Joanne Begiato: Family and Household

Introduction

In 1523, Reynold Peckham left instructions in his will that he be buried beside the grave of his uncle, William Peckham, Esquire, in the Church of St George, Wrotham, Kent. Peckham was Esquire to the body of Henry VIII, a wealthy landed gentleman with substantial lands. In his will, he mentioned among other relatives, his brother and his nephew, and he made arrangements for the custody and marriage of his ward, another nephew. He also directed his executors to provide a monumental brass depicting a man, a woman, and children, with a Latin inscription, to be set upon his grave within six weeks of his death. Historians have variously recorded Peckham's status as 'lifelong bachelor' and 'childless widower' (Fleming 2004: 79; Thomas 2009: Tucker 1974: 233). For them, the brass indicates the increasing social value attributed to children, demonstrates people's concerns to determine their posthumous image by communicating to the future an ideal status, or illustrates that children were so fundamental to the status of patriarchal manhood that wife and children needed to be imagined if they did not exist. In fact Reynold had been married, though his wife, Joyce Culpepper, pre-deceased him in 1523. Ralph Griffin's record of sepulchral memorial brasses in Wrotham (1915), described the brass that was placed upon Reynold's grave following his death in 1525 (Griffin 1915: 11; Weever, 1631: 326). It included Reynold in armour on the left and his wife Joyce on the right. Although Reynold requested 'children' to be depicted on his 'fair stone,' he did not mention any offspring in his will, hence historians' assumption that Reynold was childless. Certainly, the brass depictions have not survived. Griffin referred to Thomas Fisher's drawing of the brass, made around 1800, and noted that all the shields Fisher recorded as accompanying the brass

were now lost. So too were the additional representations of two children; already lost when J. G. Waller visited the church in 1840 and made another record of stones and brasses.[1]

So what should the historian of family and household make of all this? Speculating on Reynold's paternal status can indeed tell us something, though we can now reject the discredited thesis of a chronological improvement in the status of childhood and children during this period. These recorded moments in Reynold's life reveal the significance of parental, religious, reputational, and dynastic feelings which extended beyond one individual's lifespan. Being a parent mattered, but historians need to be mindful of the precarious nature of family life before assuming anyone's childless status. With the high rates of infant and child mortality, it is possible that Reynold and Joyce bore children, but that they predeceased him and were not therefore mentioned in his will. Nonetheless, as a pious man, he had still wanted them to be memorialised as part of his family. Indeed, Reynold's concerns at the time of writing demonstrate a diachronic understanding of family, whose bonds did not disappear when a family member died, something which historical demographers' accounts of the composition of families and households often miss. Reynold's arrangements for his death also illustrate the expansiveness of his family and household. This was no simple nuclear family, a category which earlier historians of the family saw as the defining set of relationships to be investigated, since the key members of his nuclear family were absent due to mortality. Reynold's will and his place of burial also speak to family members' close attention to wider kin and to parental-style responsibilities beyond biological children. In sum, it shows that Peckham experienced numerous different kinds of 'family' during his lifetime thanks to its precarious nature, the mutability of family relationships, and the inclusivity of assorted individuals within any one household. Despite the focus upon wider rather than closer kin, these aspects of his family and household relationships could be the source of powerful emotions.

---

[1] The current state of the brasses can be seen in a photograph on the Church's website:
http://www.wrothamchurch.org/St_George/Tour/Floor_Brasses.html (accessed 25/04/17)

This chapter will argue that the history of emotions offers the most effective conceptual framework to understand family and household in the two centuries spanning 1450 to 1650. Both were constituted through the nexus of feelings and attachments that bound together individuals of various kinds, whether related through marriage or blood, co-resident or absent. It is also an approach which moves on from the rather stagnant state of the history of the family that had emerged by the last decade of the twentieth century. Until recently, a student had two approaches to choose from when studying households and families: 'structural' or 'affective'. On the one hand were structural accounts of increasing nuance and complexity, which identified broad regional patterns of marriage and inheritance, and family and household size and composition (Hajnal 1965; Laslett 1965; Laslett and Wall 1972) . On the other were social history analyses of families, typically relatives related by blood and marriage and their servants, which focused on the extent to which family relationships were founded on love over time and social rank (Stone 1977). These two approaches could at times seem incompatible. Over the last decade, however, emotions history has flourished, which can be defined as a conceptual approach to understanding the changing nature of emotions in different times and places, and the ways in which this shaped human experience. Innovative historians have begun to apply it to provide insights into family and household structures and composition, as well as illuminate lived experiences of gendered inequalities in inter-personal relationships and subjectivities. This chapter first briefly outlines this shift in scholarly interests. It then applies a history of emotions framework, moving beyond more conventional organisation around relationships or life-phase, to instead examine the family and household through the themes of connections and constituencies, which captures their mutability, dynamism, and various permutations far more effectively.

Family and Household: Structures and Forms

Scholars have long debated the terms family and household, attempting either to impose overarching categories in order to measure their composition and form over time, or to understand

their contemporary meanings and complexities across Renaissance Europe. Initially, scholars distinguished family from household and kin by applying a measure of relatedness and co-residence; at the risk of crude generalisation, a family was whoever lived in the household, although for demographic purposes non-related individuals were removed from the category, focusing on what might be called ties of reproduction (Fleming 2004: 2-3). Historical demographers, for example, attempted to chart the broad patterns of household composition, therefore identifying families as either North-West European in form: nuclear, consisting of parents and children with unrelated servants, or Mediterranean: extended (sometimes referred to as stem) with variations in form but usually consisting of more than one married couple, perhaps including generational couples (parents plus one married offspring and their family) or two married siblings and their families (for critical overview see Goldberg 2010: 22-28; Cavallo 2010: 11-12). These family forms were correlated with other regional patterns that demographers detected. Delayed age at marriage and a significant minority of never-married people were correlated with areas where nuclear families predominated and 'universal' marriage prevailed with very young women marrying older men with regions where extended families (Fleming 2004: 19-23). When demographic analysis was combined with studies of property transmission, kin density could also be assessed. It was argued that areas that showed least worker mobility demonstrated high kin-density. If this did not strictly conform to the category of extended families where two generations co-resided, then it demonstrated 'functional' extended families where local aid from kin was accessible to nuclear families. Areas experiencing most geographical mobility showed reduced kin density and a higher prevalence of nuclear households. Historians saw these conditions as driven by mortality and economic opportunity in medieval England, with weaker kin density more likely to prevail by the early modern era (Razi 1981). If household composition here represented family, then scholars also extrapolated that these different household types shaped power hierarchies. Marriages between similar aged couples were seen as more equitable than skewed-age unions; multi-generational households were expected to provide

more patriarchal authority for one man, but also lead to challenges given competition between adult men for resources.

Twenty-first century scholarship has, however, shown these patterns to be simplistic, requiring some degree of special pleading to keep distinct such categories as nuclear, extended, and functional-extended. It also exposes the difficulties of mapping them onto life-courses, time periods, and geographical regions in any satisfying way. Sandra Cavallo sums up the revision of these outdated approaches by observing that 'geographical homogeneity' is an illusion and, even more worrying, that the interpretations of these family forms were driven by 'ethno-centric assumptions' (Cavallo 2010: 12). What has emerged in the last decade instead is a picture of household complexity, with very local economic conditions determining which family members formed a household. It is now clear that in the Renaissance, people experienced many different kinds of family members co-residing because families were disrupted by death and re-marriage, seasonal working practices, and types of employment, and religious conventions. Trying to plot the size of the average household thus becomes ever more reductive, given its changeable nature over its own life-course and variation according to local conditions such as proximity to epidemics, economic opportunities, or to levels of wealth (Fleming 2004: 66-7). Equally, what records of household membership cannot fully capture is that a family consisted of any of the following configurations: a variety of kin and step-kin, such as spouses, widowers, parents, children, siblings, uncles, aunts, grandparents; non-kin, including servants, apprentices, employees, nursemaids, sick-nurses, wet-nurses, unrelated fostered children; and, depending on denomination, spiritual kin.

Indeed, contemporaries tended not to distinguish between family and household as separate entities; for instance they typically described servants who shared their dwelling as part of both family and household (Gordon 2008: 86). Recent scholarship has tried to capture this experience by coining the term household-family (Tadmor 2001). An historical demographic approach also risks

being too functionalist because it sees families as primarily reproductive forms. Accounts which prioritise marriage, for instance, neglect households not structured around marriage, such as those shared for economic security, by single women or men, or formed following the cessation of marriage through death. Similarly, as Reynold Packham's monument suggests, a family does not stop being a family when some of its members die. Furthermore, one of the striking features of family life that emerges from studies of late medieval and early modern households from all levels of wealth is the degree of movement of people into different households. Infants were sent to wet-nurses, or wet-nurses came to live with their charges, older children went to train as servants or apprentices, or were fostered and adopted in other households. The sick and poor were cared for and nursed by paid and unpaid carers, and lodgers or boarders shared family homes (Broomhall 2008:18).

The impact of Emotions on Categories, Gender and Power

What do we do with this more fragmented picture of family formation and life? The risk of such a position is that all families look different from each other, which is true but unhelpful for historians of family life whose job it is to contextualise and historicise family life. Family and household were in practice and ideology the building blocks of society and their role and meaning, as well as people's experience of them, was subject to historical forces. Yet this is far easier to do at the micro level, as Cavallo recommends, where the influence of society, economy, religion, and politics and the complexity of their interactions can be identified in detail. It is a far less tenable task when surveying family and household across two centuries and a wide geographical area (Cavallo 2010). This is where an emotions framework is helpful. In the first place, it resolves some of the issues of who to include in a study. As Susan Broomhall explains, it shifts the focus to the 'connections forged by members of household communities,' and the emotions that shaped interactions between these people drawn together by shared economic, social, and biological needs, rather than relations forged only from marriage or blood (Broomhall 2010: 1). This chapter follows her advice, since it

means that we can focus on relationships, as people did at the time, and accept they may be temporary or longer term, shaped by events and activities, rather than by inflexible categories.

Secondly, using the history of emotions as an overarching conceptual framework tackles some of the shortcomings of the 'affective' model of investigation. This had the limitation of attending only to love, with scholars generally measuring its depth, and consequently categorising relationships in one of two oppositional ways: affective or instrumental. It also placed constraints on who could be included in such a study: generally only spouses, parents and children were, because it was assumed that only 'close' marital or blood links forged such affection. Moreover, it restricted the social groups included, since such historians tended to assume that only life-writings could give information about family feelings (love) because until the nineteenth century, most ego-documents were written by an educated, elite minority (Fleming 2004: 53-4). By reconceptualising what investigating emotions in the past aims to achieve, however, it is possible to resolve this supposed problem. The historian of emotions is concerned with the full range of feelings, recognising that emotional relationships include anger, anxiety, grief, fear, apprehension, pain, and suspicion, as well as love (in its diverse forms) and desire. This also means that most of the records used to capture family life can be used, such as court records, literary works and conduct books.

Thirdly, scrutinising the emotions that circulated within the household facilitates a more expansive account of the family that is neither structural nor affective; it is inclusive since it does not depend on rigid characteristics of relatedness, is less synchronic in nature, and not dependent upon co-residence. With emotions as our conceptual category it becomes clear that people included household members unrelated by blood or marriage in their understanding of family. Attention to emotions also reveals that families were reconfigured in temporary forms around emotional cultures, such as those following bereavement or during pregnancy and childbirth. Moreover, it enables us to extend our understanding of family to encompass family members who were rarely co-

resident. As Susan Broomhall observes, ideas about emotional relationships transcended physical boundaries and were played out by people at a distance (2008: 16).

Fourthly, emotions history nuances family life by revealing that feelings interacted with power to act upon and disrupt age and gender hierarchies, birth, rank, and occupational order. Studies recognise that while emotions in the household create and reproduce subordination, they can also unravel it (Broomhall 2008: 5, 14-16). As this chapter will show, this breaks down a tendency to apply binaries when analysing the family. It helps us move away from placing ideal and reality in opposition or at a distance from each other (previously explained through ignorance or rejection of conventions). It prevents us defining hierarchical relationships only through the categories of dominance and subordination (and thus seeing them as based on obedience or subversion or mediated by reciprocity and negotiation). It shows instead that gender ideals were not simply inculcated to favour men, but could be trained in both sexes as simultaneously an instrumental tool and an intrinsic value. As Broomhall explains, the household 'offered a set of rules to order the emotional content of individuals, whether strangers or blood relatives' which are thus, of course, historicisable(Broomhall 2008: 4).

This chapter thus insists that the dwelling group is too limiting a category by which to measure family, and that temporal and spatial fluidity should not militate against recognising an enormous variety of family relationships (Cavallo 2010: 8-9, 27-28). Again, it is important to emphasise that these relationships involved emotions and did not require co-residence. Studying the Lisle Letters of the 1530s, exchanged between Lord Lisle and his servant Husee, Catherine Mann argues that they indicate that 'household ties were predicated on good feeling, affection, and understanding, rather, perhaps, than duty or proximity' (Mann 2008: 127). It also deliberately shakes off the shackles of structural and affective models together with their organisational formulations and suggests that we think of family and household in terms of connections and constituencies. Connections rather than co-residence are the key factor for inclusion in this examination of family and household. This

recognises the constellation of emotional ties between those who resided, for more than a brief visit, in the household or who were bound by ties but at times did not co-reside and, admittedly, largely in the case of the elite, therefore relied upon correspondence as the means by which the familial relationship was maintained. As Broomhall and Van Gent's analysis of the Nassau family indicates, siblings were not just part of family and household as children when they co-resided, but continued to be so, even as they moved between each other's dwellings (Van Gent and Broomhall 2009: 152).

A constituencies approach aims to capture the sense of family as a group of individuals (perhaps an 'emotional community' (Hanawalt 2006)) who had shared interests, which extended beyond the walls of a dwelling, consanguinity or affinity, and which included people who formed family-households based around other kinds of activities, such as single women sharing a home for economic advantage or to avoid local authorities' harsh regulations, and individuals living together with shared occupations and professional interests. As Susan Broomhall's collection demonstrates to magnificent effect, the social unit of the household structured its residents' identities and interactions with other communities (Broomhall 2008: 2). With these framing formulations in mind, the rest of the chapter is divided into sections around the powerful and motivating feelings of love and hate, sex and suspicion, and the ties of responsibility and reciprocity. It also explores the impact of emotions in constructing and mitigating various temporary and more longstanding bonds and hierarchies.

Love and Hate

The family and household were the location of physical and emotional reproduction: loci in which loving relationships were forged but also broke down. Hence, historians have tended to investigate only these two: love and hate, oppositional yet intertwined emotions through marital relationships. Historians of family and household in the Renaissance period have been caught up for some time in speculating about the extent to which marriage was based on mutual love. Early scholars, such as

Lawrence Stone, saw an increase in the making of marriage for love from the late medieval period, when he deemed it did not serve as a basis for a union, to the seventeenth century, when at least Protestants were increasingly attuned to the necessity for companionate marriage (Stone 1977). Others have rejected such a crude periodisation, pointing to numerous examples of love and affection in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, such as that expressed between Margery Paston and the family's bailiff, Richard Calle, in the late 1460s (McCarthy 2004: 93). Nonetheless, historians have struggled to accommodate their idea of love with noble families arranging marriages between children for social and political advancement. Scottish Highland chiefs of clans in the sixteenth century, for example, used marriage as either a way to reinforce internal clan cohesion or to form and maintain external alliances. The union in 1571 of Helen, daughter of John Grant, fourth of Freuchy, and Donald, son of Angus MacDonald of Glengarry, cemented a bond between the two clans. It bound MacDonald to his promise to assist Grant in his activities, defend his lands from attack, and help recover stolen goods in the event of an attack (Cathcart 2008: 130-2). Pragmatic unions are observed in other social groups. Middling-sort unions wed according to economic wherewithal, and in times of need poor and widowed individuals married to secure a basic level of economic provision for themselves or their young children.

Of course, it is easier to reconcile such a variety of unions with love, if we define love according to understandings applied at the time (Reddy 2012). Marital love was understood to develop over time, and thus be consistent with a union constructed for instrumental reasons out of which romantic love could grow. Interestingly, the supposed absence of love in marriage is generally constructed by historians as damaging for women, not men. Thus courtly love is cast as largely theoretical and favouring noblemen, not their objects of desire: symptomatic of families' sacrificing women's happiness to dynastic interests. Any notion of love in the patriarchal context of marriage is viewed as primarily serving men's benefits. Men held the most power in the family over their dependents; yet contemporaries saw love as offsetting or limiting their desire to exert their will. The instrumentality

of this is clear, seemingly constructed merely to facilitate women's acceptance of their husbands' authority and thus enabling them to proffer obedience (Fleming 2004: 54-55).

Scholarship attuned to gender has nuanced much of this account. Wives had more authority in certain household circumstances, such as when their husbands were absent, or because they held property in their own right (Sandvik 2008: 112-13). The sixteenth-century Nuremberg couple, Magdalena and Balthasar Paumgartner's correspondence reveals her considerable agency which resulted from his extensive travels in Europe as a merchant (Ozment 1989). Furthermore, married women garnered degrees of autonomy and power through the emotions engendered in situations such as childbirth, childrearing, and care of the sick, although we need not see this as wrested from husbands. Hannah Newton's account of parental care of sick children in sixteenth-century England reveals that fathers nursed their ill offspring as much as mothers did, with both feeling the same levels of emotional distress (Newton 2012: 4-5). Accounts of early modern marriage now stress the space it offered for spouses to negotiate their relative positions of authority along gendered lines, but enabling a flexibility that cut across these gender restrictions that placed wives in a subordinate role (Barclay 2011). It is also acknowledged that noble women were trained in feminine virtues for instrumental reasons, aiding their capacity to exercise female forms of authority within the family, rather than simply to ingrain obedience (Pollock 1989). Tracy Adams' work on fosterage in early modern French noble families reveals that efforts were aimed at cultivating them into gentle, amiable young women. This helped manage the conditions of this collective style of living, which did not centre on biological relationships. However the virtues of piety, chastity and amiableness were not inculcated simply in order to make women submissive. Appreciated in themselves, the values were also intended to enable a woman 'to better exercise influence': a form of diplomacy to be exercised by women in a system that forged political contracts and created chains of influence between families. The values, supposedly modelled by the noble women in whose families they were fostered, were intended to 'help them to enter successfully into the system of exchange through which one gained power' (Adams 2008).

Work on masculinities reveals that patriarchal manhood was itself precarious, undermined by wives' sexual and moral reputation, and by their economic contribution to the domestic economy (Shepard 2006). Less often acknowledged is that lack of love and affection was as detrimental to men's wellbeing as to women's. Perhaps our questions of these sources need to be reconfigured to ask what love meant for both spouses when separation and divorce remained either unavailable or damaging. As such, it is more useful to acknowledge that successful marriage was always understood to be constructed on several pillars: love, sex, economic stability, and compatibility of various kinds, which were as essential for husbands as well as wives. Those with additional means sought to secure dynastic, financial, and political advancement through it, though this was not necessarily in opposition to these concerns.

The counterpoint to studies that seek convincing evidence of marital affection are those which expose marital violence. Julie Hardwick, for instance, explores individuals', communities', and courts' negotiations of the parameters of husbands' prerogative to use force to discipline their wives in seventeenth-century France (Hardwick 2006). The patriarchal structure of society and family governance in this era provided men with the right to correct insubordinate dependents, though it should always be remembered that violence was not considered acceptable by secular or canon law or in popular culture. Men were not supposed to let themselves be bested by their women, in the endless battle of the sexes for dominance, but for all that examples of men's horrific abuse of their wives can be found all too often, the protection of women from abuse was carried out at several levels from family to Church and state(Bailey and Giese 2013). Moreover, boys were typically trained to channel anger into appropriate forms and not display uncontrolled rage (Foyster 1999). Since marital abuse stems from a man's desire to control his wife, and its incidence remains shockingly high in societies deemed relatively egalitarian, we should be very cautious about condemning late medieval and early modern marriages for being structured to accommodate and condone husbands' blows against wives.

Sex and Suspicion

The household was the site of both legitimate and illegitimate sexual acts; the former in the marital bed, the latter in a variety of liminal spaces within the dwelling and its environs. These acts and the meaning surround them also shaped notions of family relationships. Marriage was a union that conferred mutual care and companionship and was expected to be founded on mutually satisfying sexual relations. St Paul's statement upon the 'marital debt' in 1 Corinthians 7 was unequivocal about the centrality of sex in marriage:

> to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband. Let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence: and likewise also the wife unto the husband. The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband: and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife.

Moreover, one model of sexual reproduction saw mutual orgasm as a necessity for conception, which presumably encouraged satisfying sex for women as well as men (Kingsley Kent 2012: 14-15). It is perhaps not surprising then, that marital sex was understood not simply to serve reproductive ends, but to sustain a married couple in their union and to strengthen the relationship.

Yet the family and household consisted of family members who directly threatened this legitimate sexuality. Spouses were regularly reminded of infidelity's risks for household and gender reputation. Throughout the period, bawdy tales and, in the later part of the period, conduct advice, and popular customs, such as charivari, rough music, and Skimington rides, mocked and reprimanded men whose wives cuckolded them (Burke 2009: 279-80). Being seen by one's community as weak and unable to satisfy or control a wife's sexual appetite not only undermined a man's personal identity, it also threatened his standing in his community as governor of his household. Furthermore, husbands' adultery was often very close to home; in imagination and practice, men engaged in sexual relationships with their household maids. These were often exploitative relationships, though there

could be some degree of female volition. In Venice, 1627, one maid brought a defloration case against her master Bortholomio Agazi, a spice merchant. She apparently agreed to exchange her virginity for a dowry, but sued him when he failed to provide it (McGough 2010: 41-2). As such, while servants were understood to have potentially affectionate relationships within their family of employment, the more sinister side of this was their perceived role in causing conflict and tensions. The potentiality and reality of maid-master sexual relationships meant that mistress-maid relationships could be fraught and constructed around mutual mistrust. As such, court records from cases of illegitimacy inevitably reveal the fear, anger, hatred, as well as, occasionally, care and pity, emanating from these relationships. Often wives were obliged by their own lower position in the household hierarchy to support their unfaithful husband, even when he had clearly exploited a dependent, the maid. Marko Lamberg thus identifies suspicion as the main feeling characterising mistress-maid relationships in Stockholm, 1450-1650 (Lamberg 2008: 172).

Responsibilities and reciprocities

At various points in the family life-course, most households were filled with children. Although family sizes varied and not all households were formed around fertile married couples, nevertheless children, whether biologically or socially related, were usually present. Procreation was considered the purpose of marriage and, unless infertile, couples had children, though their numbers varied according to rates of infant mortality and, perhaps, the practice of family limitation. Moreover, older children entered households as employees, kin, and through fosterage (Gager 1996). Despite previous scholarly debates about the degree to which late medieval and early modern society conceptualised and valued childhood, and parents emotionally invested in their offspring, the consensus is that parents were expected to love their children and do their best to establish them for adult life which often meant securing training for them in other people's households. Love could ameliorate power hierarchies. It is perhaps as fathers that this is most evident. When sons behaved badly, or sought to follow an occupational route other than that planned, their fathers might be

more likely to accommodate their position due to their love (Cavallo 2010: 22). As noted earlier, love has had different definitions in the past, but there are continuities where parenting is concerned, revolving around responsibilities and reciprocities. Mothers and fathers were to give their offspring care, compassion, religious and educational or employment training, all of which necessitated considerable emotional and financial investment, and the exercise of authority. In return, children offered affection, respect, duty and care. These parenting bonds extended across generations. For example, grandparents would take on the duty of care for their grandchildren when their children died, as Lucy Laumonier's study of late medieval Languedoc reveals. For instance, a reciprocal arrangement was forged between Guillimeta and her deceased daughter's husband that he and her orphaned grandson would provide and care for her, and offer her reverence like a good son would his mother. In return, the widower secured a home and place to work for his son, as well as, perhaps, a carer for the child (Laumonier 2016: 110).

Societies set, monitored, and judged parental performance of their responsibilities for children, typically through scriptural tenets, custom, and law. In post-reformation Scotland, for instance, parents' duties to their children were publicly declared through the baptismal ceremony. The ministers' sermon made it clear that parents were admonished, 'that ye nourish and bring up the children of God's favour and mercy …. So ought it make you diligent and careful to nurture and instruct them in the true knowledge and fear of God' (Hollander2008: 67). Melissa Hollander shows that the Kirk placed particular emphasis upon fathers being educated and well equipped for their role as moral, spiritual, and social head of house (Hollander2008: 68). In England, by contrast, god-parents took this role, selected from the family's extended relatives or social network. In fact, parents were still intended to secure their offspring's spiritual education, with the choice of god-parents establishing links between generations and families (Hollander2008: 70-2). Moreover, maternity and paternity carried reputational benefits and those who failed in their roles lost their standing (Krausman Ben-Amos 1997: 13-14).

Parental roles were often performed in relation to other people's children. Fosterage was a widespread practice with families fostering children in order to train the child in the necessary gendered social and/or occupational skills required for adulthood. It was also part of a patronage system wherein children were sent into a household of a higher social rank. In any of these situations, an emotional relationship between the child or adolescent and the family in which they were fostered could develop. In 1584, Duncan Campbell of Duntraein and his wife Agnes Nikolleane agreed to foster the son of Duncan Campbell of Glenorchy. Their formal bond stated the motivation for the fosterage: to ensure 'luife and favour suld be and contenew betwex the housis of Glnurquhay and Duntrone'. Still, this did not preclude the obligation of care for the child. Agnes was bound as foster-mother to 'do hir dewtie to him in all thingis according to the custome and condition of ane favorabill fostermother' (Cathcart 2008: 137). Even at the more general level, emotions shaped expectations and behaviour in this relationship. Tracy Adams' analysis of guides for fostering girls in early modern noble French families reveals that they advocated strategies to create pleasant atmospheres for the girls, as well as training them to be agreeable. This was intended to cultivate an atmosphere of mutual affection, in order to transmit skills to the women and facilitate the success of this form of extended family (Adams 2008).

Poorer households boarded a range of children too. In the later sixteenth century, John Harrys of Essex, boarded his daughter Elizabeth with Philip Baker, in London, 'for a certain time, to th'end his said daughter might learn some breeding' by being in London. The Bakers kept Elizabeth for ten years until she married, perhaps an indication of each party's satisfaction with the arrangement (Keniston MacIntosh 2005: 63). Some took in illegitimate and orphaned children. Joel Harrington demonstrates that parentless children of all ages, citizen and non-citizen, were circulated in early modern Nuremberg, a minority organised by the state, but most following horizontal relationships among neighbours and friends (Harrington 2008). Again this had a financial aspect. The Collectors of the Poor accounts from 1579 to 1596 of Hadleigh, Suffolk, show that the town paid elderly married couples themselves in receipt of poor relief to board young children. As Keniston MacIntosh

observes, the town fathers believed both parties would 'benefit from the economic, physical, and emotional stability of such arrangements (Keniston MacIntosh 2005: 71-2). In 1580, John Rede, a London vinter, arranged that his sister Elizabeth and her husband take in an illegitimate child, presumably so that the mother, Agnes, could work or find a spouse. The contract was for several months, and Agnes signed a bond promising to pay for her child's boarding. When she later married, her husband continued to pay the couple for several years. When the mother and her new husband then requested the return of the child, the foster parents refused and sued Agnes for the higher boarding amount originally agreed in the bond she had signed. It would seem that they had been happy to be paid the lower amount and keep the child, only demanding the higher sum with the prospect of giving it up. This surely resulted from the development of family-feelings for the child, and was not solely driven by the regular sum paid; otherwise the couple would have sued earlier (Keniston MacIntosh 2005: 66).

Bonds, rivalries, and tensions

Siblings lived together for at least part of their childhood, periodically separated by wet-nursing practices, training, education, and fosterage. During this time, they learned their place in the hierarchical family and social order, shaped by birth order, sex, and more broadly by their family's status, wealth, and religion. Though differentiated in this way, most brothers and sisters will have known that brothers took precedence over sisters, that boys and girls were reared for different purposes, which marriage for girls unless they were intended for religious seclusion, and a wide variety of employment for their brothers. They encountered these gendered rules through their clothing, their activities, and religious instruction. Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline Van Gent's study of an aristocratic Nassau family between 1570 and 1650, for instance, notes that gifts were often gendered, with boys receiving toys or educational gifts, while girls were given gifts that emphasised their appearance (Van Gent and Broomhall 2009: 143-165, 150).

In many cases, siblings dispersed in adulthood; but their relationships continued to be a significant feature of family life. Detailed accounts of children's lives as siblings are scarce for this period, but studies that attend to the emotional exchanges between adult siblings in correspondence exchanged during long distance separation reveals considerable interaction. Broomhall and Van Gent's study of the twelve legitimate children of William the Silent in the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, for example, reveals numerous 'exchange acts', from visiting each other and gift exchange, to fostering children. Unsurprisingly, given gendered property ownership, sisters circulated service to siblings, while brothers sent material aid. Broomhall and Van Gent also reveal how emotions shaped the siblings' relationships as adults in ways that contributed to, and reshaped, familial power norms and hierarchies. Child-bearing could reshape family order, with women gaining more power and influence regardless of their own birth order by having children first, particularly sons. As Broomhall and Van Gent observe, the 'ability to have children as well as their sex caused envy and competition to emerge' among siblings (Van Gent and Broomhall 2009: 157).

The vocabulary of emotions they used to some extent confirmed gender constructions and age conventions. The Nassau sisters were more likely than brothers to articulate feelings in letters; the corollary was that when brothers did express emotions, these feelings were deemed more authentic and powerful. Younger siblings were more likely to be effusively grateful and proffer services; though this was instrumental and anticipated elders' care in return (Van Gent and Broomhall 2009: 147-9). Other emotional vocabularies were strategical, demonstrating or renewing preferred familial connections, such as a mother naming her new-born after another family member, or a sibling flagging up favourites among brothers and sisters to give an individual leverage other another (Van Gent and Broomhall 2009: 152). This meant that adult siblings would align with other siblings in order to undermine other family members, perhaps an older brother or the family patriarch. In the Dutch Nassau family, elder siblings expressed negative emotions to younger siblings about still older siblings (Van Gent and Broomhall 2009: 155).

In noble families, dynastic political authority was the subject of dispute between siblings, with brothers jostling for power. Disputes frequently occurred when a father died and transferred property and power to one male successor. This led to horizontal disputes between brothers, largely operating as peers since they were equal before the law. Erica Bastress-Dukehart's work on early modern German noble families reveals that gender was also a key factor in such dynastic jostling and negotiation for power. She focuses upon brother-sister conflict, wherein despite their unequal legal position, women attempted to achieve their own ambitions. Such conflict reveals that noble women often expected to support themselves, rather than be dependent upon a brother's financial protection, because these women inherited moveable goods of value, which included rents and mortgages from family-owned properties, and their high birth meant they were trained for the task of managing this property. It also demonstrates that the making of marriage and transmission of property were both integral to noble dynastic strategies. As such, sisters' actions were just as significant in altering a family's political fortunes as their brothers' (Bastress-Dukehart 2008).

This does not mean that women were entirely passive objects, despite the extreme lengths to which brothers went to regain control. Bastress-Dukehart examines three early modern German cases from the early fifteenth to mid sixteenth centuries in which noblemen placed their sisters under house arrest, denying them access to the wider world and repudiating the efforts of state and church to intervene on the women's behalf. Bastress-Dukehart argues that the meaning of a siblings' defiance affected the brother whom they resisted differently, according to their sex. A brother's challenge tested his male sibling's right to rule, while a sister's defiance questioned her brother's capacity to rule, since his inability to control his sister intimated his inability to manage his other responsibilities. As such men might act with especial severity in controlling defiant sisters who resisted their authority, typically when a sister wished to marry a man of lower social rank, or refused to renounce rights to natal property. Indeed, in some cases a man who defied higher authority's demands and intervention in his family's affairs, could improve his family's social and political reputation (Bastress-Dukehart 2008).

Other types of relationships had the potential to construct emotional bonds, as we saw above between surrogate parents and children, but also between masters, mistresses, and their servants (Broomhall 2008: 19.). Servants in this period were taken on in smaller households as well as constituting the vast entourage of noble families; in the former they included women, in the latter for much of this period they were male. Employed from adolescence (defined by historians as life-cycle service), generally single, and learning employment- and life-skills until their own marriage or maturity, they were drawn from their masters' kin, neighbourhood, or trade. Servants' sex and intended training shaped their roles within their household-family, and perhaps their treatment. There is evidence of good and bad relationships. Some degree of emotional intimacy or dependence is perhaps evident in masters' and mistress's bequests of property and cash to their servants. In 1611, Marjorie Clutton died, with a huge estate worth £1,468.1s.4d. She made bequests to her daughter and cousin, but also left £5 each to her ''old servant'' William Reeve, ''her man Goodyer'' with £5, and her maid, and to the poor, and 2s.6d to another maid. Although Karen O'Brien interprets this as evidence of family feeling, it is perhaps significant that the Nantwich widows and single women who left cash for servants also left similar sums to the poor. It may well be that leaving money to servants and the poor was a charitable and virtuous act as much as a sign of familial affection; of course, the two were by no means incompatible (O'Brien 2016: 137). Indications of greater and lesser affection survive. When Ann Wright died in 1634 she differentiated between her servants, giving her favourite servant £10 and the rest 40s (O'Brien 2016: 138).

As with all intimate relationships, there is also evidence of tensions; the failure of trust and suspicion which some mistresses and maids encountered from each other is discussed above (Fleming 2004: 72-6). Masters could have a very instrumental and exploitative attitude towards their servants, particularly maid servants who were vulnerable to sexual abuse in the patriarchal household. Indeed, late medieval bawdy and humorous literary tales often featured maids who were objects to be used by both masters and mistresses for their own ends. In one mid-fifteenth century Burgundian collection of tales, masters pronounced that their maids' bodies were their masters' to possess. In

other stories, mistresses exploited maids to serve their own ends, whether to sexually satisfy an undesired husband or facilitate an affair (Bibring 2008). Yet it would be a mistake to see servants as universally passive and oppressed, or without emotional depth. There is no doubt that the domestic servant was considered socially inferior to the master of the household, subjected to another through contract, or bloodline, but also emotionally (Gordon 2008). Yet emotional connections and vocabularies were another way to resist other family members' power. Broomhall observes that early modern representations of servants, suggested that moral householders should fear servants because they impacted upon the household's honour. Thus masters and mistresses' perception of the threat of their servants' potential or actual disobedience and its repercussions for household reputation gave servants some emotional power (Broomhall 2008: 22, 30). The embeddedness of servants in kin and community in this era could be interpreted as providing some degree of protection for the servants, either because their employers were related by blood or marriage, or because their families were near enough to be called on for support. Similarly, this may have afforded some servants a position of negotiation, which at least alleviated their inferior status within the household, or gave them some leverage in negotiating an amenable situation.

Anxiety and Grief

Family relationships were reconfigured time and again in response to life-stage events, such as birth and death. Each of these instances was prefigured by a period of time in which families and households were changed by the corporeal demands of pregnancy and sickness, and in each case the constituency of the household reformed to meet these events' challenges. Pregnancy placed demands upon families, whether due to the mother's physical needs and capacity to work, expectations upon a father to provide materially and psychologically for his wife's state, or in wealthy households where anticipation of childbirth might also include extensive ceremonial arrangements. In many different social ranks, family members moved around or communicated with each other in order to monitor, facilitate, and participate in the pregnancy and its culmination.

Where written evidence exists, it is clear that pregnancy elicited a number of emotions for the parents and their household-families, primarily anxiety, apprehension, fear, and pain, hope, joy, and gratitude. As I have argued elsewhere, this emotional vocabulary, expressed in conversation, presumably, as well as letters, helped families navigate the stresses of this condition. It forged further bonds between spouses, but also between them and family members, for example when mothers sought guidance and support from their own mothers or mother-in-laws (Begiato 2017).

As noted earlier in this chapter, emotional events and vocabularies enabled people to subvert traditional hierarchies. Thus mothers used the various emotions associated with pregnancy and birth to construct female authority and make demands or challenge patriarchal authority (Begiato 2016). For example, Susan Broomhall argues that Catherine de' Medici used her correspondence with the Spanish Court about her daughter Elisabeth de Valois, Queen of Spain between 1559 and 1568, to legitimise her authority to direct her daughter's care during childbearing. This authority was established through her knowledge of the intertwined health and emotional well-being of pregnancy and childbirth (Broomhall 2002). Furthermore, the ability to share feelings of anxiety helped bridge the difficult transitions from one phase of life to another, and helping neutralise the fear of the arrival of the child, an unseen 'stranger' (Begiato 2017). Unfortunately, pregnancy also had a sinister side in that it was a time of increased incidence of violence in some marriages, perhaps related to its potential to undermine traditional patriarchal hierarchies. Court cases of marital violence reveal that a husband's abuse of his wife frequently occurred during her pregnancy. Indeed husbands were warned not to strike wives during this time. St Bernardino (1380-1444), for instance, included this admonition in his recommendations that husbands rely on correcting wives through words rather than blows (Fleming 2004: 57).

Childbirth also led to the circulation of family members and carers between households and temporary instantiations of emotional constituencies. Renaissance women drew upon their husbands for support and various services as childbirth came closer. Nonetheless, the event itself

was predominantly a female occasion, with men waiting for the delivery of the child, while women took the key roles: a group drawn from the mother's family (especially the child's future maternal grandmother) and friends, as well as the professional services of the midwife. The rituals of childbirth materialised collective female action, with the birth chamber physically and symbolically enclosed by blocking out day light. The lying-in period following birth (ideally a month), in which a mother was given time to physically recover, also meant that family members stayed for some time in the household to assist with domestic duties and childcare (Wilson 2013: chapter 4). Richer parents would employ a nurse (Wilson 2013: 178-9). Historians have debated whether these customs, and the churching ceremony that followed, indicated a rite of passage, signified society's belief in women's inferiority and impurity, or enabled a transitory reversal of gender order by placing women on top (Wilson 2013: 191-8). For our purposes, it is the emotional connotations that illuminate how the relationships within households were malleable both physically and conceptually. When a woman of reasonable means gave birth, her family reconfigured to accommodate those with whom she already had familial feelings. It also temporarily reshaped her relationship with her husband since she was removed from his immediate authority, and their sexual relationship, as well as some of her household labours.

It should be noted that the same circumstances could forge negative emotions that challenged familial relationships. These provisional familial configurations could also be a period of conflict rather than female conviviality (Pollock 1990). Laura Gowing observes that childbirth could lead to tensions between women. The women involved might engage in questioning the mother's behaviour or morality, gossiping and slandering her, and arguing with rather than supporting family members. As she points out, when poor women gave birth, and particularly when unmarried women did, the 'Honest matron's who attended did so primarily to uphold parish interest as well as assist the travailing mother (Gowing, 2003: 159, 163). Indeed, Gowing argues that childbirth might be another area 'for the exercise of authority and deference', since the women attending births were by no means social equals. Gentlewomen sometimes attended the lying-in of villagers, and 'poor old

women' assisted with cleaning and nursing mothers in labour, as part of the conditional requirements imposed by receiving poor relief (Gowing, 2003: 155). The gathering of women during a lying-in period was also potentially disruptive and argumentative; male satirists certainly feared it was (Gowing, 2003: 174).

Sickness and death in the family also created a temporary emotional constituency. This was practical, since it led to more people entering and staying in the dwelling when a family member was ill and known to be dying, including medical professionals, paid carers and attendants, clergy, and kin (Brady 2008: 194). Following death there were a number of religious and customary rituals surrounding funeral rites and bereavement and grieving, which forged links between the community and family. As Andrea Brady argues, both sickness and death created new emotional bonds. This had the potential to cut across social hierarchies, temporarily creating equity between family members, and embodying affection, since not only did paid carers minister to sick family members, servants who were ill could be cared for by their employers (Brady 2008: 192). In the early seventeenth century, Jane Stephens, a maid in Alice and William Payne's household in Canterbury became ill and died a couple of weeks later. She slept in the same chamber as her master and mistress and during the night she sickened, she called out that she was dying. At that William leapt up and lit a candle, and Alice got her warm broth. In the next two weeks, Alice provided solace, support and food and William applied himself to helping Jane sort out her property and will. At the end, Jane died in the Paynes' home, surrounded by female friends and neighbours, all presumably facilitated by her employers (Hallam 1996: 69-71).

Trust, Service and Support

Restricting the study of families and households to those with parents, children and servants at their centre ignores household-families composed of different members who were nonetheless bound by feelings, such as trust, service, and support, which shaped both their living arrangements and their emotional lives. An excellent example is Marcantonio Sabellico's household based around the

profession of teaching. In the late fifteenth-century, this Venetian family was composed of Sabellico and his son, along with a number of male amaneuses, tutors, foster carers, students, and servants; women being largely absent. By his teenage years, Sabellico's son was hosted by other households in Ferrara and Padua, and Sabellico took in his brother's son to educate him, as well as boarding adolescent residential students in his household. Neither proximity nor co-residency was critical in shaping this household-family. Ruth Chavasse points out that his authority as pater-familias extended over his own residence and those where he sent his son to board. Although composed predominantly of unrelated or distantly related individuals, the correspondence between members of his household reveals strong bonds. This was not without instrumental cause since the members were financially dependent upon Sabellico, but it was founded on feelings of trust and care (Chavasse 2008).

Another household in which the main familial relationships were forged between its male members was in the scholarly Godfrey household in France, in the mid seventeenth century, whose members were employed in pedagogy. Caroline Sherman notes that while the patriarch, Theodore Godfrey, paid his clerks and copyists a good salary in exchange for fidelity and effort; he also entered affective relationships with them. Travelling is his advanced years, two of his amanuenses not only accompanied him to carry out their work and physically cared for him, and they kept his son up to date with his father's health and activities. The amanuenses were afforded the permanent status of younger son or brother. As with younger brothers, they were only allowed to express themselves in more childlike emotions, such as wonder, fear, gratitude, and anxiety. Like some of the siblings discussed above, whose acceptable modes of communication were determined by their relative birth order, an amanuensis was the individual to whom a 'superior' expressed displeasure. They therefore could construct affective alliances which offset patriarchal relationships, such as a clerk allying with a son against a domineering father (Sherman 2008: 155, 158).

In noble families, it is possible to examine the ways in which service constructed affective relationships through the correspondence between its unrelated household members. An example is the relationship between Lord Lisle and his high-ranking servant and agent in London, Husee, laid bare in his communications with his master and mistress in the 1530s when they resided in Calais. Catherine Mann shows that Husee deployed a language of obligation and feeling engendered by duty. This secured his position and offered him a safe platform from which to defend his actions and offer criticism of his employers. Husee frequently explained his actions in his letters to his employer, Lord Lisle, through a vocabulary of loyalty and duty. What is particularly interesting is that he deployed a gendered mode of contact in his letters to Lord and Lady Lisle. Not only did he drawn on ideals of 'good lordship' and 'good ladyship' to negotiate his position with both, he corresponded with Lady Lisle in such a way that potentially subverted the power relationship between him and his master; as well as requesting her intervention in his letters, Mann argues that he constructed his duty towards her as devotional, establishing a certain gendered intimacy that was not replicated in his letters to his master (Mann 2008: 126-7).

There is less detailed evidence surviving of such households at lower social levels, though court cases and records of governance offer some clues to alternative forms of household-families forged around support. There are examples across Europe of several single women living together. Local authorities frequently viewed single women as sources of social disorder, masterless women who were not under the authority of father or husband. Many forbade unmarried women from living and working independently; although in fact women's pay was usually too low to make this viable anyway. For authorities, controlling single women thereby prevented the moral disease of prostitution, and limiting their capacity to find employment prevented them undermining married men's ability to earn enough to keep their dependents. A Coventry Ordinance of 1492, for instance, forbade single women from keeping a house or chamber by themselves, or with another, and required them to go into service or leave the city; all strategies which brought them under a master's authority (Froide 2005: 19-25; Peters, 2003: 24-6). Still, some single women did form

households together though usually related, such as sisters, and of some means (Froide 2005: 22-3, 54-55, 71-3). While possibly composed of both non-kin and kin, some of these relationships may have stimulated or depended upon feelings such as affection, obligation, or trust.

Another way to achieve a household-family that was more economically viable was for women to take on unrelated children, part of the plethora of makeshift economies. Thus urban women boarded children who attended local schools. In the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century, Christ's Hospital, London, sent out illegitimate and orphaned children to be wet-nursed in the suburbs, and cities paid 'foster mothers' to take parentless children into their homes. Lone women with children might also board with male householders, presumably as a way to secure a more respectable living and avoid concerns over their masterless state. Most of the evidence of modest households doing such work comes from institutional or court records, and thus does not always record details of everyday lives and feelings, yet it is clear that at the least, these relationships would result in reciprocal obligations (Keniston MacIntosh 2005: 61-2). In the 1560s and '70s, for instance, Elizabeth Watson, had come from London to board with Thomas Freman of Leominster. She stayed for about four months and then left, returning the next year with with her two-year old child, boarding again for nearly four months, and leaving again. She also paid Thomas to board a second child. During this time, Thomas loaned her cash and paid some debts, while Elizabeth claimed she had loaned him a larger sum (Keniston MacIntosh 2005: 2). Such temporary constituencies may well have forged trust and support, and as this case shows, when trust failed, had the capacity to engender a number of far more negative feelings.

Conclusion

This chapter shows the value of attending to emotions as the framework for exploring family and household in Renaissance Europe. Attention to the full range of emotions that was created by family life and household connections reveals the extensive web of relationships that constituted family and household, their variety, their mutability, their temporality (both short and long), and the ways

in which these changed over time and location. This overview of emotional ties also points to the significance of emotions themselves in shaping family life and the people whose relationships constituted family and household. Feelings determined behaviours, shaped gender and age hierarchies for good or bad, and influenced the interactions between individuals, households, communities and states.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Tracy (2008) 'Fostering Girls in Early Modern France' in in Susan Broomhall (ed), *Emotions in the Household 1200-1900*, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 103-118.

Bailey, Joanne and Giese, Loreen (2013) 'Marital cruelty: reconsidering lay attitudes in England, c. 1580 to 1850,' *The History of the Family* 18 (3), 289-305.

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

Bastress-Dukehart, Erica (2008) 'Sibling Conflict within Early Modern German Noble Families', *Journal of Family History* Vol 33, Issue 1, pp. 61 - 80

Begiato (Bailey), Joanne (2016) 'Emotions, Pregnancy and Birth', in Susan Broomhall (ed) *Early Modern Emotions : An Introduction*, London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.

Begiato (Bailey), Joanne (2017) 'Breeding' a 'little stranger': managing uncertainty in pregnancy in later Georgian England' in Jen Evans and Ciara Meehan, *Perceptions of Pregnancy from the Seventeenth to Twentieth Century*, Basingstoke, Hants: Palgrave.

Bibring, Tovi (2008) 'Love thy chambermaid: emotional and physical violence against the servant in Les Cent Nouvelles' in Susan Broomhall (ed), *Emotions in the Household 1200-1900*, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan pp. 53-68.

Brady, Andrea (2008) 'A Share of Sorrows: Death in the Early Modern English Household' in Susan Broomhall (ed), *Emotions in the Household 1200-1900*, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan pp. 185-202.

Broomhall, Susan (2002) '"Women's Little Secrets": Defining the Boundaries of Reproductive Knowledge in Sixteenth-century France', *Social History of Medicine*, 15 (1) pp. 1-15.

Broomhall, Susan (2008'), 'Emotions in the Household' in Susan Broomhall (ed), *Emotions in the Household 1200-1900*, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-37.

Burke, Peter (2009) *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate.

Cathcart, Alison (2008) '"Inressying of kyndnes, and renewing off thair blud": The Family, Kinship and Clan Policy in Sixteenth-Century Scottish Gaeldom' in Elizabeth Ewen and Janay Nugent, *Finding the Family in Medieval and Early Modern Scotland*, pp. 127-138.

Cavallo, Sandra (2010) 'Family Relationships' in Cavallo, Sandra (ed.), *A Cultural History of Childhood and Family in the Early Modern Age*, vol. 3, Oxford: Berg.

Chavasse, Ruth (2008) 'Humanist Educational and Emotional Expectations of Teenagers in late Fifteenth Italy', in Susan Broomhall (ed), *Emotions in the Household 1200-1900*, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan pp. 69-84.

Fleming, Peter, (2004) *Family and Household in Medieval England*, Basingstoke, Hants: Palgrave.

Foyster, Elizabeth (1999) 'Boys will be Boys? Manhood and Aggression, 1660- 1800', in Tim Hitchcock and Michelle Cohen (eds.), *English Masculinities*, London: Longman, pp. 151-66

Froide, Amy (2005) *Never Married: Singlewomen in Early Modern England*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gager, Kristin Elizabeth (1996) *Blood Ties and Fictive Ties: Adoption and Family Life in Early Modern France*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Goldberg, Jeremy (2010) 'Family Relationships,' in Wilkinson, Louise (ed.), *A Cultural History of Childhood and Family in the Middle Ages*, vol. 2, Oxford: Berg.

Gordon, Sarah (2008) 'Humour and Household Relationships: Servants in Late Medieval and Sixteenth Century French Farce', in Susan Broomhall (ed), *Emotions in the Household 1200-1900*, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 85-102.

Gowing, Laura (2003) *Common Bodies: Women, Touch and Power in Seventeenth-century England*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Griffin, Ralph (1915) *Kentish Items Wrotham*, John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, Ltd: London.

Hajnal, John (1965) 'European marriage pattern in historical perspective' In D.V. Glass and D.E.C. Eversley (eds.), *Population in History*, Arnold: London.

Hallam, Elizabeth (1996) 'Turning the Hourglass: Gender Relations at the Deathbed in Early Modern Canterbury, *Mortality* 1 (1), pp. 61-82.

Hanawalt, Barbara (2006) *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*, New York: Cornell University Press.

Hardwick, Julie (2006) 'Early Modern Perspectives on the Long History of Domestic Violence: The Case of Seventeenth-Century France' *Journal of Modern History* 78:1, 1-36.

Harrington, Joel (2008) 'Child Circulation Within the Early Modern Urban Community: Rejection and Support of Unwanted Children in Nuremberg' in Michael Halverson and Karen Spierling (eds), *Defining Community in Early Modern Europe*, London: Routledge.

Hollander, Melissa (2008) 'The Name of the Father: Baptism and the Social Construction of Fatherhood in Early Modern Edinburgh' in Elizabeth Ewen and Janay Nugent, *Finding the Family in Medieval and Early Modern Scotland*, pp. 63-72.

Keniston McIntosh, Marjorie (2005) *Working Women in English Society, 1300-1620*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kingsley Kent, Susan (2012) *Gender and History*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Krausman Ben-Amos, Ilana (1997) 'Human Bonding: Parents And Their Offspring In Early Modern England,' University of Oxford, Discussion Papers in Economic and Social History, Number 17, pp. 13-14.

https://www.nuffield.ox.ac.uk/economics/history/paper17/17www.pdf (Accessed 15 May 2017)

Lamberg, Marko (2008) 'Suspicion, Rivalry and Care: Mistresses and Maidservants in Early-Modern Stockholm' in Susan Broomhall (ed), *Emotions in the Household 1200-1900*, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan pp. 170-84.

Laslett, Peter (1965) *The World We Have Lost Further Explored*, London: Routledge 1983.

Laslett, Peter and Wall, Richard (1972) *Household and Family in past Times*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laumonier, Lucie (2016) 'Grandparents in Urban and Rural Lower Languedoc at the End of the Middle Ages', *Journal of Family History*, 41(2) 103-117.

Laura J McGough (2010) *Gender, Sexuality and Syphilis in Early Modern Venice: The Disease that Came to Stay*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Mann, Catherine (2008) 'Displeasure, Duty and Devotion in The Lisle Letters', in Susan Broomhall (ed), *Emotions in the Household 1200-1900*, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 119-134.

McCarthy, Conor (2004) *Marriage in Medieval England: Law, Literature, and Practice*, Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press.

Newton, Hannah (2012) *The Sick Child in Early Modern England 1580–1720*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

O'Brien, Karen (2016) 'Intimate Worlds: Kinship Relations and Emotional Investment among Nantwich Women 1603–1685,' *Journal of Family History* 41 (2), 131-143.

Ozment, Steven (1989) *Magdalena and Balthasar: An Intimate Portrait of Life in 16th Century Europe Revealed in the Letters of a Nuremberg Husband and Wife*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Peters, Christine (2003) *Women in early modern Britain, 1450–1640*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pollock, Linda (1989). 'Teach her to live under obedience': The making of women in the upper ranks of early modern England. *Continuity and Change, 4*(2), 231-258.

Pollock, Linda (1990) 'Embarking on a Rough Passage: The Experience of Pregnancy in Early-Modern Society,' in V. Fildes (ed.), *Women as Mothers in Pre-Industrial England. Essays in Memory of Dorothy McLaren*. London: Routledge.

Razi, Zvi (1981) 'Family, Land and The Village Community In Later Medieval England,' *Past and Present* 93 (1): 3-36.

Reddy, William (2012) *The Making of Romantic Love: Longing and Sexuality in Europe, South Asia, and Japan, 900-1200 CE*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sandvik, Hilde (2005) 'Decision-making on Marital Property in Norway 1500-1800' in Maria Agren and Amy Erickson, *The Marital Economy in Scandinavia and Britain 1400-1900*, Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate.

Shepard, Alexandra (2006) *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sherman, Caroline (2008) 'Resentment and Rebellion in the Scholarly Household: Son and Amaneusis in the Godfrey Family', in Susan Broomhall (ed), *Emotions in the Household 1200-1900*, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan pp. 153-169.

St George's Church, http://www.wrothamchurch.org/St_George/Tour/Floor_Brasses.html

(accessed 25/04/17)

Stone, Lawrence (1977) *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*, London:

Penguin

Tadmor, Naomi (2001) *Family and Friends in Eighteenth Century England*, Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, Keith (2009) *The Ends of Life: Roads to Fulfilment in Early Modern England*, Oxford:

Oxford University Tucker, M. J. (1974) 'The Child as Beginning and End: Fifteenth and

Sixteenth Century English Childhood,' 229-258. in Lloyd de Mause (ed), *The History of*

Childhood, Lanham, Maryland, US: First Rowman and Littlefield Edition, 2006.

Van Gent, J. and Broomhall, S. (2009) 'Corresponding Affections: Emotional exchange among

William the Silent's children', *Journal of Family History*, 34 (2), pp. 143-165.

Weever, John (1631) *Ancient Funerall Monuments within the United Monarchie of Great*

Britain, London.

Wilson, Adrian (2013) *Ritual and Conflict, The Social Relations of Childbirth in Early Modern*

England, Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate.