled some people to exclude not just non-human animals but also some humans from access to affective relationships or concepts of kinship; generally, those groups deemed inferior, on the grounds of race, ethnicity, gender, or social rank, who, in their perceived incapacity to love or be loved, were exploited (Cole 2019: 4-6 and passim).

Conclusion

The examples of love in this chapter raise questions about the extent to which love can be used as a primary conceptual tool for thinking about families. Scholars in the last quarter of the twentieth century devoted much time to debating how far love was instrumental or authentic. A history of emotions approach helps demonstrate that love in the family was never an emotion that could be assessed in terms of binary opposites. Its impact is historically specific, not least because the definitions of love, and who it was intended to connect and exclude, are a force in underpinning broader gender, racial, and political structures and thus could be felt most acutely in the family, a domain in which all these forces intersected. Furthermore, love is an emotion that is multiple in form and meaning and differs according to the perceptions of those who proffer or receive it. As this chapter shows, love in the family in the age of Enlightenment was many things at once: a joy, a duty, and a sacrifice, a bond that brought succour, support, and strength to individuals, as well as a performance and justification for unequal relations. Love can ennoble and abuse in equal measure, and its protean qualities render it a slippery category of analysis.

Bibliography

Altink, Henrice (2007*) Representations of Slave Women in Discourses on Slavery and Abolition, 1780–1838* (Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group)

Altink, Henrice (2005) 'Deviant and dangerous: Pro-slavery representations of Jamaican slave women's sexuality, c. 1780–1834', *Slavery & Abolition*, 26:2, 271-288.

Bailey, Joanne (2012) *Parenting in England 1760-1830: emotion, identity, and generation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Bailey, Joanne (2010) '"A Very Sensible Man": Imagining Fatherhood in England c.1750–1830', *History* 95: 3 (267-292.

Bailey, Joanne (2003) *Unquiet Lives: Marriage and Marriage Breakdown in England, 1660-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Barclay, Katie & Carr, Rosalind (2018) 'Women, love and power in Enlightenment Scotland', *Women's History Review*, 27:2, 176-198.

Barclay, Katie (2019) 'Love, care and the illegitimate child in eighteenth-century Scotland', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 29, 105 – 125.

Barclay, Katie (2015) 'Illicit Intimacies: The Imagined 'Homes' of Gilbert Innes of Stow and his Mistresses (1751–1832)', *Gender & History*, 27:3, 576-590.

Barclay, Katie (2011) *Love, Intimacy and Power: Marriage and Patriarchy in Scotland, 1650–1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Begiato, Joanne (2020) *Manliness in Britain, 1760-1900: bodies, emotion, and material culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Berry, Helen (2012) 'Queering the History of Marriage: the Social Recognition of a

Castrato Husband in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *History Workshop Journal*, 74, 27-50.

Browne, Randy M, Lindsay, Lisa A & Wood Sweet, John (2021): 'Rebecca's Ordeal, from Africa to the Caribbean: Sexual Exploitation, Freedom Struggles, and Black Atlantic Biography', *Slavery & Abolition* DOI: 10.1080/0144039X.2021.1938399

Bruce, Emily C. (2014) '"Each word shows how you love me": The social literacy practice of children's letter writing (1780–1860)' *Paedagogica Historica*, 50:3, 247–264.

Burnard, Trevor (2004) *Mastery, Tyranny, and Desire: Thomas Thistlewood and His Slaves in the Anglo Jamaican World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press)

Cathcart, Alison (2008) 'Inressyng of kyndnes, and renewing off thair blud': The Family, Kinship and Clan Policy in Sixteenth-Century Scottish Gaeldom' in Ewan, Elizabeth and Nugent, Janay, *Finding the Family in Medieval and Early Modern Scotland* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashbridge Publishing Company), 127-138.

Cole, Lucinda (2019) 'Animal studies and the eighteenth century: The nature of the beast', *Literature Compass*, 16, 1-12.

de Schweinitz, Rebecca (2020) '"Loving hearts" and "brave ones": slavery, family, and the problem of freedom in antebellum America' *Slavery & Abolition*, 41:3, 479-504.

Donington, Katie (2020) *The bonds of family: slavery, commerce and culture in the British Atlantic world* (Manchester: Manchester University Press)

Downes, Stephanie, Holloway, Sally and Randles, Sarah (eds) (2018) *Feeling*

Things: Objects and Emotions through History (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Finn, Margot (2019) 'The Female World of Love & Empire: Women, Family & East India Company Politics at the End of the Eighteenth Century', *Gender & History*, 31:1, 7-24.

Forth, John to his father William Forth (1779) City of York Libraries, Archives and Local History. Papers of the Munby family of York [includes papers of the Forth, Woodhouse, Pearson and other related families]. Letters to William Forth Acc 54:166

Gibson, Kate (2020) '"I am not on the footing of kept women": Extra-Marital Love in Eighteenth-Century England', *Cultural & Social History*, 17:3, 355-373.

Gibson, William and Begiato, Joanne (2017) *Sex and the Church in the Long Eighteenth Century: Religion, Enlightenment and the Sexual Revolution* (London: Bloomsbury)

Ghosh, Durba (2006) *Sex and the Family in Colonial India: The Making of Empire* (Cambridge Studies in Indian History and Society, New York: Cambridge University Press).

Gowrley, Freya (2022) *Domestic Space in Britain, 1750-1840: Materiality, Sociability & Emotion* (Bloomsbury)

Gowrley, Freya (2018) 'Reflective and Reflexive Forms: Intimacy and Medium Specificity in British and American Sentimental Albums, 1800-1860,' *Journal 18: a journal of eighteenth-century art and culture*, Issue *Albums*, https://www.journal18.org/3036.

Hearne, George, 1648-1723 to Hearne, Thomas, 1678-1735 (1 May 1722), Bodleian

Library Shelfmark:MS Rawl. letters 26 fol. 37 (https://tinyurl.com/yc24okz3)

Holloway, Sally (2019) *The Game of Love in Georgian England: courtship, emotions, and material culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Holloway, Sally (2016) '"You know I am all on fire": writing the adulterous affair in England, c. 1740-1830', Historical Research, 89:244, 317-339.

Lanzinger, Margareth (2018) 'Emotional bonds and the everyday logic of living arrangements: Stepfamilies in dispensation records of late eighteenth-century Austria' in Warner, Lyndan (ed), *Stepfamilies in Europe 1400-1800* (Taylor & Francis)

Lindblom, Ina (2016) 'The botany of friendship and love: Flowers and emotional practices in the Gjorwell family, c. 1790-1810', *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 41:3, 410-426.

Livesay, Daniel (2012) 'The decline of Jamaica's interracial households and the fall of the planter class, 1733–1823', *Atlantic Studies*, 9:1, 107-123.

Livesay, Daniel (2017) 'West meets east: Mixed-race Jamaicans in India, and the avenues of advancement in imperial Britain', *Atlantic Studies*, 14:3, 382-398.

Livesay, Daniel (2015) 'Emerging from the Shadows: New Developments in the History of Interracial Sex and Intermarriage in Colonial North America and the Caribbean', *History Compass*, 13:3, 122–133.

Lovell, Margaretta, (1987) 'Reading eighteenth-century family portraits: social images and self images', *Winterthur Portfolio*, 22:4, 243–64.

Mordecai, Ben (Henry Taylor) to Mrs Courtauld (14 May 1782) Courtauld, S. A. (ed.),

Courtauld family letters, 1782–1900, 7 vols. (privately printed, 1916), vol 1.

Retford, Kate (2006)*The Art of Domestic Life: Family Portraiture in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press).

Robinson, Angelo Rich (2007) 'Why Does the Slave Ever Love? The Subject of Romance Revisited in the Neoslave Narrative', *The Southern Literary Journal*, 40:1, 39-57.

Scheer, Monique (2012) 'Are emotions a kind of practice (and is that what makes them have a history)? A Bourdieuian approach to understanding emotion', *History and Theory*, 51:2, 193-220)

Shaw, William to John Shaw (20 June 1801) Cadbury Research Library: Special Collections, University of Birmingham, The Shaw Letters, Shaw/39.

Smith, Lisa Wynne (2020) 'Resisting Silences: Gender and Family Trauma in the Eighteenth Century', *Gender and History*, 32 (1), 30 – 53.

Steedman, Carolyn (2009) *Master and Servant: Love and Labour in the English Industrial Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Stoler, Ann Laura (2006) 'Intimidations of Empire: Predicaments of the Tactile and Unseen', in Ann Laura Stoler (ed.), *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History* (Durham: Duke University Press)

Tadmor, Naomi (2001) *Family and Friends in Eighteenth-century England: Household, Kinship & Patronage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Tague, Ingrid (2001) 'Love, Honor, and Obedience: Fashionable Women and the Discourse of Marriage in the Early Eighteenth Century', *Journal of British Studies*,

40:1, 76-106.

Tait, Clodagh (2020) ‘Kindred Without End’: Wet-Nursing, Fosterage and Emotion in Ireland, c. 1550–1720’, *Irish Economic and Social History*, 47:1, 10-35.

Taylor, Elizabeth to Ben Mordecai (Henry Taylor) (23 April 1782) Courtauld, S. A. (ed.), *Courtauld family letters, 1782–1900*, 7 vols. (privately printed, 1916), vol 1.

The Lady’s Magazine, or entertaining companion for the fair sex (1790) vol XXI.

The Lady’s Magazine, or entertaining companion for the fair sex (1784) vol XV.

Turner, Sasha (2017) ‘The nameless and the forgotten: maternal grief, sacred protection, and the archive of slavery’, *Slavery & Abolition*, 38:2, 232-250.

Vickery, Amanda (1998) *The Gentleman’s Daughter: Women’s Lives in Georgian England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press).

Warner, Lyndan (ed) (2018) *Stepfamilies in Europe 1400-1800* (Taylor & Francis)

Warner, Lyndan (2016) ‘Stepfamilies in Early Modern Europe: Paths of Historical Inquiry’, *History Compass*, 14:10, 480–492.

Wilson, Lisa (2014), *A History of Stepfamilies in Early America*, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press).

Wood, Kirsten E. (2009) ‘Courtship and Love among the Enslaved in North Carolina’, *Slavery & Abolition*, 30:3, 473-475.

Wright, Thomas ed (1864) *Autobiography of Thomas Wright, of Birkenshaw. In the County of York. 1736-1797* Edited by his grandson (London).

Wulf, Karin (2010) ‘Women and Families in Early North America and the Wider

Atlantic World', *History Compass* 8:3, 238–247.