

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Family *in a Hurry*

The oldest institution, and how it changed

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 6

The Core Ideas 8

How It Actually Works 21

What People Get Wrong 32

Use It 37

Terms 42

Go Deeper 45

Notes and Sources 47

Bibliography 54

The Whole Thing in One Page

Family is usually pictured rather than explained. The picture has two parents, their children, one home and a clear line between relatives and everyone else. It feels ancient because many people first met it as children. As history, it is one arrangement among thousands.

Calling family the oldest institution is useful shorthand, not a claim that archaeology can identify the first household. Structured care, reproduction, childrearing and recognised relatedness predate writing, states and formal markets. Human children depend on others for unusually long periods. Adults become dependent again through illness, disability and age. Death leaves property, memories and unfinished duties. Family turns these recurring conditions into claims that can outlast the moment: this child belongs with these carers; these people count as kin; this person may inherit; these adults owe support; these dead remain our ancestors.

That definition must remain broad. The English word *family* is an analytical umbrella, and other societies divide or combine its relationships differently. Four maps are commonly folded into one. Kinship classifies relations and their consequences. A household shares living arrangements or domestic resources. Marriage creates a recognised bond between adults and often between their groups. Family is the wider field of durable belonging, care, authority and transmission built through birth, partnership, adoption, law and sustained practice. The maps overlap, then separate. A grandmother can be family outside the household. A lodger can share the household without joining the family. A genetic parent can lose legal authority while an adoptive parent acquires it.

The institution has carried a large bundle: reproduction, childcare, work, food, property, inheritance, education, religion, old-age support and political alliance. That bundle made family protective and dangerous at once. It could provide care no distant authority supplied. It could also turn dependence into obedience, place property under one person, trap spouses, rank children and pass inequality to the next generation. Love may soften power; it does

not remove it.

Change came by rearranging claims and functions. Agriculture made land, stored wealth and succession more consequential in many societies without producing one universal system. Religions and states recognised marriages, heirs and household heads because rule depends partly on knowing who belongs where. Wage labour moved some production away from home. Falling mortality and fertility changed the arithmetic of parenthood. Schools, hospitals, pensions, welfare systems and care markets took over parts of work once carried mainly by relatives. Contraception, divorce, adoption reform, same-sex marriage and assisted reproduction widened the distance between sex, marriage, genes, pregnancy, residence and parenthood.

None of this made family disappear. It made some ties more chosen, some duties more supervised by law and visible forms more diverse. A small address can sit inside a large network of money, memory and care. States that appear to replace family still rely on relatives to fill gaps. Markets sell care, but somebody decides who notices the need, pays the bill and remains when the contract ends.

Family survived by changing who could belong, what members owed, what crossed generations and how people could leave. Its history is neither a fall from one stable form nor a march towards private freedom. It is the continuing attempt to organise care, identity, authority and transmission among people who never live as independent units.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

A census form can make a parent disappear. In the 2021 census of England and Wales, a child moving between parents' homes was assigned one usual address. The other parent might provide money, overnight care and the school run while disappearing from that household's family category. The statistic is not wrong. It is answering a narrower question than ordinary speech asks. A record of who lives here cannot tell you everyone who belongs.

That gap matters because arguments about family often begin with a measurement and end with a moral verdict. Marriage rates fall, cohabitation rises, more young adults live with parents, more older people live alone, and each trend is offered as proof that family has weakened or returned. The same data can point in opposite directions because residence, legal status, emotional commitment and practical obligation are different things.

The UK's 2025 household estimates make the problem visible. Most families were married-couple families, while cohabiting couples formed a substantial minority. About 8.6 million people lived alone, yet that did not tell you whether they were isolated, caring for relatives or supported by adult children nearby. More than a quarter of adults aged twenty to thirty-four were counted as living in their parents' family. Even that measure excludes people who have formed their own family within the same home. The label tells you which statistical box someone occupies, not the whole relationship.

Family is worth understanding because it is the first welfare system most people encounter and the main institution through which advantages and disadvantages travel. Before a child meets a school, employer, bank or court, somebody has supplied language, food, expectations, safety, time and an address. Families transfer money and property, but also contacts, confidence, habits, risk and a sense of what futures are available. Public policy can weaken that inheritance or deepen it. It cannot pretend the starting household is irrelevant.

The subject also exposes a mistake in economics and politics. A household

is often treated as though it were one person with one income and one preference. It is not. Members cooperate because their lives are joined, and they may disagree over spending, work, children, sex, care and exit. The person who earns the wage may not perform the unpaid labour. The person who needs care may have little bargaining power. Resources entering a home do not distribute themselves.

This is why the family cannot be placed safely on either side of a private-public line. Marriage rules, inheritance, housing, taxation, immigration, parental leave, schooling, pensions and social care all shape what relatives can demand from one another. When governments withdraw support, family obligation can expand or needs can go unmet. When services improve, relatives gain options but rarely cease to matter. The state does not stand outside the family. It helps draw its boundaries and sends part of the bill back inside.

The moral stakes are equally double. Family can be the place where a person is known without having to earn membership. It can also be the place where surveillance, coercion and violence acquire the language of love. Any account that treats family as either sanctuary or prison has selected one half of an institution capable of both.

The next hour will give you a cleaner map. You will see why there was never one traditional family, why the small household is older than industrialisation in some regions, why love and strategy have long coexisted in marriage, how childhood changed, why care remains unequally allocated and why modern choice keeps producing new obligations. The family is familiar enough to escape explanation. Once explained, it becomes one of the best ways to see how a society distributes dependence, power and time.

The Core Ideas

A Claim That Outlasts the Moment

Begin with a newborn. It cannot feed or protect itself, and it will remain dependent for years while learning the language, skills and rules of the people around it. Other primates also care for young. What is unusual is the length and cost of human childhood, combined with frequent help beyond the mother. Fathers, grandparents, siblings and unrelated companions can matter, with contributions varying by ecology and society. Biology therefore yields no single prehistoric household.

Research on recent hunter-gatherer communities corrects the isolated-couple picture. Camps may join several families and include substantial cooperation among people who are not close genealogical relatives. Mothers can receive food, protection, carrying and supervision from others. This evidence is not a photograph of the deep past, and no living community is a fossil. It establishes a narrower point: human survival is compatible with flexible residence, dispersed care and durable bonds wider than a small biological unit.

Childhood is the first dependency, not the whole explanation. Injury, sickness, pregnancy, unemployment, disability and old age can turn a productive adult into somebody who needs time, money or bodily care. Death creates dependants, inheritance disputes and questions of continuity. Any society therefore faces recurring problems. Who feeds the child whose mother dies? Who supports an old person who can no longer work? Who may use the dead person's land? Who speaks for somebody who cannot decide? Whose membership or status crosses a generation?

Family supplies answers before each crisis arrives. It gives names to relationships, places people inside histories of descent or affiliation and attaches expectations to positions such as parent, child, spouse, sibling, grandparent or heir. The claim may be moral, religious, legal or economic. A stranger may help generously, but a recognised relative can be expected to help tomorrow, and others know whom to ask when help is missing.

Care alone cannot define the institution. Nurses, neighbours and friends care, while some relatives neglect or harm. Family adds a claim of belonging and continuity: this relationship is understood to persist, to authorise some actions, to prohibit others and to matter beyond the pair. Adoption can create that claim without genes. Descent can preserve it without affection. Marriage can extend it between groups. Everyday feeding, naming and remembering can make relatedness where formal law is absent.

English gathers these relationships under *family*. Other languages divide them differently. The word is useful provided it does not turn a local arrangement into a universal one.

Such durable claims make family powerful and morally unstable. A child cannot bargain for years of care in advance. A frail parent may be unable to repay the adult child who bathes them. Obligations can move resources across time without continuous pricing. They can also convert need, inheritance and belonging into control. Parents have authority because children require protection, but authority can exceed protection. A spouse may gain security through shared property and lose the means to leave.

Calling family the oldest institution does not mean one ancient form survived intact. No evidence can identify a first marriage ceremony or universal ancestral household. The defensible claim is that organised relationships around care, reproduction, belonging and succession predate states, written law and formal markets. Those later institutions joined the struggle over who counts, who owes and who inherits.

The newborn will eventually grow up; the need for dependable others will not disappear on its eighteenth birthday. Family carries those expectations forward. What changes is who can call on whom, for what, and with what power to refuse.

Family, Kin and Household Are Different Maps

Take an illustrative case. A woman lives alone in Manchester. Her daughter lives nearby, her son in Australia, her sister in Scotland, and a paid carer visits each morning. How large is her family? How large is her household? The questions sound interchangeable until an answer is required.

A household is primarily a residence and resource arrangement. Its members occupy the same dwelling or share domestic provision under a statistical or legal definition. They may be relatives, partners, friends or lodgers. A household can split while a family remains connected. It can contain more than one family, or no family under the census definition.

Kinship is a system for classifying relationships and their consequences. Some connections are traced through birth, some through marriage, adoption, ritual or sustained care. Societies differ in which links they emphasise. Bilateral systems recognise relatives through both parents. Patrilineal descent follows a line through men; matrilineal descent follows a line through women. Neither term tells you who governs. A matrilineal society can give senior men strong authority over a sister's children. Descent is a map of membership and succession, not a synonym for the sex holding power.

Residence adds another map. A married couple may live near either partner's group, establish a separate home, move between groups or follow work. Labels such as patrilocal, matrilocal and neolocal describe tendencies rather than prison cells. Actual people adapt to land, housing, conflict, labour and the availability of carers.

Marriage is another relation again. It creates recognised claims between partners and often between their families, but need not produce a shared household or children. People can live together without legal marriage, remain legally married after separating, or maintain a partnership across two addresses. Divorce can end one set of claims while parenthood continues.

Family is the broadest and least tidy map. In ordinary English it names people treated as belonging together through descent, partnership,

adoption, care or collective history. As an analytical term it must be used carefully, because other languages and institutions may divide these relationships differently. Law then selects parts of the field for particular purposes. A tax rule, inheritance statute, hospital policy and immigration system may each recognise a different family. The same person can count as next of kin in one setting and as legally unrelated in another.

These distinctions are not academic housekeeping. They prevent false conclusions. A rise in one-person households does not prove a rise in people without family. A fall in marriage does not measure the disappearance of partnership or parenthood. Multigenerational care can increase without three generations sharing an address. A grandparent who provides childcare twice a week is outside the household and inside its operating system.

The UK's official family definition centres on co-resident couples, with or without children, and lone parents with children, including adult children who have not formed a family of their own. That is a useful counting unit, but it misses care between homes and relationships outside those categories. Classification makes society visible by discarding detail.

Return to the woman in Manchester. Suppose her daughter handles the shopping, her son pays for extra care and her sister knows whom she would like to see. The carer may know her daily needs best. Each person matters differently; nobody has to move in for the arrangement to work.

Now suppose the daughter moves away. The household count stays at one, but the practical arrangement must change. Conversely, someone could move into the spare room without becoming kin. Statistics can register a large change while relationships barely shift, or miss a change that transforms an ordinary day.

Marriage Joined Lives, Property and Lineages

Marriage is often described as a public recognition of private love.

Historically, the direction commonly ran the other way. A recognised union created a framework within which intimacy, sex, children, property and cooperation were expected to develop. The arrangement joined two people, but it could also join households, land, labour, status, allies and descendants.

That wider function explains why families, religious authorities and states cared about it. A marriage could settle who had legitimate children, who controlled a woman's work or property, which group gained an alliance, where a couple lived, what transferred at the wedding and where assets went after death. Bridewealth, dowry and dower moved different resources in different directions and carried different rights. They cannot be collapsed into one purchase of a bride, though each could become part of unequal bargaining.

Marriage systems have varied widely. Monogamy may be the legal rule while serial partnerships are common. Polygyny, one man with more than one wife, has been permitted in many societies but practised by a minority where additional households were costly. Polyandry, one woman with more than one husband, has been rarer and concentrated in particular ecological and property settings. Rules of endogamy and exogamy determine whether partners should come from within or beyond a defined group. Ideals and practice rarely match perfectly.

This diversity does not mean anything counted as marriage. Societies normally marked the relationship because consequences depended on recognition. Witnesses, gifts, registration, ritual, cohabitation or sexual union could establish the bond. The recognised marriage distinguished a spouse from a lover, a legitimate heir from a disputed claimant, or an alliance from an encounter. Where property and succession mattered, ambiguity was expensive.

Strategy did not exclude affection. Letters, songs, court cases and

household records show desire, companionship, grief, jealousy and conflict long before modern companionate marriage. The mistake is to force one motive to erase the others. A union could be arranged by relatives and become affectionate. A love match could improve status. A couple could choose one another within a narrow field shaped by religion, class, caste, race or locality. Choice has always had a menu.

In much of Europe and North America, the route towards modern marriage involved several connected shifts. Wage work weakened some forms of kin supervision. Property and custody reforms challenged husbands' legal authority. Contraception made parenthood more controllable, while divorce made marriage less irrevocable. These changes did not remove economic calculation; rent still had to be paid. They changed how much weight personal compatibility could carry, and how far a disappointing union could be challenged. Elsewhere, similar pressures met different religious, legal and household arrangements. There was no single march from family strategy to freedom.

This was an expansion of expectation as much as a release. A spouse once selected partly for land, labour, family alliance or survival could be judged within a wider network of kin and work. A modern partner may be expected to be lover, closest friend, co-parent, confidant, economic teammate and source of personal growth. Marriage became more voluntary in many settings and emotionally more ambitious. Its failures became more legible because satisfaction had become part of the contract.

Law still matters. Depending on the jurisdiction, marriage can affect property, inheritance, parental status, tax, migration, medical decisions and separation. The package has changed through conflict. Same-sex marriage did not merely add a ceremony. It extended a legal package through which the state recognises a couple and its claims.

Marriage makes an intimate relationship consequential to other people. Its history follows the changing contents of that consequence.

The Household Distributed Work and Power

For most of history, home was also a workplace. Households farmed, cooked, spun, brewed, traded, repaired tools, raised animals, trained children, nursed the sick and managed stores. Work crossed the threshold in both directions. Even where people hired labour or served another household, survival depended on tasks performed by relatives and dependants who were not paid a separate wage.

A household can cooperate without becoming one mind. Members share risks, produce goods together and care about one another. They can also disagree over how much each person works, eats, spends, learns or controls. Treating household income as though it automatically produces equal welfare hides the institution's hardest question: who has command over resources and whose needs count as urgent?

Power comes from several sources. Property gives an exit option and a claim on decisions. Earnings can increase bargaining strength, though a wage handed over to another person may not. Law can authorise one spouse and disable another. Kin support can protect someone who leaves. Social norms shape whose sacrifice looks natural. Information matters too. The person who manages accounts, documents and outside contacts may control choices without appearing to issue orders.

Suppose two parents decide that the lower earner should reduce paid hours because childcare would cost more than those paid hours bring in. The arithmetic may work this year. But the parent who steps back loses experience and promotion opportunities; the other keeps accumulating them. When the next care crisis arrives, the earnings gap may be wider, making the same decision look more sensible still. An apparently neutral calculation can reproduce the inequality it began with. The household solves an immediate problem and changes the terms of the next negotiation.

Sex has organised much of this allocation. Women have worked in fields, workshops, markets and firms across periods in which ideology described them as domestic dependants. Men have also cared, cooked and performed

household labour. The recurring asymmetry lies in responsibility and time. An International Labour Organization synthesis published in 2018, drawing on time-use surveys from 64 countries, attributed about three quarters of unpaid care hours to women. The surveys covered different years and societies; this is no reading of every home, or a fresh measurement of the world today. It is evidence of a large, unevenly distributed workload.

Care can matter enormously without leaving a price. Feeding a child or accompanying a disabled relative sustains a life whether money changes hands or not. GDP counts paid childcare but excludes a parent providing the same service unpaid at home. Separate accounts can estimate that work; the headline measure does not. Changing who pays can therefore change measured output without changing who gets fed. The apparent disappearance is in the accounting, not in the kitchen.

Cooperation can also conceal coercion. Financial control, isolation, forced sex, threats and violence may occur inside relationships whose public language is loyalty. Dependants are especially exposed because leaving requires housing, income, documents, care and credible protection. The existence of affection does not cancel power, and the existence of conflict does not prove affection absent.

A sound model avoids two errors. The first romanticises the household as a refuge from markets and states. The second treats it as a permanent war among selfish individuals. Most families contain cooperation and conflict at once. People may give more than they receive because they love one another, because they expect later reciprocity, because norms demand it or because refusal is costly. Motives overlap.

The practical unit is therefore not the household budget but the household settlement. Who does which work? Who has personal money? Whose career moves? Who can say no? Who inherits? Who is believed? Who can leave without losing children, status or safety? Those questions reveal how care is produced and how its price is distributed.

Fewer Children, Longer Obligations

Across much of the world during the last two centuries, death rates fell and birth rates later followed. The timing, speed and causes varied, and the transition remains incomplete in some places. More children survived, adults lived longer, families had fewer births and the overlap among grandparents, parents and children expanded.

High mortality once made family life structurally unstable. Mothers died in childbirth, infants died from infection and fathers died before children reached adulthood. In many high-mortality populations, remarriage, care by other households, step-relations and orphanhood were common responses to loss, not modern deviations from an intact norm. A large family photograph could conceal several dead siblings and a previous spouse. The past was not stable because its rules were strict. It was often unstable because life was short.

Parents did not need modern child psychology to grieve. The claim that frequent death made earlier parents indifferent confuses adaptation with absence of feeling. People could expect loss, distribute care among kin and still experience devastation. Evidence survives unevenly because poor parents left fewer diaries and because demographic records count an event more reliably than emotion.

As survival improved, fertility could fall without reducing the number of children reaching adulthood. Urban living changed the economic value and cost of children. Schooling delayed their productive work and required fees, clothing, transport or parental time. Contraception gave couples more control, though access remained unequal. Women's education and paid opportunities changed the cost of repeated pregnancy. Pensions and savings could weaken reliance on adult children in old age. Norms often shifted as lower fertility became visible and socially acceptable.

When fewer children are born and a greater share survive, resources can be concentrated. Schooling and preparation for adult work can demand more years of spending and attention. The child becomes less a contributor to a

household economy and more a long investment project. This pattern is strongest where schooling is long, housing costly and labour markets demand credentials. It is not proof that parents love children more than earlier parents did.

Consider a child staying in education rather than bringing home wages. The household gives up present income in the hope of greater future security. Where qualifications decide access to good work, spending on lessons, housing near a school or years of study can look less like an optional extra than an entry fee. Having fewer children may make that investment possible without making it affordable. A small family can devote more to each child and still feel permanently behind.

Longer lives create a second transformation. More adults know grandparents, and more grandparents live long enough to provide childcare or need care themselves. A sixty-year-old may assist an adult child, support a grandchild and coordinate care for a parent in their eighties. The classic dependency ratio divides populations by age, but real dependency runs through health, income, housing and family obligation. Older people provide as well as receive.

Improved survival spared families much bereavement while allowing obligations to last for more decades. Low fertility reduced the number of siblings who might share them. Fewer relatives need not mean less responsibility: the people who remain may carry more of it, for longer.

States and Markets Redistributed Family Work

Imagine a household responsible for teaching every child, nursing every illness, insuring every lost wage, supporting every old person, finding every job and enforcing every private agreement. For much of history, relatives carried a large share of those functions because alternatives were thin. Modern states and markets built specialised institutions around them. The result was redistribution, not simple replacement.

Schools took on formal teaching; hospitals took on parts of care. Pensions pooled old-age risk, while shops sold goods once produced at home. None

abolished domestic work. A child still had to reach school with clean clothes and breakfast inside them. Specialisation changed the work left behind as well as the work transferred.

Public provision can enlarge personal choice. A widow with an independent pension need not live with an adult son to survive. A disabled child with education and care support may depend less completely on parents. Childcare can allow both parents to remain employed. Legal aid, shelters and income support can make exit from abuse possible. Rights have practical value when institutions supply the capacity to use them.

When services are scarce, expensive or withdrawn, families can become the default insurer. Consider a patient well enough to leave hospital but still unable to shop or cook. The bed can be freed while the work continues somewhere else. A relative may supply it, a paid worker may be hired, or care may fail to arrive. A government can reduce public expenditure by increasing unpaid work without recording the transfer as a tax.

Markets also relocate care rather than making it vanish. A prosperous household may buy cleaning, childcare or elder care from workers whose own dependants are cared for by relatives elsewhere. Migration can send wages and remittances across borders while separating parents, children and grandparents. A global care chain links several households, each solving one dependency by moving another. The effect can be opportunity, strain or both.

States decide which family claims receive force. They register marriage, set ages and prohibited relations, assign parenthood, regulate adoption, tax transfers, enforce maintenance, control immigration and decide whose relationship counts at a hospital or border. They record names, births and deaths, turning lineage into an administrative fact. Even refusal to recognise a union is a policy. The family a state treats as natural arrives in its records with paperwork.

Markets and states shape transmission between families. Schools may widen opportunity or convert residential property into educational

advantage. Tax systems can support children or subsidise inherited wealth. Housing supply affects when adults leave parents and whether separated parents can maintain two homes. Employment rules determine whether care interrupts one career or can be shared. Public institutions do not meet each generation on empty ground; they interact with money, knowledge, contacts and security already carried through families.

The contrast between strong families and strong welfare states is therefore misleading. Public systems may displace transfers while protecting relationships from compulsory survival arrangements. Adult children may visit parents by choice when basic income and care are secure. Parents may support children more effectively when healthcare and schools share the load. State capacity can reduce coercive dependence without erasing attachment.

Specialisation has costs. Services can become impersonal, eligibility rules rigid and care workers poorly paid. Relatives may hold knowledge an institution misses and remain after a case closes. Returning every function to them would not remove those failures; it would change who must absorb them. The question is where dependable help comes from when any part of this mixed system falls short.

Choice Unbundled the Form, Need Rebuilt the Claims

Older family arrangements often tied sex, marriage, co-residence, reproduction, property and gendered work together. Modern change loosened those ties. People can marry without children, raise children without a spouse or divorce without ending parenthood. Adoption creates parenthood without conception; assisted reproduction can separate genetic, gestational, legal and social roles. Same-sex marriage removed the assumption that spouses must be one man and one woman in jurisdictions that adopted it.

This history is often told as individual choice defeating institution. Choice widened, and that matters. Forced marriage, marital subordination, barriers

to divorce and exclusion from recognised parenthood constrained lives. Legal reform gave many people more authority over whether and how to form a family.

Choice never occurs on an empty field. Housing prices, wages, fertility, health, religion, immigration status, care duties and local expectations narrow the options. A person may delay children because work is insecure, rent is high, childcare is scarce or a suitable partner has not appeared. A young adult may live with parents through affection, cultural expectation or economic pressure. The same outward arrangement can contain different degrees of freedom.

Unbundling creates new legal work. When birth, genes, pregnancy and daily care no longer point automatically to the same adults, institutions must assign rights and duties. Who is a parent after donor conception? What information may a child later obtain? Which adult may consent to treatment or travel? What happens when an intended arrangement breaks down? Technology does not make kinship arbitrary. It exposes decisions that biology never settled alone.

Family claims also form outside conventional routes. Friends may become chosen kin, especially where relatives reject a person or live far away. Stepparents can perform years of care without acquiring the same automatic authority as a legal parent. Former partners coordinate children across homes. Grandparents supply childcare that makes employment possible. Digital communication keeps transnational families present in daily life while distance limits touch and emergency response.

The contemporary institution is therefore less well described as one household than as a network with unevenly formal links. Some claims are enforceable. Others depend on memory, affection and repeated conduct. Greater freedom to enter and leave can improve the quality of relationships that continue. It can also leave carers exposed when their contribution creates no recognised right. Informality protects flexibility and can hide liability.

Need keeps rebuilding connections that choice separates. A baby requires continuous care regardless of the adults' labels. A disabled partner may turn romance into nursing and advocacy. Separation ends co-residence while child support, school runs and emotional work continue. An ageing parent pulls siblings into decisions postponed for years. Death reactivates questions of inheritance, identity and remembrance. The event arrives first; families, courts, employers and services then assemble a response.

More freedom over intimate life does not produce a population of self-sufficient adults. It changes which obligations can be chosen, which can be refused and which must be secured by other means. A child still needs dependable care after a partnership ends. A person excluded by biological relatives may build a lasting family elsewhere. The old need for continuity survives inside arrangements that earlier law might not have recognised.

The important change is not that obligation has vanished, but that its justification can be contested. Being a parent, spouse or adult child no longer settles every question in many societies, though it still settles a great deal. That leaves room for fairer settlements and room for abandonment. Freedom from a prescribed role and freedom from needing anyone are quite different achievements. Only the first is on offer.

How It Actually Works

Before the record

Long before anyone recorded a wedding or inheritance, children were surviving inside cooperative groups. Human infancy demands food, protection, carrying and teaching for years, while mothers may have several dependent children at once. Help from fathers, older children, grandparents and others made that burden shareable. Exactly who helped would have varied, as it does among documented foraging peoples.

The evidence does not support one fixed domestic design for small mobile communities. People could move between camps, maintain ties across distance and cooperate beyond close descent. Marriage or partnership

linked adults and groups, but residence could change with food, conflict and available helpers. Kinship made obligations memorable without reducing every relationship to genetic closeness.

Food sharing made these relations material. A hunter's success was uncertain, gathering returned different foods and sickness could remove a producer without warning. Sharing across a camp spread risk while building claims that reached beyond one meal. The arrangement was neither a modern welfare state nor a pure family economy. It joined kinship, reciprocity and reputation in ways the surviving evidence cannot divide cleanly.

There is no surviving diagram of an original family. Burials, dwellings and biological relationships cannot disclose every rule of care. What can be reconstructed is a set of pressures: long childhood, recurring vulnerability and death favoured arrangements that made help and succession durable.

Fields, stores and descendants

Agriculture changed the material around family. Land, animals, stored grain and houses could remain after an owner died. Labour was tied more closely to place. Children could contribute to farming while becoming claimants to property. Marriage connected workforces and inheritance lines as well as partners.

These pressures often strengthened descent groups and senior authority, but they did not produce one agricultural family. Herding, shifting cultivation, irrigated grain and intensive horticulture create different needs. Some systems transmit property through men, some through women, some through both. Residence may keep brothers together, daughters near mothers or couples in new dwellings. Ecology constrains the options without writing the rules.

Stored wealth made succession harder to ignore. A society needed to know which child inherited, whether daughters could hold land, what a widow retained and whether an adopted child entered the line. Rules could keep an estate intact, divide it among heirs or direct part of it towards religious

institutions. Each settlement created winners, dependants and disputes.

Descent could become a political resource. A lineage might control land, avenge injury, arrange marriages, worship ancestors or support members in conflict. Genealogies then did more than remember the dead. They ranked the living. Claims to seniority, purity or founding descent could justify office and exclusion, while adoption or invented ancestry repaired a line that biology had failed to continue.

The household also became more legible as a unit of production and extraction. Rulers and landlords wanted labour, tax, military service and grain. Counting hearths or household heads simplified collection. The family was now an intimate institution and an administrative address.

States enter the house

Some of the oldest surviving laws are full of family because early states could not govern without it. Mesopotamian law collections addressed marriage payments, adultery, divorce, adoption, inheritance and the status of children. They did not invent households. They selected which claims courts and rulers would enforce.

The Roman *familia* was wider than the modern emotional family. It could encompass people, property and enslaved dependants under a household head. Roman law gave the *paterfamilias* extensive authority in principle, while age, wealth, marriage forms and imperial change complicated life in practice. Women lacked political office yet could inherit and control substantial property under some arrangements. The clean legal hierarchy never described every household interaction.

Medieval China offers a different warning against reading family life straight from its ideals. In the Sung period, from 960 to 1279, demands for female obedience and widow chastity coexisted with improvements in women's marriage and property rights. Patricia Ebrey's history follows the choices women faced inside those arrangements: entering marriage, dealing with concubines and deciding what to do after a husband died. A patrilineal ideal did not settle every woman's practical position.

Religious traditions added further authorities. Marriage might involve family agreement, sacred ritual, community recognition and civil consequence in different proportions. Rules concerning prohibited relatives, divorce, legitimacy, widowhood and inheritance could connect a household to priests, jurists or courts far beyond its locality.

The recurring pattern was not state conquest of a private zone. Family helped make rule possible. Governments knew people through households, descent and marital status. Families then used law to secure property, contest a marriage, establish parentage or claim support. Public authority entered domestic life because domestic classification produced public consequences.

Dynastic government magnified the connection. A ruler's marriage could alter an alliance, and the absence of an accepted heir could produce civil war. Royal families made succession spectacular, but ordinary inheritance worked through the same institutional problem at smaller scale: property and standing had to cross a death. States cared about legitimate descent because private transmission could become public order.

Households before factories

The popular story places an extended preindustrial family in a farmhouse, then sends young couples into nuclear homes after factories arrive. Historical demography broke that sequence.

Parish registers, censuses, tax lists and household listings showed that in parts of north-western Europe, many people married relatively late and established a separate household. Young unmarried adults often worked as servants in other homes before marriage. Households were commonly simple in structure even when wider kin lived nearby and exchanged labour, credit and care. Industrialisation did not invent the small household there.

This was not a European universal. Joint and extended households were more common in other regions, and household composition changed over a person's life. A newly married couple could later take in a widowed parent, a sibling, servants, lodgers or grandchildren. Death could produce a lone

parent or stepfamily within months. A snapshot conceals the cycle.

Nor did a separate address mean independence. Land access, marriage prospects, employment and relief depended on families and communities. A couple might live alone while borrowing from parents, working family land and expecting to support them later. The difference between household and kin network was already doing important work.

The small household in these regions was not a factory invention. Industrialisation changed the conditions under which families lived; it did not supply their first domestic blueprint.

A household listing catches these arrangements at one moment. It cannot, by itself, show whether a young servant later married and formed a separate home, or whether an elderly parent had recently joined an adult child. Comparing addresses without comparing stages of life can turn a temporary arrangement into an imaginary lifelong tradition.

Families under ownership and empire

Atlantic slavery exposed the family's dependence on recognition. Enslaved people formed partnerships, raised children, named kin and sustained obligations. Slave law allowed owners to ignore those claims. A spouse or child could be sold because the recognised property right belonged to somebody outside the relationship.

The result was neither the absence of family nor its secure continuity. Enslaved people married without reliable legal protection, travelled to visit relatives where possible, searched after separation and created extended or fictive kin. Their relationships mattered intensely while remaining vulnerable to sale, violence and forced movement. Emancipation made legal marriage and family reunification urgent partly because slavery had denied public standing to bonds people had maintained themselves.

Colonial regimes repeatedly classified family for labour, land and rule. Administrators selected customary authorities, codified personal law and treated fluid practices as fixed tradition. Missionaries promoted particular

marriage and household ideals. Migrant labour systems separated workers from spouses and children while relying on home communities to reproduce and support the labour force.

These histories block a sentimental definition. A family can survive against a state, be broken by one and be used by one. Legal recognition may protect a bond, yet recognition can also impose a hierarchy or exclude relationships that do not fit the authorised form.

On 11 May 1867, Hawkins Wilson wrote to the Freedmen's Bureau in Richmond asking for news of his sisters. He had heard nothing from them since leaving Virginia twenty-four years earlier. To help locate his sister Jane, he named the man who had owned her, her husband's owner and a nearby store. The machinery that had separated people supplied the addresses by which they might be found. Wilson's letter does not tell us whether they met again. It shows what emancipation made possible to ask an official: help me recover a family that slavery never made me stop recognising.

Wages, walls and the breadwinner

Industrialisation moved growing amounts of production into mills, mines, offices and factories. Wages arrived as cash attached to individual workers. Urbanisation often separated workers from land and some kin. Home and workplace became more distinct for many households, though home production, family businesses, lodgers and informal work remained.

Women and children entered industrial labour in large numbers. The early factory family was not automatically supported by one man. Earnings were pooled, controlled and contested. Employers sometimes preferred women or children because they could be paid less. Protective legislation then limited some work by women and children, mixing real safety concerns with ideals about dependence.

The male breadwinner household became especially influential during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries where wages, unions, public policy and expanding white-collar work allowed one income to support a home. It was

an aspiration before it was a majority reality, stronger among some classes, racial groups and countries than others. Poor women kept earning. Rural households kept combining market and domestic production.

Its cultural force came from a division of domains. The man's wage represented public contribution. The woman's housework represented love and duty. That separation concealed economic dependence and made unpaid labour look outside production. It also gave some families time for specialised domestic care that had previously competed with paid work.

The model weakened as women's education and employment expanded, services replaced some home production, fertility fell and two incomes became desirable or necessary. Yet the old allocation did not vanish when women entered paid work. Many households added employment to women's existing responsibility for care. The industrial wall between home and work had changed the accounting more completely than the labour.

Consumer goods altered the bargain without ending work. Piped water, washing machines, prepared food and domestic appliances reduced some physical tasks. Standards of cleanliness, childcare and consumption rose at the same time. Time was released and then claimed by new expectations. Technology changed the content of housework more reliably than it delivered its disappearance.

The demographic turn

During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, sanitation, nutrition, vaccination, medicine and public health reduced mortality unevenly across the world. Children survived in greater numbers. Adult life lengthened. Fertility later fell through a mixture of deliberate limitation and changing conditions.

The transition changed family strategy. The number of births needed to produce a given number of surviving adult children fell, although fertility often remained high for a time. Schooling expanded, child labour contracted in many settings and the direct cost of raising each child rose. Contraceptive methods improved and became more accessible. Women gained education

and paid options. Urban housing made large families harder to accommodate. Old-age support began to come from pensions, savings and public services as well as descendants.

These mechanisms interacted rather than forming one universal sequence. Fertility could remain high after mortality fell, producing rapid population growth. It could fall under economic pressure without generous welfare. Governments could encourage, restrict or coerce reproduction. Culture shaped which methods were acceptable and who controlled them.

Longer lives created families with more surviving generations. Grandparents became more available for childcare and more likely to require late-life support. Divorce and remarriage produced longer histories of step-relations because adults survived for decades after an earlier union. The same change that reduced childhood bereavement increased the duration of adult obligation.

By the twenty-first century, low fertility and ageing had become central concerns in many societies, while others remained younger. The UN's 2024 population revision put global fertility at about 2.3 live births per woman and life expectancy at birth at 73.3 years for that year. These were modelled figures, not a count of the children a generation eventually had or a prediction of anyone's lifespan. More than half of countries and areas were below 2.1 births per woman. The same revision projected that people aged sixty-five or older would outnumber children under eighteen by the late 2070s.

Family change therefore no longer moves in one global direction. Some governments worry about too many births, others about too few. Both treat private reproduction as a public matter, and both risk describing women's choices as a demographic instrument rather than a field of rights, constraints and unequal care.

Rights, welfare and exit

Modern family law in many jurisdictions weakened some powers once attached to marital status and household headship. Married women gained stronger rights over property, earnings and legal action. Civil marriage and registration expanded state control while making status easier to prove. Divorce became more available in varied forms. Custody law changed along different routes; many systems placed greater formal weight on the child's welfare, while doctrine, enforcement, presumptions and access remained uneven.

Childhood also acquired public claims. Compulsory education, age limits on work, child-protection systems and maintenance duties treated children as people whose interests could exceed a household head's authority. Adoption moved in many places from private transfer or inheritance strategy towards regulated child placement, with continuing disputes over identity, secrecy and the rights of birth families.

Welfare institutions changed exit. A person with income, housing, healthcare and childcare has choices unavailable to someone whose survival depends on a spouse or parent. This does not make separation easy or public systems complete. It changes the bargaining background even for families that remain together.

The sequence was conflict rather than administrative tidying. Property reform altered what marriage meant. Maintenance rules decided whether separation transferred poverty to one parent and the children. Parental leave defined care as a social cost or a private interruption. Each reform redistributed leverage inside relationships, which is why family policy attracts moral language far beyond its budget line.

Law widened recognised forms. Cohabitation and same-sex partnerships gained varying degrees of recognition. Clinics created further questions. On 25 July 1978, Louise Brown was born in Oldham, the first baby born following in vitro fertilisation, through work by Robert Edwards, Patrick Steptoe and Jean Purdy. A repurposed glass desiccator jar had served as

an incubator after fertilisation outside the body. Reproductive change could begin with an ordinary laboratory object. As techniques developed, law had to distinguish the contributions of genes, pregnancy and daily care, rather than assume they always identified the same parents.

The modern recombination

The contemporary family is often smaller in residence and larger in operation. Money moves between adult children and parents. Grandparents provide childcare. Separated parents coordinate across homes. Migrants send remittances and make daily video calls while relatives supply physical care. Friends perform family roles where birth relatives are absent or unsafe.

UK statistics for 2025 estimated 29.0 million households. One-person households made up 29.5 per cent of them. Meanwhile, 28.7 per cent of people aged twenty to thirty-four were counted in their parents' family, compared with 25.4 per cent in 2015. The latter measure excludes young adults who have formed their own family, even under the same roof. Neither statistic measures the strength of a relationship. They can rise together as housing and partnership pressures affect the young while more older people live alone. There is no single modern household.

Individualisation has changed the language. Adults are more likely in many settings to describe partnership as chosen, conditional on satisfaction and compatible with personal development. That freedom coexists with housing shortages, insecure work, costly care and unequal fertility. People may have wider legal options and narrower practical ones.

The state and market now sit inside nearly every family arrangement. An app maintains contact; an employer decides whether care is compatible with work; a landlord controls space; a court allocates time; a clinic separates reproductive roles; a pension changes where an old person can live. Family remains intimate, but intimacy operates through infrastructure.

Ageing makes the mixed system easier to see. An older person may receive a public pension, own a private home, buy some assistance, rely on a

spouse for daily help and call an adult child when the formal service fails. Five institutions support one body. Dependence travels between them. Removing any one of them changes what the others must do.

A household may look conventional while relying on purchased care and public benefits. Another may look unconventional while performing old tasks of protection and childrearing. The family portrait tells less than the arrangements that keep its subjects alive.

How we know

Family history survives through records made for other purposes. Parish registers count baptisms, marriages and burials. Censuses and household listings capture residence on one date. Courts preserve conflict over property, legitimacy, violence and separation. Letters and diaries reveal feeling but overrepresent literate people whose papers survived. Enslaved families often appear through documents produced by owners and officials whose categories denied the relationships being reconstructed.

Historical demographers can link names across records and estimate marriage, fertility, mortality and household composition. Their strongest findings remain bounded by place, period and source survival. A simple household in a listing may sit inside an active kin network. A legal rule describes authorised power more readily than daily negotiation.

Archaeology and ancient DNA can recover residence, movement and biological relatedness, but genes do not reveal the social meaning of a burial or who provided care. Ethnography supplies richer local categories, while comparative databases test broader patterns by coding them. Each method loses something: situated accounts do not automatically travel, and coded traits compress disagreement and change. Current surveys have parallel limits because shared care crosses addresses and unpaid supervision is hard to record. The account is strongest where several kinds of evidence answer the same narrow question.

What People Get Wrong

"Family used to mean one stable form"

The stable traditional family is assembled by choosing a favoured class, place and decade, then extending the photograph backwards. Past societies had rules, but rules differed and lives repeatedly broke them. Death produced widows, orphans, stepfamilies and remarriage. Work sent young people into other homes. War, slavery and migration separated relatives. Servants and lodgers entered households that look nuclear only after they are removed from the frame.

The mistake survives because law and moral writing preserve ideals more clearly than ordinary negotiation. A rule against an act proves concern about the act, not its absence. Census tables then freeze one night and make a changing household look permanent.

There were durable family systems, not one durable shape. Stability might describe obligations across several addresses while household membership changed. The English category *family* can also flatten local distinctions among descent, residence, care and marriage. Terms such as legitimate, dependent or household head changed, so a historical category cannot be carried into the present without checking its rules.

Policy built around a fictional norm treats predictable variation as failure and makes people fit a memory that never described everyone. It also turns comparison into judgement: a stepfamily, lone parent or cohabiting couple is measured against an idealised household rather than against the care, security and power present in the relationship itself, and the exits available when it fails.

"Everyone once lived in a three-generation household"

Extended kin mattered greatly in many societies, and multigenerational households remain common. The universal ancestral household is still false. Historical listings show that many people in parts of north-western Europe lived in relatively simple households before industrialisation, often marrying late after service elsewhere. Parents, married children and grandchildren did not automatically share one dwelling.

Other regions and property systems produced more joint residence. Even there, household form changed through the life cycle. A couple might begin alone, absorb a widowed parent and later divide when sons married. Nearby relatives could exchange work, credit and childcare without sharing a roof.

The myth comes from confusing kinship strength with co-residence and from imagining that poor transport required everyone to live together. Large historical households could also be large because they contained servants, apprentices or lodgers rather than grandparents. Headcount does not reveal relationship structure.

It matters because today's rise or fall in multigenerational living is often read as moral revival or decline when housing, longevity, migration and care costs may explain more.

"Marriage was loveless until modern times"

Marriage carried property, labour, status and alliance, so it is easy to picture earlier spouses as pieces on a family board. Surviving letters, songs, wills and disputes show affection, desire, jealousy and grief alongside strategy. An arranged marriage could become loving, and a self-chosen marriage could be economically useful. People rarely keep motives in separate boxes.

What changed was the authority given to feeling. Modern companionate marriage makes mutual affection and satisfaction central reasons to enter and remain. Earlier systems often gave families, property and duty more

formal weight, while choice operated within a restricted field. Arranged does not always mean forced, and romantic does not mean unconstrained.

The myth flatters the present by claiming invention of love. It can also make any strategic concern look corrupt, although money, housing, children and family approval still shape modern partnerships. Romantic choice did not remove material life from marriage.

It also hides the new burden placed on partnership. A spouse now carries expectations once spread across kin, neighbours and institutions. Emotional freedom rose in many settings; so did the standard by which a marriage could disappoint.

"The male breadwinner is the traditional household"

The breadwinner and homemaker model is historically specific, not the default from prehistory. Women have farmed, traded, manufactured, served, sold, managed and earned across societies that denied them equal authority. Poor households often required several incomes. Enslaved women laboured under coercion. Agricultural homes joined productive and domestic work too closely for a clean male-public, female-private division.

The one-wage household gained unusual reach in parts of the industrial world when male earnings, unions, public policy and post-war growth made it possible for more families. Even then, it was uneven by class, race and country, and often an aspiration rather than a description.

It became traditional because a recent ideal was repeated through law, advertising and memory. National statistics and employment practice reinforced it by naming one occupation as the household's public status while treating the rest as dependence.

The legacy remains practical. Policies may assume an available unpaid carer and a continuous full-time worker as though one household can produce both without cost. Usually, somebody's time absorbs the contradiction.

"Biology decides who counts as family"

Birth and genetic connection matter. They can carry identity, medical information, resemblance and obligations that people experience as deep. They do not settle every family relationship. Adoption turns a non-genetic adult into a legal parent. A step-parent may perform daily care without automatic status. Donor conception and surrogacy can separate genetic contribution, pregnancy, legal parenthood and social parenting.

This does not mean kinship is invented at will. Societies recognise some routes and refuse others, and children develop their own interests in continuity, origins and care. Biology can matter differently to medicine, identity and authority. A genetic link may answer one question while leaving custody or responsibility open.

The error persists because reproduction supplies an apparently clean foundation beneath social disagreement. Yet societies have long used adoption, milk kinship, ritual kin and acknowledged descent to create or prohibit relationships that genes alone would not identify. Modern technology made the distinction harder to ignore rather than inventing it.

Difficult cases therefore require the question to be named. Are we allocating care, inheritance, information, belonging or legal power? One biological fact cannot do all five jobs.

"Divorce and cohabitation prove commitment collapsed"

A divorce rate measures legally ended marriages, not the total amount of loyalty in a society. It can rise because divorce becomes lawful, affordable and less stigmatised, because people live longer after marrying, or because expectations of safety and companionship change. Low divorce can indicate stable satisfaction or blocked exit. The number alone cannot choose.

Cohabitation is equally varied. It can be a brief relationship, a trial before marriage, a long-term alternative or a response to cost and law. In some countries it carries broad recognition; in others partners discover at

separation that they have few automatic rights.

The decline story became persuasive because marriage is visible and informality is harder to count. Divorce figures also depend on the denominator, period and cohort. A yearly rate, the share of current marriages ending and the lifetime experience of one generation are different measures.

Yet separated parents may remain bound by care, and unmarried partners may share decades. The useful question is not whether one status rose. It is which obligations people undertake, whether they can enforce them and what happens to dependants when the relationship ends.

"The family is a private institution"

Close relationships contain privacy, and protection from arbitrary intrusion matters. The family itself has never sat outside public power. Law defines marriage, parenthood, inheritance, maintenance and adoption. Tax and benefits reward some arrangements. Housing determines whether care can cross generations. Immigration rules decide whether partners and children may live together. Schools and health services distribute duties between households and institutions.

The private label became attractive for opposite reasons. It protected intimacy from the state, and it protected authority inside the home from scrutiny. Violence, forced marriage, child neglect and financial control reveal the conflict. Non-intervention can leave the strongest household member governing everyone else.

The correction does not require officials to manage affection. It requires honesty about boundaries. Every state intervenes through recognition, enforcement and omission. A benefit rule that ignores an unmarried partner and one that treats two addresses as one household are both choices with distributional effects.

The serious question is which interests justify intervention, which relationships deserve protection and which costs are being returned to

unpaid family labour. Privacy should shield intimacy and personal choice. It should not turn a home into a jurisdiction where ordinary protections against coercion, deprivation or violence stop at the door.

Use It

Name the map before judging the change

When somebody says family is getting smaller, ask which map changed and which claim is being measured. The household may contain fewer people while kin live longer, communicate more often and exchange more money or care. Marriage may decline while parenthood remains common. A person may live alone and spend much of the week supporting relatives.

This distinction improves policy and ordinary judgement. A housing measure counts addresses. A hospital needs decision-makers and carers. An inheritance dispute needs legal relationships and recognised successors. A study of loneliness needs contact and attachment. One definition cannot answer all four.

Name the unit before interpreting the trend: residence, partnership, descent, pooled resources, care network, legal status or felt belonging. Then ask what the category leaves outside. Much apparent disagreement disappears once people stop using the same word for different structures.

This also prevents an administrative box from becoming a theory of human attachment. What a form can count is often narrower than what people must manage.

Follow the claims and functions

A family form becomes clearer when you list the claims and functions travelling through it. Does it organise childcare, production, property, old-age support, migration, status, religion, identity or emotional intimacy? Which tasks are handled elsewhere, and which have been left to relatives by default? Who gains membership, and what survives a death?

This prevents exoticising unfamiliar systems. A joint household may keep land intact and spread care. A late-marriage system may use service and separate households to manage scarce property. A transnational family may exchange income from one country for care in another. The form is not a custom floating above material life.

The same lens works at home. A disagreement presented as a clash of values may be a failed allocation of time, money, authority or risk. Naming the work and the claim reveals which institution could share it and who benefits from keeping it inside the family.

Birth, illness, separation and death expose the package quickly. They show which tasks were being performed quietly and which relationship was expected to last.

Count the dependency budget

Every society has people who cannot supply all their own care. The cost appears as money, time, interrupted work, lost sleep, housing and attention. It can be carried by relatives, public services, employers, charities, paid workers or the dependant. It cannot be wished away.

Budgets often record only cash. That makes a policy look cheap when it transfers hours into homes. A care service cut may save public expenditure and reduce one daughter's earnings. A lack of childcare may appear as personal choice in labour statistics. A hospital discharge may depend on an unpaid relative whose capacity was never assessed.

The family lens asks where the full dependency budget lands. Count the invisible time, the future pension loss and the people whose own needs are deferred. Include reciprocal flows as well: older relatives may receive care while supplying housing, money or childcare.

The answer is usually more useful than declaring a society family-friendly.

Check voice, property and exit

Affection is not a distribution rule. In any household, ask who owns assets, receives income, controls information, decides large spending and can leave without losing shelter, children or social standing. These factors shape bargaining even when nobody states a threat.

Exit deserves particular attention. A relationship can be voluntary at entry and coercive in continuation. Legal divorce means little without housing, income, documents and safety. A dependent child or frail adult may have no meaningful exit at all, which increases the duty on law and institutions to scrutinise the authority exercised over them.

This lens does not reduce love to calculation. It explains why good intentions are insufficient protection. Children, disabled adults and frail relatives may need representation precisely because dependence limits their bargaining voice.

Care works best when devotion is supported by rights, resources and credible alternatives rather than demanded in their absence.

Find public rules inside private life

A family decision often contains a policy in disguise. The couple deciding who reduces work is responding to pay, tax, leave, childcare and workplace expectations. The adult child deciding whether a parent moves in is responding to housing, pensions, social care and inheritance. The partners delaying children are responding to fertility, cost and time as well as preference.

Look for defaults. Whose name is on the tenancy? Who acquires parental status automatically? Which relationship receives a visa? How does a benefit system define a couple? Who is contacted in an emergency? These rules give some bonds administrative force and leave others dependent on goodwill.

Government does not cause every private outcome. Private choices are still made through public infrastructure and its default assumptions. Comparing

jurisdictions can reveal the effect: similar preferences produce different arrangements when leave, housing or legal recognition changes.

Seeing that link makes reform more precise and moral blame less lazy.

Read change as recombination, not decline

Family debates often compare a current form with one earlier package.

When marriage, fertility or household size changes, the whole institution is said to be collapsing. A better approach tracks functions separately.

Work may leave the home while care stays. Marriage may weaken as the gate to sex and strengthen as a statement of chosen intimacy. Households may shrink while grandparental childcare grows. Divorce may end partnership and create a long system of shared parenthood. Public pensions may reduce compulsory co-residence and preserve warmer relationships.

Recombination is not automatic progress. New forms can distribute risk badly, and old protections can disappear before replacements exist. Track what moved, what replaced it and which obligation became informal.

The lens keeps the judgement attached to outcomes: care, security, freedom, voice, continuity and the treatment of dependants. A changed shape is evidence of change, not its moral verdict.

The limits

Family explains much and cannot explain everything. Similar households can produce different lives because personality, illness, violence, discrimination, schools, labour markets and luck intervene. Statistical associations between family background and outcomes do not prove that one parenting practice caused the result. Parents and children influence one another, and families select neighbourhoods, partners and institutions under constraints.

Cross-cultural comparison has sharper limits. Terms translated as marriage, household or lineage may carry different meanings. Ethnographic databases compress local disagreement and historical change. European

parish records are rich enough to tempt universal claims. Current surveys count what their definitions permit.

The family lens can also become conservative by treating unpaid obligation as natural, or technocratic by turning intimacy into service delivery. It can pathologise unfamiliar forms when the real harm lies in poverty or exclusion.

Some goods depend on love, loyalty and presence that cannot be commissioned. That truth does not decide who should sacrifice, how much or without what protection.

The one thing to keep

A family photograph records who stood together. The institution extends beyond its edges.

Someone missing from the picture may be paying the rent or collecting a child. Someone at its centre may possess most of the money and little freedom. A small household can rest on an extensive circle of help; a crowded one can leave somebody alone with every difficult task. Counting the faces is only the beginning.

But family is not exhausted by an inventory of services. People want to belong somewhere without performing an audition, to have someone remember the part of their life nobody else saw. Hawkins Wilson was seeking his sisters after twenty-four years without news. His letter asked an official to help restore contact, not to create the relationship. The claim had survived a system built to disregard it.

That persistence can sustain people or be used against them. Belonging gives nobody an unlimited right to command. A duty to care cannot make time, money or strength infinite. Judge an arrangement by what it makes possible and what it asks particular people to surrender.

There is no original household waiting to be restored, and no new form that removes every old difficulty. Families change under pressure from livelihoods, longer lives, law and the people contesting their allotted roles. The enduring need for others does not dictate one fair way to live together.

The photograph cannot show whether someone can leave safely, whether help will arrive tomorrow or whose sacrifice makes the scene possible. Those are now part of what you see when you look at it.

Terms

Thirty words and distinctions that make family research easier to read without turning every relationship into one household type. Many describe separate dimensions: descent is not residence, marriage is not parenthood and a legal household is not a complete care network. Their meanings also vary across disciplines and societies. Use them as questions about how a relationship is organised, not as boxes into which every life must fit.

Family. A socially recognised set of durable relationships carrying expectations of care, belonging, authority or transmission. Membership may arise through birth, partnership, adoption, law or sustained practice.

Household. People sharing a dwelling or domestic provision under a stated definition. A household can contain one family, several families, unrelated members or one person with relatives elsewhere.

Kinship. The system through which a society classifies relationships and attaches consequences to them. It includes descent and marriage, and may also recognise adoption, ritual or care.

Descent. A rule for tracing membership, identity or succession through generations. Descent can be bilateral, patrilineal, matrilineal or organised through other selective connections.

Affinity. Kinship created through marriage or partnership rather than common descent. In-laws can carry obligations, alliance and inheritance consequences without being blood relatives.

Social reproduction. The work and institutions that sustain people and carry skills, identities and social positions across generations. Families perform much of it alongside schools, health systems, states and markets.

Lineage. A descent group whose members trace connection to a known or

accepted ancestor. A lineage can organise property, ritual, mutual aid, status and political claims.

Clan. A named kin group claiming wider common ancestry, sometimes without a fully traceable genealogy. Clans may coordinate identity and obligation across several lineages or local communities.

Bilateral kinship. Recognition of relatives through both the mother's and father's sides. It produces overlapping personal networks rather than membership in one exclusive descent line.

Patrilineal. Descent, name, property or group membership traced primarily through men. The term describes transmission, not automatic residence patterns or universal authority by every male.

Matrilineal. Descent or group membership traced primarily through women. It does not mean matriarchy: senior men may exercise authority within a line transmitted through their sisters.

Patrilocal. A post-marital residence tendency placing a couple with or near the husband's kin. Actual households may move, divide or make exceptions under economic pressure.

Matrilocal. A residence tendency that places partners with or near the wife's kin. It can support cooperation among women without determining the whole power structure.

Neolocal. Residence in a new household separate from either partner's parents. It is associated with some late-marriage and wage-labour systems but never means freedom from kin support.

Marriage. A publicly recognised union that assigns rights and expectations between partners and often their groups. Its contents can include sex, property, parenthood, residence, support and inheritance.

Monogamy. Marriage limited to one spouse at a time. Legal monogamy can coexist with divorce, remarriage, non-marital partnerships and gaps between formal rules and lived conduct.

Polygyny. A permitted marriage of one man to more than one wife. Permission does not show prevalence, since additional households require resources and may be concentrated among elites.

Polyandry. A permitted marriage of one woman to more than one husband. It is comparatively rare and usually tied to particular property, labour or ecological arrangements.

Endogamy. A rule or preference for marriage within a defined group, such as caste, religion or community. It can preserve identity, property and hierarchy across generations.

Exogamy. A rule or preference for marriage outside a defined kin or social group. It creates alliances and helps regulate which close relationships are prohibited as partners.

Bridewealth. Resources transferred from the groom's side to the bride's side or associated kin. Meanings vary, including recognition of alliance, labour and claims concerning children.

Dowry. Property transferred with a bride, commonly from her family towards the new marriage. Control and return rights vary, so dowry cannot be equated automatically with inheritance or purchase.

Dower. Property or income reserved for a wife, often for use after her husband's death. It offered protection within systems that otherwise channelled assets through men.

Inheritance. Transfer of property, claims or status after death. Rules concerning spouses, children, birth order, sex and adopted heirs reveal how a society imagines family continuity.

Legitimacy. Historically, the recognised status of a child born within an authorised union, with consequences for inheritance and standing. Modern law has reduced many such distinctions.

Adoption. Creation of a parent-child relationship through social or legal recognition rather than direct procreation. Adoption can serve care,

succession, alliance or several purposes at once.

Cohabitation. An intimate partnership organised through shared residence without marriage. Its legal consequences vary sharply, and duration or commitment cannot be inferred from the label alone.

Fertility. Births in a population, distinct from biological capacity to reproduce. A period total fertility rate describes births under that period's age-specific rates, not the completed family size of a real generation.

Demographic transition. The broad historical movement from high mortality and fertility towards lower mortality and fertility. Timing and mechanisms vary, and no single sequence describes every society.

Unpaid care work. Childcare, elder care, cooking, cleaning and related labour performed without direct wages. It sustains households and economies while remaining difficult to measure and distribute fairly.

Go Deeper

The accessible history

Stephanie Coontz, *Marriage, a History: From Obedience to Intimacy, or How Love Conquered Marriage* (Viking, 2005). Read this next for a clear account of marriage changing from an economic and political arrangement into an emotionally ambitious partnership. Coontz ranges widely, corrects the myth that love was absent from earlier unions and explains why modern freedom increased expectations as well as satisfaction. The sweep is strongest on Europe and North America, and its broad comparisons sometimes move faster than specialists in one region would. It remains lively, humane and the easiest route into the subject. Its best chapters show institutions changing through ordinary expectations rather than through legislation alone.

The evolutionary argument

Sarah Blaffer Hrdy, *Mothers and Others: The Evolutionary Origins of Mutual Understanding* (Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009). Hrdy builds a major interpretation around cooperative childrearing: human infants depended on care and provisioning beyond mothers, and that social environment helped shape unusual capacities for reading other minds. The book is rich in primatology, anthropology and evolutionary reasoning. Read it for a serious alternative to the isolated mother-child picture, while keeping the distinction between a supported evolutionary argument and a directly observed prehistoric family. The useful question is how far observed cooperation can explain the evolution of our minds. Keep it open while following Hrdy's case.

The global twentieth century

Göran Therborn, *Between Sex and Power: Family in the World, 1900-2000* (Routledge, 2004). This is the broad comparative work behind the book's insistence that family change had several regional paths. Therborn follows patriarchy, marriage and fertility across the world while linking intimate arrangements to law, religion, class, states and political movements. It is analytical rather than intimate and demands concentration, but its scale prevents one Atlantic chronology from becoming universal history. The book ends at 2000, so use it for the century's structures rather than for current statistics or the latest legal position. Pair its comparisons with newer national data where present conditions matter.

The anthropological correction

Janet Carsten, *After Kinship* (Cambridge University Press, 2004). Carsten shows why kinship cannot be reduced to a genealogical chart. Drawing on anthropology, she examines relatedness made through houses, food, memory, substance, adoption and everyday practice, then connects those findings to reproductive technology and identity. This is the most conceptually demanding recommendation here, but it changes what the word family can mean without pretending biology is irrelevant. Read it after the other three when the standard categories begin to feel too neat. It is concise, argument-led and especially valuable for questioning which relationships an observer has chosen to count. The reward is a vocabulary for relatedness wider than descent but still disciplined by evidence.

Notes and Sources

The notes distinguish documented examples from broader interpretations. Figures retain their stated geography and reference period; a publication year is not necessarily the year in which its underlying observations were collected.

Scope and the word institution. The subtitle uses institution in the sociological sense: durable recognised roles, rules and expectations, not a single organisation. No evidence identifies a first family or one original household, so “oldest” is treated as bounded shorthand. Organised relationships around childrearing, dependency, belonging and succession predate written states and formal markets, while their exact forms remain unrecoverable. Sarah Blaffer Hrdy and Karen Kramer supply the evolutionary and comparative basis for cooperative care. Janet Carsten and Sam Passmore with Fiona Jordan support the warning against treating Western genealogical categories or one kinship terminology as a universal template.

Dependency and cooperative care. Kramer’s review defines human cooperative breeding broadly as assistance by non-mothers in care or

provisioning and stresses cross-cultural variation in who helps. Rebecca Sear and Ruth Mace reviewed effects of kin on child survival and found no universal helper whose presence has the same result in every setting. The manuscript therefore says that fathers, grandparents, siblings and non-kin can matter, not that one helper or one household form was biologically fixed. Hrdy develops the larger argument that alloparental care contributed to human social cognition; this remains an interpretation rather than a directly observed prehistoric sequence.

Hunter-gatherer residence. Kim Hill and colleagues analysed co-residence in 32 present-day hunter-gatherer societies and found camps containing many people who were not close kin. Mark Dyble and colleagues modelled how equal influence over residence choices by men and women can help produce mixed-kin bands. These studies challenge the isolated biological family as an ancestral default. They do not turn living communities into fossils, settle all residence patterns or establish one causal route from sex equality to social organisation. The prose keeps those limits visible.

Counting families and households. The opening uses the usual-residence rules for the 2021 Census in England and Wales: a child whose parents lived apart was counted at the address where the child spent most time, or, if time was equal, at the address on census night. This is a rule for locating people, not a judgement of parental involvement.

The later UK figures come from the ONS bulletin *Families and households in the UK: 2025*, released on 17 April 2026 and based on the Labour Force Survey. One-person households are a share of households, not of people. Young adults living in their parents' family exclude those who have formed their own co-resident couple or have their own child, even under the same roof. ONS families include dependent and non-dependent children; lone-parent does not mean that a child has no other involved parent. Survey estimates carry sampling uncertainty and do not measure the quality or full extent of relationships. The illustrations of housing pressure explain possibilities, not a causal result established by these percentages.

Cross-cultural comparison. D-PLACE links cultural, linguistic and

environmental data for more than 1,400 societies, drawing much of its coded material from ethnographic accounts with specified focal places and periods. It is useful for testing whether marriage, descent and residence traits cluster across cases. It is not a population-weighted survey, and one coded value may compress internal disagreement or historical change. Sam Passmore and Fiona Jordan tested proposed universals in kin terminology across 176 societies and found only patchy support for eighteen coevolutionary theories. The manuscript uses the comparative record to reject one universal family design, not to imply unlimited variation or timeless cultures.

Kinship and relatedness. Standard terms for bilateral, patrilineal and matrilineal descent and for residence after marriage follow anthropological usage. Carsten's *After Kinship* and earlier work on relatedness show how feeding, houses, memory and daily practice can produce recognised kin relations alongside descent. The statement that matriliney is not matriarchy is a necessary distinction: descent through women can coexist with strong authority exercised by maternal uncles or other men. Local systems require their own account.

Marriage systems and transfers. Stephanie Coontz and Göran Therborn support the broad history of marriage as a changing bundle of intimacy, property, alliance, labour, parenthood and status. Jack Goody is used for property and inheritance in comparative perspective. The terms monogamy, polygyny, polyandry, endogamy and exogamy describe authorised forms or preferences, not their prevalence in a whole population. Bridewealth, dowry and dower differ in direction, control and legal effect across societies. The manuscript rejects the routine description of each as a purchase without claiming that any was immune from coercion or inequality.

Love and strategy. Evidence for feeling in earlier marriages is uneven because elite letters and court records survive better than ordinary speech. Coontz's central correction is retained: strategic and family-arranged unions did not exclude affection, while modern companionate marriage made affection and personal satisfaction more authoritative reasons to form and

continue a union. The causal account is deliberately plural. Wage labour, individual legal status, contraception, fertility decline, urbanisation and rights movements interacted; none is presented as the single cause of romantic marriage.

Household cooperation and conflict. Amartya Sen's "Gender and Cooperative Conflicts" supplies the model of households as sites of shared gains and unequal bargaining. Bina Agarwal extends bargaining beyond current income to property, social support, norms and the ability to survive outside the household. Their work also explains why household-level resources can conceal unequal allocation by age and sex. The manuscript does not assume that each family member maximises private advantage, or that pooled income reaches everyone equally.

Unpaid care and national accounts. The ILO's 2018 report combined time-use data from 64 countries representing about two thirds of the world's working-age population. Women accounted for 76.2 per cent of unpaid care hours in that synthesis, rounded here to three quarters. The surveys came from different years and used differing methods; the aggregate is neither a measurement taken in 2026 nor a rule for individual homes.

The System of National Accounts excludes unpaid domestic and care services produced for consumption within the same household from its central production boundary. Paid provision is included. Extended accounts can value unpaid household work without changing that distinction. The comparison concerns the same childcare service, not a claim that all unpaid production is omitted or that a household has no economic value.

Fertility, mortality and longer lives. The numerical anchor is the UN's 2024 population revision, published in July 2024, rather than completed observations of that calendar year. The headline fertility and life-expectancy measures are modelled period measures. Total fertility describes births under a period's age-specific fertility rates; life expectancy describes survival under its mortality rates. Neither is the eventual experience of a real generation. The late-2070s crossover is a projection, not an observed event or a forecast for each country.

Ronald Lee and Massimo Livi-Bacci supply the historical account. Mortality and fertility changes interacted with policy, contraception, education, urban costs, labour markets and norms. Where survival improved, fertility fell and schooling expanded, investment per child could rise in money, time or foregone earnings. This does not establish that earlier parents cared less, or that every small family spends more.

Ageing and intergenerational support. Longer lives increase the overlap of generations, but co-survival does not guarantee contact or support. Older adults may provide childcare, housing and money while later receiving care. The manuscript treats dependency as relational rather than equating old age with dependence. A chronological dependency ratio remains useful for population planning, but health, income and household roles determine the direction of actual transfers.

States, markets and family functions. Nancy Folbre on children and care and Jane Lewis on welfare regimes explain how public provision changes private bargaining and care allocation. Schools, pensions, healthcare and childcare redistribute particular tasks and risks; they do not replace an entire family network. Withdrawal may increase unpaid work, purchased care or unmet need. It does not guarantee that relatives can fill the gap.

Intergenerational transmission. The World Bank's *Fair Progress?* assembled a global database on mobility and found outcomes associated with parental education and status across a wide range of economies. The manuscript does not treat family background as destiny or infer one parenting mechanism from the association. Families transmit property, location, contacts, expectations and risk through public institutions that can amplify or reduce those differences.

Before agriculture and after it. The link from agriculture and storable property to inheritance pressure is a comparative causal inference, not a universal revolution in family form. Land, herds, grain and fixed dwellings make succession and labour claims more durable, but farming systems differ. The manuscript rejects a simple claim that agriculture created patriarchy or the extended household. Its narrower proposition is that

transferable resources made descent, succession and household extraction more consequential in many settings.

Law and household government. Martha Roth's Mesopotamian law translations establish the importance of marriage payments, divorce, adoption, inheritance and children's status. Judith Evans Grubbs supplies Roman marriage, property and paternal authority, including the distance between formal law and changing practice. The Chinese example is specifically Patricia Ebrey's Sung-period study, covering 960-1279. Its coexistence of restrictive ideals and women's practical rights should not be transported into all of ancient China. These cases show governments working through family classifications, not a single ancient household system.

Households before industrialisation. Peter Laslett and Richard Wall's *Household and Family in Past Time* established the importance of household listings and challenged the assumption that industrialisation created simple households. John Hajnal's account of late marriage and separate household formation in parts of north-western Europe remains influential, but later work has challenged a fixed East-West line and large causal claims built upon it. Steven Ruggles reviews the field and shows why household composition, kin availability and life-cycle stage must be separated. The manuscript therefore restricts the finding by region and period.

Slavery, emancipation and colonial rule. Tera Hunter, Brenda Stevenson and Stephanie Camp document family bonds under laws permitting sale and separation. Hawkins Wilson's letter of 11 May 1867 is preserved among Freedmen's Bureau records at the US National Archives, microfilm M1913, roll 58. The letter gives the twenty-four-year separation and the names and location clues used to seek Jane. The account claims no reunion beyond what that document records. Ann Laura Stoler supports the wider account of colonial authorities classifying intimacy for labour, race and rule.

Industrialisation and the breadwinner. Louise Tilly and Joan Scott, Jane Humphries and Claudia Goldin support the account of women's and

children's paid work, household pooling and the uneven rise of a male breadwinner norm. The manuscript distinguishes an influential ideal from its prevalence. One-wage households became more attainable in particular economies and periods but never described all classes, racial groups or countries. Domestic technology is treated as changing tasks while standards and expectations also changed, not as an automatic release from household labour.

Rights, welfare and exit. The account compresses legal changes that occurred at different dates across jurisdictions: married women's property, civil registration, divorce, custody, child protection, adoption and maintenance. It therefore avoids a single reform date or global sequence. The causal claim is institutional: rights are more usable when income, housing, childcare, documents and safety make exit credible. This is not a claim that public provision determines whether any individual relationship succeeds.

Assisted reproduction. The Science Museum account by Harriet Jackson documents Louise Brown's birth in Oldham on 25 July 1978, credits Edwards, Steptoe and Purdy, and describes the glass desiccator jar used as an incubator. Fertilisation took place outside the body; the embryo was then transferred for pregnancy. Louise's birth does not itself demonstrate donor conception or surrogacy. The distinction among genetic, gestational, legal and social parenthood concerns the wider possibilities of assisted reproduction and the separate rules governing them.

Migration and care chains. Rhacel Salazar Parreñas supports the account of transnational households, remittances and care chains. Migration can increase household resources while relocating physical care to relatives or paid workers. Effects differ by legal status, distance, gender and family arrangement. The short treatment preserves fuller migration systems for *Immigration in a Hurry*.

Misconceptions and rates. Divorce statistics depend on whether the measure is a yearly rate, a cohort probability, a current-status share or a ratio using a changing number of marriages. The text therefore refuses to

read one divorce rate as direct evidence of commitment. Historical household size also cannot establish multigenerational kin residence because servants, apprentices and lodgers may enlarge a household. These are measurement corrections rather than claims that family structure has no effect on wellbeing.

Evidence limits. Family evidence is systematically selective. States document taxable households, legal marriages and disputes. Genealogies may legitimise a claim as well as record descent. Censuses assign one usual address to mobile people and shared-care children. Ancient DNA identifies biological relatedness, not the social meaning of a burial, adoption or care relationship. Ethnography observes situated communities through translated categories. Time-use surveys struggle with simultaneous care. The “How we know” passage follows the strongest common conclusion: narrow questions supported by several record types are safer than universal claims drawn from one administrative map.

Examples and applications. The Manchester woman and her relatives are explicitly illustrative. The household bargaining and care-budget examples are hypothetical demonstrations, not reported case histories or prevalence estimates. Hawkins Wilson and Louise Brown are documented examples; their experiences illustrate mechanisms without proving how common those mechanisms are.

Bibliography

Official data and original research

Addati, Laura, Umberto Cattaneo, Valeria Esquivel, and Isabel Valarino. *Care Work and Care Jobs for the Future of Decent Work*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 2018.

Dyble, Mark, Gul Deniz Salali, Nikhil Chaudhary, Abigail E. Page, Daniel Smith, James Thompson, Lucio Vinicius, Ruth Mace, and Andrea Bamberg Migliano. “Sex Equality Can Explain the Unique Social Structure of Hunter-Gatherer Bands.” *Science* 348, no. 6236 (2015): 796-798. DOI

10.1126/science.aaa5139.

Hill, Kim R., Robert S. Walker, Miran Božičević, James Eder, Thomas Headland, Barry Hewlett, A. Magdalena Hurtado, Frank Marlowe, Polly Wiessner, and Brian Wood. "Co-Residence Patterns in Hunter-Gatherer Societies Show Unique Human Social Structure." *Science* 331, no. 6022 (2011): 1286-1289. DOI 10.1126/science.1199071.

Kirby, Kathryn R., Russell D. Gray, Simon J. Greenhill, Fiona M. Jordan, Stephanie Gomes-Ng, Hans-Jörg Bibiko, et al. "D-PLACE: A Global Database of Cultural, Linguistic and Environmental Diversity." *PLOS ONE* 11, no. 7 (2016): e0158391. DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0158391.

Kramer, Karen L. "Cooperative Breeding and its Significance to the Demographic Success of Humans." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39 (2010): 417-436. DOI 10.1146/annurev.anthro.012809.105054.

Office for National Statistics. *Families and households in the UK: 2025*. Statistical bulletin. Released 17 April 2026.

Office for National Statistics. *Output and enumeration bases: residential address and population definitions for Census 2021*.

Passmore, Sam, and Fiona M. Jordan. "No Universals in the Cultural Evolution of Kinship Terminology." *Evolutionary Human Sciences* 2 (2020): e42. DOI 10.1017/ehs.2020.41.

Jackson, Harriet. "Happy Birthday Louise Brown!" Science Museum Blog, 25 July 2024.

Sear, Rebecca, and Ruth Mace. "Who Keeps Children Alive? A Review of the Effects of Kin on Child Survival." *Evolution and Human Behavior* 29, no. 1 (2008): 1-18. DOI 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2007.10.001.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. *World Population Prospects 2024: Summary of Results*. UN DESA/POP/2024/TR/NO. 9. New York: United Nations, 2024. See also the UN's [population overview](#).

United Nations Statistics Division. *2025 System of National Accounts, Chapter 7: The Production Account*. Final-draft chapter, 2025, paragraphs on unpaid household services and extended accounts.

Wilson, Hawkins. Letter to the Chief of the Freedmen's Bureau, Richmond, Virginia, 11 May 1867. National Archives, Freedmen's Bureau records, microfilm M1913, roll 58. [Document and archival description](#).

World Bank. *Fair Progress? Economic Mobility across Generations around the World*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2018.

Modern works

Agarwal, Bina. "Bargaining' and Gender Relations: Within and Beyond the Household." *Feminist Economics* 3, no. 1 (1997): 1-51. DOI 10.1080/135457097338799.

Camp, Stephanie M. H. *Closer to Freedom: Enslaved Women and Everyday Resistance in the Plantation South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Carsten, Janet. *After Kinship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Coontz, Stephanie. *Marriage, a History: From Obedience to Intimacy, or How Love Conquered Marriage*. New York: Viking, 2005.

Cowan, Ruth Schwartz. *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

Ebrey, Patricia Buckley. *The Inner Quarters: Marriage and the Lives of Chinese Women in the Sung Period*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Folbre, Nancy. *Who Pays for the Kids? Gender and the Structures of Constraint*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Goldin, Claudia. *Understanding the Gender Gap: An Economic History of*

American Women. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Goody, Jack. *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Grubbs, Judith Evans. *Women and the Law in the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook on Marriage, Divorce and Widowhood*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Hajnal, John. "European Marriage Patterns in Perspective." In *Population in History: Essays in Historical Demography*, edited by D. V. Glass and D. E. C. Eversley, 101-143. London: Edward Arnold, 1965.

Hrdy, Sarah Blaffer. *Mothers and Others: The Evolutionary Origins of Mutual Understanding*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2009.

Humphries, Jane. *Childhood and Child Labour in the British Industrial Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Hunter, Tera W. *Bound in Wedlock: Slave and Free Black Marriage in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2017.

Laslett, Peter, and Richard Wall, eds. *Household and Family in Past Time*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Lee, Ronald. "The Demographic Transition: Three Centuries of Fundamental Change." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 17, no. 4 (2003): 167-190. DOI 10.1257/089533003772034943.

Lewis, Jane. "Gender and the Development of Welfare Regimes." *Journal of European Social Policy* 2, no. 3 (1992): 159-173. DOI 10.1177/095892879200200301.

Livi-Bacci, Massimo. *A Concise History of World Population*. 6th ed. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2017.

Parreñas, Rhacel Salazar. *Servants of Globalization: Migration and*

Domestic Work. 2nd ed. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015.

Roth, Martha T. *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor*. 2nd ed. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Ruggles, Steven. "The Decline of Intergenerational Coresidence in the United States, 1850 to 2000." *American Sociological Review* 72, no. 6 (2007): 964-989. DOI 10.1177/000312240707200606.

Ruggles, Steven. "The Future of Historical Family Demography." *Annual Review of Sociology* 38 (2012): 423-441. DOI 10.1146/annurev-soc-071811-145533.

Sen, Amartya. "Gender and Cooperative Conflicts." WIDER Working Paper 18. Helsinki: World Institute for Development Economics Research, 1987.

Stevenson, Brenda E. *Life in Black and White: Family and Community in the Slave South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Stoler, Ann Laura. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Therborn, Göran. *Between Sex and Power: Family in the World, 1900-2000*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Tilly, Louise A., and Joan W. Scott. *Women, Work, and Family*. Revised ed. New York: Routledge, 1987.