

Lawrence Stone was educated at Charterhouse School and Christ Church, Oxford. He was a lecturer at University College, Oxford, from 1947 to 1950, and a Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford, from 1950 to 1963. Since 1963 he has been Dodge Professor of History at Princeton University, and Director of the Shelby Cullom Davis Center for Historical Studies, also at Princeton, since 1969. Professor Stone has contributed numerous articles to learned journals and periodicals. His published works include *The Causes of the English Revolution, 1529-1642, Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641*, and (editor) *Schooling and Society*. He is also author of *Sculpture in Britain: The Middle Ages*, published in The Pelican History of Art series.

LAWRENCE STONE

THE FAMILY,  
SEX AND MARRIAGE

In England 1500-1800

ABRIDGED EDITION

HARPER TORCHBOOKS

Harper & Row, Publishers, New York  
Grand Rapids, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco  
London, Singapore, Sydney, Tokyo, Toronto

# Contents

List of Graphs	10
List of Illustrations	12
Acknowledgements	15
Preface to the Abridged Edition	17
PART ONE: INTRODUCTION	
Chapter 1 Problems, Methods and Definitions	21
1. The Pattern of Change	21
2. Evidence and Interpretation	24
3. Definition of Terms	28
Chapter 2 The Demographic Facts	37
1. Marriage	37
2. Birth	37
3. Death	51
4. Conclusion	54
66	66
PART TWO: THE OPEN LINEAGE FAMILY	
1450-1630	
Chapter 3 Family Characteristics	69
1. Structure and Values	69
2. Affective Relationships	76
i. The Society	76
ii. The Family	81
3. Conclusion	88
PART THREE: THE RESTRICTED	
Patriarchal Nuclear Family 1550-1700	
Chapter 4 The Decline of Kinship, Clientage and	
Community	93
1. Introduction	93

CONTENTS

2. The Landed Classes: The Decline of Kinship and Clientage	94
3. The Middle Ranks: The Modification of Kinship	97
4. The Causes of Change	99
5. Peasants, Artisans and the Poor: The Decline of Community	105
Chapter 5 The Reinforcement of Patriarchy	109
1. General Causes	109
2. Parents and Children	113
i. Areas of Permissiveness	113
ii. Areas of Repression	115
iii. Control of Occupation and Marriage	127
3. Husband and Wife	136
i. Subordination of Wives	136
ii. The Education of Women	142
4. Conclusion	145

PART FOUR: THE CLOSED DOMESTICATED  
NUCLEAR FAMILY 1640-1800

Chapter 6 The Growth of Affective Individualism	149
1. Introduction	149
2. Affective Individualism in Society	153
3. Affective Individualism in the Family	164
i. Attacks on Patriarchy	164
ii. Decline of Family Prayers	168
iii. Personal and Bodily Privacy	169
4. Conclusion: The Causes of Change	172

Chapter 7 Mating Arrangements	181
1. Theory	181
2. Practice	192

Chapter 8 The Companionate Marriage	217
1. The Rise of the Companionate Marriage	217
2. Early Feminist Movements	225
3. The Education of Women	228
4. Case Histories	233

CONTENTS

5. Single Persons	241
6. Conclusion	245
Chapter 9 Parent-Child Relations	254
1. The Child-oriented, Affectionate and Permissive Mode	254
i. General Indicators of Change	254
ii. Changes in Child-rearing Practices	267
2. Child-rearing Modes and Social Categories	285

PART FIVE: SEX

Chapter 10 Upper-class Attitudes and Behaviour	303
1. Introduction: General Considerations	303
2. Upper-class Culture in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries	309
3. Upper-class Behaviour in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries	323
4. Behaviour of 'The Quality' in the Eighteenth Century	326
5. Conclusion	339

Chapter 11 Gentlemanly Sexual Behaviour: Pepys and Boswell	340
1. Samuel Pepys	341
2. James Boswell	350
3. Conclusions	379
Chapter 12 Plebeian Sexual Behaviour	382
1. The Facts of Change	382
2. The Causes of Change	395

PART SIX: CONCLUSION

Chapter 13 Facts, Interpretations, and Post-1800 Developments	407
1. The Facts of Change 1500-1800	407
2. Interpretations of the Change 1640-1800	414
3. Post-1800 Family Types	422
4. General Conclusions: Family Change and Historical Development	424
Index	429

## CHAPTER ONE

# Problems, Methods and Definitions

'The public life of a people is a very small thing compared to its private life.'

(G. d'Avenel, *Les Francais de mon Temps*, Paris, 1904, p. 1)

'To judge fairly of those who lived long before us . . . we should put quite apart both the usages and the notions of our own age . . . and strive to adopt for the moment such as prevailed in theirs.'

(Lady Louisa Stuart, c. 1827, in *Letters and Journals of Lady Mary Coke*, ed. J. A. Horne, Edinburgh 1889, I, p. xxxv)

'We have very little of correctly detailed domestic history, the most valuable of all as it would enable us to make comparisons . . .'

(*The Autobiography of Francis Place*, c. 1823-6, ed. M. Thale, Cambridge, 1972, p. 91)

### 1. THE PATTERN OF CHANGE

The subject of this book can be stated fairly simply. It is an attempt to chart and document, to analyse and explain, some massive shifts in world views and value systems that occurred in England over a period of some three hundred years, from 1500 to 1800. These vast and elusive cultural changes expressed themselves in changes in the ways members of the family related to each other, in terms of legal arrangements, structure, custom, power, affect and sex. The main stress is on how individuals thought about, treated and used each other, and how they regarded themselves in relation to God and to various levels of social organization, from the nuclear family to the

#### THE FAMILY, SEX AND MARRIAGE

state. The microcosm of the family is used to open a window on a wider landscape of cultural change.

The critical change is that from distance, deference and patriarchy to what I have chosen to call affective individualism. I believe this to have been perhaps the most important change in *mentalité* to have occurred in the Early Modern period, indeed possibly in the last thousand years of Western history.

The four key features of the modern family – intensified affective bonding of the nuclear core at the expense of neighbours and kin; a strong sense of individual autonomy and the right to personal freedom in the pursuit of happiness; a weakening of the association of sexual pleasure with sin and guilt; and a growing desire for physical privacy – were all well established by 1750 in the key middle and upper sectors of English society.

Further stages in the diffusion of this new family type did not take place until the late nineteenth century, after a period of nearly a century during which many of the developments that have been described had gone into reverse. When forward movement picked up again at the end of the nineteenth century, it involved a spread of the domesticated family ideal up into the higher court aristocracy and down into the masses of artisans and respectable wage-earners who composed the bulk of the population.

This is not the first time that problems of this sort have been studied, for they are similar to some of those with which both Max Weber and Jacob Burckhardt wrestled more than three-quarters of a century ago. They too were obsessed with the complex inter-relationships thanks to which changes in culture emerged from changes in religion, social structure, political organization, economics, literacy and so on. Neither Weber nor Burckhardt solved these problems either to their own or to posterity's full satisfaction, and I cannot hope to succeed where scholars of such pre-eminent distinction have partly failed. But it is worth making a new effort, using a much narrower focus, in a different national context and in the light of another seventy-five years or so of historical scholarship, if only because these issues are so central to the evolution of Western civilization.

Early Modern English society was composed of a number of very distinct status groups and classes: the court aristocracy, the country gentry, the parish gentry, the mercantile and professional elite, the

#### PROBLEMS, METHODS AND DEFINITIONS

property owners in town and country, the respectable and wage-earners, and the totally destitute who lived on their wits. These constituted more or less self-contained units, with their own communication networks, their own sense of value and their own patterns of acceptable behaviour. Cultural divisions between social groups ran much deeper than they do today, when the differences are as much between classes as between classes. As time went on and as writing and printing spread to become the main vehicle for the diffusion of ideas, the degree to which different social strata used or were affected by a new means of expression brought with it still more marked divisions. The result was less the supersession of one family pattern by another than the provision of a wider set of familial values by another than the provision of a wider number of quite different patterns.

Attitudes and customs which were normal for one class or social stratum were often quite different from those which were normal in another. Such changes as took place sometimes affected one class but not others; for example, the rising rates of pre-marital pregnancy and illegitimacy affected the peasantry, the artisans, and the poor in the late eighteenth century, but not the upper middle class, the gentry and the aristocracy. Other changes, for example the drift towards a more child-oriented attitude, affected different groups at widely different times, taking a century or more to flow from one to another. Other powerful influences were confined to a single class. Thus possession of property to be handed down vitally affected family structures and marriage arrangements among the propertied classes, but left the propertyless masses untouched. Conversely, the pressures of urbanization and industrialization profoundly affected the poor, but hardly impinged on the lives of the nobility in any significant way. Even religion, which was so powerful a force in the early seventeenth century and again in the nineteenth century, affected the more literate middling social strata far more deeply than the pleasure-seeking court aristocracy or the illiterate poor. Magical beliefs remained deeply embedded in the minds of the lower ranks who constituted the majority of the population, so that the religious enthusiasm of the age created a dissociation of sensibility rather than a restructuring of the values and beliefs of the society as a whole. Once again, there was a fragmentation of cultural norms. Stratified diffusion of new ideas and practices is the key to any realistic understanding of how family change took place. Generalizations

about family change have therefore always to be qualified by a careful definition of the class or status group, the literate or the illiterate sector, the zealously godly or the casually conformist, which is under discussion. Patterns of behaviour found in the leading sectors of value-change, the professional and gentry classes, do not necessarily apply to the court aristocracy, the urban lower-middle class, the rural smallholder, or the landless labourer.

Simple models of family evolution may work perfectly well for primitive and culturally homogeneous societies unaffected by the technology of printing, the social consequences of demographic growth or the rise of capitalism, the economic consequences of gigantic wealth alongside abject poverty and unemployment, and the intellectual consequences of Puritanism, Newtonian Science and the Enlightenment. But they will not work for so sophisticated, so diversified and so changing a society as seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England, where there is a plurality of cultural worlds, and a consequent plurality of family styles and values. Thus of the three ideal types of family which have been identified, each overlapped the other by anything up to a century, and none of them ever fully died out.

## 2. EVIDENCE AND INTERPRETATION

Every possible type of evidence has been examined to pick up hints about changes in values and behaviour at the personal level. The greatest reliance has been placed on personal documents, diaries, autobiographies, memoirs, domestic correspondence, and the correspondence columns of newspapers. Other sources which have been used are the more popular and most frequently reprinted handbooks of advice about domestic behaviour, before 1660 written mainly by moral theologians and after 1660 mainly by laymen, with doctors becoming increasingly prominent after about 1750; reports of foreign visitors; imaginative literature, concentrating on the most popular novels, plays and poems of the day; art, especially conversation-pieces and caricatures; architectural house plans showing circulation patterns and space use; modes of address within families, between husband and wife and parents and children; folk customs such as bundling and wife-sale; legal documents such as wills, inventories, marriage contracts, and litigation over divorce or sexual

man; and finally, demographic statistics about birth, marriage, pre-nuptial conception and bastardy. This rag-bag of evidence has been picked over and the finds assembled to try to create a coherent composite picture. The principal weakness of the data does not lie in sampling, since most of the readily accessible surviving personal documents and of the most popular didactic, literary and artistic works have been examined. The preservation of the first is poor, and undoubtedly there has survived only a fragment of what once existed. But there is no reason to suppose that there is any inherent bias between what was kept and what was thrown away, except that much correspondence of an explicitly personal or embarrassingly intimate character has undoubtedly been destroyed. It can therefore be assumed that what we have today is fairly representative of what still remains in manuscript. The one sampling weakness is that an examination of manuscript wills and marriage contracts for the eighteenth century has not been undertaken, although such material before 1660 has been carefully sifted.

Interpretation is more of a problem, since the most revealing materials, namely diaries, memoirs, autobiographies and letters, can rarely be checked from an independent source. We have, for example, no records kept by Mrs Pepys or Mrs Boswell to act as controls on the accuracy of the reporting of their husbands, who were the two greatest diarists in the English language. This material needs to be treated with the same critical scrutiny which the historian gives to documents in political history: an exchange of love letters needs to be handled with exactly the same sceptical caution as an exchange of diplomatic notes — no more, no less. But these personal records are peculiarly difficult to interpret. As E. H. Carr has warned, 'no document can tell us more than what the author of the document thought — what he thought happened, what he thought ought to happen or would happen, or perhaps only what he wanted others to think he thought, or even only what he himself thought he thought.' A good deal of this kind of material, unfortunately, probably falls into the last two categories. A second difficulty is that these are highly personal documents and, therefore, often very idiosyncratic, reflecting the quirks and quiddities of the individual psyche of the author, as well as the shared norms of social and moral behaviour of persons of his social class, education and time. They must, therefore, be exam-

ined in bulk, to make sure that one is not taking the exception for the rule, given the known wide variations of family patterns even within a single class at a certain time in a limited area.

Autobiographies are particularly suspect forms of evidence. This is partly because some tended to copy stereotyped models from the past such as St Augustine, Plutarch, Seneca or Marcus Aurelius, while others developed new stereotypes, like the Quaker model; partly because they were often very selective in what they recorded, being written with a view to placing the authors in a good light for posterity and leaving the world with some useful moral lessons; partly because even when they appeared most frank and intimate, like Rousseau's *Confessions* or Casanova's *Memoirs*, they were often involved in deliberate fantasy or role-playing.

The nature of the surviving evidence inexorably biases the book towards a study of a small minority group, namely the literate and articulate classes, and has relatively little to say about the great majority of Englishmen, the rural and urban smallholders, artisans, labourers and poor. But the consequences are mitigated by the fact that everything suggests that the former were the pacemakers of cultural change. Distortion of the record can be avoided if it is always remembered that the principle of stratified cultural diffusion and the persistence of distinctive, class-determined sub-cultures are the two keys to a proper understanding of the complicated history of family evolution in any society as socially differentiated as Early Modern England.

This problem is compounded during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries by the extreme loquacity of the Puritans and their compelling anxiety to commit their thoughts and beliefs to paper. An even more serious difficulty is caused by the dramatic increase in the amount and type of printed material and a substantial increase in literacy and in the capacity to handle the language, especially by women. Fortunately, there is also sufficient independent evidence from advice books and contemporary comment to make it fairly certain that the change is in the message, not merely in familiarity with the medium.

Any generalization inevitably runs into the objection that any behavioural model of change over time imposes an artificial schematization on a chaotic and ambiguous reality. This is, of course, true in the sense that a survey of family types at any one moment in time will reveal the same complexities as a geological

Strata are piled upon strata in layers that earth movements pushed and pulled out of place, so that older formations lie on surface in places, while very recent formations are beginning to top here and there. Similarly, older family types survive unchanged in some social groups at the same time as other groups are being quite new patterns. There will, therefore, be a plurality of existing types, without there being any single pattern predominant among all social classes, or even necessarily within a single class. Model building, therefore, involves an attempt to identify Weberian types out of the welter of historical evidence, and to highlight features which seem to have been dominant in certain social groups, but were far from universal at any given time.

The historian of the family is faced with the usual problem, but in its most intractable form, of how best to interweave fact and theory, anecdote and analysis. As Lévi-Strauss has well said, 'biographical and anecdotal history... is low-powered history, which is not intelligible in itself, and only becomes so when it is transferred *en bloc* to a form of history of a higher power than itself... The historian's relative choice... is always confined to the choice between history which teaches more and explains less and history which explains more and teaches less.' This book oscillates between analysis, which tries to explain, and anecdote, which tries to teach, in the perhaps vain hope that it may thus be possible to have the best of both worlds.

In dealing with the anecdotal material, the alternatives are to offer brief extracts from a large range of sources, or to use selected case studies to illustrate a point in depth. In this book the second method has been adopted, since in so sensitive an area as family relations only fairly detailed accounts can bring out the nuances of the situation. This choice has been deliberately made in full awareness that the method is open to the charge that the case studies selected are unrepresentative of the whole sample. All that can be said in defence is that a deliberate effort has been made to find representative examples and to eliminate exceptional sports.

## 3. DEFINITION OF TERMS

In order to understand what follows, it is first necessary to define with some care what is meant by 'family', 'household', 'lineage', 'kin', 'marriage' and 'divorce'. On close inspection these apparently simple words turn out to have complicated and ambiguous meanings.

The word 'family' can be used to mean many things, from the conjugal pair to the 'family of man', and it is therefore imperative to begin with a clear definition of what the word will mean in this book. Here it is taken as synonymous neither with 'household' nor with 'kin' — persons related by blood or marriage. It is taken to mean those members of the same kin who live together under one roof.

A household consists of all persons living under one roof. Most households included non-kin inmates, sojourners, boarders or lodgers, occupying rooms vacated by children or kin, as well as indentured apprentices and resident servants, employed either for domestic work about the house or as an additional resident labour force for the fields or the shop. This composite group was confusingly known as a 'family' in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It was because of their legal and moral subordination to the head of the household that no one, not even the Levellers, suggested that the electoral franchise should be extended to children or servants or women. They were not free persons.

In a society almost entirely without a police force, the household was a most valuable institution for social control at the village level. It helped to keep in check potentially the most unruly element in any society, the floating mass of young unmarried males; and it provided the basic unit for taxation. No wonder both Church and state looked on marriage with approval, and the sixteenth-century moral theologians spoke eulogistically about it as 'appointed by God Himself to be the fountain and seminary of all other sorts and kinds of life in the Commonwealth and the Church'.

In the Early Modern period, living-in servants were not the rarity that they are today, but a normal component of all but the poorest households. From the time of the first censuses in the early sixteenth century to the mid-nineteenth century, about one third or more of all households contained living-in servants.

The lineage are relatives by blood or marriage, dead, living, and

to be born, who collectively form a 'house'. The kin are those members of the lineage who are currently alive and who by virtue of the relationship are recognized to have special claims to loyalty, assistance or support. It was the relation of the individual to his lineage which provided a man of the upper classes in a traditional society with his identity, without which he was a mere atom floating in a void of social space.

As this traditional society eroded, however, under the pressures of church, state, and a market economy, different values came to the fore. These included the interest of the state in obtaining efficient and honest servants who were best fitted for their tasks; the interest of the individual in obtaining freedom to maximize his economic gains and freedom to pursue his personal goals; and the claims and interests of intermediate organizations, such as churches and professional groups. These new values undermined allegiance by the kin, and the result was a crisis of confidence among the aristocracy.

As one proceeds further away from the Highland zone and closer to London, and further down the social scale through gentry, bourgeoisie, peasants and artisans, the concept of kinship carried less and less of the baggage of ideological commitment to 'honour' and 'faithfulness', etc., to which most great magnates and their followers paid more than mere lip-service. In these less exalted circles, lineage meant little, and kinship was more an association for the exchange of mutual economic benefits than a prime focus of emotional commitment. Further down still, among the propertyless, the community of friends and neighbours was probably more important in both respects, especially in the urban environment.

In the Early Modern period, marriage was an engagement which could be undertaken in a bewildering variety of ways, and the mere definition of it is fraught with difficulties. Up to the eleventh century, casual polygamy appears to have been general, with easy divorce and much concubinage. In the early middle ages all that marriage implied in the eyes of the laity seems to have been a private contract between two families concerning property exchange, which also provided some financial protection to the bride in case of the death of her husband or desertion or divorce by him. For those without property, it was a private contract between two individuals, enforced by the community sense of what was right. A church ceremony was an expensive and unnecessary luxury, especially since divorce by mutual consent followed by remarriage was still widely practised.



It was not until the thirteenth century that the Church at last managed to take over control of marriage law, to assert at least the principle of monogamous indissoluble marriage, to define and prohibit incest, to punish fornication and adultery, and to get bastards legally excluded from property inheritance.

Although by the sixteenth century marriage was fairly well defined, before 1754 there were still numerous ways of entering into it. For persons of property it involved a series of distinct steps. The first was a written legal contract between the parents concerning the financial arrangements. The second was the sponsals (also called a contract), the formal exchange, usually before witnesses, of oral promises. The third step was the public proclamation of banns in church, three times, the purpose of which was to allow claims of pre-contract to be heard (by the seventeenth century nearly all the well-to-do evaded this step by obtaining a licence). The fourth step was the wedding in church, in which mutual consent was publicly verified, and the union received the formal blessing of the Church. The fifth and final step was the sexual consummation.

But it cannot be emphasized too strongly that according to ecclesiastical law the sponsals was as legally binding a contract as the church wedding, although to many laity it was no more than a conditional contract. Any sort of exchange of promises before witnesses which was followed by cohabitation was regarded in law as a valid marriage. In remote areas, especially the Scottish border country, Wales and the extreme south-west, the betrothal ceremony itself, the 'handfast', continued to be treated by many of the poor as sufficient for a binding union without the blessing of the Church. There is some evidence that even in the Lowland zone quite large numbers of the poor were not getting married in church in the late seventeenth century. Indeed the church wedding had not been elevated to the position of a sacrament until 1439, and it was only in 1563, after the Reformation, that the Catholic Church first required the presence of a priest for a valid and binding marriage.

The Anglican Church naturally did not recognize this Catholic innovation, and since it took no measures of its own, the situation was left in considerable confusion. As the Anglican Church tightened its grip on society in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, both the laity and the clergy came increasingly to regard the wedding in church as the key ceremony, but the civil lawyers who ran the courts continued to recognize the sponsals before witnesses.

could take two forms, one of which was the contract *per te futuro*, an oral promise to marry in the future. If not followed by consummation (which was assumed to imply consent in present), this was an engagement which could be legally broken without consent at a later date. If followed by consummation, however, it was legally binding for life. The contract *per verba de presenti*, however, by which the pair exchanged before witnesses phrases as 'I do take thee to my wife' and 'I do take thee to my husband', was regarded in ecclesiastical law as an irrevocable contract which could never be broken, and which nullified a later wedding to someone else.

To make matters worse, the canons of 1604 stipulated that a wedding must take place between the hours of 8 a.m. and 12 p.m. in the church at the place of residence of one of the pair, after banns had been read for three weeks running. Marriages performed at night, in secular places like inns or private houses, or in towns or villages remote from the place of residence, would subject the officiating clergyman to serious penalties. The canons also forbade the marriage of persons under twenty-one without the consent of parents or guardians. The catch, however, was that although such marriages were now declared illegal, they were nonetheless valid and binding for life: this was a paradox the laity found hard to understand.

This post-1604 situation resulted in a brisk trade carried on by unscrupulous clergymen, operating in districts which were immune from superior ecclesiastical supervision, who would marry anyone for a fee, no questions asked. This was a commerce which became more and more widespread and scandalous in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, when parent-child relations on the issue of control of marriage were becoming more and more strained, and more and more children were defying their parents and running away (Plate 1). Shadwell described a clergyman who 'will marry a couple at any time; he defies licence and canonical bann, and all those foolish ceremonies'. If the playwrights are to be believed, some clergymen were even more obliging. Captain Basil in Farquhar's *The Stage Coach* reported: 'We saw a light in the parson's chamber that travelled with me, went up and found him smoking his pipe. He first gave us his blessing, then lent us his bed.' Many London churches, which were by various legal quirks unlicensed or exempt from superior jurisdiction, specialized in quick marriages. Between 1664

and 1691 some 40,000 marriages took place in St James's, Duke Place, while 'there's such a coupling at Pancras that they stand behind one another, as 'twere in a country dance'. The most flourishing trade of all was done by decayed clergymen in the vicinity of the Fleet in London, particularly in the first half of the eighteenth century when official weddings were heavily taxed, and those around the Fleet were both legally valid and very cheap. Notice-boards advertised 'Marriages performed within', and touts encouraged passers-by with the invitation 'Sir, will you be pleased to walk in and be married?' For the poor within walking distance of London, Fleet marriages were a financial godsend, but many drunken, hasty and exploitative unions were also sealed in these sordid surroundings, and once performed they could never be dissolved. These venal clergymen were also prepared, for a fee, to back-date a registration to legitimize children already born, or even to supply a man for a woman seeking a husband in a hurry.

It was not until 1753 that Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act was passed, which at last brought coherence and logic to the laws governing marriage. From 1754 only the church wedding, not the verbal spousals, was legally binding, so that a prior oral contract was no longer a cause for the annulment of a later marriage in church; secondly, all church marriages had to be entered in the parish register and signed by both parties; thirdly, all marriages which occurred at times or in places defined as illegal by the 1604 canons were now also declared invalid; fourthly, no marriage of persons under twenty-one was valid without the consent of parents or guardians; and fifthly, enforcement of the law was transferred from the feeble control of the Church courts to the secular courts, which were empowered to impose up to fourteen years' transportation on clergymen who disobeyed the law. From now on, the only recourse for runaway couples defying their parents was the long and expensive flight to Scotland, especially to Gretna Green, where the new Marriage Act did not apply, and where there sprang up a new trade in commercialized marriage on the spot with no questions asked (Plates 2 and 3).

The debate over the passage of the Bill provides revealing evidence about current attitudes to marriage among the propertied classes. The prime reason for the Bill was frankly stated as being the fact that both men and women of the most infamous character had opportunities of ruining the sons and daughters of the greatest families

England, by the convenience of marrying in the Fleet and other licensed places; and marrying had become as much a trade as any mechanical profession. The solution was to deny the validity of the solemn ceremony unless it conformed to certain conditions, including parental consent if under twenty-one. This necessarily involved the rejection of the ceremony as a sacrament, an indissoluble union before God. Advocates of the reform complacently declared that 'we have in this age got the better of this as well as a great many other pernicious opinions . . . so as 'to render Christianity consistent with common sense'. Marriage was now regarded as a contract like any other, subject to statutory controls for the public good, for 'this adding of a sanctity to the marriage is inconsistent with the good of every society and with the happiness of mankind in general'. The Bill was thus clearly only made possible by the growing secularization of elite society and by the acceptance of the idea that personal happiness could be achieved by public legislation. Its proponents would have preferred to restrict the clause demanding parental consent to persons of 'fortune and rank', but recognized that 'this is impossible in this country'.

The second object of the Bill was to do away with secret pre-contracts and secret marriages, which made bigamy all too easy (Plate 4). Public registration of the marriage was now an essential part of the ceremony. It was argued, with some plausibility, that under existing conditions in which marriage could be made by mere verbal contract, by the blessing of a wandering clergyman in an ale-house, by a private chaplain in a private house, or by a commercial clerical marriage-maker in one of the unlicensed London churches, a man could have as many wives as he wished. 'Every man may privately have a wife in every corner of this city, or in every town he has been in, without it being possible for them to know of one another.' Another speaker agreed that 'the crime of polygamy [is] now so frequent'.

At this period there was no divorce permitting remarriage in the Anglican Church. For marriages which broke down, usually because of adultery, there was only separation of bed and board, accompanied by a financial settlement. This was currently called 'divorce', but it did not allow either party to remarry. Moreover the many medieval impediments which could create a nullity were now blocked up. These had been so numerous that a rich man with a good lawyer could probably obtain one, although the records of

#### THE FAMILY, SEX AND MARRIAGE

ecclesiastical courts show that the average man did not use this device. He almost certainly simply divorced himself or ran away without going to law. After the Reformation, an annulment could only be obtained on the three grounds of a pre-contract to someone else, consanguinity within the Levitical degrees, or male impotence over a period of three years – the last not an easy matter to prove. A man or woman whose spouse had left home and had not been heard of for a period of seven years was also free to remarry, on the assumption that the missing spouse was dead. If he or she returned, however, either the first marriage took priority over the second or the woman was permitted to choose which husband she preferred.

For most people in England, therefore, marriage was an indissoluble union, breakable only by death: this point was emphasized by Defoe in 1727, and by that acidulous spinster Miss Weeton in a sarcastic poem in 1808 about a discontented husband:

'Come soon, O Death, and Alice take,  
He loudly groan'd and cry'd;  
Death came – but made a sad mistake,  
For Richard 'twas that died.

Unlike the other Protestant churches, the Anglican Church, largely because of historical accident at its inception, failed to provide for remarriage by the innocent party in cases of separation for extreme cruelty or adultery. This question remained in some doubt throughout Elizabeth's reign, but was finally clarified by number 107 of the canons of 1604, which forbade the remarriage of 'divorced' persons. To the aristocracy this created an intolerable situation, since it meant that a nobleman whose wife committed adultery before producing a son was precluded from marrying again and begetting a legal male heir to carry on the line and inherit the property. It was to circumvent this difficulty that in the late seventeenth century, as the concept of marriage as a sacrament ebbed with the waning of religious enthusiasm, divorce by private Act of Parliament became a possible avenue of escape for wealthy noblemen and others who found themselves in this predicament. But this was a very expensive procedure, and it was almost entirely confined, especially before 1760, to those who had very large properties at stake to be handed on to a male heir by a second marriage. Between 1670 and 1799, there were only 131 such Acts, virtually all instituted by husbands, and only seventeen passed before 1750. Thus in 1715, by a close

#### PROBLEMS, METHODS AND DEFINITIONS

of 49 to 47, the House refused to pass a divorce bill requested by Sir George Downing. In 1701, at the age of fifteen, he had gone through an arranged marriage with a fifteen-year-old girl. They had then immediately parted, Sir George going abroad for four years, and the marriage, by mutual consent, had never been consummated. The bill was rejected on the grounds that both parties had been over the age of consent (fourteen and twelve respectively).

At the other end of the social scale, among the propertyless, there were also alternatives to death as a means of finally dissolving an unsatisfactory marriage. In a society without a national police force, it was all too easy simply to run away and never be heard of again. This must have been a not infrequent occurrence among the poor, to judge by the fact that deserted wives comprised over eight per cent of all the women aged between thirty-one and forty listed in the 1570 census of the indigent poor of the city of Norwich. The second alternative was bigamy, which seems to have been both easy and common. In the eighteenth century, more or less permanent desertion was also regarded as morally dissolving the marriage.

A third alternative for the poor in the eighteenth century was the unofficial folk-custom of divorce by mutual consent by 'wife-sale'. As described in 1772, the husband 'puts a halter about her neck and thereby leads her to the next market place, and there puts her up to auction to be sold to the best bidder, as if she were a brood mare or a milch-cow'. A purchaser is generally provided beforehand on these occasions. This procedure was based closely on that of the sale of cattle. It took place frequently in a cattle-market like Smithfield and was accompanied by the use of a symbolic halter, by which the wife was led to market by the seller, and led away again by the buyer. The transaction sometimes even included the payment of a fee to the clerk of the market. In the popular mind, this elaborate ritual freed the husband of all future responsibility for his wife, and allowed both parties to marry again. Very often, perhaps normally, the bargain was pre-arranged with the full consent of the wife, both purchaser and price being agreed upon beforehand. The latter varied widely, from a few pence to a few guineas.

It appears that this procedure was almost exclusively confined to the lower classes, and was centred mostly in the big towns and the west of England. It had a medieval origin, but evidence for it becomes far more frequent in the late eighteenth century, then dies away in the nineteenth, the last recorded case being 1887. To the labouring

classes, this ritualized procedure was clearly regarded as a perfect legitimate form of full divorce, to be followed by remarriage, despite its illegality in both secular and ecclesiastical courts, and despite increasing condemnation in the public press. Indeed the courts made intermittent and half-hearted attempts to stop it, Lord Mansfield treating it as a criminal offence, a conspiracy to commit adultery.

In the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, therefore, full divorce and remarriage were possible by law for the very rich and by folk custom for the very poor, but impossible for the great majority in the middle who could not afford the cost of the one or the social stigma and remote risks of prosecution of the other.

## CHAPTER TWO

### The Demographic Facts

Birth, copulation and death,

That's all the facts when you come to brass tacks,

Birth, copulation and death.

(T. S. Eliot, *Sweeney Agonistes*)

'Man that is born of Woman is of few days and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower and is cut down. He fleeth also as a shadow and continueth not.'

(*Emblems of Mortality*, London, 1789, p. 39 (quoting Job xiv, 1), illustrated in *Early Children's Books and their Illustration*, ed. G. Gottlieb, Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, 1975, no. 86)

The best way to start an analysis of family structure is to establish the demographic facts, which inexorably dictated so many of its basic features, including even such apparently independent variables as emotional commitment. These facts did not alter very dramatically over time, but they varied from class to class, and it is necessary to distinguish between the landed, professional and mercantile rich, the top three to five per cent who dominated the society, and the plebeians of moderate, modest or marginal wealth who formed the vast majority.

#### 1. MARRIAGE

Among the landed classes in pre-Reformation England, nuptiality – the proportion of surviving children who married – was determined by family strategy. The three objectives of family planning were the continuity of the male line, the preservation intact of the inherited property, and the acquisition through marriage of further property or useful political alliances. Given the very uncertain prospects of survival, the first could only be ensured by the procreation of the largest