The Contradictions of Patriarchy in Early Modern England

Susan Amussen

When I wrote my dissertation proposal almost 40 years ago, my goal was to understand the impact of agrarian capitalism on patriarchy. That interest derived from both political and academic engagements with these questions: how did we, in the present, integrate the need to transform the economic and social order with the challenges of patriarchy? What did history have to teach us? The relationship between capitalism and patriarchy was a big question in feminist scholarship, as was the political question of whether we should work first for the dismantling of capitalism or patriarchy.[1] By the time I completed my dissertation three years later, however, both patriarchy and capitalism had disappeared as analytical categories. This was not because I was no longer interested in either capitalism or patriarchy, but because the abstractions they represented were obscured by the complexity and detail I had found in my research. When I knew nothing, I could speak confidently about patriarchy. As I began to learn more (and I knew very little going in) it was more elusive.

Androniki Dialeti's historiographical analysis has shown that my experience was by no means unique, but is instead exemplary of the trajectory of feminist history over the past forty years. While social historians in the 1970s used broad analytical categories, in the years since,

we have gained rich knowledge of ordinary people's lives. However, the particularities of experience have often obscured the broad structures within which they lived. There is an ongoing tension between the desire to understand broad social processes and the desire to understand the lives of ordinary people.[2] The response to this tension has been shaped by the impact of the linguistic turn in both feminist and historical scholarship. Cultural history has often obscured the structural dynamics of the past. It has paid less attention to social and political formations – our focus in the 1970s – than to structures of thought and practice. This is almost certainly also tied – as Judith Bennett reminds us – to the ways in which feminists have become established in the academy: if I am trying to speak to colleague who does not understand gender, it is not helpful to use words like 'patriarchy' that might be seen as alienating.[3] Nation and empire have joined capitalism as salient categories, but patriarchy has been labelled more than analysed. As I finished my most recent book, I became convinced that the missing piece was an analytical handle on patriarchy as a social formation.[4]

The challenge is that patriarchy is easier to see from the air than on the ground. Where do we find it in our sources? How does it change over time? Because patriarchy is the water we (and our historical subjects) swim in and the air we and they breathe, it is often not visible. Over the past thirty-five years, historians of early modern England have developed a rich understanding of the texture of social life and social relations in the context of the English state. We have come to

understand the emergence of empire, and the commodities that shaped material life. Our analysis of gender, class and (more tentatively) race has become increasingly complex.[5] There has been some interest in the history of capitalism, and its changing contours. But we have rarely engaged directly with the history of patriarchy as a formation that changes through its relationships to these other social formations and which also changes them. To do so we need to ask new questions. For example, what does the relationship between gender and class tell us about patriarchy? What is the impact of the growing bureaucratic state on patriarchy? How does slavery change patriarchy? Patriarchy – like the state, capitalism, or empire – is simultaneously a product and producer of historical change. It helps shape the social formations with which it interacts at the same time it is shaped by them.

A historicised understanding of patriarchy helps us understand some of the broader tensions and conflicts of early modern English society. It will also provide comparative tools to help us understand what is particular to patriarchy in its contemporary instantiation. The early modern period is a useful place to probe patriarchy as a social formation for reasons I intuited forty years ago: this period was marked by demographic expansion, and long before what Jan de Vries called the 'industrious revolution', increasingly far-flung trade had a profound effect on patterns of consumption for a growing middle rank European people. The Reformation highlighted issues of gender and family. Religious changes interacted with other social

developments, making the question of whether Protestantism was good for women not particularly useful. However, Protestant rejection of celibacy as an ideal, and acceptance of married clergy, gave more value to family life, while the significance of individual reading of scripture provided space for religious independence; in Catholic communities, both women's monastic communities and female saints offered women lives.[6] Europe's increasing engagement with the world highlighted cultural differences; in addition, over time some physical differences came to be defined as critical markers of difference. Both became important for systems of racialization. Furthermore, the wealth that was generated by Europe's empires shifted an ever-larger portion of the economy into capitalist modes that led to the expansion of a large (and largely poor) laboring class.[7] While these phenomena are Europe-wide, they play out in national contexts shaped by particular political, legal and economic contexts.

Patriarchy was one of the overarching structures within which early modern people lived. It was embedded in multiple dimensions of society, from law and the economy to social practice and literature; it was taken for granted. Patriarchy, in its broadest sense of male supremacy, has been identified as a framework for almost all historical societies; equally, both historians and anthropologists have pointed out that patriarchy is never absolute. There were (and are) always spaces of female authority and (relative) autonomy.[8] Yet these limits, and the ways they work, are historically contingent. Judith Bennett has drawn our attention to patriarchal equilibrium.[9]

Treating patriarchy as a social formation will help us understand how patriarchal equilibrium works, and explain why differences emerge in women's experience in any given society, as well as the various kinds and natures of subordination across time. These differences were shaped by the distinct forms of patriarchy within which women lived. While doing this is challenging, it is particularly suited to our skills as historians. We are accustomed to thinking about the dynamic between change and continuity, just as we manage the tensions between what the *Annalistes* called 'structures' and 'conjonctures'. While the history of patriarchy is distinct from the history of women, or of gender, it will enrich both.

Central to understanding the history of patriarchy, like the history of capitalism, is understanding and analyzing the contradictions inherent in the system. Like capitalism – and almost any other system of power – patriarchy produces multiple demands that are in tension with each other. It can also be in tension with the demands of the economic and political systems with which it interacted. Like capitalism, patriarchy repeatedly managed to work around and through its contradictions and transform itself into something new. The contradictions at any time are what constitute the specificity of patriarchy. It is the changing nature of these contradictions, I argue, that animate the history of patriarchy; they explain the process by which it changes. The contradictions of patriarchy help us understand the subordination of women _ which continues in multiple different forms of patriarchy – as the result of a historical process.

To show how the contradictions of patriarchy can help us understand its history, I will focus on those that are visible in England between about 1560 and 1640. This limited geographical and temporal focus is designed to draw attention to the specificity of patriarchy as a formation. During this period, English society was marked by significant economic and social tensions as a result of demographic growth, as well as political and fiscal tensions: these all exploded in the 1640s with revolution and civil war. It is also before English society was significantly changed by its colonies. I will revisit familiar territory for specialists, with an eye to what happens when we examine it in terms of the history of patriarchy. These examinations will illuminate how attention to patriarchy can reshape our understanding of early modern society and provide an illustration of the advantages of such an approach on a broader historical canvas.

While patriarchy has a simple definition, it was articulated in religious and moral ideas, political thought, medicine, law and economic practice. These sets of ideas intersected – none of these act independently – but each had different imperatives. While all these systems assumed male superiority, none of them was fully coherent; each had assumptions and values that were at best in tension with those of other systems. Indeed, tracing the demands of patriarchy, we find repeated catch-22s where it was impossible to succeed. Men were supposed to govern a household of people they could not fully control; women were supposed to be submissive to their husbands while simultaneously sharing in governance of the household and representing the

household in the market. Women were expected to help keep order in their households but were assumed to be disorderly by nature. It is safe to say that it was almost impossible for either men or women to meet the standards established by patriarchy.

The contradictions I will focus on here emerged from men's authority over their households and women's role in household governance. The core of patriarchy was the assumption that women were, by nature, inferior to men, and thus should be governed by them. While their spiritual equality before God was asserted by both Catholics and Protestants, it was before God, and not in society. The tension between spiritual equality and social subordination was a persistent challenge, demonstrated by the contortions that writers of English household manuals went into when discussing the appropriate exercise of authority by husbands over wives. Yes, they would say, he must govern her, but he should be nice about it; he should correct her, but not too strictly and he should let her get away with minor faults. The tension here reflects the next contradiction, that between women's subordination to their husbands and their authority over children and servants (if they had them). The puritan preacher William Gouge, who first delivered what would become his *Of Domesticall Duties* as sermons, found himself criticised (he thought unfairly) by women in his parish. His response, and the convoluted argument he made, indicates his awareness of the tension though he argues that it was only in theory and not in practice.

> I take the main reason of the many exceptions which were taken, to be … that wives duties … being in the first place handled, there was taught what a wife, in the uttermost extent of that subjection under which God hath put her, is bound unto, in case her husband will stand upon the uttermost of his authority:which was so taken, as if I had taught that an husband might, and ought to exact the uttermost, and that a wife was bound in that uttermost extent to do all that was delivered as duty, whether her husband exact it or no. But when I came to deliver husband's duties, I shewed, that he ought not to exact whatsoever his wife was bound unto . . .but that he ought to make her a joint Governour of the family with himself, and refer the ordering of many things to her discretion, and with all honourable and kind respect to carry himself towards her. *In a word, I so set down an husbands duties, as if he be wise and conscionable in observing them, his wife can have no just cause to complain of her subjection. That which maketh a wives yoke heavy and hard, is an husbands abuse of his authority: and more pressing his wives duty, then performing his own.*[10]

This is a tortured argument. Gouge denied implications of male supremacy, that a husband could in fact 'exact' from his wife whatever he wished. He had to say this was what was owed, but did

not want to admit it was ever expected. Accounts of the abuse of women by their husbands is a reminder that at least some men did indeed do so.[11]

Discussions of authority – like those in Gouge – invoked a reciprocal model of rule. In this model, it was the work of the superior that was seen as particularly difficult; all the household manuals spend far more time detailing the roles of husbands and fathers than of wives and mothers. Governing was understood to be a learned skill. Furthermore, governing was not a role for all men; it came with age and marriage, but also with property. It required wisdom and moderation. At the same time, men were responsible – by popular culture, and in some cases by law – for the behaviour of their wives, children and servants.[12] It turns out, however, that wives, servants and even children often acted as they wished.

Enforcing their government of the household was particularly difficult for men because of the economic role of the household. After all, early modern women (of all classes) assumed that they played an active economic role. The household was the most common framework for organizing work. The dependence of household economies on women's work is most visible in patterns of remarriage: widowers appear to have remarried faster than widows and a greater proportion of them remarried.[13] In urban areas women might have separate occupations. In rural areas, specific areas of the household economy – dairying and brewing – were associated with women's work. Legally, however, in England, the income of the household belonged to its male

head, not jointly to him and his wife. Her goods and money were his.[14] So the official – prescriptive and legal – distribution of power in the family (everyone subordinated to the father/husband) did not match the actual experience, where husbands depended on wives. The reason that husbands could not enforce their authority too strictly was that they needed their wives.

The result of this tension were the two ways patriarchy was challenged in what I have come to call unruly women and failed patriarchs. They are two sides of the same coin: an unruly woman demonstrated that the patriarch responsible for her – husband, father or master – had not done his job. I will illustrate these by looking at scolds – a particular type of unruly woman – and cuckolds, failed patriarchs who were (apparently) particularly prevalent. The failure of both scolds and cuckolds to uphold patriarchal norms was punished in both formal and informal ways. Cuckolds and scolds were stock figures on the English stage, as well as in jest books and ballads; they were the targets of insults and shaming rituals; they regularly showed up in court. Analogies between the family and the state meant that these figures also had political implications. The multiple ways that unruly women and failed patriarchs are visible show the ways they undermined the structures of order.[15] Each of these figures illuminates the difficulties inherent in navigating patriarchy's demands, and the attempts that were made to enforce it.

Scolding women were perhaps the most familiar threats to patriarchal order. Scolds were usually married, but failed to be modest and submissive. At least in the late medieval period, the women accused were generally from established families, which suggests a certain amount of economic power. Scolding was an offence that could be prosecuted in ecclesiastical courts, where it was a 'breach of Christian charity', and in both manorial and royal courts, where it was a disturbance of the peace: it was primarily an offense of women although men were prosecuted on occasion. Women's propensity for scolding was one more manifestation of their disordered nature. While the chronology and frequency of scolding prosecutions is unclear, prosecutions for scolding reflect 'a desire for order and justice, and conflicts about how to get [them]'. Prosecutions for scolding (or being a 'common barretor', who picked quarrels with neighbours) were sufficiently common that in 1580 the Wiltshire Sessions tried to limit their number. Scolds' verbal abuse was seen as a form of violence (as witchcraft cases also demonstrated). When prosecuted in the ecclesiastical courts, the penalty for scolding was penance; when presented in local courts punishment might be a fine, but also often included being carted through the town and ducked in the cucking stool.[16]

Scolding prosecutions rarely provide more than the name of the offense and the guilty party. Even these brief mentions provide a sense of how people thought about both the offense and the offenders. Punishments could be put on hold to see if behaviour improved; in Oxford, the

1615 Sessions ordered Katherine Forrest and Elizabeth Slye to be ‘well ducked’ for ‘common strife and scolding,’ but because of their repentance, the punishment was only to be carried out if they offended again. The rare description of a scold’s actions shows why their behaviour was threatening; they also show prosecution as a last, rather than a first, resort. In 1620, Oxford ordered Margaret the wife of Edmund Slayman be ‘kept in safe custody’ until she could safely be ducked, ‘after many misdemeanors, daily disorders, abuse of officers and drunkenness’. The following year, they ordered Margaret Atwood ‘to be put in the ducking stool at a time to be named for horrible scolding and base and scandalous words to Agnes Lee’.[17] Scolding was often joined to other offences: Mary, the wife of Lawrence Yate of Charlton, Worcestershire, was described in 1607 as ‘a common scold and tale carrier’. As a local resident who would have received poor relief if necessary, she also stole produce from the fields, ‘apples, crabs and corn, and has been seen to cut the barley’.[18] With such offenders, officials would punish offenses separately. Anne, the wife of John Sweting of Middleton Quernhow, Yorkshire, was ‘a notorious scold, a common drunkard and a woman of very lewd and evil behaviour amongst her neighbours’. It was ordered that whenever she was scolding, the constable was to duck her, but when she was drunk, she was to pay her fine or be put in the stocks for six hours.[19] London local courts held special sessions in the late sixteenth century to deal with ‘harlots, bawds, and scolds’. In 1628, two ‘scolding’ ‘fisherwomen’ were taken up in London along with a third, ‘pulling one

another by the hair of the head': this was not a minor quarrel.[20] Women whose verbal abuse was more troublesome could also be suspected of witchcraft, with their words having malevolent power to punish their enemies.

Scolds had their literary counterpart in a series of shrew plays performed on the English stage from the 1590s on. The most familiar of these is Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, but Shakespeare's play was part of a longer conversation. John Fletcher's *The Woman's Prize, or The Tamer Tamed*, written in 1610 as a sequel to Shakespeare's play, ends up arguing for mutual respect between husbands and wives. In it, Petruchio's second wife, Maria, goes on a sex strike; only when Petruchio agrees to respect her does she offer obedience. Her conclusion echoes Gouge:

> *The* Tamer's tam'd, but so, as nor the men
> Can find one just cause to complain of, when
> They fitly do consider, in their lives,
> They should not reign as tyrants o'er their wives;
> Nor can the women from this precedent
> Insult, or triumph: it being aptly meant,
> To teach both Sexes due equality;
> And, as they stand bound, to love mutually.[21]

Scolds disturbed the harmony of a community – good neighborhood – through conflicts with neighbours, but local peace could also be disrupted by women who defied the authority of their husbands. In the context of patriarchy, they remind us that while patriarchal norms were ubiquitous, they were not necessarily observed. Some breaches of patriarchal expectations served other patriarchal demands and were generally accepted: women in the market served the household, even when they were assertive and confrontational. The prosecution of scolds, however, served as reminders of the expectations.

Scolds were a threat not just because they disrupted the community, but because they often disrupted the household; they were frequently assumed to reject their husbands' domestic authority or to commit adultery. Henpecked and cuckolded husbands, often depicted wearing the horns cuckolds were thought to wear, were targets of ridicule. Indeed, while not all women were seen as scolds, all men were expected to be cuckolds. A cuckold had failed because his wife was unfaithful. Ballads and jest books were full of these jokes about cuckolds which often assumed that to be a husband was to be a cuckold: women were expected to be unfaithful. In his account of Cuckold's Haven, a monument south of London, John Taylor the Water Poet wrote, 'Unto that Tree all are plaintiffs or defendants . . . some cuckolds, some cuckold makers'.[22] Or, as Shakespeare had the foresters sing in *As You Like It*,

Take thou no scorn to wear the horn;

It was a crest ere thou wast born:

Thy father's father wore it,

And thy father bore it:

The horn, the horn, the lusty horn

Is not a thing to laugh to scorn. (4.2.14-19)

This message of the inevitability of being a cuckold is elaborated in *Tarlton's Newes from Purgatorie*, a book of jests 'fit for gentlemen to laugh at an houre,' by 'Robin Goodfellow', which consists of tales about men's afterlives. 'A Tale of Three Cuckolds' offers an anatomy of cuckoldry which defines three types and describes their fate. The highest ranked in purgatory was the wittol, the man who knew and accepted that his wife was unfaithful, but loved her so much that he did nothing. His emblem was a ram, with two large horns. Next was the man who trusted his wife, and was unaware of her many betrayals. His emblem was a goat, as the horns were behind, and he could not see them. The final cuckold in *Tarlton's* catalog was the man whose wife was beautiful and honest; because of her beauty, he did not trust her and assumed she was unfaithful if she as much as looked at someone else. His emblem was an ass: he thought the long ears were horns, but they were just ears. In this scenario, a man had three choices:

acceptance of a wife's infidelity, misplaced trust in her fidelity or misplaced suspicion. Tarlton makes each of these men a gentleman in purgatory, and none is punished for his faults as their miserable lives are thought to be punishment enough. In this patriarchal fantasy, men's suffering at the hands of their wives in life is reversed after death; the upside - down world is righted again. This message was emphasised by the last paragraph of the tale which linked scolds and cuckolds: while cuckolds were rewarded, scolds were hung by their tongues.[23] If in life women's misbehaviour was inevitable, after death it could be controlled.

While cuckolds were a subject of jest and humor, there is extensive evidence that men did not in fact laugh when they were cuckolded. Whether you thought the horns were funny, after all, depended whether you were making the joke or its target. Cuckold jokes emphasize the sharp edge of ritual humor. For instance, neighbours' simply using a horn as decoration identified a putative cuckold. In 1591, when parishioners at Westwick, Norfolk, decorated the church at midsummer, George Elmer used two branches, 'the one bowed one way, the other another way' at the seat belonging to Joan Holmes and her husband, to create a set of horns. In Charminster, Dorset, in 1609, ram's horns were hung up outside the church during a wedding, while the following year in Somerset, horns were hung outside the window of a newlywed couple: both uses suggested that the bride had had lovers other than her husband. More aggressively, in the

late 1580s, Richard Lamberd of Helion Bumpstead, Essex, placed horns in the chancel of the church, thus defaming the minister.[24]

The horns were not always left to speak for themselves: in Norwich in 1609, a man threw a pair of ox horns into a shop, saying 'Take that for the key to your bedchamber door'.[25] In the midst of a conflict over church seats and other issues in Sithney, Cornwall, the minister William Robinson brought 'a great and huge pair of goat horns' and threw them against Edward Fosse's window, and followed it by 'bragging what he had done'.[26] Indeed, actual horns were not necessary for such insults. When Alice Phesey of London told William Dynes that 'thy horns are so great that thou canst scarce get in at thine own doors, take heed thou dost not break a hole with thy horns through thy neighbours wall', the vivid image obviated the need for a concrete symbol.[27]

Insults directed at cuckolds were often very creative, and indicated the significance of the accusation. The most elaborate were libels, where a verse was circulated in writing in the neighborhood, as well as (frequently) sung in alehouses.[28] When John Gordon, Gent., was suspected of adultery with Elizabeth, the wife of Edward Frances, Gent., in Melbury Osmond, Dorset, the first verse of the libel referred to him having 'Actaeon's head', wearing the horns that were the cuckold's sign, and then compared his wife to a bear. It concluded, 'But her husband I might be/ I would make her leave her venery.' This was spread in 'divers places in the county of

Dorset', through multiple copies which were sung and recited.[29] The libel emphasised Frances's failure to control his wife. The assumed ubiquity of cuckolds pointed to the impossibility of men meeting the standards set by patriarchal norms: they could never fully control their wives.

Cuckolds and scolds are evidence of the catch-22 of patriarchy: it was almost impossible to conform to patriarchal demands. Other such tensions or contradictions are less obvious. As defined in the early modern period, patriarchy provided authority to some men over not just women, but other men: only married men with property could fully participate in patriarchy and achieve what Alexandra Shepard has called 'patriarchal manhood'.[30] In a world that assumed male superiority, not all men were superior. Women's claims to property, or control over marriage, did not necessarily involve scolding or shrewish behaviour, but asserted independence from male control. Household disorder of any kind presented particular challenges for men: either they had not controlled their subordinates, or they had permitted disorder. In either case, they had failed as patriarchs. Prosecutions of scolds and shaming cuckolds punished those failures. Yet the failures also provided opportunities for agency, and also to shift expectations.

In the late seventeenth century, didactic literature worried less about the relationship between husbands and wives. Prosecutions for scolding were less common. There are many reasons for this: the social and economic tensions in English society diminished in the later seventeenth century, and some of the political tensions of the first half of the century were

resolved by the Restoration. Even more, patriarchy was transformed by England's engagement with its colonies. The contradictions of patriarchy in the later seventeenth century seem more deeply embedded in the ways consumption of colonial commodities – a capitalist imperative – undermined women's modesty.[31] Women may not have been prosecuted as scolds, nor men shamed as cuckolds, but patriarchy did not disappear.

Patriarchy, as we know, is not just a feature of early modern society. The challenge historians have had in writing a history of patriarchy is that in any given historical setting it exists in multiple realms – legal, scientific, medical, moral and religious. It is also shaped by social and economic structures. Patriarchy is not a coherent system, but full of contradictions. To make patriarchy a useful category of historical analysis, we need to make its abstractions specific. By focusing on the contradictions of patriarchy, we can begin to analyse it as a dynamic system whose perseverance was made possible by its shape-shifting adaptations.

Susan: I have highlighted several points in the notes where I was unfamiliar with the item being cited, and unclear if these were archives or sources. If it is an unpublished source in an archive, for the first cite please provide full information for the location of archive and cataloguing system, followed by [hereafter, (abbreviation of your choosing)]. All additional references to this archive, use the abridged title. Please let me know if you have questions.

---

[1] Zillah Eisenstein, *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1979) was probably the most important book in my thinking, but the discussions were widespread in the feminist network. See, for instance, Roberta Hamilton, *The Liberation of Women: A Study of Patriarchy and Capitalism* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1978) for a historical analysis focused on early modern England.

[2] Androniki Dialeti, 'From Women's Oppression to Male Anxiety: The Concept of "Patriarchy" in the Historiography of Early Modern Europe', in Marianna Muravyeva and Raisa Tovio, (eds), *Gender in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (New York: Routledge, 2013), pp. 19-36. The ways in which social theory informed English social history is discussed in Steve Hindle, Alexandra Shepard, and John Walter, 'The Making and Remaking of Early Modern English Social History', in Steve Hindle, Alexandra Shepard, and John Walter (eds), *Remaking English*

Society: Social Relations and Social Change in Early Modern England, (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2013), pp. 1-40, esp. pp. 1-19.

[3] Judith Bennett, *History Matters: Patriarchy and the Challenge of Feminism,* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), chap. 2, 'Feminist History and Women's History', esp. pp. 27-28.

[4] Susan D Amussen and David E. Underdown, *Gender, Culture and Politics in England, 1560-1640: Turning the World Upside Down* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017).

[5] For example, see Alexandra Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) and *Accounting for Yourself* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); Laura Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words, and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); Susan D. Amussen, *Caribbean Exchanges: Slavery and the Transformation on English Society, 1640-17000* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Steve Hindle, *The State and Social Change in Early Modern England, c. 1550-1640* (New York, St. Martin's Press, 2000); Cynthia Herrup, *A House in Gross Disorder: Sex, Law, and the Second Earl of Castlehaven* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Amanda Flather, *Gender and Space in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2007); Jane Whittle, *Consumption and Gender in the Early Seventeenth Century Household: The world of Alice LeStrange* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Garthine Walker, *Crime, Gender*

and the Social Order in Early Modern England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Bernard Capp, *When Gossips Meet: Women, Family and Neighbourhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: (Oxford University Press, 2003).

[6] For recent summaries, see Susan E. Dinan, 'Female Religious Communities Beyond the Convent' and Merry Wiesner-Hanks, 'Protestant Movements', in Allyson Poska, Jane Couchman, and Katherine McIver (eds), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 115-27 and 129-48.

[7] Jan de Vries, *The Industrious Revolution* (Leiden: Cambridge University Press, 2008); other relevant works include Regina Grafe, 'Social and Economic Trends' in Hamish Scott (ed), *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern History*, vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 269-94; Keith Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities: Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000); Nuala Zahedieh, *The Capital and the Colonies: London and the Atlantic Economy 1660-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Marcy Norton, *Sacred Gifts, Profane Pleasures: A History of Tobacco and Chocolate in the Atlantic World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008); Stuart Schwartz (ed.), *Tropical Babylons: Sugar and the Making of the Atlantic World, 1450–1680* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004). For some of the questions about 'early modern' as a period, see Mark Hailwood,

‘On Periodisation: A Defense of “Early Modern”’, (2016) https://manyheadedmonster.wordpress.com/2016/04/26/on-periodisation-a-defence-of-early-modern/

[8] For instance, see Allyson Poska ‘Upending Patriarchy: Rethinking Marriage and Family in Early Modern Europe’, in Allyson Poska, Jane Couchman, and Katherine McIver (eds), *Ashgate Research Companion to Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (2013), pp. 195-211, and in this forum.

[9] Bennett, *History Matters*, chapter four.

[10] William Gouge, *Of Domesticall Duties: Eight Treatises*, (2nd ed.. 1622: STC 12119) please clarify latter half of this citation), ‘Epistle Dedicatory’, sig 3v-4.

[11] Susan D. Amussen, ' “Being Stirred to Much Unquietness”: Violence and Domestic Violence in Early Modern England’, *Journal of Women's History* 6 (1994), pp. 70-89; Joanne Bailey, *Unquiet Lives : Marriage and Marriage Breakdown in England, 1660-1800*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Elizabeth Foyster, *Marital Violence: An English Family History 1660-1857* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); for a recent review of the literature, along with questions of periodisation, see Joanne Bailey and Loreen Giese, ‘Marital Cruelty: Reconsidering Lay Attitudes in England, *c*. 1580 to 1850’, *History of the Family* 18 (2013), pp. 289-305.

[12] For instance, accountability for church attendance changed over time, and was the subject of intense debate: J. E. Neale, *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, 1584-1601* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1966), pp. 396-402 for the debate in the early 1590s; Michael Questier, 'Conformity, Catholicism, and the Law' in Peter Lake and Michael Questier (eds), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, 1560-1660* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2000), pp. 237-61; the responsibility of the master or mistress, or of parents, to ensure that their servants/children were catechised is enshrined in the canons of both 1571 and 1604: *The Anglican Canons, 1529*-1947, in Gerald Bray (ed), Church of England Record Society, vol. 6. (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1998) pp. 189, 349; for expectations of men's control over their households, see the discussion of petitions against disorderly men in Susan Amussen, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988) pp. 166-8; Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood*, esp. pp. 173-85.

[13] Remarriage rates are difficult to determine, and depend to a great extent on local patterns of property holding; Margaret Pelling, Jane Whittle, 'Inheritance, Marriage, Widowhood and Remarriage: A Comparative Perspective on Women and Landholding in north-east Norfolk, 1440–1580', *Continuity and Change* 13 (1998), pp. 33-72; Barbara J. Todd, 'Demographic Determinism and Female Agency: The Remarrying Widow Reconsidered. . . again' *Continuity and Change* 9 (1994), pp. 421-50; Margaret Pelling, 'Old Age, Poverty, and Disability in Early

Modern Norwich: Work, Remarriage, and Other Expedients', in Margaret Pelling and Richard M. Smith (eds), *Life, Death and the Elderly: Historical Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 1994), pp. 74-101; Jeremy Boulton, 'London Widowhood Revisited: The Decline of Female Remarriage in the Seventeenth and early Eighteenth Centuries', *Continuity and Change* 5 (1990), pp. 323-55; Vivien Brodsky, 'Widows in Late Elizabethan London: Remarriage, Economic Opportunity, and Family Orientations', in Lloyd Bonfield, Richard M. Smith, and Keith Wrightson (eds), *The World We Have Gained: Esssays on Population and Social Structure*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986), pp. 122-54; for a comparative view, see G. Cabourdin, 'Le remarriage en France sous l'Ancien Régime (seizième-dix-huitième siècles), in J. Dupâquier, E. Hélin, P. Laslett, M. Livi-Bacci and S. Sogner (eds), *Marrriage and Remarriage in Populations of the Past* (London: Academic Press, 1981) 273-85.

[14] Sara Mendelson and Patricia Crawford. *Women in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 37-8, and chap. 6; Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood*, pp. 195-205.

[15] What follows draws on the fuller argument in Amussen and Underdown, *Gender, Culture and Politics*, chaps. 1 and 2.

[16] David Underdown, 'The Taming of the Scold: The Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England,' in Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson (eds), *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 116-36, esp. p. 119;

Amussen, *Ordered Society*, p. 122; For the criticism of Underdown and the complexities of this issue, including a discussion of the late medieval evidence, see Rachel J. Weil, 'Politics and Gender in Crisis: David Underdown's "The Taming of the Scold"' and Susan D. Amussen, 'Turning the World Upside Down: Gender and Inversion in the work of David Underdown', *History Compass* 11 (2013), pp. 381-88 and 394-404: the quote is from Weil, 'Politics and Gender in Crisis', p. 386; *Wiltshire County Records: Minutes of Proceedings in Sessions, 1563 and 1574 to 1592*, H.C. Johnson (ed), Wiltshire Archeological and Natural History Society, vol. 4, (Devizes, 1948 and 1949), p. 59 (1580); in the visitation of the Diocese of Bath and Wells in 1594, scolding represents just over 1 per cent of prosecutions, but 62 per cent cover absence from church, incontinence and standing excommunicated: *Bishop Still's visitation 1594 and the 'smale book' of the clerk of the peace for Somerset 1593-5*, Derek Shorrocks (ed), *Somerset Record Society*, vol. 84 (Taunton, 1998) p. 19.

[17] *Oxford Quarter Sessions Order Book, 1614-1637*, Oxford Historical Society, NS 29, Robin Blades and Alan Crossley (eds), (Oxford, 2009), pp. 5, 61, 72.

[18] Worcestershire County Records, *Calendar of Quarter Sessions Papers* (3 vols.), ed. J. W. Willis Bund, (Worcester, 1899-1900), vol II, p. 105.

[19] *Quarter session records*, North Riding Record Society, (ed), John Christopher Atkinson (1884-85), vol 1, p. 180.

[20] Paul Griffiths, *Lost Londons: Change, Crime and Control in the Capital City 1550-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 133, 394; as Laura Gowing has shown, accusations of scolding often encoded other conflicts: Gowing, *Domestic Dangers*, esp. p. 118.

[21] John Fletcher, *The Woman's Prize, or The Tamer Tamed, (*eds), Celia Daileader and Gary Taylor (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006) (please clarify page range here, p. 91-8? This is Act 5, Scene 4, li. 91-8) 5.4.91-98; for the shrew plays, see 'Introduction', in *Taming of the Shrew (*ed), Barbara Hodgdon (Arden Shakespeare, 3rd Series, 2010), pp. 35-6.

[22] Douglas Bruster, 'The Horn of Plenty: Cuckoldry and Capital in the Drama of the Age of Shakespeare', *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 30 (1990), pp. 195-215; John Taylor, *A new discouery by sea, with a wherry from London to Salisbury*, (London, 1623, STC 23778), A3v–A4. Please clarify if you are citing a volume number – no, STC is a bibliographic identifier

[23] Robin Goodfellow, *Tarltons Newes out of Purgatorie: Onely such as iest as his jigge, fit for gentlemen to laught at an houre.* (London: 1590: STC 23685), pp. 21-24; for the role of credit, see Amussen, *Ordered Society*, pp. 152-5; Alexandra Shepard, 'Manhood, Credit and Patriarchy in Early Modern England', *Past and Present* 167 (2000), pp. 75-106; for an economic focus, Craig Muldrew, 'Interpreting the Market: The Ethics of Credit and Community Relations in Early Modern England.' *Social History* 18 (1993), pp. 163-83.

[24] Norfolk R.O. DEP /26, Holmes con Elmar, f. 315v; Wilts. R.O., Deans Peculiar, Presentments, 1609 no 18; National Archives (TNA) STAC 8/152/7, Glovier con Warren et al.; F.G. Emmison, (ed),. *Elizabethan Life: Morals and the Church Courts*, (Chelmsford, 1973) p. 127.

[25] Norf. R.O. DEP 35, William Gray con Robert Nash, f. 21v.

[26] TNA STAC 8 140/29, Complaint of Edward Fosse, Yeoman.

[27] Quoted by Laura Gowing, 'Gender and Language of Insult in Early Modern London.' *History Workshop Journal* 35 (1993), pp. 1-21, p. 17.

[28] Adam Fox, 'Ballads, Libels, and Popular Ridicule in Jacobean England,' *Past and Present* 145 (1994), pp. 47-83.; Alastair Bellany and Andrew McRae (eds), *Early Stuart Libels: An edition of poetry from manuscript sources*, Early Modern Literary Studies, (2005). <http://www.earlystuartlibels.net/htdocs/index.html>, (accessed 23 January 2014): several of these libels, most of which are political, directed particularly at courtiers, include references to horns and cuckolds: see e.g. L10, Nv11, Oi5, Oii5, R8.

[29] TNA STAC 8/153/29, Gordon, Frances v. Auncell, Owen and others, 1622/23.

[30] Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood*, esp. chap 3.

[31] Susan D. Amussen and Allyson Poska, "Shifting the Frame: Trans-imperial approaches to Gender in the Atlantic World." *Early Modern Women: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 9 (2014) 3-23.