

Consumption, Social Capital, and the
'Industrious Revolution' in Early Modern Germany

Sheilagh Ogilvie

October 2009

CWPE 0943

**Consumption, Social Capital, and the “Industrious Revolution”
in Early Modern Germany**

SHEILAGH OGILVIE

Faculty of Economics, University of Cambridge

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to Marco Belfanti, André Carus, Tracy Dennison, Jeremy Edwards, Stan Engerman, Giovanni Favero, Claudia Goldin, Tim Guinnane, Phil Hoffman, Alexander Klein, Markus K pker, Naomi Lamoreaux, Paola Lanaro, Anne McCants, Janine Maegraith, Ben Polak, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, Ulinka Rublack, Francesca Trivellato, Danielle van den Heuvel, and participants at seminars at Caltech, Cambridge, Harvard, Venice and Yale for stimulating comments on earlier versions of this paper. I also gratefully acknowledge the financial support of a Leverhulme Trust Major Research Fellowship (F/09 722/C) and an ESRC Large Research Grant (RES-062-23-0759).

Abstract

This paper uses evidence from German-speaking central Europe to address open questions about the Consumer and Industrious Revolutions. Did they happen outside the early-developing, North Atlantic economies? Were they shaped by the “social capital” of traditional institutions? How were they affected by social constraints on women? It finds that people in central Europe did desire to increase market work and consumption. But elites used the “social capital” of traditional institutions to oppose new work and consumption practices, especially by women, migrants, and the poor. Although they seldom blocked new practices wholly, they delayed them, limited them socially, and increased their costs.

JEL Classifications: N0; N33; N43; N63; N73; N93; J13; J22; J31; J4; J7; O15; O17

Keywords: economic history; consumption; social capital; institutions; guilds; communities; labour; discrimination; gender; Germany

Expanding market consumption is widely ascribed a key role in European economic growth before industrialization. A “Consumer Revolution” between 1650 and 1800 is thought to have seen the middle classes spending lavishly on luxuries and the masses buying cheap fashions and comestibles.¹ In a parallel “Industrious Revolution”, it is argued, a growing demand for market goods motivated households – especially women and children – to re-allocate time from leisure and household production to income-earning work.² New norms of market consumption and market work are supposed to have become self-reinforcing, drawing hitherto unused supplies of human time and ingenuity into productive activities and increasing the demand for new goods. These Consumer and Industrious Revolutions, it is believed, fuelled the agricultural revolution, proto-industrialization, and factory industrialization – setting the stage for the Industrial Revolution and modern economic growth.³ Theories of the Consumer and Industrious Revolutions thus have far-reaching implications not only for economic history but for economic development more widely. However, they also pose significant open questions.

For one thing, nearly every early modern economy – in northern, central, and southern Europe, as well as parts of Asia – is now supposed to have had its Consumer and Industrious Revolution.⁴ But supportive evidence – inventories showing a proliferation of market goods, sources hinting at longer working hours – comes almost

¹ McKendrick (1974), esp. 197-200; Berg (1985), 169-72; Brewer and Porter (1993).

² De Vries (1992), esp. 106, 110, 112-4, 118-9; De Vries (1994), esp. 257, 261; De Vries (2008).

³ De Vries (1992), esp. 106, 110, 112-4, 118-9; De Vries (1994), esp. 257, 261, 264 (quote); De Vries (2008), 6-9, 17, 22-8, 70-85, 93-100, 111-32.

⁴ For German-speaking central Europe, see De Vries (2008), x, 19, 103-04, 123-24, 159-63, 179, 182; see Safley (2005), 348; Beck (2003); and Maynes (2004), 59-60. For France, see De Vries (1992), 114; De Vries (2008), x, 38, 51, 60, 88, 92-93, 96, 101-02, 106, 117-19, 124-27, 132, 134-39, 147-49, 157-61, 164-8, 179, 182-85; Maynes (2004), 60. For Italy, see Belfanti and Guisberti (2000); Pinchera (2006), 6. For Spain, see Ringrose (1996), 287; Ramos (2004), 1-2, 30-34. For China, see Bayly (2004), 52; Pomeranz (2000), 94-5. For Japan, see Bayly (2004), 52, although for an opposed view see Saito (2005), 37-9. For applications of the Industrious Revolution thesis to economies as various as Scandinavia, Spain, Japan, Bangladesh, India, Britain, Flanders and the Northern Netherlands, see the papers presented at Session H4 (“Industrious women and children of the world?”) of the XVth World Economic History Congress, Utrecht, 4 Aug. 2009 [<http://www.wehc2009.org>].

exclusively from the north Atlantic economies. Indeed, most of it applies specifically to the Netherlands and England which, as the early modern “miracle economies”, may have been exceptional in other ways.⁵ Until we explore the Consumer and Industrious Revolutions more thoroughly for later-developing economies we will not fully understand how crucial a shift toward market consumption and market industriousness actually was for modern economic growth and development.

This raises a second question. Consumption and work are social activities, yet theories of the Consumer and Industrious Revolutions invoke only two social institutions: the family and the market.⁶ This may be justified for the Netherlands and England, with their nuclear family households and precocious market economies. But most early modern European economies had active non-familial, non-market institutions: craft guilds, merchant associations, village communities, urban corporations, manorial systems, religious bodies, privileged corporate “orders”, political authorities, and many more.⁷ Political scientists regard many pre-modern institutions (particularly guilds and communities) as exemplars of the closely-knit and multi-stranded social networks that generate “social capital” – the stock of norms, information, sanctions, and collective action that are believed to play a key role in economic development.⁸ Social institutions and their associated social capital varied greatly across early modern Europe, but their impact on the Consumer or Industrious Revolutions has yet to be explored.

This leads to a third open question. These early modern “revolutions” are supposed to have been spearheaded by females, who increasingly purchased clothes and comestibles in the market, using cash they earned from reallocating time from

⁵ Berg (2005); McKendrick (1982); De Vries (2008); McCants (2006).

⁶ See, e.g., De Vries (2008), 19.

⁷ See Ogilvie (1996, 1997, 2003, 2007a).

⁸ For positive views of this role, see Putnam et al. (1993), pp. 163-185; Putnam (2000), pp. 319, 322-3, 325, 346-8. For a more critical evaluation, see Ogilvie (2003, 2004a, 2004b).

unpaid household work to market jobs.⁹ This might seem perfectly consistent with what we know about the Netherlands and England, where early modern travellers remarked on the astonishing degree of freedom manifested by Dutch females,¹⁰ and the Duke of Württemberg wrote on his 1598 visit to England that “the women have much more liberty than perhaps in any other place; they also know well how to make use of it, for they go out dressed in exceedingly fine clothes ... [England is] a paradise for women, a prison for servants, and a hell or purgatory for horses ... for the females have great liberty and are almost like masters, whilst the poor horses are worked very hard”.¹¹ But in most early modern European economies women faced a huge array of institutional constraints on their work and consumption choices. Did these widely varying restrictions on women have no impact on the Consumer and Industrious Revolutions?

This paper addresses these questions by focusing on an economy in late-developing Central Europe which, although market-oriented in many ways, had strong non-market institutions, which differed from those of the classic Consumer Revolution economies and imposed very serious economic constraints on women. The southwest German territory of Württemberg differed from the Low Countries and England, but resembled many other parts of continental Europe, in the enduring powers of its guilds, communities, and local religious institutions. Württemberg retained occupational guilds until 1862, not just in traditional handicrafts, but also in export-oriented proto-industries, shopkeeping, and merchant trading.¹² Württemberg also had powerful local communities, whose courts, councils, officials, and citizens’

⁹ De Vries (1992), esp. 118-9; De Vries (1994), 261; Noordegraf / Van Zanden (1995); McKendrick (1974), 199-200; Berg (1985), 169-72 .

¹⁰ See the contemporary descriptions quoted in Laurence (1994), 129-35; and Schama (1987), 404, 407-12.

¹¹ Frederick Duke of Wirtemberg, “A true and faithful narrative of the bathing excursion”, in Rye (1865), 7, 14.

¹² See Medick (1996), esp. 65-140; Ogilvie (1997), 72-9, 106-11, 419-37; Ogilvie (2004a).

assemblies enabled them to monitor and regulate work, leisure, consumption, education, marriage, sexuality, and economic transactions.¹³ Württemberg established local church courts in the 1640s which remained active until c. 1890, had the power to impose fines and incarceration as well as religious penances, and closely regulated work, consumption, sociability, sexuality, poor relief, and cultural practices.¹⁴ Detailed micro-studies have shown how these guilds, communities, and religious institutions generated a rich “social capital” of shared norms, information, sanctions, and collective action, which significantly influenced the economic options of an otherwise highly market-oriented population.¹⁵ Württemberg is thus a good test case for exploring the Consumer and Industrious Revolutions in a late-developing economy permeated by the “social capital” of non-market institutions.

What would we expect to observe if “social capital” affected the Consumer and Industrious Revolutions? For one thing, traditional institutions often enforce social norms about labour, particularly for women, youths, and the labouring poor. So the first section of this paper examines whether social institutions, by regulating work and wages, observably changed people’s incentives and capacity to reallocate time from household to market production. Second, traditional institutions often enforce norms about commerce – who can trade, in what goods, in what ways. Section 2 therefore explores whether social institutions, by regulating commerce, affected how retailers made new market wares available to wider social strata. Third, traditional institutions also typically impose social norms about the quantity, quality, and style of consumption deemed appropriate for particular social groups – particularly women and the lower orders. Section 3 therefore investigates whether sumptuary controls observably affected

¹³ Ogilvie (1986); Ogilvie (1997), 42-72; Ogilvie (2003); Sabeian (1990), 106, 109, 148, 160-1; Warde (2002), esp. 22.

¹⁴ Popkin (1996); Ogilvie (2003).

¹⁵ See Maisch (1992); Medick (1996); Ogilvie (1997); Ogilvie (2003); Rublack (1999); Sabeian (1990); Warde (2002).

people's consumption practices. Finally, traditional institutions often enforce norms about gender roles and household authority. Section 4 therefore examines whether non-familial social institutions, by intervening in family conflicts, observably altered women's ability to increase market work and market consumption.

1. Social Capital and "Industriousness"

For the Industrious Revolution to succeed, economic agents mainly active in household production and leisure – particularly women – had to be free to shift into market employments. They also had to be offered remuneration that motivated them to make this move. Historians of the Netherlands and England have pointed out two of the institutional preconditions for this to happen: a family system permitting women to work outside the household, and labour markets for both sexes – both satisfied under the European Marriage Pattern.¹⁶ But *other* institutions also affected the extent to which women could shift from household to market, as we see by broadening the analysis to other parts of Europe.

Württemberg, as Table 1 shows, had all the hallmarks of the European Marriage Pattern – late female marriage, high female celibacy, low fertility, small and simple nuclear-family households. Indeed, female celibacy rates and marriage age increased during the early modern period, as male emigration soared. Had the family system been all that mattered, low sex ratios and high female celibacy should have created generous labour market opportunities for women.

¹⁶ De Vries (2008), 9-19.

Table 1:
Women and the European Marriage Pattern in Pre-Industrial Württemberg

Benchmark	Date	Place	Value
Mean age at first marriage for females	1575-1624	Wildberg	23.5
	1659-1722	Wildberg	26.0
	1693-1746	Wildberg	26.0
	1658-1884	Laichingen	26.7
	1652-1875	Böhringen	24.6
	1700-1749	Öschelbronn	24.6
	1750-1799	Öschelbronn	24.7
	1800-1824	Öschelbronn	25.8
% of females over age 49 dying unmarried	1780-1789	Neckarhausen	26.4
	1615-1699	Wildberg	7.8
	1700-1799	Wildberg	15.7
	1800-1834	Wildberg	17.4
% of females over age 45 dying unmarried	1615-1834	Wildberg	14.0
	1625-1699	Laichingen	8.7
	1700-1799	Laichingen	8.1
	1800-1874	Laichingen	17.5
% of females over age 49 alive and unmarried	1625-1874	Laichingen	11.8
	1717/1722	Wildberg	14.0
% of females not currently married (all ages)	1744	Wildberg	13.0
	1717/1722	Wildberg	65.0
% of females not currently married (aged 15-64)	1744	Wildberg	70.0
	1717/1722	Wildberg	50.0
Sex ratio (males per 100 females)	1744	Wildberg	47.0
	1626/1631	Wildberg	91
	1717/1722	Wildberg	82
	1736/1737	Bietigheim town	87
	1736/1737	Bietigheim villages	86
Estimated GRR	1717/1722	Wildberg	2.08
Mean household size	1717/1722	Wildberg	4.2
% nuclear-family households	1717	Wildberg	87

Sources: Knodel (1988), 122-3; Maisch (1992), 226-33; Medick (1996), 319, 633; Ogilvie (1997), 225-307; Ogilvie (2003), 40-78; Sabean (1998), 218.

Women in Württemberg did often work in the market, as I have shown in detail elsewhere, and as is illustrated below in Table 3. But the jobs they did and the wages they earned were affected by institutions other than family and market.¹⁷ For one thing, community officials and community courts in Württemberg often ordered women to work inside households for husbands, parents, or masters rather than taking market employment. Communities imposed obstacles on women of all marital

¹⁷ Ogilvie (2003, 2004b, 2004c).

statuses in shifting from household to market employment. This included the married women whose shift from household to market work would have been important in any Industrious Revolution. Thus, for instance, in 1742 the Ebhausen village court ordered a knitter's wife who was working independently to return to her prodigal husband.¹⁸ Likewise in 1793 a Wildberg citizen complained that the wife of an itinerant basket-maker was collecting rags for a village paper-miller without an official licence, whereupon the communal assembly ordered the village to eject the couple.¹⁹

The Industrious Revolution also depended on unmarried women shifting from household production for fathers or masters (who also provided their clothes and comestibles) to market production in which they earned their own wages (and controlled their own consumption choices).²⁰ In Württemberg, however, such independent unmarried women were given an especially pejorative name – *Eigenbrötlerinnen* (literally “own-breaders”) – and were routinely harassed. Communities tolerated them only as long as they did not encroach on guild privileges, demand wages above the legally fixed rate, deprive male relatives of household labour, take risks that might burden the welfare system, annoy respectable citizens, or violate other social norms. In 1646, for example, when a Wildberg citizen complained that “several unmarried girls are lodging with several citizens here, and should, in his view, be instructed to engage themselves to masters”, the community assembly immediately ordered all *Eigenbrötlerinnen* to take service within three weeks on pain of a fine of 3 *Gulden* (almost one year's earnings for a maidservant).²¹ It was not uncommon for an *Eigenbrötlerin* to be ordered, like Barbara Waltz in 1687, “either to

¹⁸ PAE KKP Vol. III, fol. 166r, 27.4.1742.

¹⁹ HStAS A573 Bü. 100, fol. 28r-v, 1793.

²⁰ De Vries (2008), 86, 97, 100-02, 128, 142-43, 151, 168, 178, 187-88.

²¹ Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart [henceforth HStAS] A573 Bü. 86, fol. 265r, 24.11.1646: “bei etlichen burgern alhie, hielten sich etliche ledige magden auff, welche seines erachtens dahin anzuehallten weren, daß Sie sich verding. thetten”.

enter into service or, if she has an honourable offer, to get married”.²² *Eigenbrötlerinnen* who refused to shift back from market to household production could be ordered to leave the community, as in 1687 when the Ebhausen church court “summoned Barbara Hilber on account of her *Eigenbrötlen* [own-breading]” and “ordered her out of the hamlet”,²³ in 1717 when three Ebhausen *Eigenbrötlerinnen* were instructed to “move away within eight days”,²⁴ or in 1752 when Barbara Kleiner was reported to the Wildberg court by her landlord for working independently as a lodger “although she could work as a servant” and was promptly ordered “to refrain from *Eigenbrötlen*, and instead enter into a proper job as a servant; otherwise she shall be driven out of the town by order of the authorities”.²⁵ Communities restricted the market production even of quite mature spinsters, such as the 45-year-old Friderika Mohlin who in 1796 moved into lodgings to earn her living as a seamstress, but was ordered by the communal court “to betake herself back into her father’s house”.²⁶ Many Württemberg women did work in the market, but many others were prevented from doing so by the officials, courts and assemblies of the communities they lived in. Such institutional obstacles inevitably limited women’s ability to contribute to any revolution in industriousness.

Even when women were allowed to work, institutional controls limited what they could earn. Württemberg, like many other pre-modern European societies, set legal wage ceilings for servants and labourers.²⁷ The legislation was issued by the state, but the specific wage-rates were set by each community – that is, by male

²² PAE [henceforth Pfarrarchiv Ebhausen] KKP, Vol. I, fol. 28v, 2.2.1687: “entweder in ein diest gehod, wann sie ein Ehrlich. anstand habe, sich verheurath.”

²³ PAE KKP, Vol. I, fol. 32r, 9.12.1687: “barbara hilberin ist wegen des aigenbrötlens vorbescheyd. worden”; “Ist ... auß dem Fleckhen gehaisen word.”

²⁴ PAE KKP, Vol. III, fol. 16, 16.4.1717: “innerhalb 8 tagen wegZiehen”.

²⁵ HStAS A573 Bü. 95, fol. 31v, 14.12.1752: “die Zwar dienen könnte”; “sich deß Eigebrötlens zu bemüßigen, hingegen in einer ordenlichen dinst zugehen, widerigen falls sie aus der Stadt von obrigkeits wegen getriben werden solle”.

²⁶ HStAS A573 Bü. 62, fol. 24r-v, 18.1.1796: “Sich wider in ihres vatters Hauße zu begeben”.

²⁷ Ogilvie (2003), 109-15, including examples from German economies other than Württemberg.

employers, since it was they who manned community institutions.²⁸ Community courts also enforced these wage ceilings. To give just one example, in 1619 Hans Drescher demanded in the Wildberg community court that Burckhard Schlaiffer's wife "be punished according to the national ordinance" because she "enticed away a [maid]servant whom Drescher had at his place for several years during the inflation period".²⁹ Unsurprisingly, with such communal enforcement, comparisons between ordinances and actual wages paid reveal few violations.³⁰

Table 2:
Female-Male Wage Ratios, Calorie Consumption, and Physical Productivity, Various Economies

Place	Date	Type of worker	Measure	Basis	Ratio
Wildberg, Württemberg	1631	servants	actual wages paid	mean	0.35 ^a
Wildberg, Württemberg	1631	servants	actual wages paid	maximum	0.36 ^a
Ebhausen, Württemberg	1631	servants	actual wages paid	mean	0.48 ^a
Ebhausen, Württemberg	1631	servants	actual wages paid	maximum	0.23 ^a
Sulz, Württemberg	1631	servants	actual wages paid	mean	0.57 ^a
Sulz, Württemberg	1631	servants	actual wages paid	maximum	0.31 ^a
Gültlingen, Württemberg	1631	servants	actual wages paid	mean	0.40 ^a
Gültlingen, Württemberg	1631	servants	actual wages paid	maximum	0.31 ^a
Oberjettingen, Württemberg	1631	servants	actual wages paid	mean	0.57 ^a
Oberjettingen, Württemberg	1631	servants	actual wages paid	maximum	0.38 ^a
District of Wildberg, Württemberg	1631	servants	actual wages paid	mean	0.42 ^a
District of Wildberg, Württemberg	1631	servants	actual wages paid	maximum	0.36 ^a
Duchy of Württemberg	1642	servants	wage ordinance	maximum	0.33 ^a
Leonberg, Württemberg	1648	servants	actual wages paid	mean	0.34 ^b
Leonberg, Württemberg	1648	servants	actual wages paid	maximum	0.40 ^b
Schwäbisch Hall	1657	servants	wage ordinance	maximum	0.33 ^c
Bavaria	1688	servants	monastery accounts	maximum	0.40 ^d
Bavaria	1797-8	servants	monastery accounts	maximum	0.40 ^d
England	1388	servants	statute	maximum	0.67-0.69 ^e
England	1444-5	servants	statute	maximum	0.67-0.69 ^e
England	1564-1724	servants	wage assessment	median	0.60 ^f
England	1563-1725	servants	wage assessment	median	0.50 ^g
England	1614	servants	actual wages paid	mean	0.60-0.83 ^h
England	1689	servants	actual wages paid	mean	0.62 ⁱ
Belgium	19C	aged 20-40	calorie consumption: actual	mean	0.73 ^j
World Health Organization	1973	aged 20-40	calorie consumption: recommended	mean	0.64 ^k
USA	20C	soldiers	physical productivity: endurance/own body-weight	mean	0.80-1.00 ^l
USA	20C	soldiers	physical productivity: lifting outside weight	mean	0.50 ^l
USA/Britain	19C	farm workers	physical productivity: farm-work	mean	0.61-0.67 ^h
Biblical Near East	BCE	aged 20-60	value when dedicated to God	mean	0.60 ^m

Sources: ^a Ogilvie (2003), 111; HSAS A573 Bü. 5593. ^b HSAS A572 Bü. 56, Nro. 3. ^c Dürr (1995), 151. ^d Haringer (1975), 612-13. ^e Bardsley (1999), p. 27. ^f Kussmaul (1981), 37, 143-4. ^g Roberts (1979), 19; Roberts (1981), 189. ^h Burnette (1997), 270, 275. ⁱ Cooper, personal communication 2003; Ogilvie (2003), 111. ^j Bekaert (1991), 638. ^k Sen (1984), 250-1.

^l Vogel & Friedl (1992), 93. ^m Woodward (1995), 112.

²⁸ See, e.g., HStAS A573 Bü. 5280, fol. 46r, 9.3.1654.

²⁹ HStAS A573 Bü. 15, fol. 436r, 2.12.1619: "ain ehehalten, so er drescher in der theüwerungs zeit etlich jarlang bey sich gehabt, ein ehehalten entfiehrt, begert man solle sie der landtsordnung nach abstraffen".

³⁰ Dürr (1995), 125-9, 151; Ogilvie (2003), 109-15.

Württemberg resembled certain other pre-modern European economies in fixing wage ceilings for both sexes, but setting them disproportionately lower for women.³¹ As Table 2 shows, wage ordinances in Württemberg and other parts of southern Germany prescribed a ratio of about 0.3 between female and male wages. Surviving wage records, also shown in the table, indicate this was approximately the ratio paid. This was much lower than the 0.6-0.7 female-male productivity ratio in manual labour or the 0.64 female-male calorie consumption ratio observed in other developing economies, historical and modern. It was also much lower than the 0.6-0.7 ratio of wages actually paid in early modern England, which correspond much more closely to the ratios of labour productivity and calorie consumption between the sexes.³²

Wage ceilings were also imposed in the spinning sector, another major market employment for Württemberg women. Male employers – the weavers and the dyers – used their guild organizations to fix legal ceilings on spinners' piece-rates. Spinners who charged above the ceiling had their yarn confiscated, and weavers who paid above the ceiling – e.g. to secure scarce spinning labour or obtain finer yarn – were subjected to whispering campaigns in the community and fined by the guild.³³

Community and guild institutions thus enabled employers to fix wages, reducing potential earnings. This in turn reduced the incentives for wage-workers – particularly women – to reallocate time to market work, and thus their ability to consume market goods.

³¹ Penn (1987), 4-5, 7, 9, 13; Ogilvie (2003), 287-95.

³² Kussmaul (1981), 37, 143-4; Roberts (1979), 19; Roberts (1981), 189; Burnette (1997), 270, 275; Ogilvie (2003), 111; Vogel & Friedl (1992), 93.

³³ Ogilvie (1990), 86-8; Ogilvie (1997), 354-5; Ogilvie (2003), 292, 305-08.

A third way social capital affected “industriousness” in Württemberg was through controlling permission to do particular jobs. Women’s physical capacities and domestic responsibilities make them more productive, on average, in industrial and service activities than in farming and labouring. But guilds limited women’s work in most crafts and trades in early modern Europe. All guilds in Württemberg banned female apprentices, denying women formal vocational training.³⁴ Guilds forbade a married or widowed woman to practise any craft or trade unless her husband held the appropriate guild license, and communal courts enforced guild complaints against her if she tried to practise it illegally.³⁵ Even within a master’s own household, guilds excluded daughters and maidservants from central aspects of craft work, as in 1669 when the Wildberg weaver Hannß Schrotter was fined three weeks’ earnings by the community assembly because he “set his servant girl behind the loom and had her weave”.³⁶

In principle, textile proto-industries created opportunities for women to increase their “industriousness”, in relatively low-skilled and physically undemanding work such as wool-combing, yarn-spinning, or warp-making. But proto-industrial guilds reserved all but the most poorly paid auxiliary tasks for male masters, journeymen and apprentices. Weaving itself was forbidden to women other than masters’ wives, and the guild fined illegal female weavers and anyone who employed them.³⁷ Dyeing, too, was the preserve of the dyers’ guilds, which excluded all women except for masters’ wives and widows. Even an auxiliary task such as warp-making was prohibited on pain of a fine of 3-6 *Gulden* (1-2 years’ wages for a local maidservant), so as to protect the livelihoods of guild masters, and “in order that such daughters might be kept to other and necessary domestic tasks and business, or be

³⁴ Ogilvie (2003), ch. 3.

³⁵ See the examples in Ogilvie (2008) and Ogilvie (2003), chs. 4-5.

³⁶ HStAS A573 Bü. 92, fol. 5v, 1.11.1669: “Sein dienst mägdtlin ... hindern Stuehl zue sez. vnd weeben zuelaß.”. For further examples of such prohibitions, see Ogilvie (2003), 109-15.

³⁷ For examples, see Ogilvie (2004a), 304-7.

caused to enter into honourable service”.³⁸ Guilds in nearly all other crafts and trades imposed similar restrictions. This left spinning, farming, and labouring as the only major employments in which women could work freely.

The economic impact of such institutional constraints can be seen in a database of 2,828 observations of women and men working, extracted from c. 7,000 pages of court records for two Württemberg communities between 1646 and 1800, whose results are summarized in Table 3.³⁹

The institutional constraints we have discussed did not prevent women from working in the market, as shown by the fact that less than one-third of all observed work by females was in household production (housework, care, and healing). But, as Table 3 shows, the most important market activities for women were not the industrial and commercial occupations most suited to female physical capacities and domestic responsibilities. Rather, they were those that were unguided, particularly heavy farm-work and day-labour, which together made up nearly one-third of all observed work by females. All industrial sectors combined (craft, proto-industry, spinning, and milling) made up only one-fifth of women’s observed work, compared to nearly one-third for men. Within industry, men carried out 90 per cent of guided activities, women 90 per cent of unguided ones. It was easier for women to get jobs doing heavy farm work and manual labour than to break into the male preserve of guided industry.⁴⁰

³⁸ Troeltsch (1897), 435-53; here article 20, 446: “dergleichen Töchtern zue andern vnd nohtwendigen hauss Arbaiten vnd geschäftten Anzuehallten, oder sich In Ehrliche Dienst einzuelassen verursacht werden”.

³⁹ For detailed discussion of this database and its results, see Ogilvie (2003, 2004b, 2004c, 2008b).

⁴⁰ Ogilvie (2003), 320-52.

Table 3:
Observed Work According to Sex and Marital / Household Status, Wildberg 1646-1800 and Ebhausen 1677-1800

Sex and household status	Agriculture		Guilded craft		Guilded proto-industry		Unguilded craft (esp. spinning)		Mill		Tavern		Commerce		Labour		Service		Housework		Care		Healing		Marginal occupations		Total	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Daughters	30	22	2	1	3	2	30	22	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	3	2	1	16	12	13	10	0	0	34	25	136	100
Maids	43	40	0	0	2	2	10	9	2	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	19	18	15	14	0	0	15	14	107	100
Wives	81	20	17	4	9	2	34	9	10	3	18	5	12	3	7	2	4	1	111	28	43	11	8	2	43	11	397	100
Widows	58	33	3	2	11	6	16	9	11	6	5	3	5	3	8	5	5	3	25	14	17	10	6	3	4	2	174	100
Indep. unmarried women	34	27	0	0	0	0	42	33	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	7	6	8	6	14	11	1	1	13	10	126	100
Unknown status	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100
Total females	246	26	22	2	25	3	132	14	23	2	23	2	23	2	24	3	18	2	180	19	102	11	15	2	109	12	942	100
Sons	88	42	26	12	12	6	4	2	12	6	2	1	3	1	7	3	7	3	6	3	3	1	0	0	42	20	212	100
Male servants	108	50	25	12	4	2	1	0	27	12	2	1	1	0	15	7	1	0	3	1	3	1	0	0	27	12	217	100
Husbands	405	29	198	14	170	12	8	1	119	8	54	4	56	4	75	5	63	4	58	4	25	2	26	2	146	10	1403	100
Widowers	6	33	0	0	2	11	0	0	4	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	3	17	0	0	0	0	18	100
Indep. unmarried men	4	15	1	4	1	4	3	12	1	4	0	0	1	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	13	50	26	100
Unknown status	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	50	2	20	0	0	1	10	0	0	10	100
Total males	612	32	250	13	189	10	17	1	163	9	58	3	61	3	98	5	76	4	72	4	35	2	27	1	228	12	1886	100
Total persons	858	30	272	10	214	8	149	5	186	7	81	3	84	3	122	4	94	3	252	9	137	5	42	1	337	12	2828	100

Source: PAW KKP Vols. I-VII (1646-1800); Pfarrarchiv Ebhausen, KKP Vols. I-VII (1674-1800).

Notes:

Agriculture = all forms of agricultural work and commerce.

Guilded craft = all guilded activities except for worsted-weaving.

Guilded proto-industry = making and trading in worsted cloths.

Unguilded craft = spinning, seamstressing, knitting, brewing, attending or holding spinning-bees.

Mill = operating mill, transporting materials to or from mill.

Tavern = operating or serving in tavern.

Commerce = as merchant, shopkeeper, peddler, or private person.

Labour = carting, day-labouring, building, repairing, military work.

Service = teaching, music, writing, magic, housekeeping, laundry, barbering, bathing, prostitution, miscellaneous service.

Housework = indoor and outdoor household chores, providing lodgings.

Healing = as barber-surgeon, physician, Feldscherer, bathman, Kleemeister, shepherd, midwife, sworn woman, private person.

Marginal occupations = doing errands, gathering, stealing.

Institutional barriers were thus reflected in economic outcomes. In early modern Württemberg, women could and did work in the market, but guild institutions excluded them from the secondary and tertiary occupations in which their productivity, and hence their potential earnings, were highest. This forced female workers into sectors such as labouring and farmwork in which their productivity, and hence their potential earnings, were low – even before they were further depressed by institutional wage ceilings. This inevitably stifled market “industriousness” by females, and the market consumption it might have fuelled.

Religious institutions also affected how industrious people could be. Spinners, for instance, sought to minimize their costs by organizing nocturnal spinning-bees (*Spinnstuben*) to share light and reduce tedium. But church elders and male householders used communal councils and church courts to outlaw such gatherings, which they saw as fostering gossip and sexual license.⁴¹ Barring spinning-bees increased spinners’ costs, however, as Michel Kuch’s wife pointed out in 1734 to the Ebhausen church court, explaining that “[working] alone she does not earn her lighting costs”.⁴² Religious prohibitions thus affected women’s incentives to do market work and, in turn, their ability to consume market goods.

Sabbath regulations operated analogously, prohibiting “all business [*Geschäft*] in house and field, inside and outside the village”, not just on Sundays, but also on Saturday nights, Days of Prayer and Repentance, and other holy days.⁴³ Existing community officials such as constables, watchmen, and gate-wards were adjured to keep a diligent eye out for Sabbath work,⁴⁴ and special officers called *Kirchenrüger*

⁴¹ See Medick (1984); Ogilvie (2003), 29, 31, 116, 118, 121-3, 126, 166, 184-5, 208, 241, 274, 277, 284, 313; Ogilvie (2004b), 355.

⁴² PAE KKP, Vol. III, fol. 178r, 28.2.1734: “weil sie alleine das liecht nicht verdiene”.

⁴³ PAE KKP, Vol. V, 6.5.1759, p. 111: “alles Geschäft zu Haus- und feld, inn und außer dem flecken”; see also PAE KKP, Vol. II, fol. 121v, 2.3.1714.

⁴⁴ PAW [henceforth Pfarrarchiv Wildberg] KKP, Vol. I, fol. 204r, 18.11.1659.

were appointed by the communal church courts to patrol the streets, carry out internal inspections of suspect households, and “eavesdrop among the houses”.⁴⁵ Ordinary citizens who failed to report neighbours’ Sabbath work were punished.⁴⁶

Table 4:
Prosecutions for Sabbath Work in Community Church Courts,
Wildberg 1646-1800 and Ebhausen 1674-1800

	Total Cases	Percent Female
Village or town location		
Villages	547	24
Towns	665	16
Unknown	2	0
Quarter-century		
1646-1673	212	19
1674-1700	298	16
1700-1724	352	24
1725-1749	223	19
1750-1774	111	18
1775-1799	18	11
Total	1214	19

Note: First two "quarter-centuries" are defined with respect to beginning-dates of church-court records for Wildberg (1646) and Ebhausen (1674) respectively.

Sources: PAW KKP Vols. I-VII (1646-1800); Pfarrarchiv Ebhausen, KKP Vols. I-VII (1674-1800).

Complaints in local records show that Sabbath prohibitions were binding constraints on rural people who wanted to allocate more time to market production.⁴⁷ As Table 4 shows, between 1646 and 1800 two small Württemberg communities penalized more than 1,200 cases of people working at prohibited times.⁴⁸ This was one way social institutions restricted male industriousness more than female, since 81 per cent of those prosecuted were men.⁴⁹ Sabbath work regulation seems actually to

⁴⁵ PAW KKP, Vol. V, fol. 341v, 17.2.1717: “unter den häusern zu horchen”.

⁴⁶ For an example, see PAE KKP, Vol. II, fol. 34r, 12.8.1706; PAE KKP, Vol. VI, fol. 31r, 5.11.1777. On the legal obligation to report offences, see Dürr (1995), 247-8; Robisheaux (1989), 95-116; Ulbrich (1999), 243.

⁴⁷ See, for instance, PAE KKP, Vol. II, fol. 46v, 16.9.1708; PAE KKP, Vol. II, fol. 61v, 24.1.1710; PAE KKP, Vol. II, fol. 146r, 31.1.1716.

⁴⁸ Ogilvie (2003), 25 (Table 1.2).

⁴⁹ Ogilvie (2003), 24.

have increased up to c. 1750, and even in the 1750-75 period was still more intense than a century earlier. Only after 1775 did Sabbath regulation begin to relax, and not until October 1799 did the central government proclaim that “on what have hitherto been holy days, church services shall now be held only in the mornings, and outside those hours it shall be permitted to pursue occupations, businesses, and trades, both before and after the church service”.⁵⁰ Throughout the period postulated for the Industrious Revolution, therefore, Württemberg’s local religious institutions limited people’s capacity to intensify their industriousness and, by implication, to consume market goods.

This is not to say that all early modern European societies were like Württemberg. Many parts of central, eastern-central, southern and nordic Europe did resemble Württemberg, in seeing church, state, and community institutions intensifying “social disciplining” – including economic regulation – between 1600 and 1800. But other European societies – particularly, though not exclusively, on the north Atlantic seaboard – implemented social disciplining sporadically if at all.⁵¹ Many European economies also had strong guilds into the late eighteenth century. But in England and the Low Countries guilds regulated fewer occupations, were absent in many towns and villages, and progressively liberalized their entry barriers and internal regulations progressively between 1650 and 1800.⁵² Local communities, as

⁵⁰ PAW KKP, Vol. VIII, fol. 118v, 11.10.1799: “an den bißherigen Feyertagen nur am Vormittag Gottesdienst gehalten auser deßen Stunde aber erlaubt werden solle, sowohl vor als nach dem Gottesdienst dem berufs Geschäfte und gewerbe nachzugehen”.

⁵¹ For comparative discussion of “social disciplining” and detailed references see Ogilvie (2006), 70-4.

⁵² On English guilds, see Clark / Slack (1976), pp. 29, 108-09, 116; Coleman (1977), pp. 73-5; Ogilvie (2007b), 46-8, 50; Ogilvie (2008a); Wallis (2008). On guilds in the Low Countries, see Davids (1996); Davids (2003); De Vries / Van der Woude (1997), esp. pp. 162-3, 293, 298, 301-02, 340-1, 357, 582, 634, 638; Ogilvie (2007b), 48-50; Ogilvie (2008a); Schmidt (2007); Soly (2006), 15-16; Van den Heuvel (2007), 24, 29, 51-3, 63, 67-8, 91-8, 147-75; Van Nederveen Meerkerk (2006), 65-77, 81-8, 147-60, 169-73, 178-83, 239-40, 317-8.

well, varied across Europe in the extent to which they sought (or were able) to control women's residence, work, wages, and sociability.⁵³

The scholarship on “social disciplining”, guilds, communities, and women's history all converge in observing an earlier and more thorough relaxation of institutional controls in the Low Countries, England, northern France, and a few other enclaves, than in central, eastern, nordic or southern parts of the continent. The Industrious Revolution could proceed more easily where “social capital” was relaxed, creating institutional interstices in which deviations from norms could be experimented with – particularly by women – and new work norms could be formed.

2. Social Capital and Commerce

The Consumer Revolution not only needed people to shift into market work and earn more spending money. It also needed the commercial sector to bring new market wares within the reach of wider social strata. This certainly corresponds with what we know of early modern England and the Low Countries, where shops, stalls, hawkers, and peddlers proliferated alongside established merchants, lowering the transaction costs of indulging in new market wares.⁵⁴ But what happened where commerce was not so open? For centuries, European merchants had maintained entrenched interest-groups adept at securing rights to block new participants and competitive practices in commerce. Did these institutional privileges simply melt away in the heat of the Consumer Revolution?

⁵³ Women's position in different early modern European economies is discussed in Ågren and Erickson (2005); Ogilvie (2003); Van den Heuvel (2007); Van Nederveen Meerkerk (2006); Brewer and Vickery (2006). On the varying strength and impact of communal institutions on women, see Dennison / Ogilvie (2007); Ogilvie (2006); Ulbrich (1999).

⁵⁴ See the discussions in De Vries (2003), 61-2; De Vries (2008), 169-77, 180; Blondé, Briot, Coquery and Van Aert (2005); Blondé and Van Damme (2006); Van den Heuvel (2007), 177-81, 270-3.

Commercial change did not prove straightforward everywhere in Europe. In Württemberg, for instance, trade in most agricultural and industrial goods was legally reserved for their immediate producers until well past 1800. Middlemen (and -women) were prohibited as *Fürkäufer* (regraters).⁵⁵ Trade in craft inputs was reserved for the relevant guild masters, and “encroaching” middlemen were penalized. The export of certain wares (e.g., proto-industrial textiles) was reserved for members of privileged merchant associations with state monopolies. Specialized commerce was restricted to a specified list of “merchants’ wares” and was reserved for members of the guilds of merchants and shopkeepers. A few outsiders managed to secure guild permits or princely dispensations (*Konzessionen*), but these were granted only if one paid a fee and proved it would “correspond to the needs of the community”.⁵⁶

These were not just formal regulations but were enforced in practice. Into the later eighteenth century, those who bought up foodstuffs for resale were not regarded as reducing transaction costs but instead were prosecuted as black-market “regraters” encroaching on the privileges of local farmers and guildsmen. In 1764, for instance, the Wildberg community assembly was mobilized by a local baker who complained that “the so-called *Schmalzin* [lit. “Lard-Woman”] is buying up grain here and there, and selling it again at a higher price on offer to the citizens here, and through this *commercium* is causing damage to the bakers here”.⁵⁷ In 1793, likewise, five Wildberg citizens separately made use of the community assembly to complain that “in Liebelsberg and Schönbronn, lard is being bought up by a *Fürkaufferin* [female regrater] from Teinach”. Local officials immediately sent out written reminders to all

⁵⁵ See the prohibitions against “regrating” in HStAS A304 Bü. 968, fol. 68r-72r (19.12.1763).

⁵⁶ See Weisser (1780), 329-30; Ogilvie (1997), 70-9; Sabeau (1990), 160. Quotation from “Revidirte allgemeine Gewerbe-Ordnung” (5 Aug 1836), in Reyscher (1828ff), Vol. 15.2, art. 114.

⁵⁷ HStAS A573 Bü. 95, fol. 28v, 17.12.1764: “die sogenannte Schmalzin Kauffe hin und wider fruchten auf, verkauffe solche wider in einem höhern Pretio auf beutt an die hiesige burgere und verusache durch dises Commercium ... denen hiesigen becken einem Schaden”; for the plainant’s occupation, see PAW Bd. 7, Eheregister, 31.10.1753.

surrounding communities about the illegality of regrating, urged citizens to report every illegal middleman or -woman instantly, and instructed officials in the woman's locality to "warn her against further regrating and the penalties it involves".⁵⁸

Guilds and merchant associations also restricted competition and innovation in commerce. Between 1650 and 1797, the exclusive Calw Worsted Trading Association, a guild-like association of 20-45 privileged merchant-dyers, prevented all outsiders from introducing new worsted varieties that would circumvent the association's state privileges. Conversely, when the Calw merchants tried to introduce innovations themselves, the regional weavers' guilds blocked them, as in 1698 when the Wildberg guild lobbied against several merchants "who have begun to make new sorts of *Schlickh Cadiß* [lit. warp-worsted], and put them out to be woven, which they are not allowed to do".⁵⁹ Together, the weavers' guilds and the merchants' association hindered the introduction of innovative worsted varieties into the Württemberg market long after they had become widespread in guildless worsted industries in England, the Low Countries, and France.⁶⁰

In many other Württemberg crafts, too, guilds erected barriers against simple commercial innovations such as peddling, which would have reduced transaction costs. A Wildberg nail-smith, for instance, complained in 1742 that a village woman was encroaching on his guild privileges by peddling nails, and got her jailed by his communal assembly.⁶¹ In 1784 a guilded tawer complained that "the peddling of Jews with hides is getting so out of hand that no tawer can sell anything any more"; the communal assembly and the district authorities responded with prohibitions and

⁵⁸ HStAS A573 Bü. 100, fol. 37r, 1793: "in Liebelsperg und Schömbrohn werde das Schmalz durch eine Fürkaufferin aus deinach ... aufgekauft"; "vor weiterm Aufkauf und der darauf gesetzten Strafe".

⁵⁹ HStAS A573 Bü. 851 (1698-9), fol. 25r-v: "alß welche Neüe Sortten von Schlickh Cadiß angefangen Zumachen, und zuweben geben, dessen Sie aber nicht befuegt gewesen".

⁶⁰ Ogilvie (2004a), 314-22; Troeltsch (1997), 84-6, 119, 142-3, 151-2, 161-9, 189-90.

⁶¹ HStAS A573 Bü. 95, fol. 6v, 25.1.1742.

penalties.⁶² In 1787 a guilded weaver complained that “through the peddling of the Jews he and other craftsmen are suffering much interference and weakening of their livelihoods”. His complaint led the community assembly to threaten a 20-*Reichstaler* fine to anyone buying from Jews.⁶³

Even for legitimate “merchants’ wares” that were not the exclusive privilege of local farmers or craftsmen, shopkeepers’ guilds often blocked new commercial practices.⁶⁴ Peddling and hawking were banned altogether, and shopkeepers mobilized their own guild officials, communal courts, and state institutions to prevent any encroachment on their monopolies.⁶⁵ In 1652, for instance, a poor labourer’s widow in Wildberg was only granted a princely dispensation to open a corner shop when she petitioned that her sole son was a cripple, she was supporting four younger daughters from alms and ribbon-weaving, and the local princely bureaucrat himself guaranteed that she and her son would “sell nothing other than the ribbons they themselves make, kindling wood, and such poor things, so the shopkeepers will suffer no injury or encroachment”.⁶⁶ It was far more typical for communal and state officials to support the objections of the shopkeepers’ guilds against new retailers and competitive practices. In 1711, for instance, the Württemberg Ministry of the Interior ordered district governors to report all licensed shopkeepers in their districts. Sixty-five lists were duly delivered, along with details on how illegal retailing was being controlled. To give just one example, Maria Christothora Weysin, a converted Jew’s widow in

⁶² HStAS A573 Bü. 95, fol. 22v, 2.1.1784: “das Hausiren der Juden mit fell nehme so sehr überhand, daß ein Weisgerber nichts mehr verkaufen könne, er bitte also um ein Verbott”.

⁶³ HStAS A573 Bü. 99, fol. 67v, probable date April 1787, #197 and #198: “durch das Hausiren der juden geschehe seinem und anderm Handwerkern viel Abbruch und Schwächung der Nahrung, Er bitte, solcher abzustellen”.

⁶⁴ “Revidirte allgemeine Gewerbe-Ordnung” (5 Aug 1836), in Reyscher (1828ff), Vol. 15.2, esp. Abschnitt 3, art. 106-14.

⁶⁵ Ogilvie (2003), 167-72, 263-5.

⁶⁶ HStAS A573 Bü. 1149, fol. 32v-33v, 16.7.1652: “vnd auch den Krämerey., Sintenmahlen Sie nichts Alß selbstmachende bändlen schwevelhölzlen vnd derogleich. schlechte Sach failhl zue haben v.mag, Kein schad od. eingriff gethan würde”.

Pfaffenhofen, could not show any princely dispensation or guild permit, “for which reason, upon the complaint of the aforementioned two [guilded] shopkeepers, she was forbidden and ordered to refrain from this encroachment until she presents a legitimate princely order”.⁶⁷ Shopkeepers also used community institutions to defend themselves against new entrants and commercial practices, as in 1784 when two members of the merchants’ and shopkeepers’ guild complained in the Wildberg community assembly that “the Jews and itinerant rural traders are committing great interference against the merchants, through their prohibited peddling”. The assembly immediately ordered all citizens “to report rural traders, Jews and other persons trading counter to [the national law-code] to the district authorities” and instructed the district excise-officer and the village authorities to watch out for violators.⁶⁸

As such complaints illustrate, a black-market “informal sector” existed, in which low-cost traders illegally congregated. Thus, for instance, in 1711 the guilded shopkeepers of Bottwar sought to outlaw “the hedge- or barn-retailers ... who have not been apprenticed to the trade anywhere, whose wives and children beg, and who hold community citizenship in no locality, but with their retailing are very burdensome and cause great curtailment to the public and to the entire trade”.⁶⁹ The guilded shopkeepers of Backnang opposed the trading of Italian peddlers who “sell spices which they have not got inspected by anyone, and almost more cheaply than the shopkeepers here can purchase them in Frankfurt”. The Backnang guild also objected

⁶⁷ HStAS A228 Bü. 713 (1711), #20 (Amt Güglingen): “dahero auf vorgemeltt- Beeder Crämern Beschwerden, diese Stimppelej, biß auf beybring: und Legitimierung gndst: Befelchs. Ihro Nidergelegt und Verbotten word.”

⁶⁸ HStAS A573 Bü. 95, fol. 6r-v, 22v, 2.1.1784: “die Juden und vagirende Land-Krämer machen denen Handels Leuten durch verbottenes Hausiren in der Stadt und auf denen Amts Orten grosen Abbruch. Er bitte also, diesem zusteuren”; “das Hausiren der Juden mit fell nehme so sehr überhand, daß ein Weisgerber nichts mehr verkaufen könne, er bitte also um ein Verbott”; “die Land Krämer, Juden und andere darwider handlende Personen dem OberAmt anzuzaiagen”.

⁶⁹ HStAS A228 Bü. 713, #6, 20.11.1711: “Hackhen: oder Schewren Krämmern, ... welche die handlung Nirgents Erlehret, deren Weiber und Kinder Bettlen, und an Keinem ohrt Verburgert sein; doch darneben mit Ihrem Cramm, dem publico, alß den gesampten Handlung sehr beschwehrlich und großen abbruch thun.”

to married women selling soap and other washing products at weekly markets “without being able to show any permits to do so”.⁷⁰

Poor women and gypsies traded in illegal trinkets, as in 1780, when Agnes Dorothea Lampart from the village of Ebhausen visited a tavern to “order a bunch of garnets [from a gypsy], on commission for a female relative”.⁷¹ Poor women traded in “gathered” goods whose sale was not reserved for farmers or craftsmen, as in 1798 when the Elisabetha Walburge Luz, a migrant lodger in Ebhausen, “was trading in nuts and the like”.⁷²

Had these low-cost traders been able to establish themselves as a competitive fringe in the core commercial sector, they would have diminished the guilded retailers’ monopoly profits, as indeed occurred in the retail sectors of England and the Low Countries after c. 1650.⁷³ But in Württemberg, the retailers’ guilds increased the costs and risks of illegal traders by imposing fines and confiscations, restricting them to the peripheral goods (uninspected spices, soap, illegal trinkets, nuts) and locations (hedges, barns, taverns, lodgings) typical of the “informal sector”, where they were less likely to be prosecuted but also less accessible to customers. These characteristics are themselves clear indications of how successfully the Württemberg retailers’ guilds excluded low-cost, informal traders from core commercial activities.

It is sometimes claimed that throughout early modern Europe guild regulations were easy to circumvent and had no real economic effect. If this were true, one should observe no quantitative difference in economic outcomes between economies where

⁷⁰ HStAS A228 Bü. 713, #10, 7.10.1711: “so doch Keine Erlaubniß vorzue weißen Hatten”; “so Ihme niemalen beschauet würde Verkaufte, vnd selbiges fast wohlfailler geben, alß Sie di Hießige Krämer es in Franckhfurth, im Ankauff erhielten”.

⁷¹ PAE KKP, Vol. VI, fol. 96v, 17.7.1780: “daß sie bey einem auf Commission einer base einen Reyhen Granaten bestellt habe”. On sumptuary prohibitions against the wearing even of modest garnet and coral ornaments by villagers, see HStAS A21 Bü. 224 (1712), provisions for social classes 7-9.

⁷² PAE KKP, Vol. VIII, p. 134, 13.8.1798: “150 f hab sie von ihren Eltern erhalten, die sie jezt gröstentheils in Handel steken habe ... Sie habe mit Nuß u. d.gl. gehandelt”.

⁷³ Van den Heuvel (2007); Blondé, Briot, Coquery and Van Aert (2005).

retailing guilds were ubiquitous and strong and those where they were scattered and weak. In most German territories, retailing guilds survived at least until c. 1800 – in territories such as Württemberg until 1862 – and erected high barriers to entry which they policed quite strictly. In the Netherlands and England, by contrast, retailing guilds were not universal; those that survived progressively liberalized from the seventeenth century on, reducing their barriers to entry and increasingly admitting women, migrants, and even Jews.⁷⁴

Table 5:
Retail Ratios by Country, 1542 - 1911

Retail ratio	Württemberg		Other Germany		Northern Netherlands		Southern Netherlands		England		All Countries	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
Zero	16	21	13	12	1	2	0	0	0	0	30	10
0 - 5	49	64	28	25	1	2	0	0	0	0	78	25
5 - 10	7	10	37	33	5	10	2	15	5	9	56	18
10 - 15	0	0	24	21	6	13	1	8	13	23	44	14
15 - 20	2	3	7	6	3	6	0	0	11	19	23	7
20 - 25	0	0	2	2	13	27	1	8	7	12	23	7
25 - 30	2	3	1	1	5	10	1	8	6	11	15	5
Over 30	1	1	1	1	14	29	8	62	15	26	39	13
Total	77	100	113	100	48	100	13	100	57	100	308	100
mean	3.65		7.74		22.90		31.51		22.71		12.85	
median	2.05		6.80		23.14		36.32		19.23		8.83	
max	31.25		34.52		41.62		62.50		53.19		62.50	
min	0.00		0.00		0.00		6.45		7.11		0.00	
std. dev.	6.13		6.13		10.87		16.12		11.44		12.43	

Notes:

Retail ratio = number of retailers per 1000 inhabitants.

Most retail ratios for Württemberg and Germany include merchants as well as retailers.

Most ratios for England, Northern Netherlands, and Southern Netherlands exclude merchants.

Dataset consists of 308 individual cities, towns and villages; it excludes observations of larger zones.

Sources: Calculated from data in numerous archival documents and secondary works for each different country and community; references available from author on request.

The most commonly used quantitative benchmark of the Commercial

Revolution is the “retail ratio”, defined as the number of retailers per 1,000

⁷⁴ On retailing guilds in the Northern Netherlands, see Van den Heuvel (2007); on the Southern Netherlands, see Blondé and Van Damme (2006); for comparisons with England, see the essays in Blondé, Briot, Coquery and Van Aert (2005).

inhabitants. Table 5 shows retail ratios which have been calculated for 308 European settlements between 1542 and 1911 – 77 for Württemberg, 113 for other German territories, 48 for the Northern Netherlands, 13 for the Southern Netherlands, and 57 for England. The ratios for Germany, despite often combining retail and wholesale merchants, are lower than those for the Netherlands and England, which generally include only retailers. Low retail ratios of less than 5 per 1,000 were observed in 85 per cent of the Württemberg sample and over one-third of the sample from other German territories, but hardly ever in the Netherlands and England. Conversely, high retail ratios of over 15 per 1,000 were observed in over two-thirds of the samples for England and the Netherlands, but less than one-tenth of those in Württemberg and other German territories. In England and the Netherlands, settlements without retailers were almost non-existent, whereas they comprised one-fifth of the Württemberg sample and over one-tenth of the sample covering other territories of Germany.

Table 6:
Dataset of European Retail Ratios: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	N	Mean	Median	Max	Min	Std. Dev.
Retail ratio	308	12.9	8.8	62.5	0.0	12.4
Population	308	14342.3	1581.5	650000	55	52723.5
Log of population	308	7.8	7.4	13.4	4.0	1.7
Date	308	1769.6	1785	1911	1542	68.9

Note: Retail ratio = number of retailers per 1000 inhabitants.

Sources: See Table 5.

Of course, differences in retail ratios among countries might result from differences in other factors. For instance, as Table 6 shows, the settlements in the sample varied greatly not just in their retail ratios but in their dates of observation and their population sizes. Perhaps the German settlements had lower retail ratios because

they were observed at earlier dates or included fewer large cities? What happens when we control for these variables?

Table 7:
Determinants of European Retail Ratios, 1542 - 1911: Tobit Regression

Explanatory variable	Coefficient	Marginal effect (at sample mean value)
Log of population	2.202*** (0.000)	1.649*** (0.000)
Date	0.027*** (0.000)	0.020*** (0.000)
England	15.209*** (0.000)	13.055*** a (0.000)
Other Germany	3.590*** (0.001)	2.740*** a (0.001)
Northern Netherlands	18.207*** (0.000)	16.006*** a (0.000)
Southern Netherlands	22.099*** (0.000)	20.476*** a (0.000)
Constant	-61.402*** (0.000)	
Number of observations	308	

Notes:

Dependent variable is retail ratio (number of retailers per 1000 inhabitants).

For country-dummies, base category is Württemberg.

Robust p values in parentheses

* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%

^a Effect of discrete change of dummy variable from 0 to 1.

Table 7 reports the results of a Tobit regression with the retail ratio as the dependent variable, and population, date and country as explanatory variables. Settlements with larger populations had higher retail ratios, confirming that commercialization was associated with urbanization.⁷⁵ As one might expect, commercialization also increased across the early modern period. But even controlling for urbanization and the passage of time, the country differences remain large and significant. There was no significant difference in retail ratios among England, the Northern Netherlands, and the Southern Netherlands. But Württemberg and other

⁷⁵ Although many rural settlements also commercialized in this period, as pointed out by De Vries (2008), 93-5, 128.

German territories had significantly lower retail ratios than England and the Netherlands. Economic outcomes thus differed significantly between societies where retailing guilds were strong and those where they were more liberal.

The period after 1650 did see a vast expansion of retailing in the Low Countries and England, lowering transaction costs and bringing market wares within the budgets of poorer consumers.⁷⁶ But this did not take place everywhere in Europe, as shown by this large sample of retail ratios. In parts of Europe, permission to engage in commerce (as well as what one could do once one had it) was inhibited by the social capital of entrenched interest-groups.⁷⁷ Their institutional privileges hindered the commercial innovations that would have been required to reduce the costs of opening up market consumption to broader, poorer social strata.

3. Social Capital and Sumptuary Regulation

The Consumer Revolution not only needed more market workers with more disposable income, and retailers offering lower transaction costs. It also needed market consumption to become socially acceptable. During the Consumer and Industrious Revolutions in the Low Countries and England, contemporaries described social norms as decisively shifting toward consuming in the market – buying clothes and household furnishings rather than making them oneself, purchasing comestibles at shops and taverns rather than preparing them at home.⁷⁸ In this story, new consumption norms arose spontaneously through the aggregated choices of individuals in households and markets, with other social institutions playing no role. Accurate though this picture

⁷⁶ De Vries (2003), 61-2; De Vries (2008), 169-77.

⁷⁷ See the comparative discussions in Van den Heuvel (2007); and in Blondé, Briot, Coquery and Van Aert (2005).

⁷⁸ De Vries (2008), esp. 123-77.

may be for England and the Low Countries, can we apply it unquestioningly to other early modern societies?

Studies of early modern “social disciplining” suggest not. In many European societies, the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries saw an intensification of efforts to regulate people’s private lives, including their consumption choices.⁷⁹ Accounts of the Consumer Revolution in the Low Countries and England portray such “sumptuary” regulation as emanating solely from the central state, losing force by 1650 at latest, and lacking real economic impact even before that time.⁸⁰ The early modern United Provinces (Northern Netherlands) were certainly remarkably free of sumptuary laws, and England enacted none after 1604.⁸¹ But evidence from other European societies – including Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Scandinavia, Spain, Italy, and even France – indicates that sumptuary regulations survived long past 1650, were supported by many non-state institutions, and were enforced in practice, albeit selectively according to the interests of the social groups that endorsed them.⁸² In German-speaking Central Europe, for instance, at least 1,350 ordinances were issued between 1244 and 1816 regulating clothing alone, which in turn comprised only one aspect of consumption. Local elites shaped and enforced these sumptuary controls, and often resisted their ultimate abolition.⁸³

Like many early modern European societies, Württemberg issued numerous sumptuary regulations throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, responding to pressure from different social groups. Higher social strata demanded sumptuary rules to demarcate their status vis-à-vis lower strata: courtiers over non-

⁷⁹ For recent surveys, see Hunt (1996); Landwehr (2000); Ogilvie (2006).

⁸⁰ De Vries (2003), 65-6; Harte (1976), 148.

⁸¹ Hooper (1915), 448-9; Hunt (1996), 34, 40; Ross (2006), 385-6.

⁸² Belfanti and Giusberti (2000), 359-61; Bulst (1993), esp. 32-8; Fairchilds (2000), esp. 420-1; Freudenberger (1963), 37, 40, 43, 46, 48; Hunt (1996), 17-41; Moyer (1996), esp. 231-6, 244-336; Roche (2000), 203-04, 279.

⁸³ See Bulst (1993), 32-4, 45-6; Moyer (1996), esp. 244-336.

courtiers, townsmen over villagers, the communal *Ehrbarkeit* (the “notability” regarded as eligible for local office) over families of the lower village strata. Men demanded regulation of women’s dress to define gender-specific conduct, prevent sexual disorder, and help resist wives’ and daughters’ demand for new fashions. Employers demanded regulation of servants’ dress to reduce pressure for higher wages. Guild masters demanded regulations to reserve exotic wares to small groups of rich consumers, require ordinary people to wear domestically produced textiles and furs, and protect their own markets against foreign competition. Churchmen and local elders demanded regulations to restrain worldly adornment, lavish sociability, drunkenness, and sexual display. Princely councillors, tax-collectors, bureaucrats, and military men demanded sumptuary regulations to make ordinary people spend less on themselves so they could pay more in taxes. This conglomeration of social pressures gave rise in Württemberg, as in many other European societies, to a continual flow of sumptuary regulations between the mid-sixteenth and the later eighteenth century.⁸⁴

The main targets were “finery in clothing and excess in eating and drinking” – precisely the new forms of market consumption implied by the Industrious Revolution.⁸⁵ As in many other European societies, sumptuary regulation became ever more elaborate into the eighteenth century, alongside the local administrative

⁸⁴ For a representative selection, see “Erste Polizei-Ordnung” (30.6.1549), in Reyscher (1828ff), Vol. 12, 149-67, here 151-3; “Zweite Polizei-Ordnung” (28.10.1644), in *ibid.*, Vol. 13, 41-5; “Fürstl. Befehl in Betreff der durch den Schwäb. Kreis festgesetzten Taxen und Regeln für Dienstboten und Handwerkern” (15.05.1652), in *ibid.*, Vol. 13, 114-23, esp. 120; “Dritte Polizei-Ordnung” (08.10.1660), in *ibid.*, Vol. 13, 423-35; “Vierte Polizeiordnung” (17.12.1681), in *ibid.*, Vol. 13, 577 with note 635; “Fünfte Polizei-Ordnung” (6.12.1712), in *ibid.*, Vol. 13, 921-6; “Erläuterung der Polizei-Ordnung” (2.5.1713), in *ibid.*, Vol. 13, 759 with note 1002; “General-Ausschreiben: erinnert an die genaue Beobachtung der Polizei-Ordnung” (17.7.1714), in *ibid.*, Vol. 13, 1023; Zweite Trauerordnung” (20.8.1720), in *ibid.*, Vol. 13, 1182-5; “Verbot des Tragens von Hof-Livrée durch solche, die nicht bei Hof dienen” (18.04.1721), in *ibid.*, Vol. 13, 1217 with n. 1199; “Verbot des Tragens von grünen Kleidern und Hirschfänger durch Andere, als Forstbediente” (29.03.1727), in *ibid.*, Vol. 14, 1 with n. 2; “General-Rescript in Betreff der Unbefugten Nachahmung von Uniform-Kleidern und Farben” (6.9.1731), in *ibid.*, Vol. 14, 91-3; “Generalrescript, betreffend die Beförderung der Religiosität und Sittlichkeit” (13.1.1739), in *ibid.*, Vol. 14, 220-31, esp. article 16 (230); “Vierte Trauer- und Leichentax-Ordnung” (24.4.1784), in *ibid.*, Vol. 14, 997-1015, esp. articles 4-8 (1000-2).

⁸⁵ “Fünfte Polizei-Ordnung” (6.12.1712), in Reyscher (1828ff), Vol. 13, 921-6, quotation from 921.

machinery for its implementation, and was only abolished at the end of the Ancien Régime.⁸⁶

Local archival sources show these sumptuary norms being enforced – not perfectly, but enough to affect people’s economic choices. Community and church bodies not only issued normative exhortations against luxury and excess, but underpinned them with a surprisingly intensive everyday regulation of two specific *types* of consumption – clothing and comestibles.⁸⁷ When prepared in the household, most garments and comestibles were acceptable; when purchased in the market they were monitored, reported and penalized.

Sartorial regulation was seriously pursued by local religious and communal institutions in Württemberg from the later seventeenth century on. In 1660, the communal church court in Wildberg appointed “censors” to monitor “the excessive sartorial display that has got out of hand”.⁸⁸ From that time on, it was not unusual for local church courts to admonish offenders by name and penalize them for sumptuary violations. To give just a few examples, in 1662, the Wildberg court reprimanded the son of a local weaver, “on account of very wide trousers, which fashion it is unfitting for him to wear”, fined him 15 *Kreuzer* (about 2 weeks’ earnings for a male servant), and warned him that “if he should again put on such trousers of this fashion, they shall, by virtue of the Princely Command, be confiscated”.⁸⁹ In 1684, the Wildberg court ordered Hans Caspar Cuenz’s wife “to take off the neckerchief she had been wearing, because she is not permitted to wear it, and to set a good example to

⁸⁶ On Württemberg, see Medick (1996), 384-91; Benschmidt (1985), 34-6, 226-30. On Germany more widely, see Bulst (1993); Knudsen (2002), 38-42, 52-8; on France up to c. 1750, see Moyer (1996), 244-336.

⁸⁷ For an example from Wildberg, see HStAS A573 Bü. 94, Vogt-Rug-Gericht, 08.05.1710, Zettel between fols. 8 and 9; for similar exhortations in another Württemberg community later in the eighteenth century, see Medick (1996), 299.

⁸⁸ PAW KKP, Vol. II, fol. 18r, 14.12.1660: “daß überhand genommene ... Klaid. Pracht”.

⁸⁹ PAW KKP, Vol. II, 3.10.1662, fol. 66r: “wegen getragener sehr weiter hosen, welche manier zu tragen Ihme nicht gebührt”; “wann Er solches hosen, vff diser manier widerumb anziehen solte, selbige crafft Frst: bevelchs confiscirt werden sollen”.

others”.⁹⁰ In 1708, the Ebhausen church court admonished and penalized a proto-industrial worsted-weaver’s wife for wearing ostentatiously large neckerchiefs.⁹¹

It might be argued that such prohibitions were merely futile gestures in the face of an ineluctable Consumer Revolution, were it not for the fact that people at the time took them quite seriously. Sumptuary penalties were regarded as forms of public shaming, important enough to motivate social resentments and enduring conflicts. In 1682, for example, the local church court forbade the Wildberg barber-surgeon’s wife “to wear the prohibited clothing which violates the most recently published regulatory ordinance”, and threatened to report her to the princely authorities.⁹² The barber-surgeon himself was

summoned to the Town Hall, where several women had also been summoned on account of the clothing-ordinance, and Mr Pastor, in front of the women who were present, inspected him behind and before, and said that the small ribbon which he had on the collar of his coat also had to come off, and declared that they [the women] will themselves soon go down, and slapped his hand on the clothing-ordinance.

The barber-surgeon declared in court that he “took all of this as a contumely, because it was discussed again and again among the people in the town”.⁹³ This conflict over ribbon on the barber-surgeon’s collar, trivial though it might seem, gave rise to a feud in the community between the associates of the pastor and the surgeon, which lasted

⁹⁰ PAW KKP, Vol. IV, fol. 252r, 18.1.1684: “ist vndersagt worden, Ihre tragende hals tüecher, weil es Ihren nicht gebührt zuetragen abzulegen, Vnd andern mit einem Exempel vorzuegehen”.

⁹¹ PAE KKP, Vol. II, fol. 46r, 15.7.1708.

⁹² PAW KKP, Vol. IV, fol. 215r, 5.5.1682: “die verbottenen Klaider welche der Jüng. publicierten Policy Ordnung zue wider ... ablegen thüe”.

⁹³ PAW KKP, Vol. IV, fol. 221v, 7.6.1682: “Er vff daß Rathhauß er fordert: da etliche weiber wegen deß Klaider Tax, auch vor beschaid. word. habe herr Specialis vor denen anweßened. weibern Ihne hind. vnd vornnen besichtigt vnd gesagt die Schnierlen, so Er vff dem vmbschlag Seines rockhs gehabt, müeß. auch herab, warüber Er vermeldt, Sie werd. selbsten baldt herab gehen, In deme Sie abgetrag. werd., vnd vff die Klaider Ordnung die hand geschlagen, welches Er vor einen Spott [ins.: weil solches hin vnd wider in der Statt vnder den leüthen auß gesagt word.] vffgenommen”.

for nine years, occupied three communal court sittings, and issued in several reports to the princely authorities.⁹⁴

In a similar way, a sermon against luxurious dress delivered by the Ebhausen pastor in 1708 was perceived by Magdalena, the wife of Peter Schöttlin, as an attempt to shame her publicly. Magdalena had already been twice forbidden to wear “her excessively large neckerchief, which she is accustomed to wearing above her station”. She reacted to the pastor’s public reprimand by remarking to a group of neighbours a few days later that “if the pastor doesn’t have anything better to preach about than neckerchiefs, he could well refrain from doing it altogether”. She was then summoned before the community church court, where she denied being rude about the sermon but again refused to take off the neckerchief, whereupon the church censors fined her 11 *Kreuzer* – more than a day’s average earnings for a local worsted-weaver.⁹⁵

When exhortations, sermons, public reprimands, court hearings, gossip, fines, and confiscation did not succeed, communities resorted to heavier penalties. People who violated the clothing regulations could find themselves or their families denied communal welfare. In 1687, for instance, when Jacob Zeyher’s widow petitioned for poor relief, the Wildberg church court refused, on the grounds that “this Zeyherin’s son and daughter have let themselves be seen in clothing above what is fitting and this implies that they can probably come by other means and can support their old mother, for which reason her children are reminded to care for their mother in accordance with filial obligation”.⁹⁶ In 1703, the Ebhausen community church court summoned the

⁹⁴ PAW KKP, Vol. IV, fol. 215r, 5.5.1682; PAW KKP, Vol. IV, fol. 220r-222v, 7.6.1682; PAW KKP, Vol. V, fol. 100v-103v, 19.4.1691.

⁹⁵ PAE KKP, Vol. II, fol. 46r, 15.7.1708: “wegen ihres überaus großen halbtuches, welches sie über ihren Stand zutragen pflēget”; “wann der Pfarrer nichts wisse zu predig., als von halbtüchern, könne ers wol bleiben lassen”.

⁹⁶ PAW KKP, Vol. V, fol. 64v, 4.2.1687: “weilen dißer Zeyherin Sohn vnd Tochttern sich in Klaidern über gebihr sehen laßen vnd so her gehen dz sie wohl anderster Kommen: vnd Ihre alte Muetter erhalten Könten, Alß waißt man Ihro nit zue willfahren, sondern Ihre Kinder werden Crafft der Kindischen schuldigkeit anerjnnert Ihr Mueter zue verpfleg.”.

“house-poor people” in the village so that a list could be drawn up for the district authorities, but took advantage of having the village poor assembled before them, by “additionally giving severe warnings to various widows, that they shall refrain from the loose gossip and other disgraceful trouble-making that has hitherto occurred among them, especially at spinning-bees, and also from excessiveness in clothing”.⁹⁷ For this group of women, poor relief was tacitly made dependent on refraining from two manifestations of the Industrious Revolution – working at spinning-bees and buying new clothes.

Sumptuary regulations were thus enforced at least sufficiently to provide an instrument for “social disciplining”. A unique documentary survival from the eighteenth century, moreover, suggests even more systematic enforcement. For the community of Wildberg, there survives a single booklet of “Polizei-Tax-Rechnungen” (regulatory fine accounts), which lists all the clothing fines levied over a 12-month period between February 1713 and February 1714.⁹⁸ Similar registers of clothing fines survive for other parts of Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, suggesting that such systematic, local enforcement was not unique to Württemberg.⁹⁹

The register from Wildberg makes it possible to identify the targets of sumptuary regulation. As Table 8 shows, over this 12-month period, 110 individuals in a community of only about 1,300 inhabitants were fined for wearing forbidden garments. Most were fined for more than one offence, as shown by the fact that the register recorded 218 prohibited garments, most of them small items of silk or calico.

⁹⁷ PAE KKP, Vol. II, fol. 19r, 1.5.1703: “die haußarme Leutt”; “darneben etlichen Wittib. ernstl. Verweißung gethan, daß sie des loßen geschwäzes, Vnd andern schändlichen Vnwesens, so bißher bey v. Vnter ihnen, v. sonderlich in Liechtgäng Vorgelauff., auch Übermuths in Kleidern bemüssig. soll.”

⁹⁸ HStAS A573 Bü. 6712, fol. 3r-6v, 1713-14.

⁹⁹ On Germany and Switzerland, see, for instance, Bulst (1993), 34-6; on France, see Moyer (1996), 244-336.

Table 8:
Violations of Consumption Regulations, by Sex and Household Status,
Wildberg, February 1713 to February 1714

Sex and household status	Female			Male			Unknown sex			Total		
	no.	%	fine	no.	%	fine	no.	%	fine	no.	%	fine
Adult male	0	0	n/a	4	57	13.50	0	0	n/a	4	4	13.50
Widow	1	1	3.00	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	1	1	3.00
Wife	61	61	6.16	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	61	55	6.16
Offspring	18	18	6.17	3	43	3.00	3	100	4.00	24	22	5.50
Servant	7	7	6.43	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	7	6	6.43
Relative	6	6	4.50	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	6	5	4.50
Independent woman	7	7	5.57	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	7	6	5.57
Total	100	100	6.01	7	100	9.00	3	100	4.00	110	100	6.15

Source: HSAS A573 Bü. 6712 (Polizeiregister), 1709/17, fol. 3r-6v.

Note: Fine = mean fine imposed (in Kreuzer).

Although some of these sumptuary fines were levied for men's or children's clothing, 91 per cent of those penalized in this register were female. This finding is consistent with sumptuary regulation throughout early modern Europe, which was directed disproportionately at women.¹⁰⁰ Married women took pride of place, at 61 per cent of all females fined, a finding also consistent with European studies indicating that sumptuary laws emanated partly from men's desire for institutional support to rein in wives' spending. As one legislator declared in 1621, "laws may rule them though their husbands cannot"¹⁰¹ – a motive discussed further in the next section. But even a few unmarried daughters, maidservants, female relatives, and independent women living in lodgings were willing to allocate some of their meagre earnings to small fashionable garments – and to incur social opprobrium and monetary costs for doing so.

¹⁰⁰ Hunt (1996), 251-4.

¹⁰¹ Hunt (1996), 237 (quotation), 255-72.

It might be argued that all these fines simply show that clothing regulations had no effect, as is sometimes claimed of sumptuary laws more generally. But fines, although they did not wholly prevent people from buying prohibited garments, increased their costs, as did public shaming, threats of confiscation, and denial of poor relief. This register, after all, records the consumption only of those who could afford to pay the fines on top of the cost of the garments. The typical fine inflicted in 1713 was non-trivial. Even for an adult male, the average clothing-fine was 13.5 *Kreuzer*, 1.7 days' average earnings for a proto-industrial worsted-weaver, the most important single occupation locally.¹⁰² For a woman, the average clothing-fine of 6 *Kreuzer* weighed more heavily – 2-5 days' earnings for an independent spinner, more than 6 days' wages for a maidservant.¹⁰³ A fine of this size did not make it impossible to indulge in new forms of consumption, but cannot fail to have deterred the marginal consumer, especially among women and the less well-off. The resentment and conflict that sumptuary controls evoked provides additional evidence that even those who could afford to violate them perceived them as a real constraint.

A second major target of sumptuary controls was the public consumption of food and drink, at taverns, markets, fairs, weddings, baptisms, funerals, and other non-domestic venues. "Alimentary regulations" were common in many parts of Europe, including Württemberg, well into the eighteenth century.¹⁰⁴ As with sartorial regulation, the social pressures for alimentary regulation were multifarious – maintaining social demarcations, reining in worldly display, controlling drunkenness, enforcing gender norms, and even preventing scarcity. Alimentary regulation, too, went far beyond normative exhortations: the legal provisions provided the rhetorical justification, but underlying social pressures motivated enforcement in everyday life.

¹⁰² For average weavers' earnings, see Troeltsch (1897), 221-5.

¹⁰³ Ogilvie (2003), 304.

¹⁰⁴ Hunt (1996), 17-22, 33-40, 205, 251, 298-301, 359.

Maintaining social demarcations was one major motivation. Alimentary regulations were enforced in practice against upwardly mobile members of the lower social orders who staged lavish weddings, baptismal suppers, and funerals aping the consumption patterns – and thus challenging the valued social status – of higher strata. Community courts – both temporal and communal – prosecuted excessive consumption at baptismal suppers and weddings, measured by the quantity of food or the number of guests.¹⁰⁵ At least in some periods, this regulation was imposed quite systematically. Thus from 1713 to 1743, registers survive recording the graduated fines paid by townsmen and villagers in the district of Wildberg who violated the sumptuary ordinances by inviting “too many” guests to their wedding parties.¹⁰⁶

A second major motivation for alimentary regulation was the notion that excessive extra-familial consumption of comestibles led to scarcity. The 1644 sumptuary ordinance, for instance, claimed that excessive non-household consumption was not only untraditional and dishonourable, but “inflated the prices of victuals and other necessities”.¹⁰⁷ Men with families to support might buy food in the market, but as one Wildberg citizen complained at the 1660 community assembly, independent women (*Eigenbrötlerinnen*) should be ejected from the community because of their excessive market consumption: “in the market everything is grabbed away by them, and no citizen can get anything any more”.¹⁰⁸

This case illustrates a third key concern of the alimentary regulations – controlling women’s behaviour. Württemberg taverns traditionally functioned as social spaces for both sexes, but from the later seventeenth century on, although groups of men

¹⁰⁵ On baptismal suppers see, for instance, PAE KKP Vol. I, fol. 63v, 8.9.1695; PAE KKP Vol. I, fol. 65r, 10.11.1695; PAE KKP Vol. I, fol. 66r, 21.12.1695.

¹⁰⁶ HStAS A573 Bü. 6712-4 (Polizei-Tax-Register), 1713-1743.

¹⁰⁷ “Zweite Polizeiordnung” (28.10.1644), in Reyscher (1828ff), Vol. 13, 41-4, here 42: “so wohl die Victualien, als andere zu hüßl vnd füßl benötigte Waaren gestaigert werden”.

¹⁰⁸ HStAS A573 Bü. 91, fol. 8r-v, 29.10.1660: “werde vff dem Marckht alles von Ihnen hinweg gerissen, könne kein burger nichts mehr bekommen”.

consuming bread and wine in taverns were tolerated, groups of women who did the same began to be fined and incarcerated, even when only seeking warmth.¹⁰⁹ The controls were not limited to spinsters, but extended to married women and widows, even wives drinking alongside their husbands.¹¹⁰ Regulation of female tavern-going was thus motivated not so much by anxiety about spinsters exposing themselves to licentious contacts as by deeper concerns about the social implications of *any* woman consuming independently, outside the domestic sphere.

This is vividly illustrated by the accusation levelled in 1684 by the Ebhausen church court against Barbara Müller who, “on Michel Lodholtz’s accounting-day, remained in the tavern past closing-time and spoke very impudently, saying that she could earn 3 *Batzen* in a quarter of an hour, so what did it matter if she consumed something? ... unlike this tankard, she didn’t have a lid”.¹¹¹ Barbara Müller evidently felt that a women who earned her own money was entitled to make her own consumption choices, including engaging in the individuated consumption of comestibles outside the household evoked in accounts of the English or Dutch Industrious Revolutions.¹¹² But in Württemberg, it was precisely this combination of independent market work and independent market consumption by women that male elites found unacceptable. The village court sentenced Barbara Müller to three days and three nights in the house of discipline. Would such palpable penalties not have reduced incentives to work or consume in markets, even for such impudent women as Barbara Müller?

¹⁰⁹ For examples, see PAE KKP, Vol. I, fol. 10v, 15.01.1682; PAE KKP, Vol. II, fol. 148r, 31.1.1716; and PAE KKP, Vol. VII, fol. 11v, 2.3.1785.

¹¹⁰ For examples of married women and widows penalized for tavern-going, see PAW KKP, Vol. V, 4.12.1705, fol. 252r-v; PAE KKP, Vol. II, fol. 85r, 20.08.1711; PAE KKP, Vol. II, fol. 103r, 12.05.1713.

¹¹¹ PAE KKP, Vol. I, fol. 16r, 28.9.1684: “daß sie an Michel lodholtzen abrechnungs tag über Zeit im wirths hauß gebliben vnd damal. sich frecher weiß vernehmen laßen, sie Kohn in einer Viertel stund 3 batz. verdienen, wann sie schon etwz verzehre”; *ibid.*, 7.11.1684: “sie hab auch kein deckhel, wie dz Käntlin”.

¹¹² De Vries (2003), 63.

Sumptuary regulation appears to have intensified in Württemberg between c. 1650 and c. 1750, alongside the administrative apparatus necessary for its implementation. Local courts monitored compliance, offenders were punished, and enforcement evoked resentment and conflict. This suggests that contemporaries regarded sumptuary controls as binding constraints. But how might we assess the broader, quantitative impact of such sumptuary regulation on the Consumer Revolution?

One promising avenue is to analyse the things people owned. Württemberg law mandated detailed marriage and post-mortem inventories, which survive for around four-fifths of ordinary citizens who reached adulthood and married.¹¹³ Benschmidt's analysis of 150 Nürtingen inventories between 1660 and 1840 detected a significant decline in clothing ownership between 1660 and 1780, followed by a huge increase up to 1840, which she ascribes partly to "the abolition of all clothing ordinances after the French Revolution".¹¹⁴ Medick's study of 444 inventories for the Württemberg village of Laichingen between 1747 and 1820 describes the gradual spread of small items of sartorial luxury, but also widespread compliance with the clothing regulations until the last quarter of the eighteenth century. It was only after c. 1800, when the sumptuary regulations had been abolished, that the value of wives' clothing surpassed that of husbands, female dress began commonly to include bright colours, exotic fabrics, ornamental accessories and forbidden trinkets, and sartorial display spread beyond the village elite to day-labourers and proto-industrial weavers.¹¹⁵

¹¹³ For a discussion of these sources, illustrating their potential to analyze consumption on the micro-level, see Ogilvie, Küpker and Maegraith (2009 forthcoming).

¹¹⁴ Benschmidt (1985), 34-6, 226-8, 230 (quotation).

¹¹⁵ Medick (1996), 384-7, 398-406, 414, 427.

These studies analyse only quite small samples of inventories and do not use multivariate statistical techniques, so they cannot establish whether changes in consumption followed changes in regulation, if different strata violated rules to differing degrees or followed differing chronologies, what other personal or community characteristics influenced consumption, and whether the pattern was replicated more widely across Württemberg. A new research project on “Human Well-Being and the “Industrious Revolution”: Consumption, Gender and Social Capital in a German Developing Economy, 1600-1900” is seeking answers to these questions using a larger sample (several thousand inventories), two communities (a town and a village), and a period of several centuries (1602-1899). By linking inventories to tax registers, censuses, and family reconstitutions, it will be able to analyse variations in consumption according to individual characteristics such as sex, age, fertility, household structure, occupation, taxable wealth, community citizenship, and communal office-holding, as well as exogenous variables such as sumptuary legislation and guild regulations.¹¹⁶

But even the scattered findings available so far show clearly that although people in early modern Württemberg may have been poorer and less highly informed than those in the Low Countries and England, they, too, sought to increase their market consumption after c. 1650.¹¹⁷ In doing so, however, they faced very different constraints. In Württemberg – as in many other early modern European economies – entrenched elites used their institutional powers and “social capital” to impose sumptuary norms, limiting the extent to which women and the lower social strata

¹¹⁶ This project is supported by the Economic and Social Research Council (RES-062-23-0759) between 2008 and 2012 (<http://131.111.165.101/faculty/ogilvie/ESRC-project-English.pdf>) and builds on a database developed for the project “Economy, Gender, and Social Capital in the German Demographic Transition”, supported by the Leverhulme Trust (F/09 722/A) (see <http://www.hpss.geog.cam.ac.uk/research/projects/germandemography/>).

¹¹⁷ On this, see Benschmidt (1985), 65-8, 115-22, 226-30; Frey (1999), ch. 6; Medick (1996), ch. 5.

could transform their production decisions into new consumption choices. These institutional constraints survived well into the eighteenth century, and may therefore have influenced the timing and intensity of any revolution in consumption – and any corresponding incentive to increase industriousness – before c. 1800.

4. Social Capital and Intra-Household Resource Allocation

The Industrious and Consumer Revolutions place particular emphasis on married women's reallocation of time and consumption from household to market.¹¹⁸ But the exact processes behind this shift are not wholly clear. Household time allocation and consumption are affected by bargaining between family members. Existing analyses of the Industrious Revolution describe wives' bargaining position as being primarily affected by their earning-power – i.e. by interactions between family and market.¹¹⁹ But what if *other* institutions intervened in this bargain? We have already seen how institutions widespread in many early modern European societies – guilds, communities, religious bodies, political authorities – affected women's position in the market. Such institutions could also affect women's position in the *family*, altering the bargains between spouses over time-allocation, income-sharing, and consumption choices.

Württemberg provides an instructive example of an economy in which non-familial, non-market institutions influenced household decision-making. The willingness of communal, religious and political institutions to intervene inside households is illustrated by a database of 313 marital conflicts collected from the

¹¹⁸ De Vries (1992), esp. 118-9; De Vries (1994), 261; De Vries (2003), esp. 47; De Vries (2008), 14-19, 97-109, 139-43, 179; McKendrick (1974), 197-200; Berg (1985), 169-72; Noordegraaf / Van Zanden (1995).

¹¹⁹ De Vries (2008), 214-24.

church court minutes of two small Württemberg communities between 1650 and 1800.¹²⁰ Lacking figures for the three other jurisdictions that heard marriage conflicts in Württemberg (community, district, and consistorial courts), and lacking comparative figures for other European societies, we cannot say whether marital conflict in these Württemberg communities was especially high or low, but we can analyse its characteristics.

Table 9:
Characteristics of Marital Conflict Cases, Church Court Records,
Wildberg 1646-1800 and Ebhausen 1674-1800

Marital conflict cases	Town		Villages		Grand Total	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
<i>Whole sample:</i>	212	100	101	100	313	100
Initiated by community, church, state, neighbour	151	71	62	61	215	69
Initiated by wife	27	13	17	17	44	14
Initiated by wife plus wife's family	6	3	4	4	10	3
Initiated by wife's family	17	8	5	5	22	7
Initiated by husband	10	5	12	12	22	7
Initiated by husband's family	1	0	0	0	1	0
Initiated by couple	0	0	1	1	1	0
<i>Sub-sample with conflict details:</i>	169	100	89	100	258	100
<i>Economic causes:</i>						
Any economic conflict	83	49	47	53	130	50
Husband bad householder	32	19	30	34	62	24
Wife bad householder	12	7	11	12	23	9
Property, inventory, marriage portion	14	8	11	12	25	10
Stealing within family	12	7	7	8	19	7
Food allocation or availability	20	12	24	27	44	17
Alcohol consumption	38	22	26	29	64	25
<i>Other major causes:</i>						
Conflict with relatives	64	38	30	34	94	36
Verbal abusiveness	51	30	35	39	86	33
Sexual difficulties or jealousy	37	22	20	22	57	22
<i>Physical violence:</i>						
By husband	73	43	43	48	116	45
By wife	13	8	7	8	20	8
By both spouses	11	7	5	6	16	6

Sources: PAW KKP Vols. I-VII (1646-1800); Pfarrarchiv Ebhausen, KKP Vols. I-VII (1674-1800).

¹²⁰ For detailed analysis of this database, see Ogilvie (2003), 179-94.

As Table 9 shows, one notable characteristic was that more than two-thirds of marital conflicts were brought before the court not by spouses themselves, or by their families, but by third parties. These included not only neighbours, but also – and to a much greater extent – community office-holders, church officials, and state officials. In Württemberg, spousal bargaining was a matter not just for the family but for the wider institutional framework.

A second notable characteristic is the importance of economic issues. Details survive of the causes of conflict in over four-fifths of cases. As Table 9 shows, the four main causes of spousal disputes were economic conflict, conflict with relatives, verbal abuse, and sexual difficulties. Of these, economic conflict was the most important, playing a role in half of all cases for which details are known, compared to about one-third for conflict with relatives and verbal abuse respectively, and about one-fifth for sexual difficulties. Economic conflicts were highly various – one-quarter of cases involved bad householding by the husband, one-quarter alcohol consumption, one-sixth food allocation, one-tenth land or property, one-tenth bad householding by the wife. But, as we shall see, marital disputes – and communal, church or state intervention – were evoked by a wide range of other economic issues.

One frequent flashpoint was a wife's time-allocation. As we saw in Table 3, married women in Württemberg were both able and willing to work outside the household. Only 41 per cent of married women's observed work was in household production, compared to 48 per cent in non-household work – 20 per cent in agriculture, 18 per cent in industry (crafts, proto-industry, spinning, milling), and 10 per cent in tertiary activities (commerce, tavern-keeping, labouring).¹²¹ But the marital conflict database shows equally clearly that husbands thought that *they* should be in

¹²¹ For a detailed discussion, see Ogilvie (2003), 141-72; and Ogilvie (2008).

charge of deciding whether their wives worked.¹²² To give just two examples, in 1685 a major issue in the conflict between the Wildberg tanner Hans Bernhardt Memminger and his wife Margaretha was that she had disobeyed him when he “forbade her to go out working any longer”.¹²³ Similarly, in 1769, the main complaint of the Wöllhausen weaver Johann Martin Dengler against his wife Agnes Margaretha was that she “did spinning for strangers even though she had her own [wool] to spin ... and always wants to work more than he does”.¹²⁴

When wives disobeyed, husbands regarded coercion as legitimate. As Table 9 shows, nearly half of all marital conflict cases involved physical violence by husbands. One issue that evoked such violence was a wife’s market work, especially when it interfered with a husband’s definition of appropriate standards of household production. In 1666, for instance, Young Hanß Peürlin in Effringen justified beating his wife on the grounds that “she goes out of the house far too much and does not attend to the housekeeping, through which he is sometimes caused to become impatient”.¹²⁵ In 1685, when Margaretha Memminger disobeyed her husband’s prohibition on her going out working any longer, “he beat her so that the blood ran down her front and back”.¹²⁶ In 1769 Johann Martin Dengler of Ebhausen threatened to beat his wife Agnes Margaretha for spinning for other weavers rather than himself.¹²⁷ In 1778, the Wöllhausen weaver Daniel Dengler justified death threats against his wife on the grounds that she “is herself to blame for this, since she does not remain at home, but runs around among the houses”. He also explicitly requested reinforcement

¹²² For similar findings, see Roper (1989), 178-80.

¹²³ PAW KKP, Vol. V, fol. 28v, 24.1.1685: “hette Er Ihre verboten solte den Schaffen nimmer gehen”.

¹²⁴ PAE KKP, Vol. V, p. 267, 19.4.1769: “daß sie frembden Leuten Wolle spinne, da sie doch ihre eigene zu spinnen habe ... und [ins.: immer] mehr schaffen wolle als er”.

¹²⁵ PAW KKP, Vol. III, 12.1.1666, p. 2: “Sie lauffe gar zuvohl auß dem hauß warte der haußhaltung nicht ab, dardurch Er etwann Zuer vngeduldt vervracht werde”.

¹²⁶ PAW KKP, Vol. V, fol. 28v, 24.1.1685: “er sie geschlag. daß dz bluet hinden vnd vornen her ab gelauffen”.

¹²⁷ PAE KKP, Vol. V, p. 267, 19.4.1769.

by the communal church court, demanding that it “compel his wife, so that she remains at home”.¹²⁸ In some of these cases, the court minutes are ambiguous about whether the husband is opposing his wife’s reallocating time to market production or to leisure activities outside the household, but most make it clear that his objection is to her willingness to work for outsiders instead of doing unpaid housework or spinning for him. In such cases, the court typically threw its weight behind the husband, sometimes feebly admonishing him for violence but always ordering the wife to obey him and “attend loyally to the householding, as befits an honourable wife”.¹²⁹

Husbands consequently found that they could enforce their bargaining position within the household even more effectively by appealing to outside institutions manned by other married males, to whose fellow feeling they could explicitly appeal. In 1681, for instance, a Wildberg butcher who threatened his wife with a knife when she resisted his decisions about spousal time-allocation put it to the communal church court that, after all, “one can easily imagine that sometimes trouble arises between married people”.¹³⁰ In 1771, the Ebhausen court had been receiving reports of the forest-warden’s wife-beating for years, but had no rejoinder to the man’s assertion that “he was the husband – after all, he had the right ... his wife was his own – he could treat her however he pleased”.¹³¹ The outcome was unsurprising. External institutions supported the husband’s control over a wife’s time, as in 1657 when the Wildberg court ordered that Friedrich Hosch’s 58-year-old wife should “in future not

¹²⁸ PAE KKP, Vol. VI, 6.2.1778, fol. 43r-v: “sein Weib sey selbst Schuld daran, denn sie bleib nicht zu Haus, lauf nur in den Häusern herum”; “er bitte aber, man soll sein Weib dazu anhalten, daß sie zu Haus bleibe”.

¹²⁹ PAW KKP, Vol. III, 2.4.1669, p. 256-7: “der haußhaltung, wie einem Ehrlichen weib Zuestehet, getrewlich vorstehen”.

¹³⁰ PAW KKP, Vol. IV, fol. 199r-v, 22.4.1681: “könne mann ja leicht ermeßen, daß je mahlen eine ungelegenheit zwischen Eheleüthen geben”.

¹³¹ PAE KKP, Vol. V, p. 254, 4.7.1772: “er seye der Mann – er habe doch recht ... er habe ein Weib vor sich – er dörfe sie tractiren, wie er wolle”.

go out of the house without her husband's permission, in exchange for which her husband shall allow her to work".¹³² In a society in which external institutions intervened inside marital disputes to support husbands, married women were less free to reallocate time from household to market production, and thus to fuel any Industrious Revolution.

Husbands also claimed control over wives' and offspring's market earnings. In 1661, for instance, the Wildberg weaver Young Johannes Rempffer was "taking away from his wife and children the food that they earn bitterly with spinning".¹³³ Likewise, in 1793, the Ebhausen smith Hans Martin Hausen was demanding that his wife Barbara "give him half of her earnings, even though he earns little or nothing that he can give her".¹³⁴ If the husband could be demonstrated to be prodigal, the communal court might expostulate feebly, but it would also typically admonish the wife to yield. Thus in 1674, when the Wildberg butcher Hannß Geörg Steimblen threatened to kill his wife for not giving him 30 *Kreuzer* she had earned independently by selling ragout, the court fostered out their child for its own safety but ordered the wife to stay home with her husband, ineffectually warning both spouses "to treat each other better in future".¹³⁵ Where a husband's bargaining position was reinforced by institutional support, a wife lost disposition over any money she might earn, which inevitably altered her incentives to allocate time to market work.

Husbands' control over household resource allocation also extended to consumption. In 1689 a Gültlingen husband "locked the bread away, and when [his wife] asked for money to buy bread from the shoemaker, he said she didn't need

¹³² PAW KKP, Vol. I, fol. 153r, 9.1.1657: "die frau ins kunfftig ohne erlaubnuß deß mans nicht außer hauß gehen solle, hingegen der man Ihro Zueschaffen erlauben solle".

¹³³ PAW KKP, Vol. II, fol. 43v, 25.10.1661: "weib vnd Kinder von Ihrer speiß [ins.: die] Sie mit spinnen Saur v.diennen weg nemme".

¹³⁴ PAE KKP, Vol. VIII, p. 5, 31.5.1793: "fordere, daß sie ihm ihren halben Verdienst geben solle, u. er Verdien doch wenig oder nichts, das er ihr geben könne".

¹³⁵ PAW KKP, Vol. III, p. 641-2, 12.6.1674: "ins Künfftig sich besser alß bishero beschehen, gegen [ins.: einander] Zue bezeügen".

bread because he himself had already eaten”.¹³⁶ In 1715 a weaver’s wife in Wildberg complained that “in her last childbed [her husband] had not let anything good be cooked for her, [and] she had had to eat oat gruel”.¹³⁷ In 1770, a weaver’s wife from Wöllhausen ran away “because [her husband] gives her no money for bread, but rather makes use of it for other, less necessary things ... she had not really wanted to run away, but rather had only sought thereby to compel him to get some bread”.¹³⁸ Husbands also decided how much the dwelling would be warmed, as in 1772 when a Wöllhausen weaver’s wife “could not stay in their main room in the daytime because [her husband] heats it little or not at all”.¹³⁹ The court might admonish a husband who demonstrably deprived his wife of basic sustenance, but would also typically instruct the wife “to show and conduct herself toward her husband peacefully and modestly ... and not give him cause to give her trouble”.¹⁴⁰

A husband’s control over money earnings translated directly into control over even the most basic forms of *household* consumption such as meals and warmth. When it came to *market* consumption, his control over money earnings was even more decisive, especially when, as so often happened, it was reinforced by external institutional intervention. In 1715, for instance, Young Hans Georg Hezel’s wife in Wildberg lamented that “he does not let her have any shirts and clothes made, for which reason lice and vermin inevitably grow on her [and] her mother has to provide her clothes”; the community court merely ordered both spouses to behave better, and

¹³⁶ PAW KKP, Vol. V, fol. 87r-v, 23.5.1689: “er Ihro dz brodt ein beschloßen vnd alß sie gesagt solte Gelt hohlen beim Schuehmacher dz sie brod Kauffen Können, er Ihro zur antwort geben sie brauche Kein brodt er habe schon Geßen”.

¹³⁷ PAW KKP, Vol. V, 1.3.1715, fol. 318r: “Er habe Ihro zu theürst in ferndig. kindbett nichts guts kochen laßen, Sie habe haber brey eßen müßen”.

¹³⁸ PAE KKP, Vol. V, p. 205, 28.7.1770: “Weil er ihro Kein Geld zu brode gegeben, sondern solches zu andern weniger nöthigen dingen verbraucht ... sie habe nicht eigentlich verlauffen wollen, sondern ihn nur damit nöthigen wollen, daß er brod anschaffen solle”.

¹³⁹ PAE KKP, Vol. V, p. 258, 12.10.1772: “bey tag könne sie nicht in ihrer Stuben seyn, weil er solche wenig oder gar nicht einheize”.

¹⁴⁰ PAW KKP, Vol. III, 2.4.1669, p. 256-7: “sich geg. Ihme Ihrem Mann auch fridlich vnd bescheid. erZaig. vnd v.halten: ... vnd Ihme Zuer vngelegenheit nicht vrsach geb. Solle”.

the wife to be cleaner.¹⁴¹ In 1767, the alcoholic and prodigal Wöllhausen weaver Johann Martin Dingler “refused to provide [his wife] with a necessary skirt”, but when she sold two tablecloths to get the money to buy clothes, accused her of “being untrue to him in the domestic economy, with table and store-chest, and being a gadabout who never stayed home” – charges on which she was then closely interrogated by the community court.¹⁴² In a society in which communal and religious institutions supported husbands’ control over consumption decisions, wives – whether or not they were allowed to work outside the household – were less likely contribute to a Consumer Revolution by purchasing market fashions.

Occasionally a women secured some protection by bringing her husband to court, especially if she could portray his behaviour as burdening the wider community. The authorities sometimes penalized a blatantly prodigal husband even while they ordered the wife to submit in order to keep the marriage intact. But this should not lead us to conclude that communal, religious, or state institutions treated spouses impartially, let alone that they favoured wives, as has been argued by some scholars.¹⁴³ Communal and state authorities had their own priorities, high among them the desire to sustain marriages at almost any cost in order to ensure tax payments and prevent welfare burdens. Guild, community and state regulations that reduced women’s earning capacity (discussed above in Section 1) created powerful incentives for the authorities to keep married couples together and to support the husband as the major earner. Furthermore, communal and religious courts were manned by male householders who shared the perspective of accused husbands whom, as fellow

¹⁴¹ PAW KKP, Vol. V, 1.3.1715, fol. 318r: “Er laße Ihro Keine Hembd. und Klaid. machen, dahero noth wendig c: v. lauß und ohngezifer an Ihro wachsen laßen müße, Ihre Mutter müße Sie Klaid. laßen”.

¹⁴² PAE KKP, Vol. V, p. 219, 30.1.1767: “Sie habe nicht weiter als zwey tisch tücher weggegeben, und ihr davor einen nöthigen Rock, den er ihr nicht habe anschaffen wollen”; “sie seye ihm im Haus-Weßen da und dorten [ins.: in tisch und Kasten] ungetreu geweßen; sie seye eine Ausläuferin, bleibe nie daheim”.

¹⁴³ Medick (1991), 55-6; Sabean (1990), 124-46, 176-8.

citizens and guild members, they were reluctant to disoblige. This led courts to inflict an abusive husband with often risibly feeble penalties while ordering his wife “to give way to her husband in future”,¹⁴⁴ “to conduct herself toward her husband peacefully and modestly ... and not give him cause to give her trouble”,¹⁴⁵ “to greet him virtuously at all times, thereby protecting herself from misfortune”,¹⁴⁶ – in short, to defer to his resource allocation decisions.

Institutional support for husbands in household bargaining, as studies of modern developing economies suggest, affects basic aspects of production and consumption that would have been key variables in any Industrious Revolution. For one thing, depriving women of consumption reduces their productivity, reinforcing incentives to allocate them less consumption, thereby creating a self-sustaining cycle of reduced production and consumption by females.¹⁴⁷ Second, men’s consumption choices may focus more on their own individual gratification (particularly with alcohol and tobacco), while women more often seek the well-being of the entire household, particularly the nutritional and health status of children.¹⁴⁸ Third, women may be more likely than men to allocate income to staples of the Consumer Revolution such as clothing, furnishings, or market comestibles.¹⁴⁹ Institutional support for husbands in household bargaining thus not only redistributed resources from women to men (thereby reducing women’s welfare), but created incentives reducing women’s market production and consumption (thereby reducing efficiency and growth in the wider economy).

¹⁴⁴ PAW KKP, Vol. V, fol. 315v, 4.1.1715.

¹⁴⁵ PAW KKP, Vol. III, fol. 256-7, 2.4.1669.

¹⁴⁶ PAE KKP, Vol. I, fol. 82v, 9.12.1697.

¹⁴⁷ Dasgupta (1993), 305-36, 401-511.

¹⁴⁸ For modern economies, see Dasgupta (1993), 471-2; for historical ones, see Ogilvie (2003), 193-4, 349-51.

¹⁴⁹ De Vries, 47-8, 133-44.

Without analogous studies for different European societies, we cannot compare how women's bargaining position within households was affected by different institutional frameworks. The near invisibility of such institutional interventions inside households in studies of the Industrious Revolution in England or the Netherlands might be taken as *prima facie* evidence that they did not play the active role there that they did in Württemberg. Comparative studies of "social disciplining" certainly conclude that control of private life by community, church, or state was less effective in the early modern north Atlantic societies than in central, southern or Nordic Europe.¹⁵⁰ Comparative studies also tend to confirm that early modern Dutch and English women enjoyed an unusually strong position in household and market.¹⁵¹ This is not to say that spouses in England or the Low Countries did not conflict over time-allocation and consumption, but that husbands there had fewer and weaker outside institutions to which they could appeal to shore up their bargaining power in such household conflicts. If future scholarship bears out these comparisons for the sphere of household bargaining, then the relative weakness of institutionalized social capital in England and the Netherlands, compared to societies such as Württemberg, may turn out to have been a crucial variable in enabling an early and vigorous Industrious Revolution.

5. Conclusion

This paper began with three open questions about the Consumer and Industrious Revolutions. Did they happen outside the early-developing North Atlantic economies? Were they shaped by the "social capital" of institutions other than family and market?

¹⁵⁰ See the literature surveyed in Ogilvie (2006).

¹⁵¹ Schmidt (2007); Van den Heuvel (2007); Van Nederveen Meerkerk (2006).

And how were they affected by social constraints on women? Evidence from Württemberg, a late-developing, non-Atlantic economy where non-familial, non-market institutions observably influenced both sexes' economic options, sheds light on these questions.

Economic agents – especially women – did seek to reallocate time from household to market in early modern Württemberg. But their ability and incentive to become more “industrious” was affected by a wide array of institutional constraints. Communal institutions restricted women’s market work where it threatened or annoyed entrenched interests. Guilds, communities and state authorities capped the wages and piece-rates that could be charged by spinners, servants, and other dependent workers, and enforced unusually low female-male wage ratios. Guilds excluded women – as well as youths and adult male outsiders – from many of the industrial and commercial occupations in which they were most productive and hence best able to earn. Church courts forbade work at religiously prohibited times and prevented women from minimizing costs via spinning-bees. Institutionalized “social capital” thus restricted the incentive and capacity – particularly of women and lower-status males – to allocate more time to market work, and thus to power an Industrious Revolution on the Dutch or English model.

Social capital also influenced the Consumer Revolution through commerce. Craft guilds in economies such as Württemberg restricted trade in industrial inputs and outputs to their own privileged, mainly male members. Community and state regulations reserved trade in many primary products to their producers, penalizing middlemen as “regraters”. Retailers’ guilds reserved trade in most other wares to their own members and a few outside applicants who begged or purchased guild permits or state dispensations. The privileged few who monopolized the legal licenses mobilized

corporate, communal and state institutions to prosecute “encroachers”. This was reflected in economic outcomes, with retail ratios in strongly guilded German territories much lower than those in the Netherlands and England where guilds were weaker and more flexible. Corporative social capital thus hindered the new traders and commercial practices that brought new market wares within the knowledge and budgets of poorer social groups during the Dutch and English Consumer Revolutions.

A third effect of social capital was to facilitate sumptuary regulation. In many European economies between c. 1650 and c. 1750, elites supported sumptuary regulations to demarcate their own social status. Male householders supported sumptuary controls to prevent female licentiousness and resist wives’ and daughters’ demand for new fashions. Guild masters lobbied for sumptuary regulations to protect their markets from exotic imports. Church elders favoured sumptuary “discipline” to limit worldly adornment and lavish sociability. And the state supported sumptuary laws to make citizens spend less so they could pay more in taxes. Together, these social pressures created powerful local constituencies favouring sumptuary controls well into the eighteenth century. Perfect enforcement was not necessary. Local records show that the controls were enforced sufficiently to limit purchases of clothes and comestibles by marginal consumers, particularly women (the main targets) and the poor (who could not afford the penalties) – key groups of new consumers in the English and Dutch Consumer Revolutions.

Finally, the social capital of non-familial, non-market institutions affected bargaining inside households. Where communal and religious institutions were strong, husbands mobilized them to shore up their control over wives’ time-allocation, earnings, and consumption choices. This inevitably reduced women’s ability to do market work, their incentive to do so, the income they earned, and their autonomy in

spending it. The relative absence in the Netherlands and England of such institutional interventions in spousal bargaining may have facilitated an earlier and more vigorous reallocation of time and consumption by women, powering the Industrious Revolution.

These findings for Württemberg help answer our opening questions. Populations outside the North Atlantic economies did desire to work and consume in the market between 1650 and 1800, generating some symptoms of the Industrious Revolution. But the extent to which they could *implement* these desires was constrained by guilds, communities, religious bodies, political authorities, and many other institutions. Entrenched elites who perceived new work and consumption practices as threats used these institutions to generate a “social capital” of norms, information, sanctions and collective action to oppose them. Although they seldom succeeded in blocking new practices wholly, they often delayed them, limited them socially, or increased their costs. They deployed such social capital particularly strongly against less powerful groups such as women, migrants, and the poor – central agents in any Consumer or Industrious Revolution.

Cross-country comparisons suggest that such institutionalized social capital varied across early modern societies. It was widespread in many parts of central, nordic, eastern and southern Europe but relatively weak in the societies of the north Atlantic seaboard which were the cradle of the Industrious Revolution. Even in England and the Netherlands, the institutional powers of privileged elites were not altogether moribund after 1650, which may explain why the Industrious Revolution was less visible in some regions and social contexts there.¹⁵²

This analysis suggests that we may reap large dividends by focussing on economies where growth and development came late. Perhaps these economies had

¹⁵² See Overton et al. (2004) on regional variations in England; and Van den Heuvel (2007) on social and regional variations in the Dutch Republic.

their Industrious Revolutions but it led to nothing in terms of economic development. This would cast doubt on the broader logic of the Industrious and Consumer Revolutions – the idea that reallocating time and consumption from household to market prepares the way for modern economic growth. Alternatively, late-developing economies may not even have had an Industrious Revolution because it was stifled by institutional constraints. If so, then claims that social institutions are efficient or irrelevant to long-term economic growth must be wrong. Studying why some economies developed late may thus be central to understanding why other economies developed at all.

References

- Ågren, M. and A. L. Erickson, Eds. (2005). *Marital economy in Scandinavia and Britain, 1400-1900*. Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Allen, R. C. (2006). "The high-wage economy of pre-industrial Britain." Paper presented to the XIV International Economic History Congress, Helsinki, 21 to 25 August.
- Bardsley, S. (1999). "Women's work reconsidered: gender and wage differentiation in late medieval England." *Past and present* 165: 3-29.
- Bayly, C. A. (2004). *The birth of the modern world, 1780-1914: global connections and comparisons*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Beck, R. (2003). "Luxus oder Decencies? Zur Konsumgeschichte der Frühneuzeit als Beginn der Moderne." In *Luxus und Konsum. Eine historische Annäherung*. Eds. R. Reith and T. Meyer. Münster, Waxmann Verlag: 29-46.
- Belfanti, C. M. and F. Giusberti (2000). "Clothing and social inequality in early modern Europe: introductory remarks." *Continuity and change* 15: 359-365.
- Bekaert, G. (1991). "Caloric consumption in industrializing Belgium." *Journal of economic history* 51: 633-655.
- Benscheidt, A. R. (1985). *Kleinbürgerlicher Besitz: Nürnberger Handwerker-Inventare von 1660-1840*. Münster.
- Berg, M. (1985). *The age of manufactures: industry, innovation and work in Britain 1700-1820*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell / Fontana.
- Berg, M. (2005). *Luxury and pleasure in eighteenth-century Britain*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Blondé, B., E. Briot, N. Coquery and L. Van Aert, eds. (2005). *Retailers and*

consumer changes in Early Modern Europe. England, France, Italy and the Low Countries. Tours, Presses Universitaires François Rabelais.

- Blondé, B. and I. Van Damme (2006). “Consumer and retail ‘revolutions’: perspectives from a declining urban economy. Antwerp in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.” Paper presented to the XIV International Economic History Congress, Helsinki, 21-25 Aug.
- Brewer, J. and R. Porter, eds. (1993). *Consumption and the world of goods.* London, Routledge.
- Bulst, N. (1993). “Kleidung als sozialer Konfliktstoff. Probleme kleidungsgesetzlicher Normierung im sozialen Gefüge.” *Saeculum* 44(1): 32-46.
- Burnette, J. (1997). “An investigation of the female-male wage gap during the Industrial Revolution in Britain.” *Economic history review* 2nd ser.(50): 257-281.
- Clark, P. and P. Slack (1976). *English towns in transition 1500-1700.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Coleman, D. C. (1977). *The economy of England 1450-1750.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Dasgupta, P. (1993). *An inquiry into well-being and destitution.* Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Davids, C. A. (1996). “Neringen, hallen en gilden. Kapitalisten, kleine ondernemers en stedelijke overheid in de tijd van de Republiek.” In *Kapitaal, ondernemerschap en beleid.* Eds. K. Davids, W. Fritschy, and L. A. van der Valk. Amsterdam, NEHA: 95-121.
- Davids, C. A. (2003). “Guilds, guildsmen and technological innovation in early modern Europe: the case of the Dutch Republic.” *Economy and Society of the*

Low Countries working papers 2003-2.

- De Vries, J. (1992). "Between purchasing power and the world of goods: understanding the household economy in early modern Europe." In *Consumption and the world of goods*. Eds. J. Brewer and R. Porter. London, Routledge: 85-132.
- De Vries, J. (1994). "The industrial revolution and the industrious revolution." *Journal of economic history* 54: 249-271.
- De Vries, J. (2003). "The industrious revolution and economic growth, 1650-1830." In *The economic future in historical perspective*. Eds. P. A. David and M. Thomas. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 43-71.
- De Vries, J. (2008). *The industrious revolution: consumer behavior and the household economy, 1650 to the present*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- De Vries, J. and A. Van der Woude (1997). *The first modern economy: success, failure, and perseverance of the Dutch economy, 1500-1815*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Dennison, T. K. and S. Ogilvie (2007). "Serfdom and social capital in Bohemia and Russia." *Economic history review* 60(3): 513-544.
- Dürr, R. (1995). *Mägde in der Stadt. Das Beispiel Schwäbisch Hall in der Frühen Neuzeit*. Frankfurt / New York, Campus.
- Fairchilds, C. (1993). "Consumption in early modern Europe: a review article." *Comparative studies in society and history* 35(4): 850-858.
- Freudenberger, H. (1963). "Fashion, sumptuary laws, and business." *Business history review* 37(1/2): 37-48.
- Frey, D. A. (1999). "Industrious households: wealth management and 'Handwerker' strategies in Göppingen, 1735-1865." (Ph.D. dissertation, University of

- Syracuse).
- Hartinger, W. (1975). "Bayerisches Dienstbotenleben auf dem Land vom 16. bis 18. Jahrhundert." *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte* 38: 598-637.
- Hooper, W. (1915). "The Tudor sumptuary laws." *English historical review* 30(119): 433-449.
- Hunt, A. (1996). *Governance of the consuming passions: a history of sumptuary law*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Macmillan.
- Knodel, J. E. (1988). *Demographic behavior in the past: a study of fourteen German village populations in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Knudsen, J. B. (2002). *Justus Möser and the German Enlightenment*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kussmaul, A. (1981). *Servants in husbandry in early modern England*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Landwehr, A. (2000). *Policey im Alltag. Die Implementation frühneuzeitlicher Policeyordnungen in Leonberg*. Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann.
- Laurence, A. (1994). "How free were English women in the seventeenth century?" In *Women of the Golden Age: an international debate on women in seventeenth-century Holland, England, and Italy*. Eds. E. Kloek, N. Teeuwen and M. Huisman. Hilversum, Verloren: 127-135.
- Maisch, A. (1992). *Notdürftiger Unterhalt und gehörige Schranken: Lebensbedingungen und Lebensstile in württembergischen Dörfern der frühen Neuzeit*. Stuttgart, G. Fischer.
- Maynes, M. J. (2004). "Gender, labor, and globalization in historical perspective: European spinsters in the international textile industry, 1750-1900." *Journal of*

women's history 15(4): 47-66.

- McCants, A. E. C. (2006). "After-death inventories as a source for the study of material culture, economic well-being, and household formation among the poor of eighteenth-century Amsterdam." *Historical methods* 39(1): 10-23.
- McKendrick, N. (1974). "Home demand and economic growth: a new view of women and children in the industrial revolution." In *Historical perspectives: studies in English thought and society*. Eds. N. McKendrick. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 152-210.
- McKendrick, N. (1982). "The consumer revolution in eighteenth-century England." In *The birth of a consumer society: the commercialisation of eighteenth century England*. Eds. N. McKendrick, J. Brewer and R. Porter. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press: 9-33.
- Medick, H. (1984). "Village spinning bees, sexual culture and free time among rural youth in early modern Germany." In *Interest and emotion: essays on the study of family and kinship*. Eds. H. Medick and D. W. Sabean. Cambridge / Paris, Cambridge University Press.
- Medick, H. (1991). "Biedermänner und Biederfrauen im alten Laichingen. Lebensweisen in einem schwäbischen Ort an der Schwelle zur Moderne." *Journal Geschichte* 13: 46-61.
- Medick, H. (1996). *Weben und Überleben in Laichingen 1650-1900*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Moyer, J. B. (1996). "Sumptuary law in Ancien Régime France, 1229–1806." (Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University).
- Noordegraaf, L. and J. L. Van Zanden (1995). "Early modern economic growth and the standard of living: did labour benefit from Holland's Golden Age?" In *A*

- miracle mirrored: the Dutch Republic in European perspective*. Eds. K. Davids and J. Lucassen. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 410-435.
- Ogilvie, S. (1986). "Coming of age in a corporate society: capitalism, pietism and family authority in rural Württemberg, 1590-1740." *Continuity and change* 1: 279-331.
- Ogilvie, S. (1990). "Women and proto-industrialisation in a corporate society: Württemberg textile manufacture, 1590-1790." In *Women's work, family income and the structure of the family in historical perspective*. Eds. W. R. Lee and P. Hudson. Manchester, Manchester University Press: 76-103.
- Ogilvie, S. (1996). "Social institutions and proto-industrialization." In *European proto-industrialization*. Eds. S. Ogilvie and M. Cerman. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 23-37.
- Ogilvie, S. (1997). *State corporatism and proto-industry: the Württemberg Black Forest, 1580-1797*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ogilvie, S. (1999). "The German state: a non-Prussian view." In *Rethinking Leviathan: the eighteenth-century state in Britain and Germany*. Eds. E. Hellmuth and J. Brewer. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 167-202.
- Ogilvie, S. (2003). *A bitter living: women, markets, and social capital in early modern Germany*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Ogilvie, S. (2004a). "Guilds, efficiency and social capital: evidence from German proto-industry." *Economic history review* 57: 286-333.
- Ogilvie, S. (2004b). "How does social capital affect women? Guilds and communities in early modern Germany." *American historical review* 109(2): 325-359.
- Ogilvie, S. (2004c). "Women and labour markets in early modern Germany." *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 2004:2: 25-60.

- Ogilvie, S. (2005). "The use and abuse of trust: the deployment of social capital by early modern guilds." *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 2005:1: 15-52.
- Ogilvie, S. (2006). " 'So that every subject knows how to behave': social disciplining in early modern Bohemia." *Comparative studies in society and history* 48(1): 38-78.
- Ogilvie, S. (2007a). " 'Whatever is, is right'? Economic institutions in pre-industrial Europe." *Economic history review* 60(4): 649-684.
- Ogilvie, S. (2007b). "Can we rehabilitate the guilds? A sceptical re-appraisal." *Cambridge working papers in economics* 0745.
- Ogilvie, S. (2008a). "Rehabilitating the guilds: a reply." *Economic history review* 61(1): 175-182.
- Ogilvie, S. (2008b). "Verheiratete Frauen und Märkte im Württemberg der Frühen Neuzeit." In *Frauen und Geld. Wider die ökonomische Unsichtbarkeit von Frauen*. Eds. R. J. Regnath and C. Rudolph. Königstein, Ulrike Helmer Verlag: 43-86.
- Ogilvie, S., M. Kúpker and J. Maegraith (2009 forthcoming). "Women and the material culture of food in early modern Germany." *Early modern women: an interdisciplinary journal* 4.
- Overton, M., J. Whittle, et al. (2004). *Production and consumption in English households, 1600-1750*. London, Routledge.
- Penn, S. A. C. (1987). "Female wage earners in late fourteenth-century England." *Agricultural history review* 35: 1-14.
- Pinchera, V. (2006). "Art consumption in early modern Florence". Paper presented to the XIV International Economic History Congress, Helsinki, 21-25 Aug.
- Pomeranz, K. (2000). *The great divergence: Europe, China, and the making of the*

- modern world economy*. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.
- Popkin, B. (1996). "Der Kirchenkonvent in Württemberg." *Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte* 96: 98-118.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York, Simon & Schuster.
- Putnam, R. D., R. Leonardi, et al. (1993). *Making democracy work: civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.
- Ramos, F. (2004). "Patterns of textile consumption in pre-industrial Spain: Castile, 1750-1850. Consumption revolution without industrial revolution?" Paper presented to the Economic History Society Annual Conference, London, 2-4 Apr.
- Reyscher, A. L. (1828ff). *Vollständige, historisch und kritisch bearbeitete Sammlung der württembergische Gesetze*. Stuttgart.
- Ringrose, D. R. (1996). *Spain, Europe, and the "Spanish miracle", 1700-1900*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, M. (1979). "Sickles and scythes: women's work and men's work at harvest time." *History workshop* 7: 3-28.
- Roberts, M. (1981). "Wages and wage-earners in England, 1563-1725." (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Oxford).
- Robisheaux, T. (1989). *Rural society and the search for order in early modern Germany*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Roche, D. (2000). *A history of everyday things: the birth of consumption in France, 1600-1800*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Roper, L. (1989). *The holy household: women and morals in Reformation Augsburg*. Oxford, Clarendon.

- Ross, R. (2006). "Sumptuary laws in Europe, the Netherlands and the Dutch colonies." In *Contingent lives: social identity and material culture in the VOC world* Ed. Nigel Worden. Cape Town, University of Cape Town.: 382-391.
- Rublack, U. (1999). *The crimes of women in early modern Germany*. Oxford, Clarendon.
- Rye, W. B. (1865). *England as seen by foreigners in the days of Elizabeth and James I*. London, John Russell Smith.
- Sabean, D. W. (1990). *Property, production and family in Neckarhausen, 1700-1870*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Safley, T. M. (2005). *Children of the laboring poor: expectation and experience among the orphans of early modern Augsburg*. Leiden / Boston, Brill.
- Saito, O. (2005). "Pre-modern economic growth revisited: Japan and the West." *LSE Department of Economic History working paper 16/05*.
- Schama, S. (1987). *The embarrassment of riches. An interpretation of Dutch culture in the Golden Age*. London, Collins.
- Schmidt, A. (2007). "Survival strategies of widows and their families in early modern Holland, c. 1580–1750." *The history of the family* 12(4): 268-281.
- Sen, A. K. (1984). *Resources, values and development*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Soly, H. (2008). "The political economy of European craft guilds: power relations and economic strategies of merchants and master artisans in the medieval and early modern textile industries." *International review of social history* 53: 45-71.
- Styles, J. and A. Vickery, eds. (2006). *Gender, taste, and material culture in Britain and North America, 1700-1830*. New Haven, CT, Yale University Press.
- Troeltsch, W. (1897). *Die Calwer Zeughandlungskompagnie und ihre Arbeiter*.

- Studien zur Gewerbe- und Sozialgeschichte Altwürttembergs*. Jena, Gustav Fischer.
- Ulbrich, C. (1999). *Shulamit und Margarete: Macht, Geschlecht und Religion in einer ländlichen Gesellschaft des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Vienna / Cologne / Weimar, Böhlau.
- Van den Heuvel, D. (2007). *Women and entrepreneurship: female traders in the Northern Netherlands, c. 1580-1815*. Amsterdam, Amsterdam Aksant.
- Van Nederveen Meerkerk, E. (2006). *De draad in eigen handen. Vrouwen in loonarbeid in de Nederlandse textielnijverheid, 1581-1810*. Amsterdam, Vrije Universiteit.
- Vickery, A. (2006). "His and hers: gender, consumption and household accounting in eighteenth-century England." *Past and present* 192(supplement 1): 12-38.
- Vogel, J. and K. Friedl (1992). "Army data: body composition and physical capacity." in *Body composition and physical performance*. Eds. B. Marriott and J. Grumstrup-Scott. Washington, DC, Institute of Medicine: 89-103.
- Wallis, P. (2008). "Apprenticeship and training in premodern England." *Journal of economic history* 68: 832-861.
- Warde, P. (2002). "Law, the "commune", and the distribution of resources in early modern German state formation." *Continuity and change* 17: 1-28.
- Weisser, J. F. C. (1780). *Das Recht der Handwerker nach allgemeinen Grundsätzen und insbesondere nach dem herzoglichen Württembergischen Gesezen entworfen*. Stuttgart, Mezler.
- Woodward, D. M. (1995). *Men at work: labourers and building craftsmen in the towns of Northern England, 1450-1750*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.