



Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group

Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Louise Tilly

Source: *Social History*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (May, 1986), pp. 269-273

Published by: [Taylor & Francis, Ltd.](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4285527>

Accessed: 30/11/2010 06:54

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=taylorfrancis>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Taylor & Francis, Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Social History*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

and asserting this is not merely 'a restatement of an old case with all the moral signs reversed' (37). The case has had opposing moral signs from the outset. The potential conservatism of the petite bourgeoisie was not only glorified and then manipulated by the Old Right, it was also diagnosed and criticized by the Left. It is its potential for a conservative revolution which has often been overlooked – and precisely that is of great significance for developments in the twentieth century. It is true, perhaps, that there is more sympathy with the 'little man' in much that is written today, but this, I suspect, has more to do with recent changes of some moral signs and not with the previous historiographical or ideological debates. It goes, in any case, well beyond the limits of this review.

Admittedly, keeping away from the political has had gratifying results too, some of which are well reflected in this volume. The concept of a *Quartier*, of the neighbourhood, as an alternative social category, is fascinating indeed. It seems to be especially useful for investigating the contacts between the petite bourgeoisie and the working class. Suggestions in this vein made by Haupt, Nord, Crossick and Blackbourn are the highlights of the whole book. Equally interesting, though not quite as convincing, are Josef Ehmer's attempts at redefining the artisans' 'traditional family'. The argument here is partly semantic, but both his new evidence and its methodological implications are well worth following.

Finally, not having participated in the apparently stimulating round-tables mentioned in the acknowledgement, one can only regret that none of the controversies, which must have taken place there, is being reported in this book, and that the participants' close co-operation has not yielded any truly comparative study. The preparatory work has been well done. A great many interesting research routes have now opened, to be followed jointly or individually. Revisionism or not, there is much that can be explored, adding to our gradually and laboriously accumulated knowledge of the European petite bourgeoisie.

Shulamit Volkov
Tel-Aviv University

Marzio Barbagli, *Sotto lo Stesso Tetto: Mutamenti della famiglia in Italia dal XV al XX secolo* (1984), 5 + 557 (Il Mulino, Bologna, n.p.). (*Under the Same Roof: Changes in the Family in Italy from the Fifteenth to the Twentieth Century*.)

David I. Kertzer, *Family Life in Central Italy, 1880–1910: Sharecropping, Wage Labor and Coresidence* (1984), vii + 250 (Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, New Jersey, n.p.).

No longer can it be said (as both authors under review declare) that the history of Italian families is little known. Barbagli's study is an encyclopedic compendium of five centuries of family experience, combining his own original research on household structure and familial relations in central Italy with a meticulous review of that of others. Kertzer is less wide ranging; his case-study of Bertalia, a rural agricultural parish of Bologna in the late nineteenth/early twentieth century focuses primarily on co-residence. Neither author is a professional historian (Barbagli is a sociologist; Kertzer, an anthropologist); both are at ease with the past and have assembled unique primary sources for analysis.

Intellectually, the two studies contribute to some familiar debates. The first concerns the conditions under which extended and nuclear family households were more or less common. In the context of this debate, their work represents a step forward, for their

questions are more sophisticated, and their evidence both richer and more complex than that offered in earlier studies. The second debate concerns attitudes and feelings within the family. Barbagli and Kertzer both oppose Edward Shorter's simplistic 'modernization' of emotion version and stick closely to the evidence of behaviour. Within this intellectual context lies the value of the books (documenting the Italian case in comparative terms) and the reader's sense of *déjà vu*.

Not that the Italian case is one of a kind with the rest of Western Europe. Historically, Italy contained both a much higher proportion of complex households – usually taking the form of multiple simple families living together – over time, and much greater internal variation among regions. Kertzer and Barbagli differ fundamentally on 'the reason why'. Kertzer emphasizes the importance of differential access to the means of production, and the contrast among agricultural systems. He finds a good deal of continuity in household behaviour across the forty-year period he examines. Barbagli's secular sweep identifies much more change, and also argues that economic factors are less important than enduring rural–urban differences. He also presents a case for the diffusion of new family behaviours from upper to lower classes.

Let us look in more detail at these studies. Kertzer opens with an overview of Italian nineteenth-century economic and social organization, moving quickly to his region (Emilia) and his central concern, sharecropping (*mezzadria*) and co-residence. His account of the *mezzadria* system of agricultural production is based on nineteenth-century observations and government reports, the *anagrafe* (population register) and the census. The chief contrast in Bertalia is between the households of *mezzadri* (frequently multiple) and *braccianti* (wage labourers, whose households consist much more commonly of simple conjugal families). The *braccianti* proportion (22 per cent) of multiple family households, although less than half as high as that of *mezzadri*, is nevertheless high in comparison to other areas of western Europe. The *mezzadria* system was built around the household unit of production. Farm owners contracted with a family of given composition and resources (workers, livestock, tools). After a comparison with other studies (and noting that simple conjugal family households have been the common form in southern Italy, where the *latifundia*/agrotown production system is dominant), Kertzer proceeds to ring the changes on his demographic variables.

Many of his findings counter sociological truisms, offering yet another proof of their ahistorical assumptions. For example, he finds that there was considerable geographical mobility well before the quickening of the processes of urbanization and industrialization. The proportion of complex families in Bertalia underwent practically no change over his period, despite in-migration and the arrival of large-scale manufacturing (most of it, however, not modern industry). Here Kertzer argues for continuity of the custom of patrilocal post-marital residence under changed circumstances. If he had analysed a longer period, he could ask the question how long this custom, or strategy, continued; it may have lasted simply for a transitional generation.

Recognizing the shortcomings of earlier studies, Kertzer painstakingly builds a base for temporal analysis of co-residence. He finds relative stability of household residence but individual flux. The norms of co-residence were not always followed in practice, he believes, because of personal differences between fathers and their married sons, or between married brothers. Here I would note that personal incompatibility among adult women could also result in dissolution of multiple households. Kitchens hold a potential for dispute equal to that of fields and barns. Kertzer concludes his study with a discussion of anthropological use of post-marital residence rules. His historical-demographic

findings show that households, although multiple in form, were considerably smaller than the rules, which some have accepted as descriptions of reality, would suggest. He rejects both crude economic determinism and the cultural counter-argument to insist on economically based but interrelational causation and an understanding of urbanization that emphasizes its differentiated effect by age and sex, but ramifications for the entire household.

Barbagli opens with a demonstration of the long trend towards simple, conjugal family households over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He goes on to engage those who argue that the cause of Italy's characteristically high proportion of multiple family households is due to the importance of *mezzadria*. In response, he points to the north, where there was no *mezzadria* but multiple households were common. He argues that the difference lies not between propertied and proletarian classes but between propertied and stable land-controlling families, and proletarians. Although he agrees with Kertzer that *braccianti* behaviour continued to echo land-controlling peasant ways, he takes issue with him on urbanization. Barbagli writes that Bertalia was a rural commune throughout the period examined by Kertzer; hence, he concludes, urbanization is not relevant to its experience. Here, however, Barbagli is confounding urban (referring to population size of a settlement) and urbanization (a process of increasing concentration of population in urban settlements). Kertzer's argument is about the process, and it is not a refutation of one of Barbagli's points – that urban-rural differences are equally important as or more important than changes in access to means of production. The problem is the relative weight of these factors, but neither author has devised a means of systematically testing this question.

Barbagli does demonstrate important rural-urban differences; even in old régime cities, households were more likely to be nuclear at a time (sixteenth to eighteenth century) when there was a very high proportion of multiple family households in the agricultural countryside. Within cities, at the same time, there were great differences according to socio-economic status. The rich lived in more complex households. Barbagli compares the Herlihy/Klapisch findings on Florence and its *contado* to his own study of Sienna, Verona and Parma. Household patterns within these cities were similar in this period. In all of them, high adult mortality meant a relatively high proportion of truncated families. Barbagli notes also class-differentiated migration patterns; immigration was mostly a high status phenomenon (except for servants – surely not so insignificant in number as his argument implies). Changing inheritance systems are critical variables in the long-term decline in the complexity and size of wealthy households, according to Barbagli. In the early sixteenth century and before, there was a divisible patrilineal system, leading to brothers living together with most commonly only one married, in order to postpone as long as possible division of the patrimony. Later systems led to a greater tendency to simple conjugal family households. Barbagli concludes that two causes (the decline of catastrophic mortality and changing values about privacy, childrearing and domestic service) worked gradually to reduce urban household complexity from the eighteenth century onwards. However, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Italian urban concentration decreased somewhat and northern and central rural family complexity increased. Hence these centuries encompassed the highest proportion of multiple households in Barbagli's period.

His review of household structure completed, Barbagli turns to family relations, which he considers more interesting and more challenging to discover. The nature of the changes in this arena are not at issue, he insists. They include liberation of family life

from the control of community and kin; the free choice of spouse based on love; reduced asymmetry between men and women and more readily expressed affection; more affectionate parent and child relations. He rejects both Shorter's monocausal explanation and his argument that most of these changes occurred first in the lower classes. For evidence, Barbagli turns to the upper classes, and a study of forms of interpersonal address over the centuries. During the nineteenth century, the Italian upper classes adopted new family behaviours that were similar to more general European patterns, behaviours which seem to reflect respect for individual rights rather than insistence on authority.

In a comparison with the lower classes, Barbagli first examines descriptive accounts of rural customs from the early to mid-nineteenth century. The *charivari* and the *veillée* have their Italian equivalents. Wives' deference is demonstrated by their custom of eating separately in rural households; wives of sons in multiple households owed deference (and service) not only to husbands but also to mothers-in-law. Accounts of the division of labour on farms show that women were most burdened. Their husbands never helped them with their tasks; only *sometimes* did their female kin help. In the period 1880–1940, there were no changes in family structure (rural households continued to be multiple in form; urban households, more simple in structure); internally, however, relations changed. The source here is oral interviews. Barbagli again stresses forms of address; the intimate *tu* spread through all classes. Community and kin eschewed intervention in family life; within couples, asymmetry declined. The process is a top-down one, he concludes. It represents, he argues, a translation into family terms of the political ideology of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. However, for new behaviours to diffuse to lower-class families, 'it was necessary that social relations change outside the walls of the home ... in the world of production'. Here he argues that worker families continued to behave according to a patriarchal mode because 'parents tended to prepare their children for a position similar to their own, hence to socialize them to autonomy or subordination according to their own workplace relations'. Thus is explained why *mezzadri* households were patriarchal the longest: their work contract was rigidly hierarchical and embodied strictly defined inequality for 'all those who lived under the same roof'.

His closing words thus provide the book's title. However, Barbagli's evidence is not adequate to make a global argument of top-down diffusion. The *mezzadri* case may fit neatly, but urban wage-earners are barely examined. Their work situation did not directly involve their families, and working-class men and women had much more individual relationships with their employers. Their families in turn had less control over their choices. Young male and female workers did not live separately from their families, but they were permitted more choice of marriage partner, for example, than peasants. Could this not be an independent development rather than diffusion? Barbagli's case remains to be proven.

Moreover, the form of his argument, in terms of transformation of values presumably *within* groups, does not pay enough attention to compositional change. New classes – urban professional and business classes, and urban industrial workers – appeared with the growth and spread of industrial capitalism. The first persons who filled the new jobs experienced change from positions (merchants, professionals, artisans, urban underclass, rural proletarians, peasants) in the older productive systems. They then reproduced themselves and their style of living. This is not so much a change of values as the development of new groups with new values which involves one transitional generation

and then self-reproduction. The urban-industrial born grew up with urban-industrial values. Barbagli's nuanced and complex account suffers from lack of conceptualization or evidence about this process. It must be explained to understand the changes he observes.

We owe Kertzer and Barbagli thanks for their interesting and thorough documentation of Italian uniqueness in the arena of family household behaviour. When it comes to explanation, Kertzer is the stronger, for he has looked more closely at the interplay between demographic processes and economic and spatial change. Barbagli has been more venturesome; his effort to explore changes in the content of family relationships is stimulating if not totally persuasive.

Louise Tilly

New School For Social Research, New York

Rose L. Glickman, *Russian Factory Women: Workplace and Society, 1880-1914* (1984), xiii + 325 (University of California Press, £26.20).

The last few years have seen the appearance of a series of monographs on Russian workers in the revolutionary period. These are part of the impressive development in the social history of pre-revolutionary and revolutionary Russia in the past two decades that has moved the historiography beyond the long-dominant *idées reçues* of Menshevik and liberal émigré writings and allowed it to begin to come to grips with the complex social reality. While these studies have tended to support the traditional Bolshevik and Soviet views of the workers as a conscious and leading social element in the revolutionary movement, they have also stressed the internal stratification of the working class along socio-economic and also political lines. Rose Glickman's study is the first monograph, in the West or in the Soviet Union, devoted to one of these groups, the women workers, who in 1914 accounted for almost one third of the industrial workforce.

This belated interest in women workers is not only a reflection of the general neglect, until recently, of women's history. Women workers, like unskilled workers generally (and women were almost universally segregated into unskilled occupations) tended not to be at the forefront of the labour movement. As a result, these 'backward' workers, as labour activists were wont to call them, have not attracted particular interest from historians. But there are also practical problems: the historical record left by the unskilled workers, and even more by women workers, is quite thin, and one is often forced to judge about their subjective experience from the words of their more prominent and literate skilled colleagues, or those of outside observers.

The volume begins with an overview of the workers' situation in Russia. Though this contains little that is new, the general reader will find it a useful introduction to the main theme. A second introductory chapter shows the process by which part of the peasant women found themselves in the mills. Women tended to remain on the land longer than men but once having left they broke more decisively with it, at least in economic terms (though the data presented here are partial).

Direct data on the subjective world of peasant women, as the author acknowledges, are rare. The author concludes that the principal legacy they brought with them to the mills was the expectation of exhausting labour and the subordination to male authority. (One wonders if the legacy brought by male peasants was very different in this respect, except that women suffered a double subordination.) This chapter also contains a rather