

SSHA in Chicago, Nov. 18-21, 2004.

Mortality crises and marital behavior in a German proto-industrial region in the seventeenth century

Kagawa University

Satoshi Murayama

Mortality crises in the seventeenth century in Elberfeld

Burial records of a reformed church in Elberfeld of the Wupper Valley in the lower Rhine region show that there were some remarkably high rates of mortality in the seventeenth century. 221 human deaths can be confirmed in 1597, just preceding the start of the seventeenth century, and 321 persons died in 1613, 593 persons in 1630, 558 persons in 1636, and 321 persons in 1676. The average number of deaths during other years of the century is less than 100 per year.

< Fig. 1: Macro statistical change of burials, baptisms, and marriages >

The parish of the reformed church in Elberfeld included the city of Elberfeld and two nearby farm districts. The population of this parish is estimated to have been approximately 2,000 persons at the beginning of the seventeenth century and approximately 3,400 by the end of the century. Although the population increased gradually throughout the century, a mortality crisis resulted in the loss of about 25 percent of the population in one year, and such a situation occurred two times during the period of the Thirty Years' War. Since the feudal lord of this district had taken a neutral position in the war, there was no direct war damage. However, the spread of epidemics resulted in serious mortality crises.

What influence did these mortality crises have on marital behavior in this district? How did the death of parents, a spouse, or brothers and sisters affect marital behavior?

After a period of decline and a stagnant period during the Thirty Years War, the population increased rapidly in the latter half of the seventeenth century, and it reached about 5,500 persons at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Subsequently, the population increased more rapidly, to 8,500 persons by the middle of that century, and in the latter half of the century and in the nineteenth century, it grew much more dramatically, to 24,872 persons in 1792, 40,716 in 1816, and 63,231 in 1840. (1)

Elberfeld in the Wupper Valley

The Wupper Valley had two settlements, Elberfeld and Barmen, which, in the nineteenth century, were referred to as twin cities. Around 1700, however, they were more differentiated localities; Elberfeld was an urban settlement and Barmen a rather rural one. In 1698, Barmen had a population of 2,134, the number of households was 430, and the size of the average household was 4.96. In 1703, the city of Elberfeld had a population of 3,050, 768 households, and one poorhouse, where 22 persons lived. The size of the average household, excepting this poorhouse, was 3.94. (2) This difference between the settlements is the result of there being a greater number of one-person households in Elberfeld, and also proportionally more households of young couples without children. In Barmen, fifty years later, the same configuration of households was observed, with a population register of 1745 showing a large increase in the number of one-person households. The average household size was 4.11 by this time, and the proportion of one-person households increased from 1.9 percent to 10.4 percent. In 1698, there were two large households, each of which had approximately 20 members, but in 1745 no households this large existed.

Based on a population register for 1702/03 (3), we know the employment structure at that time in the city of Elberfeld. A normal city, it had many craftsmen and also many workers in the textile industry, and the ten wealthiest export merchants were the leaders and movers of the Wupper Valley economy. In Barmen, in 1709 (4), there were 55 individuals engaged in agriculture, 8 day labourers, 15 merchants, 41 master bleachers, 21 journeymen bleachers, 4 linen weavers, 48 ribbon weavers, 2 twiners, 3 shoemakers, 3 bakers, 3 blacksmiths, 3 thimble makers, 6 joiners, 9 publicans, 6 petty traders, 3 coopers, 1 roofer, 3 pig dealers, 1 miller, and 40 paupers. The number of workers and labourers in the textile industry continued to increase, and “Gemark, one of the twelve constituent localities of Barmen, eventually became the hub of the boom, primarily because of its central location and its proximity to a bridge spanning the Wupper” (5). While in 1698 Gemark contained 13.4 percent of Barmen’s total population, its share rose to 21.7 percent by 1747. The total population of Barmen rose from 2,134 to 3,790 persons (6). In the middle of the eighteenth century, Gemark could claim all the attributes of a city centre.

The Wupper Valley was a district where various textile industries developed, and their origin was a business that bleached flaxen thread and exported bleached thread. In 1527, a territorial prince granted the special privilege of monopoly to the common people who lived off of this business, which utilized the water and the fertile plain beside the Wupper River. This special privilege of monopoly was called *Garnnahrung* (= Yarn-Sustenance), and it was granted to city inhabitants, the peripheral inhabitants of the city, and to the inhabitants of Barmen, next to the city of Elberfeld. The privilege was given to the general populace of the Wupper Valley as a communal interest. In this sense, the whole community became one fixed management body. The privilege of monopoly was also a privilege of economic self-government. However, this cooperative character disappeared gradually, especially

after a large fire occurred in 1687 (6). The privilege of *Garnnahrung* arose from the medieval concept of a static society, which sustained the policy of restrictions on the quantity of production in order to realize ‘corporate ideals regarding a stable, and above all, an egalitarian income for all concerned’ (7). Such a corporate economy changed gradually into a class society.

On May 22, 1687, a large fire broke out in Elberfeld and destroyed approximately 300 houses (8). It is likely that about 1,500 people were burned out of their homes. Fortunately, few died. After the fire, the city authorities requested that the territorial prince grant an exemption from land taxes. On July 10, less than three weeks after the fire, the feudal lord withdrew an ordinance of land taxation for Elberfeld, effectively creating an exemption for Elberfeld residents.

This exemption, good for 25 years, was also granted to people who wanted to move to the city of Elberfeld (9), and thanks to this 25-year exemption, people flocked to the city. As a result of this immigration, the religious constitution of the city changed greatly. Whereas almost all of the inhabitants of the old city had been Calvinist, throughout the eighteenth century more and more Lutherans and Catholics came to live in the city. At the end of the eighteenth century, 45.8 percent of the inhabitants were Calvinist, 44.3 percent were Lutheran, and the remaining 9.9 percent were Catholic (10).

### The historiographical context

English family reconstitution datasets have clarified that “there were important variations in female marriage ages in particular according to socio-economic community type. Rural communities that were later to become industrial appear to have started the eighteenth century with relatively high marriage ages, while agrarian communities serving large urban areas appear to have had relatively low marriage ages at that time. However, the fall in female marriage ages was faster and went further in rural industrial communities” (11).

For Germany there are no such datasets, and information is especially scarce for the early phase of the rural industrialization occurring from the late Middle Ages to the beginning of the eighteenth century. Due to the lack of evidence, we cannot comment with any certainty on the declining age at marriage for men and particularly women. However, according to Imhof (12), we can observe a long process of standardization for the age at marriage (13). The mean age at marriage in the parish of Heuchelheim in Hessen was nearly constant, but this does not necessarily indicate that there was no historical change. Women’s ages at first marriage initially were widely dispersed but then gradually concentrated around a mean age as time passed, and the trend was accelerated beginning in the later part of the eighteenth century (14).

In addition, Wrigley et al noted, “while the range of variation between female mean marriage ages was still considerable in the 1830s, the enduring feature from the later eighteenth century was the convergence of female marriage ages in all areas regardless of socio-economic type” (15). According to the argument of Hudson & King (16), “Goldstone (17) noted that much of the fall in the aggregate female age at first marriage ‘can be explained by a sharp fall in the proportion of brides marrying at ages of 30 +. This fall was more than balanced by a rise in the proportion marrying at or around the age of 20 years.’”

As one of several macro-explanations for the fall in the proportion of brides marrying at ages of 30 +, a “recent macro-economic theory suggests a broad link between nuptiality and the operation of the English communal welfare system from the mid-eighteenth century onwards, with the poor law underwriting many of the demographic consequences of less restrained marriage behavior” (18). However, “the poor law cannot be invoked as a blanket explanation for falling marriage ages and rising marriage rates. At a national level, female marriage ages stabilized in the 30 years when poor relief expenditure rose at its fastest rate (1780-1810).”

An alternative macro-explanation poses industrialization as the causal factor in changing nuptiality patterns, citing mechanisms now familiar from the long proto-industrial debate. The other alternative is a famous suggestion of Hajnal (19) that marriage ages were directly related to the time required to accumulate the resources necessary for founding an independent household and residential unit. His suggestion has proved very influential. However, “cultural historians have increasingly offered alternative insights on marriage. Several of them focus not on the immediate marriage decision but on the nature of the courtship process that preceded it. While there are differences between these authors and in the source material they have used, they all stress three factors that determined the choice of marriage partner for women, and the timing of marriage. First the turbulence of courtship is emphasized. Few women married the first person they courted, often because flaws in the reputation of a partner were revealed. Second, friends and relatives often intervened (positively or negatively) in the courtship process, making marriage more or less likely. Finally, the role of accident or chance in the courtship process is stressed. This focus on the courtship process rather than on marriage allows more scope for explanation of local variations, differences within the same community, and short-term temporal changes” (20).

Many historical-demographic and socio-economic studies had tried to explain the standardization process of age at marriage, but it has not yet been sufficiently explained. Those explanations must be supported by new evidence analyzed by micro-studies of the courtship process. The falling of age at marriage and marriage restrictions have been discussed a great deal, but the differences in marriage age levels and trends between regions and communities, and also between classes and groups within a community, have not yet been sufficiently explored.

## Sources and methods

The most important official actions of the church (baptisms, marriages, and burials) were recorded by members of the community in the parish registers. The recordings of the church start in the early or high Middle Ages as baptismal lists. Germany's oldest parish registers are those from St. Theodor's Church in Klein Basel (1490), Konstanz (1463), Zwickau (1502), and the death register of the Franciscan monastery at Coburg with entries from 1250 – 1525 (21). It is estimated that approximately 150 parish registers already existed in Germany by about 1563 (22).

German historical demographic studies covered mostly the period after the eighteenth century, even though it was known that many parish registers existed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, because the family reconstitution method, which is an original method of historical demography, cannot be applied to many cases of early parish registers. The deficit of records makes this method impossible. The influence of the Thirty Years War is also large in Germany. However, what is most important is that the people who were recorded in German parish registers from the sixteenth to the late seventeenth centuries included not only the inhabitants of the parish but also foreigners or outsiders (23). From the sixteenth century to the seventeenth century, there was a period of confusion after the Reformation and also during the formation period of a pre-modern state. This period is called 'Confessionalization' (24).

In this period of 'Confessionalization', Germany was divided into territorial states; likewise, each parish was categorized as a Catholic, Lutheran, or Calvinist parish. Elberfeld, located in a valley district of the Wupper River, was a centre of the Calvinists of the Lower Rhine. In the case of the Calvinist community of Elberfeld, records of baptisms, marriages, and burials did not begin to be kept all at once. The oldest record was that of a baptism registered in 1584, while marriage records became ongoing beginning in 1586, and a burial book was kept from 1589 (25).

The three events were not always registered in one record book. There was a case of only baptism being recorded and also a case in which the records of baptism, marriage, and burial were registered in a same booklet. In addition, the records were not always arranged chronologically, so considerable care must be given when reading them. For example, an entry in a marriage book was started in the second-oldest parish register, and baptismal records were also found later in the register, following some blank pages. A record of burials was started in the third-oldest parish register, and baptisms and some marriage records were also entered in a blank portion of this record book. After 1621 such irregular entries were no longer made.

Many local historians using these records have tried to reconstitute the genealogical lines of several families, including the family of Wichelhaus, the family of Wuppermann, and others. Edmund Strutz, one of the most

famous local historians, has, according to such genealogical studies and his own works, published a respectful genealogical study on the families of “Elberfelder Bürgermeister und Stadtrichter von 1708-1808” (26), which includes more than 700 families with about 4000 family members. The family reconstitution can trace the family before the sixteenth century. Choosing from among these families, we examined 47 couples who married in the seventeenth century. The birth, marriage, and death dates of those couples are in almost all cases exactly recorded, and this was the first marriage for both partners of each couple.

< Table 1: 47 couples and their events >

The number 47 is too small to generalize our observations statistically. Here, not a quantitative analysis but a qualitative one is carried out to focus on individual marriage behavior. We use not only the information about family reconstitution of the 47 couples, but also the information about their parents and grandparents to clarify the timing of the marriage in relation to the death of parents and the change of cohabitation. We pay special attention to the courtship process.

Important information for our analysis was also derived from the poll tax recorded in 1663 and 1673 (27), which charged the city inhabitants in Elberfeld. By this list, the name of household representatives and the existence of their partner, children, relatives, and servants are clarified. The interval of ten years in almost the same information can clarify the changes of families and cohabitation through identification of the names. Moreover, in the poll tax in 1673, the amount of tax is classified, and the occupation of household representatives is clarified. Poor people, who could not pay tax, are also recognized.

Since the list of those historical materials of poll tax is not a population resister, probably less than 15-year-old children are not recorded. Even though poor families are recognized, and in some cases there is a note that children have been sent out to be beggars, it is not always clear how many children there were. The small children and infants are clearly excluded. However, the number of children is informed in some cases by a comparison with the data of family reconstitution, which includes information about land ownership and the succession of property. By using and comparing the different information derived from two different sources, we have been able to clarify the influence of the mortality crises on marital behavior.

The families of Anton Schlösser and Benjamin Teschemacher

< Table 2: Anton Schlösser and his family >

Table 2 shows that Anton Schlösser (No. 11: 1609-1665) married four times. Hr. Schlösser's first wife died in 1630, and the second in 1636. Terribly mortality crises occurred in the Wupper Valley during each of those two years. The first wife, Anna Braus (No. 11: 1607-1630), was 23 years old when she died, and the second wife, Anna Siebel, was 28 years old when she died. The third wife, Eva Katharina Holerhoff, died at the age of 38 in 1652, a year when there was also a small mortality crisis.

Since Anton died in 1665, his name can be found in the poll tax list of 1663. At that time he had a wife, a daughter called Helena, a servant, and a maid. His wife was Eva Katharina, his 4th marriage partner. They married in 1653 and had a son, Johannes, who was 14 years old in 1663, and a daughter named Eva Katharina, who was 9 years old at that time. These children do not appear in the list of 1663.

By the time Anton died in 1665, the family situation had changed a great deal from earlier years. At 16, Johannes was still too young to marry. His elder half-sister Helena was 23 years old, of marriageable age. She was a daughter of Anton's former wife, Anna Siebel. Her stepmother was Eva Katharina, who was then remarried to Johannes Cappel (?-1679) three years after Anton's death, in 1668. This was Hr. Cappel's second marriage. He does not appear in the list of 1673. His trade activity was carried out in Benrath, although his family had emigrated to Elberfeld later. The son of Johannes Cappel and Eva Katharina, Johann Peter Cappel (1668-1725), served as the mayor of the city Elberfeld in 1715, and Johann Kaspar Cappel (1710-1764), who was their grandchild, became the mayor in 1754.

By the time Eva Katharina remarried, Helena (No. 32: 1642-1703) was already 26 years of age. During her time of courtship, Helena experienced a big change in her family relations. Four years later, in 1672, she married Andreas Siebel (No. 32: 1642-1710), when both were 29 years old.

< Table 3: Helena and Johanness Schlösser >

Not only Helena but also Johannes had a good relationship with the family of Andreas Siebel, whose father was also called Andreas (= the father Andreas). Johannes appears in the list of 1673 as a household head, and he was a young journeyman. He was 24 years of age. Before his nomination to the list, Andreas Siebel and his wife Helena were registered. It is possible that Johannes had a business relation with his brother-in-law. Johannes married Gertrud Wülfing (No. 37: 1657-1734) in 1684. He was 35 years old, and his partner was 27. His partner, Gertrud, was a child of the first marriage of Gertrud Teschemacher (1626-1703), who remarried with the father Andreas, who died in 1684. Shortly before the death of Andreas, Johannes married Gertrud. Her mother Gertrud lived after the marriage with her son-in-law, Johannes.

Johannes's sister-in-law, Eva Katharina (No. 38: 1654-1734), whose mother before mentioned another Eva

Katharina was, married Bernhard Meyer (No. 38: 1657-1730), who was a pastor, in the same year as the marriage of Johannes, 1684. Mayer had been a pastor of a reformed church in Urdenbach since 1683, in Mülheim a. d. Ruhr since 1689, and in Duisburg since 1703, and had become a pastor of the reformed church in Elberfeld in 1703. The couple married in Urdenbach. The fact that these two marriages occurred in 1684 is not just a curious coincidence. I think that the father Andreas may have played a parental role for the children of Anton Schlösser, because they were so young at the time of Anton's death.

The dense kinship relations have brought to the three children of Anton a goal of marriage. The timing of the death of the father Andreas was especially crucial for the two younger children, who experienced the absence of their father and a change of their family during the time of their courtship processes. This timing probably lengthened the periods to marriage determination.

The family of Anton was directly influenced by the period of mortality crises. Not only were deaths observed, but also the influences of the parents' deaths and remarriages upon the life-courses of their children were huge, because the courtship process of younger children is mostly affected by the death of parents and remarriage of the partners.

< Table 4: Benjamin Teschemacher and his family >

We might contrast these life stories with those of the family of Benjamin Teschemacher (No. 20: 1619-1681). According to Table 4, the family of Benjamin shows a marriage pattern typical of the wealthiest families in the Wupper Valley. Benjamin married Katharina Schlösser (No. 20: 1630-1717) in 1649, when Benjamin was 29 and Katharina was 19. In the list of 1663 they appear as marriage partners, but no children were recorded, while in the list of 1673 they have two sons and three daughters. In 1663 their children were too young to be registered.

According to the information of family reconstitution, Benjamin and Katharina's children's marriages, except that of Helena, were also smoothly advanced. At the time of marriage, Anna Maria (1652-1683) was 23 years of age, Katharina (No. 33: 1654-?) was 20, and Susanna (No. 45: 1670-1744) was 24. The husband of Anna Maria, Johannes Conrads (?-1708), seems to have been born in Dortmund, but exactly when is not clear. Therefore the couple is not listed on Table 1. Johannes moved to Düsseldorf, returned to Elberfeld, and served as mayor of the city in 1700.

Benjamin was 6 years old when his father Johannes (?-1625) died. His mother, Helena Lüttringhausen (?-1627), died two years later, when Benjamin was 8. Johannes served as a mayor of the city in 1616. His family was one of the wealthy families. It is possible that Benjamin was the couple's last son. It is not clear who acted as a parent for Benjamin. Benjamin married Katharina Schlösser (No. 20: 1630-1717) in 1649. Katharina's parents were Andreas

Schlösser (No. 5: 1593-1672) and Anna Plücker (No. 5: 1595-1655). This Andreas was an elder brother of Anton Schlösser. If Benjamin had known the family of Andreas Schlösser from early times, it is possible that he experienced the deaths of Anton's first, second, and third wives at close hand.

Benjamin's wife was Katharina, who was born in 1630 and died in 1717, when she was 87 years of age. According to the population register of the city Elberfeld of 1703, she was recorded as a widow, because Benjamin died in 1681. She was 73 years of age at that time, but the record allows that she was as yet active as a merchant.

#### Characteristics of marital behavior among the wealthiest families

The mean age at marriage of women of the 47 couples is 22.2. The distribution of age at marriage is also narrow. Hudson and King stress in their study about two English townships of the eighteenth century that there existed a clear relationship between female marriage ages and kinship density (Hudson and King, 2003, p.175). Our sample of 47 couples showed a dense kinship relation, which correlated to early marriage.

Historical-demographic data for seventeenth-century Germany are scarce. For example, there is only one set of data for the city of Gießen (Imhof) for the entire century. But it is suggested from the data of other communities that the distribution of female marriage ages had a wider disbursement in the first phase of the early modern period than later on. In contrast to the females' case, the ages of [males at first marriage are dispersed from 18 to 41 years of age throughout the period.

< Table 5: Distribution of age at marriage in 47 couples in Elberfeld in comparison with the case of Giessen >

< Fig. 2: Distribution of age at first marriage (in %) >

It is not surprising that the females of some homogeneous marriage couples married between 19 and 22 years of age. A specific class seems to have had such a custom. However, some cases like the Schlosser's family show late marriage.

<Table 6: Peter Kirberg and Werner de Weerth>

Peter Kirberg (No. 27: 1630-1676) married at the age of 37. His mother died when he was 3 years old, and his father died when he was 11 years old. According to the list of 1663 he was living with Margareta, a younger sister. He married in 1667, and the list of 1673 shows that he had a wife in that year, and he was classified as a young journeyman (= Junger Geselle). The wife's father was Wilhelm Teschemacher (1598-1667), who served as the

mayor in 1643, 1644, and 1648. Peter married Wilhelm's daughter, Gertrud Teschemacher, who was 21 years old at that time. The year of their marriage was that of the death of her father. Peter's father, Johannes Kirberg (1580-1641), also served as the mayor in 1618, 1624, and 1637. It was a marriage between the families of the same rank. However, Peter's sister, Margareta, does not appear in the marriage network of the group.

Peter's daughter, Ursula (No. 43: 1670-1735), married Werner de Weerth (No. 43: 1653-1738), when she was 21 years of age, while Werner, who was born in 1653, was 38 years old at marriage. He filled the role of mayor in 1705 and 1715.

Werner's father, Christian aus dem Werth, was born on July 27, 1608, and passed away at the age of 69 on March 23, 1678, when Werner was 25 years old. His mother, Anna Peill, was born on April 1, 1612, and died on March 22, 1689, when she was 77 years old and close at hand. At this time, Werner was 35 years old. Werner seemed to be a last son of the couple, and he inherited the land property near of the city of Elberfeld after the death of his mother.

Werner lost his parents late in comparison with Benjamin Teschemacher and Peter Kirberg. When Peter died at the age of 46, Ursula, who married Werner later, was approaching her 16th birthday. Three years after Werner's mother's death, Werner and Ursula married. According to the list of 1673, Werner's father was alive at the time and was classified as a malts maker (= Malzmacher). He had a wife, three sons, and a maid. Werner was the youngest son. In this situation it was not possible for Werner to marry early. After the marriage he could take various important posts in the city. The family of de Weerth were newcomers. The marriage between Werner and Ursula meant that he entered the wealthiest family network in the Wupper Valley.

#### Death of parents and marital behavior of their children

The cases of Anton Schlösser and Benjamin Teschemacher show that the timing of the death of parents had a crucial influence upon the marital behavior of the next generation. In the period of the mortality crises there occurred often the successive deaths of parents.

#### < Table 7: Johannes and Gottfried Lucas >

Gottfried Lucas (No. 34: 1648-1714) was a son of Johannes Lucas (No. 16: 1614-1672) and Katharina Üllenberg (No. 16: 1621-1672), who died on April 25, 1672. Her husband died on June 13 in the same year, when he was 58 and she was 51. Three years after the death of his father, Gottfried married Katharina Teschemacher (No. 34: 1650-1727) on February 25, 1675, when he was 26 years of age.

Gottfried was described in the list of 1673 as a secretary of the city (= *Stadtschreiber*), and did not marry. He had a saloon (= *Schankwirtschaft*) that sold wine and beer (= *Keuth*). His two brothers, Wilhelm and Johannes, and two sisters, Margareta and Judit, lived together at that time. These four siblings do not appear in the marital relationships in the wealthiest group. When the parents died, Gottfried was 24 years of age. The fact that the brothers and sisters continued to live together after the death, may be the reason he could not immediately marry. The death of the parents seems to have been sudden.

#### <Table 8: Peter and Kaspar von Carnap>

Kaspar von Carnap (No. 29: 1648-1727) married Elisabeth Wülfing (No. 29:1646-1672) in 1669, when he was 21 and she was 23. However, Elisabeth died at the age of 26 on July 3, 1672. On the list of 1673 we cannot find Kaspar, because he lived outside of the city. His father, Peter von Carnap (No. 12:1607-1673), died on May 6, 1673. Kaspar, who lost Elisabeth, was remarried to Maria Teschemacher (1652-1711), who received baptism on August 25, 1652, and was 21 years old on August 27, 1673. She had lost her father, Wilhelm Teschemacher (No. 18: 1619-1672), on July 11, 1672, one year earlier.

Because the list of the poll tax of 1673 is considered to have been created before August 12, this marriage had not yet occurred. Maria Teschemacher is listed as a “young daughter and a merchant (= *eine Kramerin*)”. After the marriage with Maria, Kaspar moved to Elberfeld and enacted the first mayoralty at the age of 33 in 1681. He took the post of the mayor's executive repeatedly in 1686, 1691, 1697, 1703, and 1709. He had 12 children by two marriages. Of the twelve children only five reached adulthood (Strutz, 21). All of them married in the dense kinship relation. Kaspar died when he was nearly 80 years old, on July 17, 1727. He was a most typical figure of newcomers from outside the city.

#### Conclusion

By using family reconstitution information about 47 couples, and linking this to the poll tax lists, we were able to determine that the death of parents caused fundamental changes in family relations. All of the couples had dense kinship relations, and female marriage ages were low. However, this custom was often disturbed by the death of parents. The mortality crises had serious effects on family relations and for newcomers presented an important opportunity to enter the small, wealthy family groups in the Wupper Valley, which were continuously renewed by them.

## Notes:

- (1) Murayama, 1990, 132.
- (2) Murayama, 1990, 209.
- (3) Verzeichnis der in Elberfeld ansässigen Familien 1702/03.
- (4) Langewiesche, 1863, 228.
- (5) Kisch, 1981.
- (6) Murayama, 1990, 209.
- (7) Kisch, 1981, 309.
- (8) Kollekte nach dem Brand von 1687.
- (9) Goebel, *Zuwanderung*, 29-30.
- (10) Counted from E. F. Wiebeking, 1793.
- (11) Hudson & King, 2003, p.161.
- (12) Imhof, 1985, pp. 57-59; 1988, pp. 40-41.
- (13) Murayama, 2001.
- (14) Imhof, 1975, p. 328; Murayama 2001, p. 318.
- (15) Hudson & King, 2003, p. 162; Wrigley et al., 1997, pp. 121-194.
- (16) Hudson & King, 2003, pp. 161-166.
- (17) Goldstone, 1986.
- (18) Hudson & King, 2003, 163.
- (19) Hajnal, 1965; 1983.
- (20) Hudson & King, 2003, p. 166; Macfarlane, 1986; Gillis, 1985, 1997; Abbott, 1993, 1996; Adair 1996; Chan, 1998; O'Hara, 2000.
- (21) Wilke, 2004, p. 65; Börsting, 1959; Wagner & Weiss, 1994
- (22) Henning and Ribbe, 1972.
- (23) Kießling, 1970.
- (24) Heinz Schilling, 'Confessional Europe', in T. A. Brady et al. ed., *Handbook of European History 1400-1600*, (Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J.Brill), 641-681.
- (25) Kirchenbücher: Personenstandsarchiv Brühl.
- (26) Strutz, 1963.
- (27) Rechnungen, Hauptstaatsarchiv Düsseldorf.

## Bibliography

### Historical Sources:

- Rechnungen der in den Städten u. des Herzogtums Berg im Jahre 1662-1673. Hauptstaatsarchiv Düsseldorf. Berg. Landestände V 34. A 1 152.
- Kießling, Hermann. (1970). *Trauungen Kirchspielfremder in Elberfeld (Ref.). 1585-1620 und 1649-1675*. Wuppertal-Vohwinkel: Verlag BezGr. Bergisch Land der Westdeutschen Gesellschaft für Familienkunde e.V.
- Kollekte nach dem Brand von 1687: Archiv der Ev.Reformierten Gemeinde Elberfeld. III A 7-1,1.
- Kirchenbücher: Personenstandsarchiv Brühl.
- Langewiesche, W. (Hrsg.). 1863. *Elberfeld und Barmen. Beschreibung und Geschichte dieser Doppelstadt des Wuppertales, nebst besondere Darstellung ihrer Industrie, einen Ueberblick der Bergischen Landesgeschichte*. Barmen.
- Strutz, Edmund. (1963). *Die Ahnentafeln der Elberfelder Bürgermeister und Stadtrichter von 1708 – 1808*. Neustadt an der Aisch: Verlag Degener & Co.
- Verzeichnis der in Elberfeld ansässigen Familien 1702-03 (Stadtarchiv Wuppertal AV 29)
- E. F. Wiebeking, *Beiträge zur Churpfälzischen Staatengeschichte vom Jahre 1742 bis 1792, vorzüglich in Rücksicht der Herzögtümer Gülich und Berg, gesammelte vom E. F. Wiebeking*, Heidelberg / Mannheim, 1793.

### Literature:

- Adair, Richard. (1996). *Courtship, illegitimacy and marriage in early modern England*. Manchester 1996.
- Börsting, H. (1959). *Geschichte der Frühkirche bis zur Gegenwart*, Freiburg im Breisgau.
- Chan, Mary. (1998). *Life into story: the courtship of Elisabeth Wiseman*. Aldershot.
- Gillis, John Randall. (1985). *For better, for worse: British marriages, 1600 to the present*. Oxford and New York.
- Gillis, John Randall. (1997). *A world of their own making: myth, ritual, and the quest for family values*. Cambridge.
- Goebel, Klaus. *Zuwanderung zwischen Reformation und Franzosenzeit. Ein Beitrag zur vorindustriellen Bevölkerungs- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte Wuppertals 1527-1808*, Wuppertal 1966.
- Goldstone, Jack. (1986). Demographic revolution in England: a re-examination, in: *Population Studies*, 40, 5-33.
- Hajnal, John. 1965. European marriage patterns in perspective, in: David V. Glass / David E. C. Eversley (eds.), *Population in history: Essays in historical demography*, London, pp. 101-143.
- -. 1983. Two kinds of pre-industrial household formation system, in: Richard Wall (ed.), *Family forms in historic Europe*, Cambridge 1983, pp. 65-104.
- Henning, H. and W. Ribbe. *Handbuch der Genealogie*, Neustadt a.d. Aisch, 1972.
- Hudson, Pat & Steven King. (2003). Marriage in two English textile manufacturing townships in the

- eighteenth century. Christophe Duhamelle & Jürgen Schlumbohm (Eds.), *Eheschließungen im Europa des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts. Muster und Strategien*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 157-188.
- Imhof, Arthur E. (1975). Die namentliche Auswertung der Kirchenbücher. Die Familie von Gießen 1631-1730 und Heuchelheim 1691-1900, in: A. E. Imhof (Ed.), *Historische Demographie als Sozialgeschichte. Gießen und Umgebung vom 17. zum 19. Jahrhundert*. Darmstadt und Marburg: Selbstverlag der Hessischen Historischen Kommission Darmstadt und der Historischen Kommission für Hessen, pp. 279-558.
  - -. (1985). *Die verlorenen Welten. Alltagsbewältigung durch unsere Vorfahren- und weshalb wir uns so schwer tun ...* 2. Aufl. München: Beck Verlag.
  - -. (1988). *Von der unsicheren zur sicheren Lebenszeit: 5 historisch-demographische Studien*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
  - King, Steven. (1999). Chnace encounters: paths to household formation in early modern England. *International Review of Social History*, 44, 23-46.
  - Kisch, Herbert, From monopoly to Laissez faire: The early growth of the Wupper valley textile trades, in *The Journal of European Economic History* 1-2 (1972) m 298-407, later in *Die hausindustriellen Textilgewerbe am Niederrhein vor der industriellen Revolution*, Göttingen, 162-257.
  - Macfarlane, Alan. (1986). *Marriage and love in England: modes of reproduction 1300-1840*. Oxford 1986.
  - Murayama, Satoshi. (1990). *Konfession und Gesellschaft in einem Gewerbezentrum des frühneuzeitlichen Deutschland. Das Wuppertal (Elberfeld-Barmen) von 1650 bis 1820*. Tokyo: Keio Tsushin.
  - Murayama, Satoshi. (2001). Regional standardization in the age at marriage. A comparative study of preindustrial Germany and Japan. *The History of the Family. An International Quarterly*, 6, 303-324.
  - O'Hara, Diana. (2000). *Courtship and constraint: rethinking the making of marriage in Tudor England*. Manchester.
  - Schilling, Heinz. 1995. Confessional Europe, in T. A. Brady et al. ed., *Handbook of European History 1400-1600*, Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J.Brill, 641-681.
  - Wagner, D., & Weiss, V. (1994). Die Kirchenbuchführung in Sachsen und Thüringen – Ein Vergleich erster Forschungsergebnisse. *Familie und Geschichte*, 3 Jg, H. 1.