Sara Ala-Hynnilä

The Power of Emotions

Sibling Relations in England in the Long 17th Century

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND
SOCIAL SCIENCES

Sara Ala-Hynnilä

The Power of Emotions

Sibling Relations in England
in the Long 17th Century

Esitetään Jyväskylän yliopiston humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellisen tiedekunnan suostumuksella
julkisesti tarkastettavaksi yliopiston vanhassa juhlasalissa S212
tammikuun 26. päivänä 2024 kello 12.

Academic dissertation to be publicly discussed, by permission of
the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of the University of Jyväskylä,
in building Seminarium, Old Festival Hall S212, on January 26, 2024, at 12 o'clock.

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO
UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

JYVÄSKYLÄ 2024

ABSTRACT

Sibling relationships were crucial in the lives of many early modern English men and women. In this dissertation, I examine how English siblings expressed emotions to each other in the long 17th century and how emotional expressions contributed to upholding or challenging power relations and gaining agency in sibling relations. I also take note of the ways in which siblings could attempt to influence the emotions that their brothers or sisters expressed. The nine main sets of primary sources consist of egodocuments, including diaries, letters and autobiographies, but I connect the analysis to the wider contemporary normative context as well. These primary sources provide in-depth descriptions of sibling relations and direct and indirect emotional expressions, which connect to power and its uses.

While some research has been done on early modern English siblings, this study's focus on emotional expressions and their connections to power relations brings forth new perspectives into the histories of families and emotions. Hierarchical structures and social expectations influenced siblings' abilities to convey feelings and to gain agency. Nevertheless, this dissertation shows that emotional expressions gave chances for all siblings to try to have some power, even if there was considerable variation in how this was achieved and what contexts limited individual behaviour. To a degree, age influenced how siblings expressed emotions and used power, for example due to the influence that age could have on duties and primogeniture. However, situations differed among siblings, and a brother could be in a less fortunate position than his sister. While the context of patriarchy influenced the lives of sisters, they too had opportunities to convey feelings and to gain agency. Many ways of expressing emotions were used regardless of age and gender. Among other things, acting as a victim in order to create a contrast between the offender and the offended was one possible way for all siblings to express anger, although some variation existed concerning the topics involved.

Keywords: history of emotions, family, early modern, England, siblings, agency, power, duty, 17th century

TIIVISTELMÄ (ABSTRACT IN FINNISH)

Sisarusten suhteet olivat hyvin tärkeitä monelle varhaismodernissa Englannissa eläneelle miehelle ja naiselle. Tässä väitöskirjassa tarkastellaan, kuinka englantilaiset sisarukset ilmaisivat tunteita toisilleen ja miten ne ottivat osaa valtasuhteiden ylläpitämiseen tai niiden haastamiseen sekä toimijuuden saamiseen pitkällä 1600-luvulla. Tämän lisäksi tutkimuksessa otetaan huomioon ne keinot, joilla sisarukset saattoivat vaikuttaa veljiensä tai siskojensa tapoihin ilmaista tunteita. Väitöskirjan yhdeksän pääasiallista alkuperäislähdettä sisältää egodokumentteja, mukaan lukien päiväkirjoja, kirjeitä ja omaelämäkertoja, mutta analyysi yhdistetään myös normatiiviseen kontekstiin. Näissä yhdeksässä päälähteessä on seikkaperäisiä kuvauksia sisarusten suhteista sekä heidän suorista ja epäsuorista tunneilmaisuistaan, jotka liittyvät vallan teemaan.

Vaikka varhaismodernin Englannin sisaruksista on jo tutkittu, tuo tunneilmaisujen ja valtasuhteiden tutkiminen uusia perspektiivejä perhe ja tunnehistoriaan. Hierarkkiset rakenteet ja sosiaaliset odotukset vaikuttivat sisarusten kykyyn ilmaista tunteitaan ja olla kontrollissa. Tämä väitöskirja osoittaa, että tunneilmaisut antoivat mahdollisuuksia kaikille sisaruksille saada valtaa, joskin se, miten tämä saavutettiin ja mikä konteksti rajoitti heidän käytöstään, vaihteli. Ikä vaikutti jossain määrin siihen, kuinka sisarukset ilmaisivat tunteitaan ja käyttivät valtaa esimerkiksi esikoisoikeuden vuoksi tai iän vaikutuksesta velvollisuuksiin. Toisaalta sisarusten tilanteet vaihtelivat ja esimerkiksi veljellä saattoi olla huonompi tilanne kuin hänen siskollaan. Vaikka yhteiskunnan patriarkaalisuus vaikutti naisten elämään, oli heillä myös tilaisuuksia ilmaista tunteitaan saadakseen toimijuutta. Ikä ja sukupuoli eivät kuitenkaan aina olleet merkittäviä vaikuttavia seikkoja siihen, mitä tapoja tunteiden ilmaisuun valittiin. Esimerkiksi itsensä kuvaaminen uhrina ja loukattuna osapuolena oli keino kaikille sisaruksille ilmaista vihaa, joskin myös tässä oli vaihtelua eri ikäisten sisarusten välillä koskien suuttumisen aihetta.

Avainsanat: tunnehistoria, sisarukset, perhe, varhaismoderni, Englanti, valta, velvollisuus, 1600-luku, toimijuus

Author   Sara Ala-Hynnilä
                    Department of History and Ethnology
                    University of Jyväskylä
                    sara.s.ala-hynnila@jyu.fi
                    https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4659-8453

Supervisors   Professor Pertti Ahonen
                    Department of History and Ethnology
                    University of Jyväskylä

                    Senior Researcher Heli Valtonen, Docent
                    Department of History and Ethnology
                    University of Jyväskylä

                    Senior Researcher Susanna Niiranen, Docent
                    Department of History and Ethnology
                    University of Jyväskylä

Reviewers   Professor Katie Barclay
                    School of Humanities
                    University of Adelaide

                    Senior Lecturer Anu Korhonen, Docent
                    Department of Cultures
                    University of Helsinki

Opponent   Professor Katie Barclay
                    School of Humanities
                    University of Adelaide

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Besides those in the academic sphere, I would also like to extend my deepest gratitude to my family. My mother Pirjo and father Raimo in addition to my sister Tiina and brother Teemu and their families have always supported me and been there for me during the process of writing the dissertation. My friends from outside academia, including Viivi, Emmi, Kristiina and others, have also been a source of crucially important support. Thank you for all the discussions and fun times we have had. For my family and friends: thank you for all the love you have given me during these five years and beyond. I would like to add in a true

Finnish fashion that even though I do not say it to your face, I love you all very much.

Jyväskylä 29.11.2023
Sara Ala-Hynnilä

TABLES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1   INTRODUCTION

1.1   Siblings and emotional expressions

Constance Fowler, a gentlewoman from Staffordshire, had a close relationship with her second-oldest brother, Herbert Aston, who at the time lived in Madrid.[1] The letters Fowler wrote to Aston contained emotionally charged language from a sister who dearly loved her brother. The letter and its themes demonstrate many of the matters that are highlighted and analysed in this dissertation. For instance, Fowler wrote a letter in 1636 to Aston in which she not only expressed her own emotions, but talked about his affection as well. She commented that he had assured her in his own letter that his love for her was constant, which she noted was "…rich a treasure..."[2]

In her response, Fowler combined the themes of reciprocity and control. In this way, her style of writing helped her in her attempt to exercise agency over his expressions of affection. Fowler stated that reciprocating Aston's love was difficult and noted that all she could do was express gratitude and do what she could to prevent his affection from being stolen. Fowler noted that she would "… keepe it saefe for you…"[3] but would gladly give it up if he found a wife worthy of his love. However, she still attempted to influence him in this regard through the way she used language and her promise of a future action. Regarding the prospect of a future wife, Fowler told Aston, "For first, her owne hart must needes bee unighted to yours, or elce it werr not worthy of it; and then mine, which has bin the keeper of yours, I feare will not bee perswaded to part from it..."[4] Fowler did all she could to move her dear brother to marry her friend

---

[1] Capp 2018, 62; Clifford 1815, 85.
[2] Constance Fowler to Herbert Aston August 11, 1636, Tixall Letters 1815, 87.
[3] Ibid., 88.
[4] Ibid.

Katherine Thimelby, whom she loved,[5] thus attempting to exert control over both their lives.

Through Fowler's letter, it is possible to see both direct and indirect emotional expression, connections between the language used by siblings and power relations, and the ways in which reciprocity could influence sibling relationships. The letter also highlights the key focus of this study, which is that all siblings had ways to exert some influence over their brothers and sisters. This dissertation, in other words, examines how siblings expressed emotions, and how these expressions were connected to the power relations between them. More specifically, it answers the following questions:

1. What kinds of relationships did 17th-century siblings have, and what emotions did they express to each other?
2. How did siblings express their emotions in autobiographies, diaries, and letters?
3. How did societal categories, such as power and duty, connect to these emotional expressions?
4. How did men and women try to influence the emotions their siblings expressed?

The first question delves into the types of relationships siblings had and takes note of what feelings they tried to convey to each other. This is crucial to be able to understand the power relations among them. The second question concerning how siblings conveyed their feelings delves beyond the surface level of these emotional expressions. The third question explores how power relations are connected to emotional expressions in sibling relationships. It highlights the ways in which the feelings conveyed by brothers and sisters were opportunities to challenge, gain, or uphold power, agency and control, while also examining the structures that could limit these actions. The fourth question, in turn, focuses on an additional dimension of emotional expression among siblings: attempts by one sibling to influence how his or her brothers and sisters expressed their emotions. Together, all of these questions help us to understand the role of emotional expressions in granting or upholding power, in addition to highlighting how established duties came into play in these processes.

Documents such as Constance Fowler's letters provide access to the expressions of emotions by people who passed away hundreds of years ago. This dissertation focuses on examining egodocuments,[6] sources that in some way describe the lives of their authors, such as diaries, letters, and autobiographies, mainly from the 17th century but also from parts of the early 18th century – more precisely from the period 1607–1710, with one passage from 1724.[7] The chief

---

[5] For example, see Constance Fowler to Herbert Aston, Tixall Letters 1815, 108–109, 113, 117, 119.

[6] Mortimer 2002, 191.

[7] In particular Elizabeth Freke's and William Stout's autobiographies are from the end of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th centuries. In Stout's case, while most of the material is from the end of the 17th and the very beginning of the 18th centuries, his sister's death occurred in 1724. (Stout 1851, 21–22, 32, 48, 65, 81, 105; Freke 2001, 266.) The earliest year's correspondence concerns James and his brother Richard Oxinden, who was the father of the Oxinden brothers. The Oxinden brothers are examined in more detail later on in this dissertation. (James Oxinden to Richard Oxinden May 11, 1607, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 6; Gardiner 1933a, 1.)

primary sources include the autobiographies of Alice Thornton, Elizabeth Freke, William Stout, and Henry Newcome; the diaries of Samuel Pepys and John Evelyn; and collections of letters from the Oxinden brothers, Dorothy Osborne, and those sent by Thomas Meautys. While some of these sources have already been examined extensively, this dissertation aims to study them from a perspective that has not yet received much attention by attending to the emotions expressed by siblings and how power relations were connected to these expressions. I also rely on normative literature by authors such as Richard Allestree to provide context. The combination of self-written texts, normative literature, and previous research written about the long 17th century in England has allowed me to build a comprehensive picture of emotional expressions among siblings and how they emerged within this broader context.

Traces of emotional connections between siblings can be found in documents written by gentry and middling sort English people in the long 17th century. Sources that could cast light on the sibling relationships of ordinary people are, however, rather fragmentary[8] and not suitable for this dissertation. This limited the focus to only a segment of the English population. Furthermore, as the theme of the dissertation required sources in which emotions were expressed mainly between siblings, this limited the scope of relevant primary materials further. Even though it is not possible to make broad generalisations based on this source base, the primary sources that do exist still provided the means by which an in-depth analysis of how siblings conveyed various emotions in their texts could be conducted.

This study focuses on the language siblings used in their texts rather than on what they felt, as accessing those emotions is not possible. Accordingly, the emphasis is on actions as emotional expressions, in which case language is the medium through which the action is described, and on how conveying feelings linguistically gives meaning to other actions. The concept of emotional practices was therefore crucial for the analysis and will be introduced in depth later in this chapter.

Emotional expressions found in primary sources can be very subjective, as different people might have expressed similar inner feelings in different ways. As I examined how English men and women represented themselves and their emotions, I found that the recipient of the emotional expression was not necessarily the sibling but could also have been, for example, the reader of an autobiography. Indeed, the genre of the primary source was a crucial influencing factor in determining how the siblings were expressing themselves. For this reason, my focus was not just on uncovering the emotional expressions conveyed directly between siblings, but also in some cases on the feelings about their siblings conveyed to other audiences. Furthermore, the act of expressing emotions could have multiple objectives, all of which did not necessarily involve feeling and subsequently conveying emotion.[9] The emotions were expressed within complex individual contexts that differed from person to person and were

---

[8] Capp 2018, 6.
[9] Frevert 2011, 7.

based on variable factors, such as family background and birth order, for example. These contexts also affected who could use power and for what reasons and how duty influenced actions. Furthermore, it was also essential to remember that relationships are not immutable, but can change in response to certain situations.[10]

The religious and political turmoil in England during this period provides a fascinating historical background for understanding the lives of these siblings. This particular century saw, for example, rule by both king and parliament, growing faith in science, and dissident voices being suppressed and tolerated.[11] All of these factors provided a compelling backdrop for the normative and societal influences that impacted the expressions of emotions among siblings.

To understand sibling relations, considering how contemporaries understood them is crucial. However, defining sibling relationships can be somewhat complicated. Contemporaries at this time also acknowledged this. Siblings could include, for example, children with at least one parent in common, but also stepsiblings who were connected through their parents' remarriage. Furthermore, illegitimate children were usually not seen by legitimate sons and daughters as siblings, but the brothers and sisters of a spouse were seen as siblings.[12] In this dissertation, I will examine siblings who were related by blood. The focus on siblings highlights an important relationship to many people, which had the potential to be one of the longest relationships early modern English people could have,[13] giving rise to a great variety of emotionally meaningful connections related to expressions of different feelings like affection, anger, and sadness.

Siblings could be significant to each other in many ways. Emotional connections and loving sibling relationships are, of course, a strong binding force. Research into single women accentuates the importance of female kin and sibling relationships, as well as single women's contributions to helping nuclear families thrive and survive. Indeed, the most important relationships for women who never married were with the women in their families, such as mothers, nieces, and sisters.[14] Furthermore, as unmarried people did not have in-laws, their other kin, such as siblings or aunts, assumed added importance in their support network instead.[15] As children often grew up with a number of siblings, there were many chances that their brothers or sisters could have some influence on them. At the same time, high mortality rates could also enhance the significance of sibling relationships, as in some cases, a brother or sister might have to take the place of a parent. Siblings could also continue to be in each other's lives after childhood. In this sense, siblings engaged with a so-called imagined household that was as important to them as a physical one. In this version, they did not have to physically exist in the same space to count themselves as part of the same

---

[10] O'Day 2001, 129.
[11] Pederson 2014, 40.
[12] Crawford 2004/2014, 212, 214; Davidoff 2006, 19.
[13] For example, see Glover 2000, 31; Crawford 2004/2014, 209.
[14] Froide 2005, 7, 44.
[15] Geussens 2022, 155.

household. Accordingly, hierarchy, status, and authority were clarified and understood by channelling emotional relationships through either a concrete or an imagined household. While living under the same roof could build relationships, it was not a requirement. Sibling relationships, furthermore, helped each individual to build a sense of self, and others also defined the children of a family in terms of their relations to their siblings. Siblings had similarities, such as having the same background, but hierarchies based on gender, age, and birth order created a compelling context for research.[16]

1.2 Earlier research

This dissertation combines research into the history of emotions and family history by examining emotional expressions and their influence on sibling relationships. While the history of emotions has been studied extensively before, it began to gain more attention in the 1980s,[17] although Linda A. Pollock noted in 2004 that early modern European emotions had remained even at that time an understudied field. It has since gained even more attention from historians and grown into an established field, as is evident from the various monographs, conferences, and research centres dedicated to the topic. Research into emotions in history started with an analysis of emotional norms, mainly as they appeared in different conduct books, but later moved beyond this. Over the years, further investigations have helped expand what phenomena historians can study.[18]

Furthermore, the history of emotions has largely moved away from the earlier analyses conducted by the pioneers of the field. French historians of early social history and later of family history took note of feelings, and the Annales school has often been credited with launching the field. Lucien Febvre, for

[16] Crawford 2004/2014, 210–211; 223; Broomhall 2008, 17; Riswick & Engelen 2018, 521–522. See also Harris 2016, 19, 112, 114, 117.

[17] Matt & Stearns 2014, 3–4. For more on the research conducted over the years within the field of the history of emotions and discussions held within this stream, see Stearns 2014.

[18] Pollock 2004, 568; Plamper 2012/2015, 62–63; Gammerl 2014, 336–338; Dror, Hitzer, Laukötter & León-Sanz 2016, 2. Some modern research into the history of emotion has explained the field more generally. This includes *Doing Emotions History*, edited by Peter Stearns and Susan J. Matt. Besides offering a general introduction, this work examines where the field is and where it is going (Matt & Stearns 2014, 9), stressing the importance of not only focusing on certain kinds of emotions (McMahon 2014, 103). In contrast, Rob Boddice's book *The History of Emotions* provides an overview of what the study of emotions in history is about and how it is possible to examine the topic. The book contains relevant concepts, theories, and ways to approach the subject, but is also forward-looking by suggesting new approaches (For example, see Boddice 2018, 59–83, 88–92, 132–167, 205). These studies form a good baseline, which is also a goal Boddice established for the book (Boddice 2018, 3), in providing information on a variety of important subjects, including methods and theories. In another stream, the idea of the emotional communities is one of the four main concepts used to understand past feelings, according to Laura Kounine. The literature concerning these concepts of emotionology, emotional communities, emotional practices, and emotional regimes (Kounine 2017, 222) contains influential studies in the history of emotions. For example, in *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*, William Reddy discusses the concepts of emotives and emotional regimes (Reddy 2001, 96–110).

example, discussed the history of emotions in his 1941 essay. [19] However, historian Barbara Rosenwein saw him as following other researchers and also "…leading historians on the wrong path..." [20] Early related research was also conducted by Johan Huizinga, whose study *The Waning of Middle Ages: A Study of the Form of Life, Thought and Art in France and the Netherlands in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* was published in Dutch in 1919[21] and in English in 1924, and Norbert Elias, whose *Civilizing Process*, first published in German in 1939, was translated into English in 1978.[22] Both Elias and Huizinga have faced much criticism.[23]

Family history is connected to the history of emotions in many ways and has been investigated for a long time. In 1980, the economic historian Michael Anderson divided the study of the history of the family into three[24] approaches: demographic, economic, and sentiments. His text focused on examining research regarding the family conducted over the previous 500 years in the West. Will Coster explained in 2001/2017 that not all subscribed to the division into these three categories. Ralph A. Houlbrooke, for example, saw in 1984 that rather many different fields have had an influence on the history of the family. While Coster agreed that the simplification in Anderson's classification was a problem, he also noted that Anderson's manner of dividing the field into these categories was still remarkable and influential. [25] Anderson's sentiments approach has been highlighted in works by Philippe Ariès in 1960/1962, Edward Shorter in 1975, Lawrence Stone in 1977/1979, and Jean-Louis Flandrin in 1976/1979 [26], pioneering works of family history[27] that have also been subject to extensive criticism. [28] Studies within this approach have analysed, among other things,

---

[19] Lewis & Stearns 1998, 3; Rosenwein 2002, 821; Matt & Stearns 2014, 3.

[20] Rosenwein 2002, 823.

[21] The original Dutch text, titled *Herfsttij der Middeleeuwen,* was translated by Fritz Hopman, although the translation was not entirely faithful to the original (Chakravarti 2015, 96).

[22] The original German title was *Über den Prozess der Zivilisation*, and it was translated by Edmund Jephcott (Elias 1939/1978).

[23] Peter Arnade and Martha Howell, for example, argued that while Huizinga certainly did not lack talent when it came to writing and noted the fame the book gained, the study did not really explain what the period was like and provided a distorted picture of it. They also noted how the approach taken did not adhere to proper research protocols. (Arnade & Howell 2019, 11–13.) Many others, such as William Reddy in his 2000 article regarding 18th century France and sentimentalism, have criticized *The Civilizing Process* (Reddy 2000, 151). Criticism of Elias has also been discussed in Nicole Pepperell's 2016 article "The Unease with Civilization". Here, for example, she notes Elias's eurocentrism and his tendency to dismiss or explain way evidence in a way that worked in favour of his hypothesis (Pepperell 2016, 4–5, 9, 11–12).

[24] Anderson did also note that psychohistory was a fourth approach but criticized it as having big problems and thus did not pay much attention to it (Anderson 1980/1986, 15).

[25] Anderson 1980/1986, 39; Houlbrooke 1984, 4; Coster 2001/2017, 7.

[26] Anderson 1980/1986, 39. The four studies are Philippe Ariès's *Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life* (Original title L'enfant et la vie familiale sous l'ancien regime) 1960/1962; Jean-Louis Flandrin's *Families in Former Times: Kinship, Household and sexuality* (Original title *Familles: parenté, maison, sexualité dans l'ancienne société*, translated by Richard Southern) 1976/1979, Edward Shorter's *The Making of the Modern Family* 1975, and Lawrence Stone's *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* 1977/1979.

[27] Coster 2001/2017, 8.

[28] Seeing affection as a less important emotion than it may be today, was also a theme for Stone, Shorter, and Flandrin, although this perspective was criticized even in the 1970s.

family groups' emotional content, as well as assumptions and ideas about the family and the home, usually with qualitative materials.[29]

The start of the 21st century has witnessed rising interest in the history of emotions, which has increasingly been explored in the context of family history. However, the history of English siblings has not been widely examined, and several researchers have specifically noted a lack of studies of siblings and called for more work in this area.[30] While some books and articles have focused on siblings in early modern England,[31] more typically, this topic has received only a brief mention or a short section in studies of specific families or of the history of the family in general.[32]

Previous research on English siblings, however, has explored the kinds of relationships siblings had and taken note of the emotions expressed within them on a general level. Bernard Capp's 2018 book, *The Ties that Bind*,[33] contains a comprehensive introduction to early modern English siblings and provides excellent background information for this dissertation. In addition to occasionally taking note of the emotions that were expressed in various situations, Capp focuses on analysing the relationships between siblings who were gentry, the middling sort, and ordinary people. This approach affords valuable insight into the overall setting[34] around which this dissertation is based, but it still leaves plenty of room for more focused explorations into 17th-century sibling relationships. Other research on English siblings that contains examinations into emotions to some degree includes the works of Harris in 2016, McPherson in 2006, Mendelson and O'Connor in 2006, Crawford in 2004/2014, Perry in 2004, and Hemphill in 2011.[35] While this type of literature is crucial for this dissertation, my

---

Anderson also identified other problems with the research the four authors had conducted (Stone 1977/1979, 81–82, 309; Macfarlane 1979, 107; Anderson 1980/1986, 40–41, 43–44, 86). See also Coster 2001/2017, 9, Berry & Foyster 2007, 16 and Tague 2007, 187–189.

[29] Anderson 1980/1986, 40; Coster 2001/2017, 8.

[30] Coster 2001/2017, 9; Crawford 2004/2014, 231; Davidoff 2006, 17–18; Miller & Yavneh 2006, 1; Hemphill 2011, 225; Harris 2012, 1–4; Capp 2018, 3; Lang 2018, 104. See also Glover 2000, xii.

[31] Examples include Harris 2016 and Capp 2018.

[32] For instance, siblings are briefly mentioned in Jacqueline Eales's *Women in Early Modern England, 1500–1700*, which focuses on various aspects of English women's lives (Eales 1998, contents, vii). Other relevant works include Geoff Baker's *Reading and Politics in Early Modern England: The Mental World of a Seventeenth-century Catholic Gentleman* (for example, see Baker 2010, 1, 9, 37, 45) and Leonore Davidoff's chapter in the psychology work *Sibling Relationships* called "The Sibling Relationship and Sibling Incest in Historical Context", in which he, for example, notes how the words brother and sister can be defined (Davidoff 2006, 19). Lawrence Stone's *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500–1800* also refers to siblings briefly, although this work mainly discusses them in light of primogeniture (for example, see Stone 1979, 38, 87). Other related research focusing on 18th century England includes Naomi Tadmor's *Family and Friends in Eighteenth-Century England* and Ruth Perry's *Novel Relations: The Transformation of Kinship in English Literature and Culture, 1748–1818*.

[33] Capp's book, entitled *When Gossips Meet: Women, Family, and Neighbourhood in Early Modern England*, also mentions siblings (Capp 2003, 150).

[34] For example, see Capp 2018, 38–47.

[35] Amy Harris's book *Siblinghood and Social Relations in Georgian England: Share and Share Alike* examines 18th century English siblings in a way that is somewhat similar to Capp's but devotes more space to the examination emotions in two chapters, titled "Ties that Bound" and "Ties that Cut" (Harris 2016, 55–111). Kathryn R. McPherson's article "'My

analysis goes beyond the questions posed in these works and examines themes they do not cover, such as inaction and inability. The topics covered in Chapter 5 of this dissertation, which discusses siblings' attempts to influence each other's emotional expressions, have not been sufficiently considered in the history of English siblings.

Earlier research has also commented on themes closely connected to the research question posed in this dissertation, which asks how siblings expressed emotions. The history of emotions takes note of the use of language and its temporal dimensions. This highlights the importance of taking into account contemporary definitions and norms when trying to understand what historical people were attempting to convey with their emotional expressions.[36] Linda A. Pollock's 2004 article "Anger and the Negotiation of Relationships in Early Modern England" brings the history of the family point of view into the study of expressions of anger. In this sense, Pollock advocates for a focus on the analysis on lived experience and situated uses and notes chastisement, for example, as a way to express anger.[37] For this dissertation, it is crucial to remember that there were diverse contexts, thoughts, and experiences that influenced how language was used and, thus, how siblings expressed their emotions. This study builds on Pollock's work by analysing how emotional expressions were influenced by the context in which they were expressed, with a focus on siblings.

Some scholars have moved beyond these themes and reflected on ideas relevant to questions of power, while also discussing the specifics of emotional expressions. Research that is the most similar to the approach taken in this dissertation has focused on analysing how the language that describes emotions was used among siblings, in connection with hierarchical structures and the uses of power, in the early modern period. Some of these studies have explored the role of affection vis-à-vis hierarchies and power, while others have expanded the analysis to account for other feelings. While self-written texts, particularly letters, have served as key sources, documents related to inheritance have also been examined. Relevant studies in this vein include Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline

---

Deare Sister': Sainted Sisterhood in Early Modern England" explores grief (McPherson 2006, 186–187), while Sara Mendelson's and Mary O'Connor's article "'Thy Passionately Loving Sister and Faithfull Friend:' Anne Dormer's Letters to her Sister Lady Trumbull" briefly mentions the emotional context found in these letters (Mendelson & O'Connor 2006, 206–213). Patricia Crawford's book *Blood, Bodies and Families in Early Modern England* includes a chapter entitled "Sibling Relationships" (Crawford 2004/2014, 209–238), which similarly touches on emotions, albeit briefly (see, for example, Crawford 2004/2014, 225–227, 230). Ruth Perry's *Novel Relations: The Transformation of Kinship in English Literature and Culture, 1748–1818* also includes a section on the 17th century (Perry 2004, 158–167), in which she explores emotions, specifically love and affection, between 17th century siblings (Perry 2004, 158). Dallet Hemphill's book examines siblings in American history approximately between 1650 to 1850 (Hemphill 2011, 4) and includes a section called "Siblings in Old England", which contains an overview of sibling relations in England (Hemphill 2011, 15–19).

[36] The history of emotions has examined emotion words and how they were understood. These works include *Emotions in History: Lost and Found* and *Emotional Lexicons: Continuity and Change in the Vocabulary of Feeling 1700-2000* (Frevert 2011; Frevert, Scheer, Schmidt, Eitler, Hitzer, Verheyen, Gammerl, & Bailey 2014), as well as the article titled "Envy in Early Modern England" (Irish 2021).

[37] Pollock 2004, 567, 574, 590. See also Korhonen 2005.

Van Gent's 2009 article "Corresponding Affections: Emotional Exchange Among Siblings in the Nassau Family", Lisbeth Geussen's 2022 article "Striking a Balance: Sibling Emotionality and the Negotiation of Power in an Eighteenth-Century Noble Family of the Austrian Netherlands", Anu Lahtinen's 2021 study "Rakkaus 1500-luvun aatelisperheissä" (Love in 16th Century Noble Families), and Anu Korhonen's 2002 text "Constructing Emotion in a Culture of Hierarchies: a Love Story".[38] Besides analysing how affection was conveyed, Korhonen's article also explores the line between biologically based emotions and their expressions, together with the implications of this distinction for historical research[39]. Despite their thematic similarities with this study, Geussen's, Broomhall's, and Van Gent's articles do not address the 17th century or England, which again highlights the significance of context. The overall focus of this dissertation is thus different from previous studies that have investigated siblings, emotions, and power, with its unique combined focus on disagreements, attempts at helping and efforts at avoiding, changing and replacing emotional expressions. Furthermore, this dissertation is larger in scope than the previous most relevant studies, which have essentially consisted of articles and book chapters.

Generally, earlier research on the history of English siblings and their emotions has included overviews of certain periods as well as more narrow explorations of specific topics. This dissertation will deepen our understanding of the emotional connections between siblings by limiting the period of examination to one century, which will help to focus the analysis and take the wider context into account. Nevertheless, the focus on the language of emotions in previous research provides a crucial foundation for this dissertation. Compared with previous histories of siblings, this dissertation concentrates specifically on emotional expressions, exploring what they can tell us of sibling relationships more generally when connected with such themes as power and duty.

1.3   Theoretical key concepts and methods

Although earlier research into the history of emotions focused more on emotional norms, today, both these norms and the personal expression of emotions are examined in conjunction.[40] In this dissertation, I will concentrate primarily on emotional expressions and related practices, but the rules that affected how these emotions could be conveyed will also be considered. Emotions are influenced and expressed within a larger context, such as a culture. The conventions of a

---

[38] Korhonen 2002, 64–70; Broomhall & Van Gent 2009, 143–158; Lahtinen 2021, 79–90; Geussens 2022 154–171. I have also discussed power and lived religion in 17th century sibling relations within the themes of teaching Christianity and praying (Ala-Hynnilä 2023).
[39] Korhonen 2002, 64.
[40] Matt 2014, 45–46.

culture are needed for other people to accept and understand the emotions expressed. Indeed, not all emotions can, according to established norms, be expressed in all circumstances. Various norms influence different public representations of emotions. While the norms can be guidelines, they also impact individual and social lives by affecting the evaluation and perception of emotions. Norms can also have an impact on the intensity and expression of emotions. In this sense, historian Barbara Rosenwein reminds us that social, linguistic, and political contexts are important.[41] Her notion that "[w]e cannot know for sure… if the feelings expressed are purely conventional, idealised, manipulative, or deeply felt" [42] is indeed crucial to remember. The key theoretical concepts connected to power and emotions that I will introduce in this section tie into the context of emotional expressions. While the key concepts illuminate my basis for trying to understand 17th-century primary sources, I will also discuss which methods were used in this dissertation. This will provide an even more concrete understanding of how the analysis was conducted.

THEORETICAL KEY CONCEPTS: EMOTIONS

Monique Scheer notes that the concepts of emotional practices and emotives are two of the main ways in which the history of emotions has been approached.[43] These concepts touch on different sides of the subject of this dissertation, with emotional practices being the most relevant to the analysis, and emotives improving our understanding of the emotional expressions themselves. Scheer has approached emotions in history by considering the ways in which they are associated with the body in a normative context through the concept of emotional practices. She notes, "…practices not only generate emotions, but…emotions themselves can be viewed as a practical engagement with the world". [44] Furthermore, Scheer emphasises the significance of "…bodily dispositions conditioned by a social context…"[45] when considering how emotions as practices are understood. Emotions are involved both within the body and outside of it as behaviour, expression, and action, and they are affected by the social and cultural context within which they emerge. An emotion is something that is both done and experienced. The concept of emotional practices is related to practice theory, in which emotions are briefly defined as practices guided by norms and rules. Bourdieuan practice theory, which Scheer uses, investigates how social structures are connected to the physical body and the generation of emotions, as well as how the latter are experienced. Both social context and habituation are crucial within this theory, and the body is not seen as static, but as socially situated. The interior and exterior dimensions of emotions are indeed not

---

[41] Lewis & Stearns 1998, 5; Frevert 2011, 7–8; Rosenwein 2002, 839; Ikegami 2012, 350.
[42] Rosenwein 2002, 839.
[43] Kounine 2017, 222.
[44] Scheer 2012, 193.
[45] Ibid.

understood as being disconnected. Building on this tradition, Scheer sees emotional practice as something that generates or performs emotion.[46]

In considering the history of emotions, emotional practices can be approached in four ways: mobilising, naming, communication, and regulating. Mobilising, which is not always under our control, means that certain actions, such as reading or watching a movie, are involved in achieving or adjusting an emotion and can be related to emotional management, or, for example, to the erasing or changing of emotions and the awakening of new feelings. For example, reading about war crimes or seeing demonstrations related to them can, but do not necessarily have to, influence emotions. These types of practices are sustained by their continued success, as they often have some sort of effect. Besides being influenced by themselves, people can try to influence the emotions of others. For example, writing and sending letters could be an attempt to evoke emotions in others.[47]

Naming, in turn, is a classification for an emotion that is given a meaning in how it is used in different social situations, and how it is related to context and practice. For example, naming a feeling can be a way of influencing other people's emotions. Regarding communication, Scheer notes that emotional performances attempt to communicate feelings within a normative framework, and they succeed if they are interpreted correctly. Regulating, in contrast, is related to norms. In connection to the normative context, Scheer uses the term emotional style, which is adaptable and draws attention to sustaining and generating practices. The current dominant emotional style is always being challenged but remains dependent on the context and its connection to a prevalent social group and a particular time.[48]

The focus on body and actions in emotional practices is crucial for this dissertation, as it helps to explain what ties the body and one's behaviour to emotional expressions and how different ways of conveying feelings can be understood within these parameters. Furthermore, considering that emotions are both influenced and exert influence is important for the analysis of gaining or upholding power through emotional expressions. While the fourth chapter of this dissertation focuses specifically on examining actions connected to helping, the concept of emotional practices remains relevant throughout the study.

Performance theory is closely related to William Reddy's notion of emotives. It states that an emotion does not exist before a performance, but is rather formed through articulating it. This articulation can be in the form of a text, a gesture, a facial expression, or an artwork. For this reason, according to this theory, early modern texts display experiences and performances of emotions rather than just representations of inner feelings. However, this does not imply having access to the entirety of how early modern people experienced emotions, as any historical record would not entirely capture the performance of emotion. Furthermore,

---

[46] Scheer 2012, 193–195, 199–200, 202; Kounine 2017, 223; Hillard, Lempa, & Spinney 2020, 4.
[47] Reddy 2001, 105; Scheer 2012, 209–211; Davison, Jalava, Morosini, Scheer, Steenberg, van der Zande, & Fetheringill Zwicker 2018, 227; Morosini 2018, 230; van der Zande 2018, 229.
[48] Scheer 2012, 212–217; Martín-Moruno & Pichel 2019, 5.

performance theory does not exclude the influence of other factors on emotional expressions, such as genre rules.[49]

Emotives, a concept created by Reddy, helps explain how emotional expressions can be understood and how the body and its expressions of emotions are tied together. It describes an individual trying to express what they are feeling on the inside to the outside world through norms governing emotional expression. However, these efforts fail, as inner emotions cannot be expressed exactly as they are felt. A big gap between actual feelings felt on the inside and the norms limiting their expression on the outside will lead to great suffering for the person. Accordingly, this concept highlights the significance of time and place and the role of the individual in this process. A person naming their emotions at the same time communicates to themselves what they are feeling, but emotives also alter and are affected by their inner emotions and can build, change, intensify, and hide feelings. Through these concepts, Reddy takes note of both cultural and biological functions of emotions. Emotives can be effective, albeit not necessarily, since an emotional expression can cause the emotion to disappear or change. Emotives are related to speech act theory, in which so-called performative utterances do not simply describe matters but can have an impact. Emotional practices are also connected to Reddy's emotives, as Scheer notes that these practices include utilising emotives in connection with naming. The body is connected to emotions in other ways, as a blush, for example, can be an emotive.[50] Emotives are thus crucial for this dissertation in helping to explain what emotional expressions are and drawing attention to the fact that both biological and cultural factors influence how feelings can be conveyed.

It should be noted, though, that even if 17th-century sources rarely provide conclusive evidence to determine whether the emotions siblings conveyed were "sincere",[51] taking note of what Reddy has written about sincerity provides some background for understanding the nature of emotional expressions. Reddy noted that emotives influence the person expressing them, even making them feel what they are claiming to feel. When that does not happen, the emotional expression could be called a lie. Reddy reminds us that even though deception can be intentional, it is also a function of being confused about what a person is feeling.[52]

---

[49] Barclay 2017a, 15.
[50] Reddy 1999, 267; Reddy 2001, 105, 108; Rosenwein 2002, 837; Plamper, Reddy, Rosenwein, & Stearns 2010, 240; O'Neill 2011, 48; Scheer 2012, 212–213; Boddice 2014, 6; Boddice 2018, 63; Davison, Jalava, Morosini, Scheer, Steenberg, van der Zande, & Fetheringill Zwicker 2018, 227.
[51] It is also possible to find occasional glimpses of intentional insincerity in emotional expressions. For example, Samuel Pepys noted in his diary that even though he appeared to be happy when dining with his brother Tom, his cousin Thomas Pepys, and Will Joyce, Pepys's cousin Mary's husband (Loveman 2022, 1235), he did not enjoy their company (Pepys 1893, December 22, 1661). Similarly, when he went to his brother Tom's house and met his cousin Thomas Pepys and Dr. Fairebrother, Pepys also noted, "I framed myself as pleasant as I could, but my mind was another way" (Pepys 1893, August 10, 1662). Of course, naturally adapting emotional expressions and behaviours to different social situations was crucial and sometimes required conscious consideration regarding what feelings were proper to convey.
[52] Reddy 1999, 270–271; Reddy 2001, 105–106, 109.

Although understanding the history of emotions begins with grasping what emotions are, there is no definite consensus on exactly how they can be defined. Furthermore, since the 1980s, there has been discussion about whether emotions are learned, socialised, and mutable or universal, unchanged, and natural. Emotions can be described as feelings generated by a hormonal and neural process that have a cognitive aspect through which the experience is evaluated. Emotions influence our bodies physiologically and can be expressed behaviourally. Furthermore, how emotions are understood and experienced by different individuals is affected by the words used to describe them. Although emotions are expressed with similar words, such as love, what is included in the feeling of love depends on the context. At the same time, emotions can be understood as behaviours that take part in interactions. These practices, which are cultural and social and influence self-identity, happen when humans connect with one another or with other things and objects. Furthermore, it can be difficult to define what no longer counts as an emotion. Emotions are also connected to reason, not separate from or opposed to it, as claimed in the more traditional view of emotions.[53]

Social constructionism is the predominant contemporary approach to studying emotions. According to this view, emotions are constructed by different societies, depending on matters such as morality, language, and expectations. In other words, emotions are not innate or repressed; rather, every single society creates emotions and represses them based on its own rules and norms. Researchers have, however, criticised constructionism. For instance, Reddy has argued that strong constructionism omits the individual from view, as it is rather culture that is seen to shape the emotions. Still, it is crucial for us to remember that each individual is a part of a cultural framework. Culture encompasses both individual interpretations and the collective framework that allows for them to emerge.[54]

Modern research also acknowledges both the cultural and biological components of emotions. Rather than seeing a nature/nurture divide, the history of emotions is approached bioculturally, as biology always frames "nurture" and vice versa[55]. Historian Anu Korhonen, for example, has noted that emotions and ways of experiencing them are constructed, culturally understood, and connected to social interactions, but they are also tied to biology. For example, in addition to norms impacting how emotions are expressed, culture provides ways to understand and name inner feelings. Regardless, cognitively processed or, in other words, sensed and expressed emotions are the only ones available for a historian to analyse. [56] In this dissertation, I define emotions through

---

[53] Stearns & Stearns 1985, 813; Broomhall 2008, 7; Ikegami 2012, 337–339; Broomhall 2015, "Introduction: Communities of emotion"; Boddice 2018, 42, 46.
[54] Reddy 1997, 329, 333; Korhonen 2002, 61–63; Rosenwein 2002, 837; Gammerl 2014, 336.
[55] Boddice 2018, 10. See also *Rethinking Emotion: Interiority and Exteriority in Premodern, Modern, and Contemporary Thought* (2014, edited by Rüdiger Campe and Julia Weber), in which the exteriority and interiority of emotions are not seen in opposition to each other (Campe & Weber 2014, 7).
[56] Korhonen 2002, 58–61.

constructionism due to its connection to context. My approach to understanding what emotions are is, however, not strictly constructionist. Rather, I acknowledge that emotions are not merely cultural constructions, but they have a biological component as well. Nevertheless, historians can only examine emotional expressions rather than the emotions that were actually felt.

Aside from social constructionism various other theories of emotions have emerged. Disproved in the 1960s, the hydraulic model compared emotions to moving liquids residing inside the body that wanted to find a way out, which was built upon the theory of humours. This particular view saw emotions as universal, and as something that could build up and needed to be released or otherwise dealt with. Although this model is no longer valid, it can still be seen in how we use language, for example. The cognitive approach views emotions not as something to be repressed or released, but as a rational part of a process that begins with evaluating a situation, experiencing physical signals of emotion, and determining how to react to the situation. Furthermore, what emotions are felt and how they are expressed differ depending on individual appraisals and norms. Advocates of the cognitive view also admit that certain basic emotions exist, but what these are considered to be differs between scientists.[57] Rob Boddice is also not keen on universalism: "The only real universal is that everything changes".[58]

THEORETICAL KEY CONCEPTS: POWER

In this dissertation, I will use the concepts of power and control to discuss how siblings attempted to get their way or influence how their brothers and sisters acted or expressed their emotions. I will also employ the concept of agency. Agency signifies the ability to produce change and to act. It denotes action that is performed to achieve a goal and implies that others respond to and recognise it. These definitions of agency are especially relevant to how the concept is used in this dissertation. However, there are many types of agency. For example, oppositional agency describes a person or group acting or planning to act against a system's norms. Contrary to this, allegiant agency refers to goal-oriented actions that are performed in accordance with popular thought. Such action may include physical actions, along with choices and thoughts, but also routines. Different categories, such as class and gender, in addition to location, time, and place, enable and limit agency.[59] In Chapter 3, I will also discuss narrative agency in connection with siblings describing themselves as victims.

The use of language is crucial to the ways in which power is employed through emotional expressions. Language is a social process and an integral part of power relations and societies. Social differentiation creates linguistic variations in how language is used. Social conventions impact the use of language, even in the most private interactions. The use of language can also play a key role in

---

[57] Rosenwein 2002, 834, 836–837.
[58] Boddice 2018, 53.
[59] Maslak 2008, xv; Ojala, Palmu & Saarinen 2009, 16, 21–22; Pöysä 2015, 135.

changing or maintaining relationships. These factors are taken into consideration in critical discourse analysis, as the connection between discourse and power and its socially constitutive and conditioned nature are essential to this approach.[60] Interactions that construct social reality are all connected to power. At the same time, certain interpretations of reality are more easily accepted by people due to the nature of social practices.[61] Linguist Norman Fairclough has noted that ideology is deeply connected to language and coercion. Power could be used by manufacturing consent, for example, through ideology or by at least acquiring more or less reluctant acceptance.[62] In this dissertation, it was thus essential to acknowledge how the use of language could be connected to the use of power.

French philosopher and historian Michel Foucault theorised about power in a more general sense. He noted, "Power is everywhere… because it comes from everywhere… it [is] a certain strength we are all endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society".[63] Foucault understood that power could be detected in human relations and that action needed to be taken for power to exist. Power could have various forms, of which, for example, the form of the law or the sovereignty of a state were terminal types. Finally, Foucault noted that resistance came with power. For example, concerning discourse, he indicated that while this could be a way to use power, it also could be leveraged to oppose power.[64]

Foucault's view of power has gained a great deal of criticism. For example, anthropologist P. Steven Sangren suggested that Foucault did not give agency to people or, in other words, did not give them authentic and effective intentions. Norbert Ricken has claimed that Foucault's theories of power were, overall, seen by some as contradictory, and that there had also been criticism that the notion of power being inherent in everything was too broad. In contrast, Ricken stated that this criticism relied on a misunderstanding, as, according to Foucault, power was not everything but rather *in* everything. According to Ricken, the ubiquitous nature of power reflected an approach to understanding and observing how humans influenced each other and the notion that power relations were actions that influenced the actions of others.[65] Regardless of these criticisms, Foucault's views of power can still be helpful. For example, when considering the emotional expressions of 17th-century English siblings, understanding that power was used in different interactions in a great variety of situations is especially illuminating. In other words, we need to recognise diverse, and also implicit, modes of the use of power.

---

[60] Fairclough 1989/2001, 17–19; Blommaert 2005, 2, 24–25; J. L. Austin's definition of perlocutionary acts in connection with speech act theory also reminds us of how language can be used to, for example, convince, influence, and please (Vanderveken & Kubo 2001, 3). He noted: "perlocutionary act…is the achieving of certain effects by saying something" (Austin 1962/1975, 121).
[61] Juhila & Suoninen 1999, 247.
[62] Fairclough 1989/2001, 3, 10.
[63] Foucault 1978, 93.
[64] Ibid., 92, 95, 101; Foucault 1982, 219.
[65] Sangren 1995, 4; Ricken 2006, 551.

According to the economist and philosopher Kenneth E. Boulding, society can give integrative power to those who do not have much power otherwise, for example, by taking care of the elderly. In the same manner, children can receive help from their parents, which would accumulate a form of debt connected to reciprocity, so that later, the children would take care of the parents when they were old.[66] Boulding explained that when the powerful wanted to keep the weak alive, they had to support them, thus creating the "power of the 'weak'".[67] In other words, the weak could, in this manner, have some control over the powerful and thus obligate the powerful to act in a certain manner.[68] This could also be reflected in duties, which could therefore be tied to the use of power. Along similar lines, Anthony Fletcher has argued that ties of blood and affection can change or subvert the authority that the powerful hold.[69] This dynamic is reflected in the way 17th-century siblings expressed their emotions, a theme that will be examined throughout the dissertation from the point of view of emotions. Specifically, my analysis reflects on the power of the weak in addition to examining the ways in which the authority of the powerful was not just upheld, but also challenged.

A look into how 17th-century thinkers defined power can also help to define how contemporaries approached the subject. In the late 17th century, John Locke defined power as either active or passive, seeing the latter as the ability to "…receive any change…"[70] and the former as being "…able to make…" change.[71] He further argued that active power was the "…more proper signification of the word power…"[72] Richard Allestree also thought that there were different kinds of power, as he commented on the authority a gentleman had towards his servants and friends in his 17th-century book *The Gentleman's Calling*. Allestree explained that a man would possess a certain level of authority "…over those that relate to, or depend on him…"[73] While his power over servants was one that "…[sprung] from this servile stock of hopes & fears,"[74] his authority vis-à-vis his friends was more efficient and noble and connected more strongly to persuasion tactics rather than commands.[75] Allestree also gave advice on how power should be used, suggesting that "…[p]ower [was] instrumental to the infusing good…"[76] and further contending that a gentleman should use his authority to encourage virtue.[77] Therefore, a gentleman had the power to control the behaviour of others and steer it towards what was good, within the limits set by the prevailing norms of proper behaviour. In contrast, a Puritan preacher[78] by

---

[66] Boulding 1990/1989, 119–120.
[67] Ibid., 120.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Fletcher 1995, 213.
[70] Locke 1695, 124.
[71] Ibid.
[72] Ibid., 125.
[73] Allestree 1671, 111.
[74] Ibid., 114.
[75] Ibid., 115.
[76] Allestree 1671, 116.
[77] Ibid., 111.
[78] Harvey 2015, 58.

the name of William Gouge discussed in his 1622 book *Of Domesticall Duties* the hierarchical nature of society, writing: "…euen they who are superiours to some, are inferiours to others…"[79] Gouge noted that this was due to God putting everyone in their correct place.[80] He wrote further that those in places of authority could hold on to their power, but he also warned his readers to "… not [be] high minded, nor swell one against another".[81]

Intersectionality is another useful concept for understanding how 17th-century siblings were able to use power through their emotional expressions.[82] This concept is used to examine the ways in which different categories, such as age, gender, class, ethnicity, race, sexuality, and health, produce classifications that create distinctions and identities; it can also be applied to investigate the complex connections among these categories and their links to power.[83] As Kimberle Crenshaw has noted, there is a "…need to account for multiple grounds of identity when considering how the social world is constructed". [84] Intersectionality does not just describe the interaction of different factors that affect identities; it also casts light on subordination and exclusion in processes that can create discrimination but also redistribute power. Categories such as health and gender can work in different ways within this configuration, and case-by-case individual examination is therefore necessary. [85] In this dissertation, intersectionality emphasises the variety of contexts that influence individuals' agency and their possibilities to use power in connection with emotional expressions.

THE METHOD

There are many ways to approach the history of emotions in the early modern period, such as by analysing looks and gestures and the language that was used to name feelings. Furthermore, context, such as the interpretive nature of the emotions of other people, which is understood from different clues, such as actions and words, expectations regarding emotional expressions, and ideally also different continuities, are crucial to the study of early modern emotions.[86]

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine the information that emerged from the sources themselves instead of using a pre-existing theoretical framework. This decision was made because theoretical frameworks of emotions that can be applied to the study of early modern sibling relations are limited. Deductive approaches may result in overly vague or restrictive understandings of this phenomenon. Therefore, an inductive approach, in which the phenomenon is explored from a ground-up perspective, was adopted here.

---

[79] Gouge 1622, 5.
[80] Ibid., 6.
[81] Ibid., 7.
[82] I would like to thank Dr. Hannah Yoken for pointing out the benefits intersectionality offers for this dissertation.
[83] Davis 2008, 68; Karkulehto, Saresma, Harjunen, & Kantola 2012, 16.
[84] Crenshaw 1991, 1245.
[85] Davis 2008, 67–68; Karkulehto, Saresma, Harjunen, & Kantola 2012, 16.
[86] Ikegami 2012, 337; Trigg 2017, 11–12.

Methodologically, the research for this dissertation was conducted using qualitative content analysis. Through this approach, the meaning of qualitative data is described systematically by creating categories that are used in the interpretative process to find less obvious rather than highly standardised meanings in the material. While the primary sources were examined in their entirety, the main focus was on those parts that related to emotional expressions, sibling relations, and power. The method, in other words, reduced the data, which is very useful when there is a lot of material. When conducting qualitative content analysis, sources and the object of interest or the research questions are chosen first, and then a coding frame is made. This consists of creating categories and subcategories that form the focus of the research. After this step, the source material is divided according to the coding frame, which is tried out, evaluated, and modified. Finally, the analysis is written, interpretations are made, and findings are presented.[87]

Qualitative content analysis made approaching the primary sources easier, as it efficiently focused attention on the relevant parts of the material. The fact that most of the sources were digitised helped as well, in part because word searches according to the categories formed were thus possible. When categorising the material, it is crucial to note that emotional expressions were not always direct and could require more attention than simply focusing on words such as anger or affection.[88] However, the process was not without its challenges. For instance, the coding frame changed over time. At first, the main categories consisted of emotional expressions of anger, sadness, and affection. This eventually proved to be too broad a categorisation, even with plenty of subcategories. At the same time, this overall structure allowed me to examine such a wide range of emotions that the creation of new, narrower main categories became possible, which included disputes, actions, and the processes of changing, avoiding, and replacing emotional expressions, within the wider thematic approach of focusing on emotions and power.

1.4 Primary sources

In this section, I will first introduce the authors of the main primary sources. This section also contains some basic information about their brothers and sisters in a table format, including the number of siblings alive during the time each source

---

[87] Schreier 2012, 1–7, 58–60. See also Tuomi & Sarajärvi 2009, 103–122.

[88] For example, rather than expressing anger, Alice Thornton used more indirect expressions (see Thornton 1875, 120). Samuel Pepys, in contrast, used the word anger and angry (e.g. Pepys 1893, August 25, 1661, February 2, 1661/2) and the word vexed (Pepys 1893, June 11, 1662), but the word love was employed specifically only once to refer to affection towards his siblings (Pepys 1893, February 7, 1666/7). Furthermore, Bernard Capp has suggested that servants seeking permission to visit sick relatives does not provide much evidence for what their relationship was actually like, but that when women noted that they hoped their sisters would take care of their children after they died, it indicated that the siblings were close or had trust in each other. (Capp 2018, 81–82)

text was written and the lifespans of the authors. After that, I will discuss the letters, diaries, and autobiographies as sources, in addition to considering criticism of these sources. I will also introduce the conventions that governed the proper composition of the primary sources. However, it can be difficult to conclude what the precise genre conventions were and what rather just differences between people.[89]

AUTHORS OF THE MAIN PRIMARY SOURCES

The main primary sources used in this study, as noted earlier in this chapter, can be situated in the long 17th century, more precisely between 1607–1710, with one passage being from 1724.[90] These sources included texts by three women: Alice Thornton's autobiography, Elizabeth Freke's autobiography, and Dorothy Osborne's letters. The sources by male authors include letters written by Henry Oxinden and his brothers, the diary of Samuel Pepys, the autobiography of Henry Newcome, the diary of John Evelyn, the letters of Thomas Meautys, and the autobiography of William Stout. These sources, in other words, include four autobiographies, two diaries, and three collections of letters, which amount to nine sets of main primary sources. Of these sources, two were in a traditional book format, including Freke's remembrances and Oxinden's collection of letters, while the others had been digitised. While I used versions of the original manuscripts published in either the 19th or 20th centuries, I also visited England to read the original version of Alice Thornton's text. In addition, I relied on two letters sent by John Evelyn's children, also viewed in manuscript form, and two letters digitised from the original manuscripts written by the Booth family.

While most of the primary source sets contained hundreds of pages and letters, only some were directly relevant. Out of the 200 letters sent to Jane Cornwallis by different people included in the collection published in the 19th century, only about 18 were from her brother Thomas Meautys, and not all of them contained expressions of emotions. [91] The Oxinden correspondence contained similar amounts of pertinent content,[92] while Dorothy Osborne's correspondence included 71 letters, of which 14 had relevant material.[93] Alice Thornton's autobiography had 282 pages, of which 38 pages were used. William Stout's autobiography, in contrast, consisted of 145 pages, of which 23 were used.[94]

These authors were both gentry and middling sort. However, defining specifically who belonged to which group could sometimes be tricky, as the lines between these two groups were not definite. The middling sort could be defined

---

[89] O'Day 2001, 130.
[90] James Oxinden to Richard Oxinden May 11, 1607, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 6; Stout 1851, 21–22, 32, 48, 65, 81, 105; Freke 2001, 266.
[91] The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842.
[92] The Oxinden Letters sent between 1607–1642 have 240 letters from various writers and about 34 letters relevant at least to some degree. Out of these, about 19 were used (The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933).
[93] Osborne 1901.
[94] Stout 1851; Thornton 1875.

from an economic point of view as those who achieved success in their trade, but their financial situation was not the only defining factor. Historian Peter Earle has defined aristocracy and gentry in terms of often owning land and as people for whom work was not a necessity because of private income, while the middling sort worked, but usually in different positions than ordinary people. Still, this distinction was not straightforward either, and the kinds of jobs considered suitable for the two categories overlapped to some degree.[95]

---

[95] Earle 1989, 3; Hunt 1996, 15; Muldrew 1998, 299. Suitable jobs could include a career in business, but also professional jobs, such as clergy, medical work, and law. These professional jobs were also suitable, in addition to work in the military, for younger sons of the gentry. Furthermore, many younger sons of the gentry went into apprenticeships for a career in business, even if this option was not equally acceptable. Earle highlights that there were multiple different arguments about whether men working in these kinds of jobs could be defined as gentry or middling sort. (Houlbrooke 1984, 235–236; Earle 1989, 3–5, 7.)

TABLE 1   Authors of the main primary sources[96]

Name	Birth and death	Type of text	Social position[97]	Siblings mentioned	Placement in the order of birth	Place of residence	Denomination	Chapter
Henry Oxinden	1608–1670	Letters	Gentry	James, Richard	Oldest brother	East Kent and in 1660s in Radnage, Buckinghamshire	Anglican	3.1, 4.1–2, 5
John Evelyn	1620–1706	Diary	Gentry	George, Richard	Fourth child, George oldest son, Richard youngest	Born Wotton, Surrey, Deptford, London after 1652, and Wotton in 1694	Anglican	4, 5.2
Alice Thornton	1625/6–1687	Autobiography	Gentry	George, Christopher, John, Catherine Danby	Oldest sister	Kirklington, North Riding of Yorkshire and East Newton, Yorkshire after 1662	Anglican	3.2, 4, 5.2
Dorothy Osborne	1627–1695	Letters	Gentry	John, Henry	Sibling mentioned older, oldest brother John. Not the oldest sister	Chicksands Priory, Bedfordshire	-	3.2, 4.1, 5.2

---

[96] Braybrooke 1842, xxv; Heywood 1849, ii; Harland 1851a, 145; Stout 1851, 1, 20; Newcome 1852a, 70–71, 106; Parkinson 1852, ix, xii–xiii; C.J. 1875, v, viii, xi; Pepys 1893, July 14, 1660; Wheatley 1893, Previous Editions of the Diary; Parry 1901, 4, 19–20; Dobson 1908b, xi, xxxiv–xxxv; Evelyn 1908, 1, 165, 459; Gardiner 1933d, Oxinden Family Pedigree; Gardiner 1937, xli–xlii; Houlbrooke 1984, 55, 155, 245; Hill 1985, 259; Winkelmann 1996, 14–15; Salzman 2000, xxvi–xxvii; Anselment 2001, 1–5; Freke 2001, 47; McPherson 2006, 185; Loveman 2012, 46, 48–49; Del Lungo Camiciotti 2014, 144, 147; Capp 2018, 24, 71, 135, 143.

[97] Margaret R. Hunt points out that while the financial situation was not the only defining factor in defining the differences between the gentry and the middling sort, it did matter (Hunt 1996, 15). The middling sort could be defined from an economic point of view as those who achieved success in their trade (Muldrew 1998, 299).

Name	Birth and death	Type of text	Social position[97]	Siblings mentioned	Placement in the order of birth	Place of residence	Denomination	Chapter
Henry Newcome	1627–1695	Autobiography	Middling sort	Robert, Stephen, Richard, Thomas, Rose	Fourth oldest, oldest brother Robert	Cheshire and Manchester after 1656/7	Presbyterian	3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.2
Samuel Pepys	1632/3–1703	Diary	Middling sort	Tom, John, Paulina	Oldest brother	London	Anglican	3.1, 4, 5
Elizabeth Freke	1641/2–1714	Autobiography /diary	Gentry	Judith Austen	Oldest sister	Norfolk	-	3.3, 4.1, 4.3
William Stout	1665–1752	Autobiography	Middling sort	Elin	Elin oldest child, oldest son Josias, Stout third child	Lancaster	Quaker	4.2, 4.3
Thomas Meautys	-	Letters	Gentry	Jane Cornwallis	-	The Low Countries	-	4.1, 4.2, 5.2

Henry Oxinden, who was born in 1608 and died in 1670, was an East Kent squire and a landowner whose family belonged to the gentry. He was the eldest son and had three brothers, with the second eldest being James, who lived from 1612 to 1660. The third, Richard, was born in 1613, and the fourth, Adam, lived from 1622 to 1643. They had two sisters, Katherine and Elizabeth, who were born in 1610 and 1616, respectively. The letters I examined include not only those authored by Henry but also those from James and Richard. James studied at St. John's College in Cambridge before working as a clergyman in Goodnestone, while Richard was an apprentice for a cloth merchant. Henry was ordinated as a clergyman around 1661 and worked as a rector in Radnage, Buckinghamshire. The editor of the published collection of their letters from 1933 noted that she did not include all the letters available and made editorial changes to the text, such as adding modern punctuation, extending abbreviations, and correcting what she perceived as obvious mistakes.[98]

John Evelyn, a country gentleman, was a notable intellectual, Anglican diarist, author, and government official. He was born at Wotton in Surrey in 1620, moved to Deptford in 1652, and returned back to Wotton in 1694, to the family house he later inherited after his brother died in 1699. He had three older siblings and one who was younger. His sister Eliza was born in 1614, Jane in 1616, brother George in 1617, and Richard in 1622. He was known, among other things, for his interest in supporting the arts and practising and writing about horticulture and forestry. Evelyn, furthermore, had a large collection of books. Evelyn's mother died when he was 15 and his father when he was 20, which led to his eldest brother George succeeding their father. His diary, first published in 1818, describes his life from his birth to the year he died in 1706.[99] Austin Dobson, who edited the diary when it was re-published in 1908, noted that Evelyn did not write the diary daily, but often after some time had already passed. Dobson noted that Evelyn appeared to have written the diary based on notes he had made closer to the situations to which he referred. He also added that Evelyn began to make a transcription that resembled a memoir. Dobson criticised the diary's mid-19th-century editor, John Forster, for having modernised the spelling, pointing out that this had not been done consistently.[100]

Alice Thornton's autobiography has been widely used in research.[101] She was born in February 1625/6 in Kirklington, North Riding of Yorkshire, lived in East Newton, Yorkshire, from 1662, and died in February 1706/7. She was a gentlewoman with a deep devotion to her Anglican religion. She had six siblings, four of whom were brothers. Christopher was the eldest but lived only from 1618 to 1627. Her second eldest brother, or rather the eldest from 1627 until his death in 1651, was George, who was born in 1623. Her other brother, Christopher, was born in 1627/8 and died in 1687, while her youngest brother, John, was born in

---

[98] Gardiner 1933a, 1; Gardiner 1933c, xxxvi; Gardiner 1933d, Oxinden Family Pedigree; Gardiner 1933e, v; Gardiner 1937, xli–xlii; Winkelmann 1996, 14–15.
[99] Evelyn 1908, 1, 165, 459; Dobson 1908b, v, xi, xiii, xxxiv–xxxv, xxxviii–xxxix; Harris 2002, 1; Hunter & Harris 2003, 1, 10.
[100] Dobson 1908a, vii–viii.
[101] For example, see Houlbrooke 1984, McPherson 2006, and Capp 2018.

1636 and died in 1666. She had two sisters, the elder being Joyce, who did not live past childhood, as she was baptised in 1618 and buried in 1620, while the other, Catherine, was baptised in 1615 and died in 1645. Thornton was born a year before Christopher, who was the eldest son of the family from 1651 onwards. Her life was coloured by many difficulties, such as worries about her properties and many personal losses.[102]

Although Thornton was born in England, she moved to Ireland in about 1634. Her father, Christopher Wandesford, had moved there earlier when his distant relative and close friend Thomas Wentworth was selected as lord deputy of Ireland to become a member of the Irish Privy Council and to work as master of rolls. Wandesford succeeded Wentworth as lord deputy in 1640 and held other offices before dying the same year. Thornton wrote about her time there fondly in her autobiography, but the family left in 1641 after the Irish rebellion began. Their father's testament, going missing during the rebellion, proved crucial for the relationship between Thornton and her brother Christopher and their eventual legal battle over the will.[103]

The autobiography starts in 1629 and ends in 1669. Thornton wrote the text with the intention of being circulated in an attempt to defend her reputation. In her autobiography, which she wrote to her family and others close to her, she had a chance to explain her side of the story and to counter rumours of her alleged inappropriate relationship with her son-in-law, Thomas Comber.[104] These points are, of course, important to take into consideration when analysing her text. Furthermore, the editor of the version published in 1875 noted that the three volumes of the original manuscript contained many repetitions, which showed that the text had been written at different times. The editor also explained that he had made certain deletions because of the repetition and changed the order of some of the passages to make the book chronological. Still, he assured the readers that the published edition contained everything "...of any interest and value..."[105] Due to these changes, I have examined the original manuscript in London and analysed one of the deleted passages in this dissertation.

Dorothy Osborne, who was born in 1627 and died in 1695, had 11 siblings, with seven being brothers, of whom three were alive in 1653, and four sisters. Sir John was the eldest son who lived in Gloucestershire when their father, who died in 1653/4, was still alive. The editor of the published collection of letters concluded that the brother who was living at Chicksands in Bedfordshire with Dorothy and their father, and with whom she had a difficult relationship, was Henry. The last of the brothers, Robert, died in 1653, and by then, her sisters had all gotten married and moved away. The nature of her religious beliefs is unclear,

---

[102] Thornton 1875, 57, 134; C.J. 1875, xi, Pedigree of the Family of Wandesford; Houlbrooke 1984, 55; McPherson 2006, 185; Anselment 2014, xix, xxix.
[103] Anselment 2014, xx–xxi; Capp 2018, 159.
[104] Thornton 1875, 3; C.J. 1875, xiii; Wilcox, Hobby, Hind, & Graham 1989, 5, 146; Anselment 2014, xxviii. For more on the disagreements that Thornton had and rumours that were spread about her, see Anselment 2014, xxv–xxix.
[105] C. J. 1875, xv.

but she grew up in the Anglican tradition, and according to a 19th-century writer, Thomas Courtenay, she was religious, a royalist, and married to a man who was not fond of Puritan austerity.[106] In other words, both Anglican and anti-Puritan ideals affected her.

Osborne wrote letters to her future husband, William Temple, of which 77 composed in 1652, 1653 and 1654 survive. Although Temple preserved Osborne's letters, she herself, according to historian Bernard Capp, destroyed the ones he wrote to her. As their families opposed the match, and meetings in person were often impossible, she created imaginative sanctuaries in her private correspondence to ease the separation.[107] Considering the opposition they faced, the maintenance of privacy could indeed have been crucial. Even though Osborne was a talented writer, she never wanted to publish her texts. Her letters have, nevertheless, been widely used in research. The editor of the collection published in 1901 noted that he had modernised the spelling, provided the full names of persons who had originally been identified only by initials (whenever possible), arranged the text into paragraphs, added punctuation, and provided a summary of the contents and possible additional information before each letter.[108]

Henry Newcome started his autobiography in either 1663 or 1664, using the journals that he began to keep in 1646 and continued his whole life. Indeed, in the entry on April 23, 1666, he noted that he had started to go through his diaries from a few years back. The text was finished by his son in 1693–1695, when Newcome lay ill and dying. The editor of the part of his diary that has survived and was published in the 19th century noted that the autobiography was called the "Abstract" and was meant for his children.[109] The autobiography covers his life from his birth in 1627 to the time he died in 1695. Newcome was born in Caldecote, Huntingdonshire, on November 27, 1627, the son of a parson, and graduated from St John's College in Cambridge. He was the fourth eldest of eight children, with Robert being the eldest and Stephen and John the second and third, while his younger siblings were Thomas, Richard, and Daniel. The youngest child and only woman was Rose, who was born in November 1641, just a few months before both parents died, which led to the eldest siblings, Robert and Stephen, taking care of the younger ones. Newcome became a Presbyterian minister, moved from Cheshire to Manchester in 1656/7, and lived there until he died. The editor of the autobiography published in the 19th century explained that he had abbreviated some moral reflections that he found quite monotonous and removed antiquated spellings.[110]

---

[106] Courtenay 1849, 518, 525; Parry 1901, 19–20; Salzman 2000, xxvi; Hintz 2005, 106.

[107] Salzman 2000, xxvi–xxvii; Hintz 2005, 5–6; Capp 2018, 163.

[108] Parry 1901, 12; Wilcox, Hobby, Hind, & Graham 1989, 1; Hintz 2005, 3–4; Capp 2018, 167.

[109] At the same time, Newcome also explained that while reading his own writings, he recognized he had experienced many difficulties in his lifetime, many of which he would have forgotten if he had not written them down (Newcome 1852b, 226). This suggested that although he wrote the text for others, he himself also gained something by composing it.

[110] Newcome 1852a, 70–71, 106, 156; Heywood 1849, ii–iii; Parkinson 1852, iii–iv, viii–ix, xii–xiv; Delany 1969, 77; Nunn 2003, 10–11.

Samuel Pepys was a Londoner[111] whose diary has been used in many studies.[112] Pepys, who lived from 1633 to 1703, had a successful career, serving, for example, as a president of the Royal Society for two years and as a secretary for the admiralty, and he kept a diary from 1659/60 to 1669. Even though his mother leaned more towards Puritanism, a denomination that influenced his upbringing, Pepys himself later attended Anglican services. He was the eldest of four siblings, all of whom were still alive when he was writing his diary, including two brothers, Tom and John, and a sister, Paulina, whom he called Pall. Even though he felt he had a duty to take care of his siblings, their relationship was not close but often characterised by resentment. While Pepys was in frequent contact with many of his relatives, researcher Ralph A. Houlbrooke called him calculating – helpful insofar as it furthered his own cause or image – but also noted that he was dutiful and affectionate, even if he was not very generous. Historian Bernard Capp, in contrast, notes that Pepys often acted in a manner that was simultaneously generous and self-interested. Researchers have not agreed on the function of Pepys's diary. Possible explanations include that he kept a diary for posterity because it was in fashion, for self-discipline, for self-fashioning, to preserve his erotic thrills, or for religious reasons. However, historian Christopher Hill has argued that Pepys created a diary solely for himself. Indeed, he wrote it in shorthand, and parts were in different languages, which a casual reader would have had a hard time comprehending, suggesting that his intention was to have some level of privacy.[113]

Pepys, whose family was middling sort, initially worked as a clerk, earning roughly £50 a year, but soon acquired a position on the Navy Board as Clerk of the Acts and a position in the Privy Seal office. His estate's worth jumped from £25 at the start of the diary to £300 in 1660, the year he stopped writing. In March 1664/5, he was made treasurer of the Tangier Company, and eventually his estimated wealth grew from £1205 in 1664 to £6900 in 1667. When looking at his economic standing, at the beginning of the 1660s, his categorisation into the middling sort could be questioned, as an annual income of £100 could be seen as a minimum threshold, while in 1666, his earnings of £1200 per year made his position very different. While Pepys was not a courtier, he was acquainted with people of political power through his work.[114] Pepys's kin included people from many different positions in society. The Earl of Sandwich was his cousin; some acquaintances, like his cousin Thomas Pepys, were quite successful businessmen, while others, such as an uncle who worked as a blacksmith, were lesser tradesmen. Among his relatives, many from his mother's side were of a lower status. Pepys's father worked as a tailor, although given that he had a three-

---

[111] Pepys 1893, July 14, 1660.
[112] Those who have used his diary as a primary source include Houlbrooke 1984, Hill 1985, Fletcher 1995, and Capp 2018,
[113] Wheatley 1893, Previous Editions of the Diary; Houlbrooke 1984, 57; Hill 1985, 259; Loveman 2012, 46, 48–49; Sangha 2016, 116, 121; Capp 2018, 143, 145.
[114] Pepys 1893, March 17, 1664/5, March 20, 1664/5; Hill 1985, 259; Archer 2000, 82–84.

storey home, he was certainly not poor. In 1661, he inherited his brother Robert's estate in Brampton, which shifted his social position upwards.[115]

Elizabeth Freke, a gentry woman living in Norfolk, was the eldest of three siblings. She was born in 1641/2 and died in April 1714. Her sister Cicely was born in February1646/7, Frances in May 1644, and Judith in February 1646/7. Freke's writings were remembrances that had a diary-like quality. The text consists of two different versions of her life, one of them shorter and written later. She began writing the first version in 1702, when she was 60 years old, and the second ten years later, but she also wrote parts of both concurrently. Although she edited and omitted parts of the text from the later version, both are included in the edition published in 2001.[116] The writing of these two versions could have impacted how she conveyed her emotions. For example, she made changes between the two, such as removing and adding emotional expressions.[117] Furthermore, compared with the corresponding section in the first version, the later version contains more intense and expansive expressions of anger in a description of how her sister Austen left her when she was ill.[118]

Like many other early autobiographies written by women, Freke's text moves within the themes of family, self, and patriarchy, but also reveals someone who felt the need to confront the economic and social changes that threatened her identity. Besides the other kinds of patriarchal constraints that society put on her, Freke believed that her son and husband were negligent towards her. Freke's sisters' company and friendship, however, gave her support. She also had other men in her life, like her father, who was kind and gave her a sense of security. Furthermore, she highlighted her difficulties. Her text is rife with her suffering, self-sacrifice, bitterness, and disappointments as it depicts her search for reaffirmation and solace. Even though Freke was the eldest daughter, her position was often atypical, as she was the last to marry and usually had no money. However, she was still aware of her seniority. Although her relationship with her sisters was often not amicable due to her difficult personality, she and her sisters still had a sense of responsibility towards each other and maintained a lasting relationship.[119]

William Stout was a Quaker from Lancaster, born in 1665, who, according to the editor of the version published in the 19th century, wrote his autobiography when he was 79 and died in 1752. He had six siblings, the eldest being a sister named Elin[120] who was born in 1660. The second sibling and the eldest son was Josias, born 1662. William himself was the third child; the fourth

---

[115] Archer 2000, 87–88.
[116] Anselment 1997, 63–64; Anselment 2001, 1–2, 4–5, 18; Freke 2001, 47.
[117] Anselment 1997, 63–65. Differences between the two versions of Freke's remembrances could also be indicative of an expression of anger, as the changes could reflect her shifting opinion of her sister. For example, Freke deleted a passage from the later version of her text in which she had commented on how kind her sisters had been to her after her husband had died, which, according to Anselment, could have been due to their falling out. (Anselment 1997, 71.)
[118] Freke 2001, 156, 266–268.
[119] Freke 2001, 72; Anselment 1997, 58–59, 72; Anselment 2001, 1–2; Capp 2018, 71, 74–75.
[120] As Stout referred to her with this spelling of the name, I will use the same in this dissertation.

was Leonard, born in 1667; the fifth Richard, born in 1669; and the sixth Mary, born in 1672. The seventh child, Thomas, was born in 1674. The 19th-century editor John Harland noted that even though the first published version[121] of the text had omitted several parts of it, the version edited by him contained the manuscript in its entirety.[122]

Sir Thomas Meautys, who had been born into a Protestant family, was a career soldier mainly posted in the Low Countries. He worked for the Prince of Orange with a company composed of volunteers from England in the war of the Palatinate. He commanded this company and stayed in the Low Countries until 1644, occasionally visiting England during this time. His letters examined here were sent to his sister Jane Cornwallis, who raised his eldest son, Hercules, and supported Meautys and his family for many years. His letters to Cornwallis, which were informal in tone, included such items as asking for news of his child or for money. Cornwallis married Sir William Cornwallis, became a rich young widow in 1611, and remarried the youngest son of a prosperous family, Nathaniel Bacon. Besides helping her brother financially, she also had a social position quite different from his. Jane held a sought-after post in the court of Queen Anne in the early 1600s as one of the Women of the Bedchamber. Meautys, in turn, got married in 1625 to the daughter of Sir Richard Burnebye, who was named Anne.[123]

In addition to these materials, I used other ego-documents from the 17th century in a more limited capacity. Most significant is the collection of letters published in the 19th century, called the Tixall Letters, which included the correspondence between Constance Fowler and Herbert Aston, cited at the beginning of this dissertation. Fowler was a gentlewoman from Staffordshire, the youngest daughter of her family, who married Walter Fowler, Esquire.[124] Her brother, Herbert Aston, was the second eldest son. He lived in Madrid in the 1630s, when their father was working as the ambassador there. Constance wished Herbert would marry her friend Katherine Thimelby, which actually happened in 1638.[125] I also analyse texts written by relatives of the writers of the main primary sources, such as the father of the Oxinden brothers and their uncle,[126] in addition to others unrelated to the main authors. Additional texts from the authors of the main primary sources are also used, such as archival documents.[127] Normative sources from 17th-century England provide context about possible

---

[121] The text was first published in parts in the newspaper *The Manchester Guardian* beginning on October 12, 1850, under the name "Autobiography of a Lancashire 'Friend'" (The Manchester Guardian, October 12, 1850, "Autobiography of a Lancashire 'Friend' – No. I.', 9; Harland 1851b, v).
[122] Stout 1851, 1–2, 20; Harland 1851a, 145; Harland 1851b, v.
[123] Braybrooke 1842, xxv–xxvi; Heal & Holmes 1999, 105–106; Del Lungo Camiciotti 2014, 137, 144, 147.
[124] Clifford 1815, 85.
[125] Constance Fowler to Herbert Aston, Tixall Letters 1815, 108–109; Clifford 1815, 85, 97, 167; Hackett 2012, 1112; Capp 2018, 62.
[126] James Oxinden to Richard Oxinden May 11, 1607, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 6; Gardiner 1933a, 1.
[127] For example, see the letter from Mary Evelyn to John Evelyn March 1, 1676, Add ms 78442, British Library, 47.

limitations to actions or emotional expressions and about the contemporary understandings of various concepts. Most of these sources are Christian – and, more specifically, mainly Anglican –including several conduct books.[128] Taking into consideration that in early modern England, manuals that taught honourable and civil behaviour to gentlemen were very popular,[129] it is thus possible that the writers of the main primary sources used here were familiar with at least some of these books. Moral values and virtues were a key theme throughout early modern English society, from schools to wider communities, and courtesy literature was read extensively. Parents were also urged by conduct books to read moral advice tracts, lectures, and the Scriptures to their children. Furthermore, these themes were not just something written about, but also crucial components of popular expectations and everyday life. It is therefore critical to keep in mind that emotional values were affected by religion at this time.[130]

LETTERS, DIARIES, AND AUTOBIOGRAPHIES

The authors of the primary sources of this dissertation wrote letters, autobiographies, and diaries. Autobiographical sources have established their position in historical studies, as much of the focus has shifted from a more macro and structural approach to examining individual experiences on a micro level. For example, demographic trends used to be more central in studies examining families, but in the past few decades, attention has turned to feelings and thoughts through the influence of anthropology. Early modern European autobiographical texts were very diverse, for example, in terms of the written medium, function, intended audience, and type of text. Among other factors, travel, political office, and military command motivated people to write autobiographies.[131]

Women also took part in the manuscript culture and literary circulation. This participation included writing poetry and various prose genres, in addition to compilating manuscripts, for example, by transcribing poetry and collecting it. Women writers did not always have to be subversive, as they were encouraged to both compile and create various texts. These texts could be connected to women's positions as wives, pious women, mothers, and housewives and included recipe books, didactic extracts, guidance for children, biographies of husbands, and religious texts, such as meditations, prayers, autobiographies, and sermon notes, which a feeling of spiritual duty would compel them to write.[132]

While not everyone was able to take part in life writing, over the early modern period, increasing numbers of those belonging to propertied families were able to write. Many women from elite backgrounds, along with those from professional and mercantile families, were literate at least to a basic degree. The same was true of some women from humbler positions, such as lower-status

---

[128] For example, see Brathwaite 1630 and Allestree 1659.
[129] Mark 2018, 392.
[130] Jordan 2011, 249; Pollock 2011, 151, 154; Capp 2014, 95.
[131] Delany 1969, 109; Meise 2002, 107; Blaak 2009, 3, 32–33.
[132] Burke 2016, 77; Gibson & Burke 2004/2016, 1–2.

artisans' and tradesmens' wives from London. For example, researcher James Daybell found that in more well-off families during the 16th century, women could have scribes to write formal letters but penned more informal ones themselves. He additionally noted that writing had become an everyday skill for numerous women by the latter part of the century. While being, on average, less literate than men, women's life writing and its circulation in early modern English society was an important way of articulating and shaping their understanding of female identity. It is also possible that women not being recognised as full legal subjects may have provoked a sense of urgency to write about themselves.[133]

These autobiographical texts raise various challenging questions about truth, the self, identity, and individuality that also relate to source criticism. Personal documents were a partly public and a partly private mixture of artifice and art, rather than a direct look into the intimate thoughts of early modern writers, and were influenced by individual contexts and motives. Of course, this did not imply that they would be useless or inauthentic in research, but they do contain elements of both registration and presentation. Some researchers, such as Robert Woods, have maintained that autobiographical texts should not be believed to be factual, although they can be very revealing. At the same time, a person's life could appear to be completely different, depending on the material used to study it. When examining a text, understanding that it presents just a piece of the puzzle, rather than the whole picture, is essential. The authors of autobiographical texts constantly make choices concerning what to write about and what focus to take in their texts.[134] This further highlights the impact of the genre and the author's motivation on the contents of the text.

As with all genres of writing, what the author read also had an influence on autobiographical texts. This could be very apparent, like a quotation, or less visible, such as imitation, as different texts provided writers with models to use when composing texts about their own lives. This influence included religious and normative content, which will be considered when analysing how siblings expressed emotions to each other. Masculine traditions also influenced the models that female authors often followed in their texts, in addition to the male publishers and editors occasionally interfering with the process. Nevertheless, besides normative settings and formalised conventions, many individual factors, such as religious, social, and geographical influences, could impact the way life writing was done.[135]

---

[133] Houlbrooke 1984, 4; Wilcox, Hobby, Hind, & Graham 1989, 17; Eales 1998, 40; Vickery 1998, 259; Daybell 2006, 104–105; Hubbard 2015, 573–575; Dowd & Eckerle 2016, 1. See also Ferguson & Suzuki 2015. For women's spiritual writing in England during the 17th century, see Botonaki 1999.
[134] Whyman 1999, 11; Dekker 2002, 13; Woods 2006, 110; Blaak 2009, 37; Sangha 2016, 117, 124.
[135] Wilcox, Hobby, Hind, & Graham 1989, 18; Blaak 2002, 61; Ezell 2016, 35.

LETTERS

Oftentimes, 17th-century texts were first read as manuscripts and only published after the author's death. When kin or other contemporaries were editors of these publications, they occasionally commented on having selected certain texts to make the author and the text as a whole conform to normative expectations. When this was the case, it limited how much information these kinds of sources could reveal to researchers. This phenomenon also applied to published collections of letters. For example, family correspondence that passed through generations could be edited to control how the family was perceived. Various kinds of personal texts could include information subsequently deemed to be irrelevant, or something that later generations would see as unacceptable and not desired to be associated with their family. All of this could lead to analyses and interpretations being significantly affected by differences between published editions and the original.[136]

Aside from the influence of chance and the impact of those who conserved the correspondence after the death of the writer, the writers themselves could also influence which materials survived. For example, the writers could choose which letters should be preserved for publication or for their own archives. As a result, the correspondence that has survived is more often than not one-sided and fragmentary. Historians rarely have access to a complete set of correspondence.[137] This was also the case with the 17th-century correspondence examined in this dissertation. Accordingly, the analysis is based on this type of fragmentary evidence. In addition, the correspondence used in this dissertation was usually one-sided, which further limited the analysis.

Rising levels of literacy, the replacement of Latin by the vernacular in many forms of writing, and the development of postal service infrastructures led to a rapid increase in letter writing during the early modern period. As the 17th century progressed, letters were no longer used just for mercantile, scholarly, and diplomatic purposes. Growing trade, more interest in news, and increased literacy created demand for the Royal Mail to be improved during the early 1600s. However, although the public could use its services from 1635, the English postal system remained underdeveloped and stable service was not available until the 1660s. By 1677, mail was carried along main postal roads three times a week, and there were also alternatives to this service, as some chose to send letters via friends or private carrier services. Although women were less often able to read and write compared to men, some could use secretaries to take care of matters, such as exchanging letters.[138]

The general expectation was that correspondence would be reciprocal, and a response was anticipated, for example, to express gratitude for help received. Furthermore, as will become apparent later in this dissertation, for some siblings,

---

[136] Cambers 2007, 803; Ezell 2016, 34; Sangha 2016, 123.
[137] O'Day 2001, 128; Woods 2006, 104; Lahtinen, Leskelä-Kärki, Vainio-Korhonen, & Vehkalahti 2011, 19–20. See also Stanley 2004.
[138] Whyman 1999, 9–10; Daybell 2001, 67–68, 72; Whyman 2009, 4, 47–48, 50, 64; James 2017, 121.

writing often enough was crucial to maintaining a relationship through correspondence. Sophie Ruppel has found that many 17th-century German aristocratic siblings sent letters once or twice a week and expected prompt responses. However, she has also pointed out that large portions of a given correspondence could be missing, and that determining exactly how often siblings wrote to each other is therefore difficult.[139]

Even though letters were usually not meant to be public, the assumption was that multiple people would read a letter, as family members could have read them to each other, for example, which may have incited inhibitions regarding how they were written. In this period, confiscating letters was still easy for curious people or bandits while the correspondence was in transit. Nevertheless, some still attempted to maintain privacy in their correspondence. To cover up secrets, at least to a degree, correspondents could use euphemisms or a foreign language.[140] Furthermore, Constance Fowler explained that she was able to correspond with her brother Herbert Aston's future wife, Katherine Thimelby, in secret in a letter she sent to Aston in the 1630s by giving the letter to her maid, who then delivered it to Thimelby's maid. She noted that this "…proved a very saefe way to convay letters saefe to each other, without any ones knolledge".[141] Of course, the letters did not remain a complete secret, as she told Aston of them and even copied some for him to read.[142]

Established conventions and rules influenced how siblings wrote and expressed their emotions in correspondence. The conventions of letter writing were strict, and more intimate letters had set format. Different manuscript formularies, manuals, and collections of model letters passed these conventions on, with various examples that writers could adapt or copy. Furthermore, expectations set by polite society had an influence on letters, and a part of the purpose of correspondence was to teach politeness. The gender, mutual relationship, kin connection, societal status, and age of the correspondents had a material impact on the letter, affecting spacing, margins, and the quality of the paper, but they also influenced the tone and the level of politeness in the text. Furthermore, conventional letters had an opening greeting and closing remarks to make them meet expectations of politeness. Even expressions in closing remarks that may strike the modern reader as especially intense may have counted as conventional in early modern England.[143]

While greetings in letters may have followed accepted letter-writing conventions, their wording could also have had other goals. For example, a woman may have attempted to manipulate her brother by expressing obeisance

---

[139] Fowler 1815, 93; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis December 7, 1614, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 31; Fitzmaurice 2002, 51; Ruppel 2015, 253; Earle 2016, 8.

[140] O'Day 2001, 129, 140–141; Demers 2005, 119; Koskinen & Lahtinen 2011, 102; Earle 2016, 4. See also Daybell 2016 regarding letters that were copied and circulated (Daybell 2016, 368–369).

[141] Constance Fowler to Herbert Aston 1815, Tixall Letters 1815, 113.

[142] Ibid.

[143] Whyman 1999, 10; Fitzmaurice 2002, 20, 23, 25; Whyman 2009, 11–12, 21–22; Sangha 2016, 121.

in a greeting. The same applied to other letter-writing conventions, as individuals manipulated them to convey various emotions. Defiance of conventions could also signify ignorance. Usually, though, changes in the formality of greetings could indicate that a relationship was getting closer, while going back to more formal expressions could lead to hurt feelings.[144]

Long-term correspondence was not solely influenced by the larger normative context, as over time, the exchange of letters with the same partner established its own conventions that guided what could be written about and what should be avoided for the correspondence to continue. The often-fragmentary nature of surviving correspondence creates challenges for historians in exploring the precise nature of these norms. Nevertheless, while cultural customs and conventions impacted how letters were written, other factors, such as the writer's emotional state and purpose in writing a letter, were also crucial. Indeed, although some conventions certainly had an impact on the writing process, researchers have questioned the extent to which authors followed general expectations, such as those laid out in manuals. A great variety of ways to correspond existed in practice.[145] These various conventions guiding letter writing were critical to the analysis in this dissertation. What might have been written just because it was expected can sometimes be difficult to decipher, especially beyond the formulaic greetings. This was appropriately taken into consideration when examining the primary sources.

Letters also raised questions regarding sincerity, as the writer could take time to consider her or his words, edit the letter,[146] or construct a sort of character through writing, creating so-called "...fictions of the self..."[147] that were culturally specific and could differ based on the recipient. Furthermore, the writers of letters used rhetoric to be persuasive and moving, especially as they addressed a specific readership. A letter was not read passively, as the recipient interpreted the text through her or his own context in a way that did not necessarily align with what the writer intended.[148]

DIARIES

A diary can be understood as a regularly kept log of thoughts, events, and feelings authored by one writer, often open-ended with entries varying in length, and with a date before each entry. While diaries can contain reminiscences about earlier life events, many are contemporaneous. Diaries are not always chronological, but can include entries concerning both the future and the past. Some diaries are made for others, including one's offspring, to read. Many different factors motivated early modern men and women to write diaries. They could be kept due to piety, to record events that were deemed to be significant,

---

[144] O'Day 2001, 131; Fitzmaurice 2002, 31; Daybell 2015, 515; James 2017, 123.
[145] Lahtinen, Leskelä-Kärki, Vainio-Korhonen, & Vehkalahti 2011, 19–21; Del Lungo Camiciotti 2014, 138; Sangha 2016, 122.
[146] O'Day 2001, 128.
[147] Earle 2016, 2.
[148] Fitzmaurice 2002, 236, 238; Whyman 2009, 23; Earle 2016, 3.

or to give advice to younger members of the family. Diary writing spread throughout England over the course of the early modern period and became increasingly popular as time progressed. There were fewer female authors of diaries than males, but the women who wrote them differed little from men in their capability to produce intimate and analytical texts describing their lives. Since the 17th century, more than 332 diaries written by English people have survived. Out of these 332, only 20 were by female authors.[149]

Although some general descriptions of diaries existed at the time, as a genre, diary writing did not yet have a clear-cut definition, and it also had fewer prescriptive models than other genres, like letter-writing, for example. Regardless, some traditions and typical examples have emerged. Some diaries were circulated for others to read, which provided practical examples after which others could model their texts. This repetition of writing in a certain manner could generate new conventions. During the latter half of the 1600s, sharing and copying religious diaries, in addition to ministers encouraging people to write their own, established a new set of expectations, not just for these kinds of texts, but also for more secular diaries.[150]

In theory, diaries were only meant to be read by one person: the writer. Oftentimes, however, they were not merely private reflections of the author's inner self, but also manuscripts that were circulated and read by others. Authors could also take measures to attempt to conceal the text, for example, through codification, although this did not eliminate possible readers entirely, instead only limiting them. Reading these texts could also be a social event. Of course, if the author knew of the possibility of others reading the diary, this increased the likelihood of self-censorship. Finally, possibly because of the influence of shared texts and books, diaries became less and less individualistic during the 17th century, and many bore a resemblance to each other.[151] In particular, questions regarding the privacy of the genre or the possible audience were especially relevant to the analysis of this dissertation, as these factors may have had a significant impact on the text.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

One of the simplest ways to describe autobiography is to divide it into its original Greek words, *autos*, *bios*, and *graphe*, which translate into self, life, and writing. Autobiography could also be seen as a process of self-speaking to others. Researcher Paul Delany, in contrast, defined autobiography as a text written as a unified narrative after some time has passed that primarily concerns the life of the author, or a period thereof, presented in a coherent manner. It is a common and simple form of writing, as it does not really have formal rules, which poses difficulties in how to define it as a genre. As the term first emerged in the latter

---

[149] McKay 2005, 191–194; Cambers 2007, 812; Sangha 2016, 119, 122; Nandi 2021, 18–20, 23.
[150] Sangha 2016, 121–122; Nandi 2021, 17–18.
[151] O'Day 2001, 140; Cambers 2007, 806–807, 815–816, 821–822; Sangha 2016, 121.

half of the 18th century, previous texts of a similar style had other names, such as "confession", "the life", and "memoir".[152]

Despite autobiographies not being clearly distinct from diaries during the early modern period, and the term not yet existing in the 17th century, texts that could now be identified as autobiographies were still published and read during that time. Furthermore, most autobiographies published in Britain before the mid-18th century focused on religious life, while secular 17th-century autobiographies were often released much later. At the same time, while 17th-century English autobiographies can be divided into secular and religious categories, according to the authors and their focus, the division was not always clear, as secular works could contain religious elements, for example. During the 17th century, linear autobiographies beginning from childhood became influential, but a variety of different types also existed. Some autobiographies were more objective, taking a general look at the author's life but the main focus on external events, while others were more subjective. There were also various other kinds of published writings about individual lives that served as examples for writers of autobiographies, such as martyrologies, religious biographies and histories, narratives of political figures, and moralising biographies based on diaries. Autobiographies were written for many reasons, such as to serve as an example, to defend a reputation, to assert one's identity, to justify leaving a husband, or to respect, defend, and commemorate the author's achievements.[153]

Autobiographies usually had an expected audience. Regardless of the public nature of some autobiographies, however, many authors of diaries and autobiographies took into account the possibility of more unwelcome readers by taking such measures as anonymising names or using code or foreign languages to make it harder for others to understand the text. This was not necessarily a way to shut out all readers, but rather a means of limiting access. Furthermore, autobiography was not simply an act of self-expression but a kind of performance in which the writer could use different means to manipulate how the audience would respond to the text; in other words, the author could adopt a persona. This could limit the selection of which parts were included and even encourage the proliferation of deliberate lies. According to Jonathan Goldberg, the self was public and depersonalised in early modern autobiography, rather than privately construed. In this vein, literary criticism views autobiographies as both fact and fiction, as they present the author's constructed identity. By creating an autobiography, the author can imitate, create, and discover what the self is, but also lie for many reasons. Nevertheless, despite the existence of various conventions and the impact of the surrounding context, letters, diaries, and autobiographies were still written by authors who displayed individual differences in their texts.[154]

---

[152] Delany 1969, 1; Olney 1980, 3–6; Wilcox, Hobby, Hind, & Graham 1989, 17; Smith & Watson 2001, 1–2.
[153] Gusdorf 1956/1980, 36; Delany 1969, 2, 4, 107–108; Wilcox, Hobby, Hind, & Graham 1989, 15–17, 19; Sangha 2016, 122–123.
[154] Delany 1969, 114; Goldberg 1974, 71; Olney 1980, 19, 21; Gilmore 1994, 25; Cambers 2007, 806–807; Sangha 2016, 123.

The possible intended audience of an autobiography is a critical to take into consideration when analysing these types of texts. Taking note of how the intended audience could influence autobiographical texts will emerge here as a significant theme, especially in Section 3.3 of this study. These issues also connect autobiographies to questions about the sincerity of emotional expressions, which may have influenced the emotions siblings expressed. As noted earlier, I have often use 19th-century editions, which may have omitted or modified some of the original material.[155] Finding complementary sources, such as archival materials, has thus been desirable, though not always possible.

Autobiographies, diaries, and letters are complex and rich sources for historians. This section has introduced these types of texts as sources and discussed source-critical themes that are of vital importance to the analysis of emotional expressions. Genre conventions are important for understanding how texts were constructed, which, in turn, informs how the researcher approaches the material. When examining letters, the conventions within them, especially in opening greetings and closing formulae, are essential to bear in mind, so that the analysis can move on to other content-laden parts of the correspondence. The intended audiences also need to be considered, to the extent that they can be determined. However, even if authors only wrote for themselves, other matters, such as individual and societal contexts, hierarchical structures, and possible reasons for why a text was written, could impact how siblings expressed their emotions and were thus taken into consideration in the analysis. Overall, the researcher needs to be sensitive to which parts of the sources can be seen as emotional expressions – and which cannot – as understanding indirect ways of conveying feelings is important, but so is preventing the analysis from extrapolating too far.

STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION

The second chapter provides more context by examining how power relations and the frameworks that encouraged or limited emotional expressions functioned in 17th-century England. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 then go on to analyse siblings and emotions. The third chapter, entitled "Emotional expressions, chastisement, and disputes," examines the different ways in which siblings expressed emotions during disputes and how these expressions connected to such factors as biological age and power. This chapter pays special attention to chastisement and expressions of anger by appearing as the victim. Furthermore, I note how sisters could express emotions and act during disputes from the point of view of anger and affection.

The fourth chapter, "Actions and emotions", explores how siblings expressed their emotions through, or in connection with, actions, and how this could both enforce existing hierarchies and provide opportunities for those in less powerful positions to exert power. The chapter investigates the role that duty played in this process. The specific actions upon which it focuses are helping,

---

[155] For example, see Newcome & Parkinson 1852, iv.

correspondence and visiting, and caring for the sick. These two chapters reinforce each other, as they ask similar questions about the material, even though they focus on different themes. The emotional expressions analysed in Chapter 3 are primarily linked to anger or related emotions, while Chapter 4 analyses affection and sadness in more detail. The fifth chapter, "Avoiding, changing, and replacing emotional expressions", takes a slightly different approach by exploring how siblings used power in situations where emotions were avoided, changed, or replaced in some manner. This chapter aims to answer the question, "How did men and women try to influence the emotions their siblings expressed?" In doing so, it deals with disagreements, as does Chapter 3, but rather than focusing on the disagreements themselves, it addresses the time before they started or attempts to end them. It also discusses consolation. Finally, the conclusion summarises the main findings of the dissertation and contextualises them vis-à-vis the relevant literature.

2 FAMILY, POWER, AND EMOTIONS IN 17TH CENTURY ENGLAND

In this chapter, I will introduce the context that is crucial to understanding 17th-century English siblings and their emotional expressions and reflect on how it could have influenced their lives, behaviours, and the ways in which they conveyed their feelings. I will introduce the family, siblings, and relevant power structures, as well as the normative framework within which they existed. Furthermore, I will look at emotions and the ways in which they were understood in this particular normative context to determine how the siblings examined in this dissertation understood the emotions they were expressing. I will also introduce the context underlying family relationships, which pertains to most of the matters analysed in the next three chapters.

The social context examined here existed within the broader framework of the turmoil that characterised 17th-century England. The English Civil War had its roots in religious differences, which helped to generate immense social and political tensions.[156] The war was fought in 1642–1652 between those supporting the parliament, led by Oliver Cromwell, and those supporting King Charles I.[157] The writers of the primary sources used in this dissertation belonged to both royalists and supporters of parliament. For example, Alice Thornton wrote about the beheading of the king in 1648/9: "Our blessed King Charles the First, whoes memmory shall live to etternity, was cruelly murthered by the hands of blasphemous rebells…"[158] Henry Oxinden, in contrast, was referred to as a "…strong …parliamentarian…"[159]

Religion was strongly tied to the Civil War. The English Reformation was reflected in the war, as the disagreements that emerged during the 16th century became talking points in the 17th century. One of the most significant concerns

---

[156] Marshall 2003, 113.
[157] Malcolm Wanklyn and Frank Jones's *A Military History of the English Civil War: 1642–1649* offers a general overview of the subject (Wanklyn & Jones 2005/2014).
[158] Thornton 1875, 56.
[159] Thomas Barrow to Henry Oxinden July 3, 1642, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 310.

leading up to the war was the amount of power a king should have, as instability was created through what was seen by some as "popery" and arbitrary government. Charles I also feared the parliament. As he saw it, the puritans, republicans, and enemies of the monarchy wanted to reduce his power, which he was concerned about protecting. It should be noted that the fighting could be seen as having taken place between Protestants from different denominations defending the English Reformation, rather than between Protestants and Catholics. Catholicism nevertheless remained connected to the conflict, as, for example, Puritans believed that the royalists and the king had treated Catholics too leniently in the 1630s.[160] Of course, the Civil War affected the lives and experiences of many families.[161] For example, Alice Thornton wrote about her brother George Wandesforde's sequestration, noting, "Being sequestered…for the parliament…under the pretence of godlinesse and religion, because he did not joyne in such practices of rebellion against the church of God and our lawfull King…"[162]

The years of the Interregnum between 1649 and 1660, beginning after King Charles I was executed, included two periods of the so-called Rump Parliament in 1648–1653 and briefly in 1659–1660, the Protectorate from 1653 to 1659, the rule of Oliver Cromwell, and the short-lived rule of his son Richard. While the supporters of parliament won the war, the Protectorate could be seen as an elective monarchy, and the monarchical quality of Cromwell's rule was subject to criticism. The Interregnum ended with the Stuart Restoration of 1660, the objective of which was to restore the old regime at an institutional level, including bring back both the parliament and the monarchy in England. Further aims included greater ideological restraints, such as punishment for religious dissent, and government by law, instead of the kind of arbitrary rule that had often been in place before the Restoration. Charles II, who had risen to the throne in 1660, was succeeded by James II in 1685 and then by the Dutch William III of Orange and his wife Mary, King James's daughter, during the Glorious Revolution of 1688–1689. This revolution was driven partly by opposition to James II over his policies and his Catholic faith.[163]

2.1 Family, household, and siblings

The context within which 17th-century English siblings conveyed their feelings is crucial to analysing their emotional expressions. In this section, I will discuss the general significance of sibling relationships in 17th-century England. An examination of family structures will help to explain how siblings lived their lives and how these familial connections could deeply influence their actions and

---

[160] Coffey 2000, 121; Scott 2000, 24, 63, 93–94; Marshall 2003, 195, 217–219.
[161] MacKinnon 2021, 131. Dolly MacKinnon has examined the subject from the point of view of youth and children.
[162] Thornton 1875, 57–58.
[163] Scott 2000, 406, 408–409; Sowerby 2013, 7, 15, 219–220, 260. See also Hutton 1985.

inner worlds. A look into the most common household and family structures in early modern England highlights the place of siblings within them. This, in turn, provides insight into the significance of sibling relationships and the roles that the brothers and sisters examined in this dissertation played in each other's lives.

Kinship can be seen as a crucial factor shaping the history of Europe and the relationships between those who were related by blood. The family unit in early modern England was patriarchal and consisted, usually, of a nuclear family, while the household as a whole in upper and middling sort families also included servants. Except for the upper levels of society, it was uncommon to find families with more than one couple. More extended families existed primarily among the elite and could include children of siblings, stepchildren, siblings, and elderly parents. Some widowers and widows also headed their own households and lived, for example, with their children. The household was a place in which meaning was given to authority and gender through interactions involving various kinds of contestations and negotiations. Additionally, the emotional norms of the larger society were adapted into each household.[164]

Being part of the same household could be a significant determinant of the closeness of family relationships. Nevertheless, even though households were usually composed of nuclear families and their servants, this did not mean that other relatives were unimportant. Family historians have long discussed the significance of the nuclear family in comparison with other kinship ties in England. Influential research conducted by Lawrence Stone in the late 1970s did not consider the nuclear family as important before 1630, as compared with relations with neighbours and other kin. Naomi Tadmor, however, has subsequently argued that England was always focused on nuclear families, with kinship ties being looser. In Tadmor's view, continuity could be detected in this kind of English kinship system that extended from medieval times through to modernity. In contrast, David Cressy has emphasised the need to critically examine the dominant understanding of the prevalence of the nuclear family. While Stone maintained that kinship declined in importance during the 17th century and onwards, Cressy criticised this view for not having strong enough evidence. Other studies have seen kinship ties, including, for example, cousins, according to Alan Everitt's research first published in 1969, as being strong and even growing in importance going forward into modernity.[165]

While other forms of household composition were rarer, they did exist. Although siblings living under the same roof as their parents would be considered part of the same family and household, the situation could change when they grew up and moved out. The amount of kin located within immediate reach could be limited regardless of the societal position, for example, due to marriages or young people becoming apprentices or finding employment elsewhere as servants. Nevertheless, siblings still occasionally lived together.

---

[164] Eales 1998, 60–61; Kertzer & Barbagli 2001, xv; Crawford 2004/2014, 8–9, 209; Froide 2005, 18; Broomhall 2008, 3–4; Johnson & Sabean 2011, 1. For more on non-elite households, see Buxton 2015.
[165] Cressy 1986, 38, 40, 44; Tadmor 2001, 110–112.

Sisters and brothers who lived with their sibling's families have been considered by some researchers to be part of the same household, but not the same family, while others have pointed to evidence of them having been more integral to the family unit. Furthermore, although elder brothers might have allowed their younger brothers to live with them temporarily, brothers did not usually live together when they were already married.[166] Overall, the general complexity of families is evident in the 17th-century self-written documents. For instance, in Sir John Bramston's autobiography, he describes how, after his aunt's husband John Stepkin died, his aunt Mary and their children moved in with John's father, also named John, as was instructed in the will. Mary looked after her brother while the children grew up with the family. In this case, the siblings called their aunt "grandmother".[167]

Being part of the same physical household was, however, not the only way siblings could play a significant role in each other's lives. Susan Broomhall's notion of siblings being part of a so-called imagined household, discussed in the first chapter, highlights how whether siblings actually lived together or not was not necessarily that important. An imagined household could connect siblings who lived apart and provide a space in which to define authority and hierarchy in emotional relationships. Such a conception was tied to the expectations that family members had regarding their emotional connections.[168] The siblings analysed in this dissertation did not often live together, but this was not necessarily indicative of their significance to each other. Rather, many of the cases examined here reveal the relevance of sibling relationships even though they did not form a shared physical household. As Bernard Capp has stated, "…the sibling relationship was recognised as important and rooted in nature".[169]

Overall, while nuclear families were formed and held important significance among married couples in 17th-century England, other kinship ties could, depending on individual circumstances, have great importance as well. This was especially evident in the sources examined in this dissertation concerning sibling relationships. Although kin could bring duties, these relationships also provided benefits. Ignoring wider kin and turning to other members of the community was possible, but becoming close to distant kin could provide someone to turn to when the need arose.[170] The focus on the nuclear family did not rule out other relationships being significant in the lives of men and women. Rather, siblings could have the longest-lasting familial relationships and thus exert an influence on their brothers and sisters throughout their lives. Furthermore, they could form crucial support systems or even replace parental roles for orphaned children.[171]

---

[166] Tadmor 2001, 108; Broomhall 2008, 17; Capp 2018, 43.
[167] Bramston 1845, 14.
[168] Broomhall 2008, 17. See also Harris 2016, 19, 112, 114, 117.
[169] Capp 2018, 202.
[170] Cressy 1986, 68–69. In contrast, when examining the patients of Richard Napier, who treated the mentally ill, MacDonald noted that the nuclear family was the emotional centre of ordinary people's lives. Still, others, such as neighbours, siblings, and other kin, were also important. (MacDonald 1981/1983, 13, 105.)
[171] Glover 2000, 31; Crawford 2004/2014, 209–211, 218–219.

To effectively understand the family relations described in the primary sources, it is crucial to note that the naming conventions of 17th-century England differed from modern ones. Among the terms that early modern English men and women used for their siblings were kindred and relations. It was also possible to refer to siblings as friends. These terms were unspecific and could be used to describe different kinds of kin relations. Generally, people used the words sister and brother both in a broader and narrower sense.[172] Early modern English people could, in other words, refer to multiple people with varying degrees of kinship with the same terms, which poses some challenges for an examination of 17th-century English autobiographical sources concerning sibling relationships. It is also necessary to take performative and textual contexts into consideration when examining cases in which these kinship terms were used. Besides describing marriage and blood relations, kinship terms also signified moral duties and social relationships. This brought with it certain expectations, such as solidarity, duty, support, and consideration, but, of course, these were not necessarily followed in real life, as is the case with all norms. Moreover, naming various kin had the potential to serve as a promise of obligations and an announcement of status.[173]

Naming conventions, however, also had structures to help differentiate between siblings. In addition to different personal approaches, those related either by blood or marriage could be called by their Christian name, the kinship term, or both, while others who joined the kinship group through a marriage could be called by their Christian name and surname or just surname and the kinship term. Married women, furthermore, were called by a kinship term and often also their new surname, which usually applied to married sisters. Kinship terms were also used to describe not only relatives but other relationships as well. Specifically, the words brother and sister were used to denote various other people, such as close friends. While these ways of naming spread kinship models beyond actual kin, there were also moral attributes attached to the terms that could further promote their broader use. For example, the word brother was also, among other things, used in non-kin relationships with amity, fellowship, and sympathy.[174] The way a kinship term was used either in combination with a name and a surname or on its own was connected to hierarchies of age and gender, in addition to signifying which kin was being discussed.[175]

---

[172] Tadmor 2001, 129, 132, 139. For example, due to how marriage incorporated two kinship groups, men and women could also use the words brother and sister to describe their sister- or brother-in-law, including siblings' husbands or wives (Tadmor 2001, 133), siblings of their own spouses, or spouses' siblings' husbands or wives (Tadmor 2001, 135).
[173] Ibid., 140–141. For example, using the term mother for the wife's mother did not necessarily signify affection, wanting another mother figure, or a belief that both she and the actual mother had the same kind of a relationship with the person in question. It might rather suggest a new parental and filial relationship created by a marriage, with both parties taking up the positions these terms implied. (Tadmor 2001, 140.)
[174] Reresby 1875, 89, 128, 223; Tadmor 2001, 141–143; 157–159.
[175] Tadmor 2010, 32.

2.2 Power

In this section, I will introduce the relevant context connected to the theme of power, which could also impact sibling relationships. I will discuss those factors connected to all the cases discussed in this dissertation as background influences on how power relations were constructed.

European societies in the early modern period were hierarchical. [176] Accordingly, power relations emerged in a variety of ways in the lives of siblings. They were reflected in birth order, age, and economic factors, as the most crucial component in creating hierarchies between siblings in England was primogeniture. [177] Its significance will also become apparent in the sibling hierarchies found in the primary sources of this dissertation. Primogeniture meant that the eldest male sibling inherited most of the estate. It was favoured by the English gentry and aristocracy and by many middling sort, as well vis-à-vis real estate, but at lower levels of society, inheritance was distributed in a more egalitarian manner. The system of primogeniture kept the land of families at the upper levels of society intact and capable of producing significant income. Furthermore, it often put a strain on the relationships between an early modern English heir and his younger brothers, as well as on the bond the eldest brother had with his sisters, since it favoured one over the others and did not reward ability. However, the practice did not automatically doom other siblings to hardship, as they were often compensated in some manner. [178]

Parents shared the family wealth through settlements they had made before getting married and through wills. Generally, an early modern English father could decide, at least in the eyes of the law, how to divide his property in his testament and whom to disinherit. This was justified by the notion that it provided dependency for the children, which then supposedly created obedient offspring. At the same time, it also caused rivalries between siblings. [179] There were various kinds of settlement types. [180] If the husband died first, a strict settlement gave the wife a jointure or, in other words, an annual income. The other children, besides the eldest son, were awarded provisions, usually in cash, while the heir, like his father, was a tenant for life on the estate he owned. Strict settlements were common in the late 17th century. Furthermore, a trust could be set up for a wife's separate estate in a settlement and, for example, paid as an

---

[176] Burke 1993, 92.

[177] The significance is also apparent when considering how Lorri Glover has argued that 18th-century South-Carolinian gentry sibling relationships were not hierarchical due to, among other things, the lack of primogeniture. As primogeniture existed in England, it can be said to have created these hierarchies. (Glover 2000, 10–11.)

[178] Earle 1989, 315; Davidoff 1995, 214; Austin 1999, 18; Ben-Amos 2000b, 301; Glover 2000, 10; Johnson & Sabean 2011, 2. According to Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall's analysis, at least from 1780 to 1850, partible inheritance was preferred by the middle class (Davidoff & Hall 1987/2002, 206).

[179] Staves 1995, 199–200.

[180] It should be noted that a dowry, also described as the female inheritance, was also significant for forming connections and alliances, as through this process, women played a part in the power relations between two families (Johnson & Sabean 2011, 2).

annuity.[181] Through such arrangements, not just men but also women in various life stages had the potential to be financially supported. Settlements and wills could also include an allowance to be paid, for example, to younger children by the father or the heir, although many would not pay one. Even if there were these unpaid portions, normatively, the expectation was for the younger children to think twice about suing the father or the heir, upon whom they could in the future rely for favours, and who were entitled to respect. Of course, in reality, these lawsuits nevertheless took place. It was also possible for siblings to improve their financial situations by marrying well.[182] Overall, a higher age gave more agency. The eldest brother expected obedience from the younger siblings, and the eldest daughter had a higher position than her younger sisters. This could mean that she might have better monetary support from her family compared with the others, for example, in the form of a portion.[183] In the cases examined for this dissertation, economic factors often influenced the kind of power the siblings had, and the significance of primogeniture cannot be ignored. However, power relations were much more complex than just a matter of who had money and who did not. Accordingly, in this dissertation, I take note of how emotional expressions lent opportunities for agency to those with less structural and hierarchical power. At the same time, the heir could also encounter financial troubles as well.[184]

Despite its salience, primogeniture was not, however, supported by all. John Locke noted "that primogeniture cannot give any title to paternal power, we have already shown. That a father may have a natural right to some kind of power over his children, is easily granted; but that an elder brother has so over his brethren, remains to be proved…"[185] A tract published in 1659 by William Sprigg also did not approve of only one brother inheriting most of a family's property, suggesting instead that it should be divided equally amongst the brothers. However, as historian Patricia Crawford has argued, Sprigg did not talk about women, but only about sons of the family. Crawford has also shown how some early modern English people hinted that primogeniture was unjust, or at least were aware of the inequalities it created. At the same time, Bernard Capp identified the influence of affection and obligation in motivating the heir to help their siblings.[186] Primogeniture was indeed significant for early modern siblings, but it did not mean that the heir was a tyrant or that the other siblings were deprived of agency. It should also be emphasised that the position of the heir did not always entail having a better financial position than the younger siblings.[187]

The conversation regarding equality between siblings extended to theoretical discussions, with some supporting strict patriarchal governance and others opposing it. John Locke noted in his work *Two Treatises of Government* that

---

[181] Thirsk 1969, 375; Erickson 1993, 103; Habakkuk 1994, 1–2, 12–13. See also Barclay 2017c.
[182] Staves 1995, 202–203; Johnson & Sabean 2011, 2–3.
[183] Capp 2018, 32, 71–72.
[184] Capp 2018, 33.
[185] Locke 2003, 69.
[186] Sprigg 1659, 83–84; Crawford 2004/2014, 216; Capp 2018, 34.
[187] Capp 2018, 37.

people were born free and that neither nature nor God commanded younger siblings to obey their eldest brother.[188] Locke further commented in his work on Robert Filmer's thoughts on the nature of hierarchy and power. In his text *Patriarcha; or the Natural Power of Kings,* which was published in 1680, Filmer opposed the view that men were born free. He thought that the father had absolute power within the family, and that the monarch's role in society was comparable, the basis being Adam's position in the Bible.[189]

Aside from primogeniture, gender also influenced power relations among siblings. While gender analysis was not the main focus of this dissertation, it should be noted that it was still a significant influence on sisters' relationships with their siblings, for instance. Indeed, the position of women in society also affected power within sibling relations, as is evident in the primary sources of this dissertation. Society was hardly equal for men and women. Values that were generally respected and upheld on a larger scale had an impact on sibling relationships and cannot be ignored when examining how siblings interacted. Overall, women were seen as intellectually inferior, which was used to justify their hierarchically lower position as a natural one. In general, chastity and obedience were virtues that all women were expected to follow, but silence was also crucial. Even though the heir was still in the best position, as Leonore Davidoff has reminded us, even younger brothers were born more privileged compared with their sisters. Several factors, such as the expectation of respectfulness and the maintenance of economic dependency, sustained this position. Independent status, wealth, and power were difficult to attain for women, and the principal responsibility that women were expected to fulfil continued to be giving birth. Generally, women did not have as many opportunities in life as their brothers, who, even if they were not the heirs, could still make a living by doing various kinds of work.[190]

The early modern English patriarchal household was an important factor contributing to inequalities. Understanding this background adds clarity to the broader context within which sisters operated. The household was ideally led by the husband, who was expected to maintain discipline but also to offer moral advice, although this duty also extended to the wife. Regardless, gender hierarchy was sustained in a variety of ways. Patriarchalism and women's subordination were reinforced in popular culture, which was at its core misogynistic. Furthermore, the authority of the husband was reiterated through the church, in addition to other forms of control exercised within the household, such as the master-servant relationships and the power of parents over their children. Contemporary writers specifically reminded married couples that wives should follow their men rather than attempt to give them orders. For example being a scold was associated with the characteristics of a stereotypically

---

[188] Locke 2003, 26, 59–60, 72, 100–101; Laslett 1963, 93. Despite him seeing men as equal and free, Locke still saw the husband as having paternal power and governing other members of the family. As he believed this power to be limited, this did not clash with his other ideas. (Kelly 2002, 367.)

[189] Filmer 1680, 3, 11–13.

[190] MacDonald 1981/1983, 98–99; Korhonen 2005, 17; Davidoff 2006, 20–21; Capp 2018, 17.

bad wife. On the other hand, for the husband not to act like a tyrant and abuse his power, he needed to love his family and take care of them and his servants. Others had to be respectful and loyal to him as well. Still, the household was not run by a single person, but rather collaboratively, although everyone's role within the home was defined, and there were established boundaries. Power structures within the family could nevertheless be shaken up by various emotional connections. For example, love could lessen hierarchical distances, and anger could play a role in how household dynamics were formed. Furthermore, there were continually women who had power and autonomy, at least to a degree, and patriarchy was thus not absolute.[191] The social structures that patriarchal society created influenced the possibilities women had and reflected the hierarchy of sibling relationships.

Regardless of the inequalities between men and women, the legal privileges that men enjoyed did not strictly affect sibling relationships. Many sibling relationships were altruistic and close, regardless of gender, and men and women could become closer and more equal in this setting than in other places or relationships. People valued the affection of a brother or sister and saw sibling relationships as naturally affectionate friendships. Amy Harris has explained in her research concerning 18th-century England that siblings were seen as somewhat equal in certain ways, while also noting that economic factors, such as primogeniture and strict settlements, still created inequalities, although they only affected a portion of the population. For example, variations in age differences, marital status, and gender could even out the primary social hierarchies.[192] As intersectionality reminds us,[193] there were many contexts that influenced the lives of sisters. Wealth could, for example, provide opportunities for certain women that others could not attain.[194] Indeed, the weaker position of women did not mean that sisters could not hold power over their brothers, but rather that they were less likely to be in a dominant role in the relationship. For example, in Chapter 3, I will show that despite women's lower social position, sisters were not just passive during disagreements with their brothers but also attempted to gain control.

Emotions are also connected to power in various ways. Joanna Bourke has noted that "…emotions [were] an expression of power relations"[195] and that "[t]he history of the emotions cannot ignore power relations".[196] While Bourke has argued that emotions could contribute to the ways in which subordination was reproduced or created, it was also possible for emotions to unravel subordination. In her view, feelings helped people to connect with others, but at the same time influenced power relations by unravelling or creating the means of subordination. At the same time, Anthony Fletcher has contended that the

---

[191] MacDonald 1981/1983, 99; Amussen 1995, 50; Fletcher 1995, 205; Barclay 2017b, 245–246; Brady 2008, 188–189; Amussen 2018, 344.
[192] Crawford 2004/2014, 225; Harris 2016, 33, 57, 145, 160; Lahtinen 2021, 85.
[193] See Crenshaw 1991.
[194] MacDonald 1981/1983, 100.
[195] Bourke 2003, 113.
[196] Ibid., 123.

relationships among family members were influenced by their connections through affection and blood, which could change or subvert the ways in which those in power used their authority. He also argued that this dynamic did not extend to all members of the household, as the master-servant relationship was not bound by similar factors.[197] The kinds of bonds that Fletcher describes and their ability to influence power relations will become apparent in the many cases examined in this dissertation. Although money and gender were important, and sibling relationships formed clear hierarchies, affection between siblings could have a crucial influence on behaviour.

Emotional expressions could indeed have a significant effect on how power relations between siblings developed, and this dissertation will examine how conveying emotions helped those in less powerful positions gain at least some agency. Actions and expressions of emotions were connected to power and hierarchy, but also provided ways to overturn these structures. For example, hierarchical positions affected who was able to express emotions, such as anger, but unexpected outbursts could interfere with the conventional use of power. Siblings could assert power through the way they used language to express emotions, but interpretations of feelings could also be a method to resist power.[198] Indeed, the ability to convey feelings was connected to the power members of the family held, but expressions of emotions could also help negotiate or govern hierarchies. Other factors besides hierarchy also had an influence on emotional expressions, including personality.[199]

This dissertation acknowledges the significance of primogeniture and the agency of the heir or others based on various factors, such as age. Indeed, a normatively built sibling hierarchy gave some better possibilities for agency than others. However, this study also explores the power of the weak. Beyond these expectations, sibling hierarchy was complex and influenced by different contexts, and it could vary from family to family. The connection to intersectionality is also important, as various categories such as gender and age could create subordination or privilege for different siblings. Generally, it cannot be said that sibling hierarchy in 17th-century England was strict and unchangeable. Rather, while expectations and social structures gave some siblings more opportunities to exert agency and to use power than others, there was also much room to reshape the hierarchy, regardless of age and gender. Furthermore, besides those traditionally in power due to the hierarchical structures of a patriarchal society, especially the eldest son, others could also find ways to use power. Accordingly, this dissertation discusses how brothers and sisters used their powerful positions within sibling hierarchies to have and maintain control, but it will also show how others found ways to bend the normative understanding of these hierarchical structures to gain agency.

---

[197] Fletcher 1995, 213; Bourke 2003, 113, 125.
[198] Broomhall & Van Gent 2009, 158. Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline Van Gent have studied the sibling relationships of William of Nassau's children (Broomhall & Van Gent 2009, 143–144).
[199] Geussens 2022, 156, 166.

Based on the context that influenced sibling hierarchy examined in this section, this dissertation will reveal how siblings of different ages and both genders were able to stretch the limits of existing power relations and expectations, focusing on the role that emotional expressions played in this process. While the sibling hierarchy was often formed around the eldest brother and his younger siblings, this dissertation examines how others also wanted and tried to exert control in various ways. Additionally, it will look at how conveying feelings could also reinforce the hierarchical structure of younger siblings obeying the eldest brother, who was often in a privileged position.

It is crucial to acknowledge that even siblings in powerful hierarchical positions faced limits. John Locke recognised that custom, which could now be called socialisation, along with authority figures and reputation had an impact on people's behaviour. In Locke's view, these factors supported powerful people. Although he saw that custom had great power, he noted that it should serve the authority of reason and encourage independent thinking. Reputation in a larger setting, nevertheless, set expectations and restrictions for behaviour. It was very important to a household, for example, as it was a crucial social unit and influenced how economically reliable its members were seen to be.[200] The need to maintain a reputation could motivate siblings to follow normative expectations and influence the power relations between them.

Finally, expectations connected to emotions also played a role in restricting behaviour. The code of civility in 17th-century England demanded that elite men should control their emotions, but this was not required of the poor. Rather than simply managing emotions by repressing them, different cultures also had many other ways of controlling them. In England, these included such means as intervention, arbitration, emphasising harmony, and appealing to honour. Emotional expressions were not necessarily forbidden, but moderation was often expected. Emotions were seen as feminine, subjective, animalistic, and against the common good, and the open expression of emotions was not considered manly. The normative context regarded women as more unstable in their feelings, but emotions were still seen as more fitting for women than for men. These kinds of gender differences were reflected in how women were seen as unstable and unable to exhibit control, while men were expected to control their emotions. Still, considering the way normative literature often focused on the emotions of men, feelings were certainly seen as significant in their lives as well.[201]

2.3 Emotions

Normative expectations concerning specific emotions and emotional expressions influenced how men and women expressed themselves and how they understood the emotions they conveyed to each other. Awareness of these

---

[200] Broomhall 2008, 3; Grant 2012, 607, 609–610, 624, 628.
[201] Korhonen 2002, 67; Pollock 2004, 590; Korhonen 2005, 16, 21–22; Capp 2014, 81–82, 86.

expectations also helps in attempts to recognise and analyse emotional expressions from the contemporary perspective, instead of defining these feelings through a modern understanding. These factors are important to consider, especially when examining how language was used in 17th-century sibling relations. With this in mind, in the following, I will review some of the most common emotions expressed in the primary sources that I have analysed. I will start by giving an overview of how early modern English people understood emotions based on prescriptive sources and continue by exploring how words connected to anger, affection and sadness were used. This will illuminate the richness of direct ways of expressing these emotions and provide context for the meanings behind these words. It will also give at least some indication of how contemporaries may have understood emotions. I will examine further norms connected to specific emotions in relevant places in the following chapters.

EARLY MODERN EMOTIONS

Early modern English people understood that observations regarding the body and the surroundings it produced birthed emotions. In other words, emotions could be understood as reactions to external stimuli. In addition to the connection between the mind and the body, the early modern period saw the proliferation of many discourses regarding emotions related to humoural theory. In the humoural model, the body contains four fluids: black and yellow bile, blood, and phlegm. When one of them has a dominant position in the body compared with the other humours, it produces specific character traits. These are called the four temperaments. For example, yellow bile makes a person irritable, while too much phlegm leads to sluggishness. While the four temperaments were popular in late medieval and Renaissance scientific thought and popular culture, in the 17th century, the humoural model started to become less relevant to how mental phenomena were interpreted, although it still had its place in the larger European cultural context. [202] Humoural theory may have established certain preconceptions about how siblings perceived each other and had an impact on how they received and interpreted emotions. Humoural physiology, furthermore, could have impacted the way sisters were seen, as it contended that strength came from heat, and as women were perceived as colder than men, they were often seen as weaker.[203]

A variety of 17th-century commentators also discussed how they understood emotions. Thomas Wright, a Catholic priest, based his understanding of the material causes of emotions on the humours in *The Passions of the Minde in Generall* (1604). Wright also recognised differences in people's emotional reactions and connected these to humoural theory and its different temperaments. At the same time, he also noted the influence of gender and age on emotional expressions. By following Thomas Aquinas and the Thomists, at least to some degree, he divided emotions into six types: desire, love, pleasure,

---

[202] Korhonen 2005, 14–15; Bos 2009, 31, 37–38, 44; Trigg 2017, 10.
[203] Fletcher 1995, xvi.

fear, sadness, and hatred.[204] He saw the first three as "…tend[ing] to some good…"[205] and the latter three as opposed to the first set, arguing that all emotions could be reduced to these six.[206] On where emotions came from, he commented, "…the very seate of all Passions, is the hearte…"[207] and clarified that this was true "…especially in those passions, which are about obiectes absent, as love, hatred, hope, flight, ire…" [208] He also acknowledged that emotions connected to the senses, pain and pleasure, could inhabit other parts of the body. Wright followed Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas in believing in a tripartite soul. Out of the three parts of the soul, including the vegetative, the sensitive (which was connected to the senses), and the rational, the latter two formed the mind, which housed emotions. [209] At the same time, Wright warned people of the "…inordinate motions of Passions…"[210] as they would "…blinde reason…"[211] and also influence the body and "…cause many Maladies…"[212]

Based on the work of Plato and the Stoics, the general belief among medieval philosophers was that emotions negatively influenced morality and rationality. This continued on into the 17th century. Aside from Wright's warnings about the impact of emotions on rationality, the ability of emotions to overcome reason was also present in Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621), for example. However, in *The Passions of the Soul* (*Les Passions de l'âme*), first published in France in 1649, René Descartes was one of the first to question whether reason and emotions were opposites. [213] He noted that emotions were "…all by nature good,"[214] although he did not deny the existence of unpleasant feelings, noting that feelings could provide a foundation for rational and favourable behaviours. For example, he wrote, "…these five passions are all very useful to the body…"[215] and described how pain was an indication of the body being harmed, which induced hatred for whatever was causing the pain and a desire to eliminate it. Descartes, furthermore, thought that improper feelings could be prevented and emotions controlled. He also rejected the notion of emotions residing in the heart. Instead, he connected the cause of emotions to both physiological changes and cognitive factors.[216]

At the end of the 17th-century, John Locke held an understanding of emotions that contrasted with those of both Wright and Descartes. He focused on pleasure and pain as producing emotions, maintaining that they "…are the

---

[204] Wright 1604, 8, 25, 37, 39–40; Firth-Godbehere 2015, 1, 10, 12.
[205] Wright 1604, 25.
[206] Ibid., 25.
[207] Ibid., 33.
[208] Ibid., 34.
[209] Ibid., 8, 12–13, 34; Firth-Godbehere 2015, 10.
[210] Ibid., 2.
[211] Ibid.
[212] Ibid., 63.
[213] Burton 1621, 8; Descartes 1985, 403; Gut 2018, 120–121.
[214] Descartes 1985, 403.
[215] Ibid., 376. By five passions, he meant love, joy, sadness, desire and hatred (Descartes 1985, 376).
[216] Descartes 1650, 27; Descartes 1985, 376; Gut 2018, 121, 126.

hinges on which our *Passions* turn…"[217] He also emotional expressions as names for internal sensations caused by pain or pleasure and noted that good was something that would lessen pain and increase or produce pleasure, while evil was the opposite. Joel P. Sodano has argued that Locke did not see humans as passive in terms of emotions; instead, a person had the power to govern his or her own feelings. While Locke moved towards a more secular understanding of emotions, Christianity was not completely severed from his ideas.[218]

As gender hierarchy was a crucial part of every ideology at that time, it also critically informed how people and their emotions were understood.[219] Because men's and women's experiences of emotions were seen as different, these expectations had the potential to reflect the way siblings expressed themselves as well. In seeing Adam connected to reason and Eve to emotions, history, experiences of everyday life, and medical notions were used to explain why higher emotionality and changeable moods were connected to women. Men were not emotionally as fickle but rather connected to reason, which was seen as masculine, objective, and abiding by established values and norms.[220]

ANGER, AFFECTION, AND SADNESS IN DICTIONARIES

Contemporary understandings of emotion words have received considerable attention in the study of the history of emotions. Contextual analysis of the use of language, as described by Rob Boddice, focuses on the context and meaning given to words during specific periods of time. Such an approach begins by investigating these words without assuming anything about the meaning based on one's own experience or previous knowledge. It continues by looking at the context of the surrounding environment to determine the meaning of the words and to examine what experiences were connected to them. The resulting definition of emotions needs to come from descriptions of the period under investigation. The context is always affected by power relations, etiquette, and social relations. These can be uncovered in sources that describe the norms of the time, including advice literature, but also select medical and scientific texts. Generally, these ideas and norms directly affected how emotions were experienced or expressed.[221]

Jouanna Bourke's way of approaching emotions is similar to Boddice's. She proposed that the language used needs to be examined closely, further suggesting that the starting point should be seeing emotions in history "…as a

---

[217] Locke 1695, 123.
[218] Locke 1695, 121; Sodano 2017, 453–455.
[219] Korhonen 2005, 21.
[220] Reason was connected to emotional expressions in other ways as well. The English understood that using language could have meant that reason had been a part of the expression or the thought behind it, as the speaker had to have an intention for communicating, rather than blurting words out automatically without a thought. However, it was also possible to express emotions beyond reason in cases where imagination influenced the person, and instead of reason, emotions took control (Korhonen 2005, 12.)
[221] Boddice 2018, 35, 37.

language-game that follows generic and narrative conventions".[222] According to Bourke, emotions can be observed in the rules governing them, which can be seen in grammar and understood only if conveyed through appropriate means, including form, syntax, genre, vocabulary, and word order. She further notes that writing down an emotion or speaking about it has an impact on the associated feeling, and that individual experience is influenced by changes in how emotions are narrated.[223]

One level of expectations related to how emotion words should be used and what they meant was revealed in dictionaries. However, as connotations attached to the words used to describe emotions have undergone changes over time,[224] these need to be contemporary dictionaries. The way the words were defined at the time should be considered when primary sources are examined to appropriately understand what early modern English people were attempting to convey, keeping in mind that the words might have been used differently in various contexts. Dictionaries published in the 17th century concentrated more on explaining difficult words rather than defining words that were frequently used.[225] However, those words used to explain more difficult concepts can still reveal more commonly used expressions. For example, Edward Phillips defined "stomachous" as "…angry, disdainfull".[226] Later dictionaries, however, also defined more common words.[227] For this reason, it is also necessary to analyse Samuel Johnson's mid-18th century *A Dictionary of the English Language*, which also used sources from earlier centuries to explain words, to determine what it can reveal about 17th-century emotional expressions.[228]

Men and women living in 17th-century England used a variety of expressions to describe their anger. Samuel Johnson defined most of these words as a reaction to something wrong that had been done or expressed. While the word "resentment" could have other connotations as well,[229] Johnson defined it,

---

[222] Bourke 2003, 113.
[223] Ibid., 113, 120.
[224] White 2017, 34.
[225] Starnes & Noyes 1946/1991, 18, 21, 69–71, 87. Many factors led to the need to create a list of terms to explain English words to English speakers. Among other things, there was an ever-growing number of words derived from other languages that were harder for the reader to understand during the 16th century and an increase in new words through other means, such as social connections to other countries and free borrowing, which included words of which people with only a moderate ability to read were unaware. (Starnes & Noyes 1946/1991, 8–9.)
[226] Phillips 1658, ST.
[227] Starnes & Noyes 1946/1991, 69–71, 87.
[228] For more on Johnson's use of sources from the previous centuries and its impact on the dictionary, see Allen Reddick's 2010 article "Past and Present in Samuel Johnson's Dictionary of the English Language". Reddick noted that Johnson specifically cited texts that had been written in the distant past when trying to define 18th-century language. Even though the dictionary asked the reader to engage with the past to a certain degree, it was not just a reflection of it. Rather, the texts were removed from their historical contexts, and the dictionary only provided a small sample of examples. Johnson and his choices intentions, and attitudes towards the surrounding 18th-century contexts were also influential in this regard (Reddick 2010, 209–212.)
[229] Edward Phillips noted that in the mid-17th century, it was "…a sensible feeling, or true apprehension of any thing" (Phillips 1658, RE). The word "apprehension", he maintained, in contrast, referred either to fear, joy, happiness, or danger (Phillips 1658, AP). Samuel

referring to the 17th-century writer John Dryden's use of the word, as a "[d]eep sense of injury".[230] Similarly, Johnson referred to the 17th-century author John Milton and the 16th and 17th-century writer Francis Bacon to connect the word to being offended or angry by noting that it meant "to take well or ill… to take ill; to consider as an injury or affront".[231] At the same time, Johnson noted that John Locke understood anger to mean an "…uneasiness or discomposure of the Mind, upon the receipt of any Injury, with a present purpose of Revenge".[232] Unlike the words "resentment" or "resent", this interpretation meant that anger focused more on the intent to act, in addition to reacting to the actions of someone else. However, anger could also be explained without a direct link to the actions of oneself or those of others. For instance, Johnson defined disdain as "[c]ontempt; scorn; contemptuous anger; indignation"[233] and contempt as either despising or being despised by others.[234] The writers of the primary sources explored in this study used words such as "anger" and "resentment". Samuel Pepys wrote about how he expressed "…great anger…"[235] and noted his "…great resentment…".[236] Other emotional expressions conveyed similar feelings as well, such as references to irritation. For instance, Pepys remarked, "…I am vexed with all my heart at Pall…"[237]

Mutual affection was the ideal for siblings,[238] and the potential of affection to influence hierarchical sibling relationships cannot be overlooked. Various 17th-century English documents make it clear that siblings certainly conveyed their affection and love to each other, and that these close ties existed, as will become apparent in this dissertation. Dictionaries give insight into what was meant by these expressions. The definition of the word "affectionate" was quite broad in the original edition of *The New World of English Words* by Edward Phillips from 1658, in which he referred to it as "…bearing a good affection to any one". [239] The revised edition of the book, compiled by John Kersey [240] and published in 1706, added "loving" and "kind" to the definition of affectionate and explained that affection meant "…Love, Passion, Good-will, Kindness, Inclination towards". [241] Samuel Johnson's entry on affection similarly highlighted good-will and defined it as love.[242] He added that affection could

---

Johnson also defined it, referring to the 17th-century philosopher Henry More, as "Strong perception of good or ill" (Johnson 1755, RES).

[230] Johnson 1755, RES.
[231] Ibid.
[232] Locke 1695, 122; Johnson 1755, ANG.
[233] Johnson 1755, DIS.
[234] Ibid., CON.
[235] Pepys 1893, August 25, 1661.
[236] Ibid., September 23, 1663.
[237] Ibid., June 11, 1662.
[238] Crawford 2004/2014, 209.
[239] Phillips 1658, AF.
[240] Referred to as J. K. Philobibl on the title page of the book (Phillips & Kersey 1706, title page, preface; Starnes & Noyes 1946/1991, 70).
[241] Phillips & Kersey 1706, Preface, A.F.
[242] Johnson 1755, AFF.

refer to emotion in general,[243] to a "[s]tate of the mind…",[244] and to a "[s]tate of the body…"[245] Love, in contrast, referred to a variety of things, such as friendship and kindness, "The passion between the sexes",[246] "[c]ourtship",[247] "…parental care",[248] "[l]ewdness",[249] and "[f]ondness…".[250] Kindness could also convey affection, as is apparent, for example, in the correspondence between Dorothy Osborne and William Temple.[251] While giving "love" a somewhat broader definition, both dictionaries also used various forms of the words "love" and "affection" as synonyms for each other.[252] Johnson referred to texts written in previous centuries, such as Shakespeare's *Merry Wives of Windsor*, Abraham Cowley's poem *On the Death of Mr. William Hervey,* and Francis Bacon's *Holy War* to define these words.[253] The writers of the primary sources analysed in this dissertation used both "affection" and "love". For example, Alice Thornton wrote about her brother: "…my love for him could not containe itself…"[254] and about her sister: "…her words weere full of sweeteness and affection…"[255]

Sadness was a much-discussed topic in 17th-century self-written documents in a variety of situations, for example, during illnesses and death.[256] Today, we often understand that different emotion words signify specific things, but contemporaries used words like "grief", "sadness", and "sorrow" interchangeably. While some early modern writers did use these words in more distinct ways, there was no uniformity in the connotations.[257] For example, Samuel Johnson suggested in his 1755 dictionary that the words sad, sorrowful and grief were interchangeable, as he defined the word "sad" as: "…Sorrowful; full of grief…Habitually melancholy; not cheerful… Serious…calamitous".[258]

The lack of uniformity is also apparent when comparing other dictionary definitions. The revised 1720 edition of Edward Phillips's dictionary defined "sorrow" as a reaction to the loss of something good or an emotional response to something that was understood as being negative. He described sorrow as "…an uneasiness of the Mind upon the thought of a Good lost, which might have been longer enjoy'd, or on the sense of a present Evil".[259] Conveying sorrow thus implied that an evaluation had been made of the nature of the subject, which prompted its expression. For example, during death, its expression would

---

[243] Johnson uses the word "passion" to refer to emotions (Johnson 1755, AFF).
[244] Johnson 1755, AFF.
[245] Ibid., AFF.
[246] Ibid., LOV.
[247] Ibid.
[248] Ibid.
[249] Ibid.
[250] Ibid.
[251] Pollock 2011, 127.
[252] Phillips & Kersey 1706, A.F, L.O; Johnson 1755, AFF, LOV.
[253] Johnson 1755, AFF, LOV.
[254] Thornton 1875, 33.
[255] Ibid., 52.
[256] For example, Thornton 1875, 49, 57, 194.
[257] Sullivan 2013, 161, 163.
[258] Johnson 1755, SAD.
[259] Phillips & Philobibl 1720, SO.

suggest caring for the deceased and seeing the present in a negative light. Samuel Johnson's 1755 dictionary, however, emphasised sorrow's connection to loss instead, noting that the word was generally defined as losing something good rather than "…the effect of present evil…"[260] Similarly, Johnson described grief as follows: "…Sorrow; trouble for something past,"[261] but also understood it to mean "[p]ain; disease".[262] "Grieve" was the only word that he directly connected to sadness related to death.[263] In some cases, the authors of the primary sources used in this dissertation did not directly refer to sadness, but noted how death affected them greatly,[264] rather than directly using emotion words. Johnson described "affected" as someone who is "…Moved; touched with affection; internally disposed or inclined".[265] Here, affection referred to emotion rather than to love.

In my primary sources, the writers mainly used the terms "sadness", "sorrow", and "grief". For example, after the death of her brother George, Alice Thornton wrote that it was a "…grand blow by the sad infortunate losse…"[266] but also reported that "…our misery was this"[267] when recounting the events leading up to his death. In contrast, William Stout described his emotional state after the death of his brother Richard's death by stating "…his death very much affected me…"[268] Furthermore, the way Stout described the death of his sister was a direct expression of sadness, but also conveyed his attachment to her: "I was very much affected with sorrow for the loss of my dear and only sister…"[269] Of course, other ways of expressing sadness existed as well. Samuel Pepys, for example, reported that his sister was "…crying exceedingly".[270]

In the next chapter, I will begin to examine the emotional expressions of 17th-century gentry and middling sort siblings. In this endeavour, it is essential to remain aware of the contexts explored in this chapter, ranging from family structures to power relations, duties, and the ways in which emotion words were defined and understood. This background helps to explain the kinds of individual and societal conditions that influenced how men and women could express emotions to their siblings in 17th-century England.

---

[260] Johnson 1755, SOR.
[261] Ibid., GRI.
[262] Ibid.
[263] Ibid.
[264] For example, Stout 1851, 10.
[265] Johnson 1755, AFF.
[266] Thornton 1875, 63.
[267] Ibid.
[268] Stout 1851, 10.
[269] Ibid., 105.
[270] Pepys 1893, September 5, 1661.

3 EMOTIONAL EXPRESSIONS, CHASTISEMENT, AND DISPUTES

In this chapter, I will examine how siblings living in England between 1636/7–1710 [271] expressed emotions towards each other in various ways during chastisement and disputes. In Section 3.1, I will focus on analysing how eldest brothers chastised their younger brothers and sisters and the ways in which this was connected to their power, agency and control over their younger siblings. Samuel Johnson's definition of the verb "to chastise" as "…to correct by punishment… [t]o reduce to order, or obedience…"[272] defines the approaches of the elder brothers examined in Section 3.1 quite well. In 3.2, I will concentrate on power, hierarchy, and disputes in cases where sisters disagreed with their brothers and examine how these themes influenced the lives of women in particular. In each of these two sections, the focus will be on two individuals and their siblings, with the first attending to Samuel Pepys and Henry Oxinden and the second to Elizabeth Freke and Alice Thornton. In the final section, 3.3, I will examine how siblings, both men and women and older and younger siblings, attempted to appear as morally righteous victims who described an offender acting wrongly against them. This section will focus on three people: Elizabeth Freke, James Yonge, and John Guise. The siblings examined in this chapter represent examples of possible ways to react and highlight how power and related factors, such as age and gender, affected emotional expressions. I will also address what all this can tell us about sibling relationships overall within an intersectional framework. While this chapter will highlight situations in which siblings expressed anger, the fifth chapter will, among other things, explore responses to the emotion.

---

[271] Freke 2001, 266; Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden March 5, 1636/7, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 119.
[272] Johnson 1755, CHA. Edward Phillips also, for example, noted that correction could be defined as chastising (Phillips 1658, CO).

3.1 Eldest brothers and chastisement

Research conducted on the early modern European Orange-Nassau family by Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline Van Gent has revealed that the opportunities these siblings had to express emotions depended on age, sibling order, gender, social status, linguistic distinctions, and geographic distance. When considering siblings in 17th-century England, the eldest brother was often the most likely to have power over other siblings due to primogeniture.[273] This could lead to them having more opportunities to express emotions like anger and to use power to attempt to control their younger siblings in this manner. At the same time, even if the eldest brothers had better opportunities, as noted in the previous chapter, in the normative context, expressions of anger were usually not acceptable in social situations. Controlling emotions, such as anger, was crucial, as their expression could be seen as a reason for misery. However, people still conveyed the emotion, of course, and among the early modern English elite, there were instances when expressions of anger were accepted.[274]

Anger was also written about in religious literature. The Bible was, of course, a familiar book to most. It was used by many, for example, to teach children to learn to read and would often be the only book owned by a family. It created the basis for a religious normative context, as it contained a variety of examples of sibling relationships, for instance, in connection with cases of rivalry and envy, such as Cain and Abel.[275] However, Christian texts from writers belonging to denominations such as Anglicanism and Puritanism defined and limited emotions according to their own interpretations of Christianity. Three writers, Anglican chaplain Lancelot Blackburne, Anglican writer Richard Allestree, and John Downame, who was a prominent and influential Puritan figure in London before the English Civil War,[276] warned their readers about anger. In 1694, Blackburne called it an "…unruly Passion,"[277] stating that it was a dangerous emotion and highlighting that it could not be controlled with reason in any situation. Furthermore, Allestree added in 1659 that anger was connected to impatience and rage. He argued that it brought forth uneasiness and that angry people were hated and shunned. He also compared anger to an animal's wildness and fierceness, further describing the emotion as madness and an angry person as being out of control.[278] In contrast, in 1600, John Downame[279] found positive aspects as well.[280] He suggested that God created anger and that it was therefore

---

[273] Glover 2000, 10–11; Johnson & Sabean 2011, 2; Broomhall & Van Gent 2016, 64; Capp 2018, 32, 36.
[274] Downame 1600, 4; Pollock 2004, 581–582; Korhonen 2005, 5–6, 12.
[275] Gen. 4: 1—24 (New Revised Standard Version); Gestrich 2012, 14; Hill 2001, 13.
[276] Blackburne 1694, title page; Alblas 1991, 92; Pederson 2014, 89–90.
[277] Blackburne 1694, 5.
[278] Allestree 1659, title page, 150–151; Blackburne 1694, title page, 10–11.
[279] Downame 1600, title page.
[280] Although the nonconformist Henry Newcome did not express anger toward his siblings in his autobiography, he published a book called *A Plain Discourse about a Rash and Sinful Anger* in 1693. Despite the differences in Newcome's and Downame's denominations and texts, there were also many similarities between them, such as seeing anger also as a

a good emotion "...in it owne nature..."[281] According to Downame, anger was just when its object was not a sinner but a sin, when it was used to defend God's honour or someone's reputation, and when it defended others who were wronged. However, he also argued that anger could become unjust, referring to this as vicious and a sin, affecting everyone regardless of age and gender, a stronger emotion than hardly any other, and a disease. While he did think unjust anger clouded reason, in his view, moderate and just anger would not be consumed by it.[282]

There was also a variety of expectations connected to anger in sibling relationships. This could be attributed to the fact that there was pressure to get along with siblings.[283] For example, Dorothy Osborne wrote that she was afraid that her future sister-in-law would not want to be her friend because of her failure to get along with her brother.[284] Disapproval of sibling disharmony could also be connected to themes of continuity. For the European gentry, the emotional relationships of members of the family could influence their chances of prospering, as well as their family honour.[285] While religious norms often condemned anger,[286] it still had its place in sibling relationships. Eldest brothers could express anger towards their younger siblings to set boundaries and to exert agency over behaviour in different ways within the limits of individual situations and the normative contexts set for them. One way to achieve this was through disciplining younger siblings. Within families, anger was often expressed when a father deemed his son's behaviour improper, such as being profligate or disrespectful. Expressing anger was viewed as responsible instead of uncivilised or immature when, for example, the head of the household corrected someone's bad behaviour. Eldest brothers could also take this approach because of their position as the ones using power to attempt to influence their siblings' behaviour and to remind them of their right to control behaviour, regardless of whether it was successful or not. In other words, anger was seen as a way to accomplish something.[287]

Regardless of the position that the eldest brother usually occupied in the sibling hierarchy, there were limits to what they could accomplish with their anger. An examination of how the diarist Samuel Pepys wrote about this emotion in a 1662 letter to his cousin Thomas Pepys reveals his attitude towards power, anger, and age and reflects how a hierarchical position could impact emotional expressions in ways that could apply to sibling relations as well. He wrote about disapproving of Thomas: "I did cheque him for not coming to me, as he had

---

positive force. (Downame 1600, 2, 4; Newcome 1693, title page, 6, 12. Newcome also, for example, categorized types of anger similarly to Downame; see Downame 1600, 37–42; Newcome 1693, 21).

[281] Downame 1600, 4.

[282] Ibid., 6, 8–9, 12, 21–22, 24, 45.

[283] As mentioned in the previous chapter, the conduct book writer Richard Allestree also encouraged affection between siblings (Allestree 1659, 306).

[284] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple March 18, 1653/4, Osborne 1901, 280.

[285] Gestrich 2012, 15.

[286] For example, see Blackburne 1694, 5.

[287] Pollock 2004, 574, 582, 586.

promised"[288] and commented on the kind of language Thomas used and the emotions related to the matter[289]:

> …he writes to me in the very same slighting terms that I did to him, without the least respect at all, but word for word, as I did him, which argues a high and noble spirit in him, though it troubles me a little that he should make no more of my anger, yet I cannot blame him for doing so, he being the elder brother's son, and not depending upon me at all.[290]

Pepys was willing to accept that he needed to act differently towards those in similar or higher hierarchical positions than him, but also hinted at the importance of a hierarchical order and respect in maintaining his own agency. Furthermore, he tightly linked dependence and the ability to use language in a certain manner, while also reflecting on how power relations affected how he and his cousin could write to each other. His use of the phrase "…slighting terms…"[291] highlights the somewhat hostile nature of the correspondence, and he made sure to note this was not one-sided. Although he acknowledges being troubled by his cousin's words, he does not write badly about him. In other words, Pepys's understanding appears to have been that the respectfulness of the language reflected the hierarchical position that a person held. His evaluation of Thomas's reply as an indication of a "...high and noble spirit…"[292] suggested that he understood the implications of his own behaviour, and it is likely that he would not have seen his own siblings the same way due to their lower position compared with himself. In fact, Pepys acknowledged that his cousin's father's birth order influenced the hierarchy and relations of the extended family and kin. When intersectionality is considered, compared to his siblings, Pepys was in a powerful position, but we should not forget that in other relationships, he, too, needed to submit. In the following, we will see how birth order and age were similarly important in Pepys's and his siblings' relationships.

INTENSE ANGER IN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC: SAMUEL PEPYS

Early modern English siblings expressed anger and had disagreements over a great variety of matters, such as differences connected to personality, status, age, and authority. Additionally, many elder brothers resented having to fulfil various responsibilities and duties. Siblings also expressed anger towards those lower in the hierarchy who did not follow orders and damaged the dignity and honour of their family. Both the gentry and the middling sort also expressed resentment because of how their siblings behaved, but regardless, many still fulfilled their responsibilities towards their younger brothers and sisters. Younger siblings, furthermore, conveyed anger towards tyrannical elder brothers.[293]

---

[288] Pepys 1893, March 19, 1662.
[289] Ibid.
[290] Ibid.
[291] Ibid.
[292] Ibid.
[293] Capp 2018, 27, 32–33, 38, 41, 52.

The household was not inherently private, and finding a way to secure some privacy was a concern for many men and women. For example, disloyal servants could threaten a family's honour by testifying in court concerning cases related to cruelty and adultery. Furthermore, discord between family members was to be kept private, as a failure to manage it would have reflected the inability of a gentleman to uphold the patriarchal order of the household. The impressions held by others were important to the reputation of all. Servants would often have opportunities to learn about the lives of their employers, while neighbours also kept an eye on their behaviour. Gossip was indeed a popular pastime.[294]

Normative literature at the time commented on how anger should be expressed when disciplining others. A prominent and influential Puritan figure in London before the Civil War, John Downame, wrote in 1600 about the role of anger in chastisement. He remarked, "In dooing vvhereof hee is to auoide all furious anger, and to vse sobernesse and discretion, ioyning with his chastizement wholsome admonitions…" [295] According to Downame, fixing wrongful actions should be done in private, as exposing offences to many others would only make the offender less ashamed to act similarly in the future. In a related vein, he argued that being angry for every small reason could lead to "…scoulding and fighting…"[296] and the bad behaviour not being corrected. He added that chastising should be done by avoiding furiousness, as this would make it easier for superiors to control their inferiors. [297] Downame indeed maintained that expressing unjust anger "…exposeth men to contempt…"[298] At the same time, although the writer Richard Allestree did not specifically mention chastisement, he warned in 1659 against the vice of anger and "…angry speeches…"[299]. He wrote that while "…reproachful words…in themselves can do us no harm…"[300] they could lead to anger.[301] This suggested that it was possible to be reproachful, but not angry. However, Allestree also noted that certain phrases, such as calling someone a fool, were "…a modest sort of reviling…"[302] In 1693, Henry Newcome reported that even when there was a reason for anger, it was sinful to be too angry or to express the emotion too often.[303] These authors thus hinted that not all expressions of anger were the same, and that sometimes, moderate anger was acceptable.

The general expectation was that properly performed chastisement and intense expressions of anger were not compatible, but also that correcting bad behaviour should be done through chastisement. Samuel Pepys occasionally expressed his anger intensely, but this did not mean that he did not believe his own actions and emotional expressions to be justified and proper, as I will

---

[294] Fletcher 1995, 143–144; Foyster 1995, 58.
[295] Downame 1600, 50.
[296] Ibid., 49.
[297] Ibid., 49–51.
[298] Ibid., 50.
[299] Allestree 1659, 153.
[300] Ibid., 152.
[301] Ibid., 152.
[302] Ibid., 267.
[303] Newcome 1693, 13–14.

discuss later in this section. In all of the cases, it is essential also to remember that there were many influences on how anger could be viewed in these kinds of situations, and that attitudes towards anger were not always negative.[304]

Samuel Pepys was an eldest son who had a strained relationship with his younger siblings, which was often defined by his expressions of anger and controlling behaviour.[305] He had a strong sense of obligation, but also felt a natural authority over his siblings, whom he expected to be grateful and to obey him. He was also effectively the head of the family, as he took on duties that would normally have belonged to their father, who was still alive.[306] Primogeniture and socially accepted norms regarding sibling hierarchy could have helped to create this kind of dynamic. Financial success could additionally give middling-sort men power, and Pepys's wealth was beginning to grow at this point, as he had begun to advance in his career.[307] Pepys occasionally described giving money to his brother John[308] and noted loaning money to his brother Tom.[309]

Chastising in private could happen between the dominating eldest brother and a younger sibling who was acting in a way that did not please the eldest. Chastising happening in a private setting could ensure that the eldest brother had no witnesses for his own behaviour, other than a person who could not talk back to him. This could also give room for more variety in expressions of anger than was expected in the normative literature. By chastising one-on-one, the eldest brother could also take the space to use power and convey his own message without the need to compromise with another authority figure. For example, Pepys described the following in October 1660:

> I went out by my brother Tom, who told me that for his lying out of doors a day and a night my father had forbade him to come any more into his house, at which I was troubled, and did soundly chide him for doing so, and upon confessing his fault I told him I would speak to my father.[310]

His use of the word "chide" could hint at emotions such as anger, but it also strengthened the connection to his attempt to correct behaviour.[311] The addition of the word "soundly" could indicate some level of intensity of the expression.

---

[304] As noted earlier, the analysis of the private letters of the 17th-century English elite has revealed, for example, that moderate anger was not always viewed in a negative light, and that there were situations, such as when the landed elite protected the family honour, where it was considered responsible to express anger (Pollock 2004, 571, 574, 582).

[305] For example, see Pepys 1893, October 2, 1660, July 23, 1661, August 25, 1661; Capp 2018, 143.

[306] Pepys 1893, October 11, 1667; Capp 2018, 143, 155–156, 199. Pepys needed to support his parents financially, as his father was not good with money, which gave Pepys a powerful position even over his father (Capp 2018, 154).

[307] Wrightson 1982/2003, 36; Archer 2000, 82–84; Wallis, Webb & Minns 2010, 393.

[308] He, for example, gave John 10 shillings in February 1659/1660 (Pepys 1893, February 27, 1659/1660). Nevertheless, disciplining while expressing anger did not mean he would not aid John, as in May 1661, he wrote first about disciplining John, but afterwards gave him 20 shillings (Pepys 1893, May 8, 1661).

[309] Pepys 1893, September 1, 1663.

[310] Ibid., October 2, 1660.

[311] Samuel Johnson defined chide as "To reprove; to check; to correct with words…" (Johnson 1755, CHI) but also as "[t]o clamour; to scold" (Johnson 1755, CHI).

Although Pepys did not use the word "anger", whether this would count as normatively acceptable chastisement remains in question. Later that day, Pepys asked their father to let Tom come home again, as not doing so could result in Tom "...learning the way of being worse".[312] Due to the position Pepys took as the head of the family, he could also attempt to have an impact on their father's opinion. This demonstrated that he had his own idea of the best way to react to what he saw as improper behaviour from a place of power. His authority gave him the ability to evaluate the actions in this way and more opportunities to get his own way. He was in this position by virtue of being the eldest, financially successful, and taking the role of the head of the household, whereby he could express emotions through chastising in this manner. Still, chastising one-on-one also gave his authority a boost. Chastising, while also helping the one being chastised to avoid certain kinds of repercussions, conveyed a particular kind of message emotionally. Despite his position, his power was not absolute, but rather reflected an ability to get his own way to a certain degree and to decide what was appropriate and what was not. His siblings still had ways to resist him, as I will examine in Chapter 5.

While Pepys disciplined his siblings by avoiding the word "anger" on occasion, this was not always true. There are a few instances where he expressed anger or a similar emotion, but he did not explicitly indicate whether it was conveyed to his siblings. This could help make the situation appear as a normatively appropriate form of chastisement. Pepys described his reactions to his younger brothers John and Tom acting against his expectations. In 1663, he reported that it "...vexed [him] to hear [John] say..."[313] that John had not read Aristotle or Descartes but noted that he would "...call him to task, and see what it is that he has studied since his going to the University".[314] In 1662, Pepys wrote that he "...was very angry with..."[315] his other brother Tom and his cousin Thomas Pepys for not notifying him beforehand of going to look for a candidate for a wife.[316] He added that he "... told them [his] mind about their folly in going so unadvisedly..."[317] In the latter instance, Pepys did not express anger because his brother made the trip, but rather appeared to have done so for not having had the opportunity to exert agency over his brother's actions. Although more than two people were present in the latter case, both were chastised.

Undoubtedly, a great variety of reasons influenced Pepys's choices in how he chose to discuss behaviour he found unacceptable, including empathy,[318] but family honour could also have played some part in this. The honour code did not

---

[312] Pepys 1893, October 2, 1660.
[313] Ibid., August 8, 1663.
[314] Ibid., August 8, 1663.
[315] Ibid., August 23, 1662.
[316] Ibid., August 23, 1662. Besides these kinds of instances, there are also multiple other examples of Pepys noting his irritation or anger for a specific action but not specifying whether he expressed this to his siblings or only in his diary (e.g., see May 19, 1661, July 23, 1662, April 26, 1663).
[317] Pepys 1893, August 23, 1662.
[318] Ibid., September 23, 1663. There is more on this later in this section regarding the discussion of Pepys and his justification of anger.

just concern personal virtue, but also being loyal to the lineage. Indeed, beyond the virtue individuals could have on their own, honour was understood as concerning the family as a whole. Furthermore, members of the landed ranks had their own views of what was honourable, and by trying to demand their kin to act accordingly, they could protect their reputation.[319] While Pepys was a middling sort, honour might have influenced him to chastise his brother in this manner, especially considering his controlling position in the family. The need to protect honour could encourage the use of power and potentially make it more effective as a persuasive tool. Furthermore, besides expressions of anger being aimed at changing behaviour so as not to let improper actions affect the family's reputation,[320] private attempts at influencing wrongful actions could also have been made to avoid tarnishing the reputation of the person being criticised. Pepys did not just describe chastising one-on-one, but also wrote about it in a private diary, further highlighting the secrecy of the matter.

However, protecting the family's reputation did not mean chastising only on a one-on-one basis with the people involved. Chastisement could also take place in the presence of people who might not have been involved in the situation. This, too, could be a very intentional choice, for example, to benefit the chastiser by giving him and his demands a better chance of being obeyed by a younger sibling. This did not have to mean expressing anger by chastising in public; these practices could still be kept within the family.

Pepys had taken his younger sister, Pall, to live with him and his wife and to work as a servant in 1660. It was not uncommon for single women to live with married siblings for both shorter and longer periods of time. While some needed to act as servants in return for housing, this was not expected by brothers-in-law belonging to higher levels of society. Although single women could be seen as an asset to the family, for example, serving as nurses and babysitters, and brothers did not necessarily see an unmarried sister as a problem, Pepys had a sense of duty about finding a husband for Pall. While he eventually succeeded, he had trouble with negotiations involving money. Finding a sister a husband who did not require too large of a dowry could indeed be difficult for a brother in a position to have to marry his sister off.[321]

Bernard Capp has noted that elder brothers would often protect and support their younger siblings, but that they also expected appropriate behaviour in return, such as obedience and service. While other siblings would also help sometimes, Capp has argued that the eldest brothers had a great variety of different duties that they were expected to fulfil. In practice, taking care of younger siblings could mean arranging marriages and finding careers for younger brothers, along with arranging schooling, paying annuities and portions, and providing other kinds of monetary assistance. Indeed, while the norms of a patriarchal society imposed upon men a variety of demands that required them

---

[319] Fletcher 1995, 126–127; Foyster 1999, 32–34; Pollock 2007, 17.
[320] Pollock 2004, 582.
[321] Pepys 1893, November 12, 1660, January 2, 1660/1, March 2, 1667/1668; Froide 2005, 58, 78–79; Capp 2018, 144–146.

to invest in others, they also wanted to be compensated for this through affection, consideration, and support. In other words, the needs of the patriarch could differ from the expectations placed upon him.[322]

Within the limits of the norms and his duties towards his siblings, Pepys determined the rules and what he expected of others in the sibling hierarchy, and his reactions to his siblings' behaviour reflected this. He valued loyalty, hard work, and modesty from his servants and was not indifferent towards them.[323] However, Pall had not responded to his help in the manner Pepys expected, both as a sister and a servant. Pepys noted that he was "...much afeard of [Pall's] ill-nature",[324] suggesting that he was not fond of her to start with. Perhaps, based on this preconception, it is not a surprise that he became unsatisfied with her actions, describing her as "...proud and idle..."[325] This led him to inform her of his decision to have her move out in their father's presence. He wrote:

> I...called Pall up to us, and there in great anger told her before my father that I would keep her no longer, and my father he said he would have nothing to do with her. At last, after we had brought down her high spirit, I got my father to yield that she should go into the country with my mother and him, and stay there awhile to see how she will demean herself.[326]

No longer wanting to keep Pall at his home could be seen as a disciplinary action and an attempt to change her behaviour.

Additionally, on another occasion, Pepys was offended by his brother John, who had written "...base letters..." [327] about Pepys, and remarked that he "...[brought] in any business of anger..."[328] the next day, with his brother and their father present. He also made sure to note that his brother's response was disagreeable. I will analyse Pepys's brother's reaction in more detail in Chapter 5. Pepys also decided not to give his brother further financial assistance and did not forgive him for a couple of years, even though their father and mother wanted him to.[329] Pepys confronting his siblings with their father present could have represented an attempt to use him and his authority to help convey Pepys's anger in a more effective manner. As Pepys also had a powerful position, having their father present and being more lenient in John's case[330] did not risk Pepys's ability to react with anger and attempt to influence his siblings. In these cases, Pepys very clearly described expressing anger while noting the shortcomings of

---

[322] Hendrix 1995, 193; Capp 2018, 33–36, 51. Hendrix studied these themes in the context of Reformation Germany (Hendrix 1995, 177). The heir's duty to support his sisters could persist after she had married, as those who were responsible would keep assisting her by, among other things, defending her honour. At the same time, some heirs inherited debts, which could impact their ability to fulfil these obligations and have a direct effect on the lives of the younger siblings. (Capp 2018, 51, 53.)
[323] Fletcher 1995, 215.
[324] Pepys 1893, November 12, 1660.
[325] Ibid., July 23, 1661.
[326] Ibid., August 25, 1661.
[327] Ibid., March 20, 1663/4.
[328] Ibid., March 21, 1663/4.
[329] Ibid., March 21, 1663/4, April 27, 1664, April 30, 1664, October 15, 1664, June 22, 1665, April 28, 1666, June 17, 1666.
[330] Ibid., March 21, 1663/4.

his siblings. While there were a variety of normative limits to expressions of anger during chastisement, conveying the emotion was a way for Pepys to emphasise his point and attempt to make his orders more likely to be followed. Both Pall's and John's cases also highlighted that while Pepys had duties towards his siblings, their inability to act appropriately towards him gave him the justification to no longer offer his help and to chastise them.

The Puritan ideas of needing to correct behaviour in private,[331] as noted by John Downame and discussed further earlier in this section, could also have impacted Pepys, given that there were Puritan influences in his life.[332] Still, Pepys was Anglican,[333] and his behaviour did not always align with the normative understanding held in the denomination, at least according to Richard Allestree, who, for example, warned against reproachfulness but saw some expressions of anger as more reasonable.[334] Additionally, Pollock's analysis of 17th-century English elite letters revealed that it was generally acceptable to express anger with proper justification.[335] Pepys transgressing the normative expectations of the proper expression of anger could underline his powerful position and paint a corresponding picture to his siblings. Furthermore, all of the situations analysed were relatively private and could have given Pepys more freedom to express himself. At the same time, they also indicate that many different normative rules coexisted and that choices needed to be made, depending on the situation. Furthermore, just the fact that a norm was not followed did not necessarily mean that this was done out of defiance or that it was not seen as significant.[336] Finally, the way he described his siblings' behaviours and their father's apparent agreement with his actions could also help legitimise how Pepys expressed his emotions.

Nevertheless, while the person holding the power within the family, usually the father or some other man, was responsible for upholding the hierarchy and ensuring that it functioned as it should, this did not give him unlimited power in the normative context. For example, the father was not expected to punish members of the household when he was angry, since the emotion prevented him from thinking in a just manner. Patriarchalism also contained the ideas of righteousness and benevolence, which the hierarchy should have ideally reflected. Overly strong emotional reactions were nevertheless not considered masculine, and the important task of taking care of the family was not possible if the man of the family was not rational. Furthermore, the normative literature prescribed that children should learn to control their anger as they grew older.[337] It is possible that the intensity of Pepys's emotional expressions impacted how his siblings viewed his masculinity, but then again, he may have considered how he disciplined his siblings as rational and

---

331 Downame 1600, 52.
332 His mother leaned towards Puritanism (Loveman 2012, 48).
333 Loveman 2012, 48–49.
334 Allestree 1659, 152, 267.
335 Pollock 2004, 581–582.
336 Pollock 2004, 589; Pollock 2011, 155.
337 Korhonen 2005, 18–19.

compatible with the norms of chastisement. Anna Bryson has stressed that early modern English gentlemen were preoccupied with the relative rank between them. [338] Perhaps this could also partly explain how Pepys acted and thus reflected his awareness about sibling hierarchy. Not all eldest brothers behaved and conveyed their emotions in the same way as Pepys, however. Some were comparably less intense, as we shall now see.

A GENTLER CHASTISEMENT: HENRY OXINDEN

Eldest brothers could also convey their disapproval of their siblings' actions in a more indirect and less intense manner than how Pepys chastised his siblings. They could attempt to set boundaries by asking rather than commanding, while also expressing anger, which would establish a different atmosphere than Pepys. This could give the younger siblings room to express themselves in a freer manner and open up the conversation to the prospect of negotiation. This approach hints at eldest brothers who did not necessarily desire or manage to have absolute control or as strict an idea of proper conduct as Pepys. Even though these eldest brothers had the ability to express anger through chastisement, like Pepys, not taking a more commanding tone could indicate a more trusting relationship or the willingness to tolerate disobedience. The eldest brother's confidence in his own authority could give him the confidence to react in this manner.

The religious normative context highlighted the dangers of anger. Richard Allestree advised in his Anglican conduct book that, particularly when anger was rising, it was crucial not to fan its flames but rather to do the opposite and be careful regarding one's choice of words, so as not to make the emotion more intense in both the speaker and the listener. [339] However, Allestree also noted that when discussing the negative things that someone had done, not all ways of expressing anger were the same. He wrote, "…the calling thou fool, is a modest sort of reviling, compared with those multitudes of bitter reproaches we use in our rages".[340] Along similar lines, in his sermon given in 1694,[341] the Anglican chaplain Blackburne highlighted the importance of compromising, adding that "...when a Superiour dictates, 'tis rather an Imposition than an Agreement".[342]

Siblings who expressed their anger while attempting to change bad behaviours in a less intense manner through chastisement could use other strategies to emphasise their point aside from more intense expressions of emotions. The eldest of the Oxinden brothers, Henry, who was an East Kent squire and landowner,[343] did not express intense anger. He acted as a provider for his younger brother, James, with whom he had a mutually affectionate

[338] Bryson 1998, 136.
[339] Allestree 1659, 152–153.
[340] Ibid., 267.
[341] Blackburne 1694, 5.
[342] Ibid., 10.
[343] Gardiner 1933d, Oxinden Family Pedigree; Winkelmann 1996, 14–15.

relationship.[344] Still, according to research conducted by Bernard Capp, James Oxinden resented Henry for being controlling, and Henry knew that the other brothers also had similar feelings.[345] This was not the only way James wrote to Henry, as he also complimented his brother, for example, for being a loving and helpful sibling.[346] Henry noted in his draft letter to James in 1636/7 that he had sent his brother much more money than James had recalled.[347] He expressed his emotions regarding the issue as follows:

> Now I infinitely admire how you take noe more notice of what you send for and receive, insomuch as it maketh mee doubt the worst, and it maketh mee have little heart to send up monies still at your demands, when you forget what you have received.[348]

Henry also asked his brother to remember the amount of money he had given him by appealing to his affection, kindness, and sympathy.[349] His notion that "…too apparent ill husbandry…"[350] could make him no longer love his brother anymore[351] could have been a hint at the reason for expressing these feelings. Rather than directly and intensely expressing anger, Henry conveyed his disapproval and connected this sentiment to emotions in other ways. He explained what was unacceptable and set boundaries by giving a concrete example of what would happen if James did not act as Henry wanted him to and expressed his feelings, such as anger or irritation, through sarcasm and criticism, much more subtly than Pepys.

In this case, Henry chastised his brother while expressing his emotions, but I will also examine cases reflecting attempts to completely avoid expressions of anger in Chapter 5. Along with chastising, this less intense approach could also help to calm down the situation. The description of the potential emotional consequences could also serve as a warning. In this case, it gave James a chance to explain himself and showed flexibility on the part of Henry regarding which emotions he could express in response the situation in the future. This likely helped to maintain the relationship by avoiding further escalation down the road.

Providing an example of how emotions could be expressed during disagreements could also have been a way for Henry to attempt to influence James within normatively acceptable parameters. This was also seen in other texts. For example, while the biography of John Janeway, written by his brother James, painted a normatively correct picture of an obedient and humble younger brother, it also reminds the reader that John acted well as an elder brother to his

---

[344] For example, see James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden September 15, 1629, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 48; James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden January 14, 1632, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 82; Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden March 5, 1636/7, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 119.
[345] Capp 2018, 39.
[346] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden May 27, 1634, The Oxinden Letters 1607–1642 1933, 93.
[347] Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden March 5, 1636/7, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 118–119.
[348] Ibid., 119.
[349] Ibid.
[350] Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 114.
[351] Ibid., 114.

younger siblings. Janeway noted, "He was an excellent Example to his younger brethren; and his wise instructions, and holy practices, did not a little influence them".[352]

While Pepys's and Oxinden's approaches were different, they both expressed anger or similar emotions when noting their disapproval, thus bolstering their agency and reminding their younger siblings of their positions of control. Although Oxinden's approach was clearly more compliant with the expectations of normative chastisement, this did not mean that Pepys did not see his way of conveying emotions as chastisement or an acceptable form of anger. The genre of the text could also be a determinant of the choice of intensity. As Oxinden expressed himself in letters, following the expected norms of chastisement in cases of anger could be more important, considering the possibility of others reading the letters. As with Pepys, in Henry's case as well power meant that he had a better opportunity to react to actions he evaluated as wrongful and was more likely to get his way.

Henry's reference to expectations, duties, and reciprocities between siblings helped him enforce boundaries, not just by providing a reminder for James but also by highlighting that he was not only commanding his brother to act, but also giving him something in return. It is possible that their mutual affection[353] may have impacted Henry's expressions of anger or his willingness to tolerate certain kinds of behaviour. These factors and Henry's expression of anger in this manner also gave his brother the opportunity to engage in a more open dialogue, for example, by attempting to prevent James from keeping secrets from Henry, as Pepys's siblings had done.[354] At the same time, for a man's reputation, providing for the family could be crucial, because otherwise, he could be perceived as idle or neglectful. However, masculinity was not in practice dependent on economic autonomy and could be built in other ways, too.[355] This could have influenced Henry's willingness to continue helping James.

The surrounding context may have directed how Oxinden expressed himself, highlighting that even the eldest brother was not free to act without restrictions. However, understandings of honour were also reflected in the differences between Oxinden and Pepys. Manuals of proper behaviour described men who cared about what others thought of them and were competitive and sensitive to insults. While Pepys's manner of chastisement reflected this way of understanding honour, Oxinden's approach was also connected to honour, as there was an expectation of having moderation and harmony in daily life for one to be considered honourable. One of the renowned qualities of a leader was the ability to keep calm; thus, it was a serious attack on the reputation of a man to be described as hot-headed. The general understanding was that during disputes, elite men should act in a reasonable manner, which did not mean exhibiting

---

[352] Janeway 1674, 36.
[353] For example, see James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden May 27, 1634, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 93; Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden March 5, 1636/7, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 119.
[354] For example, see Pepys 1893, March 19, 1663/4, March 20, 1663/4, March 21, 1663/4.
[355] Shepard 2000, 105–106; Bailey 2003, 64.

passivity but rather moderation. Furthermore, restraint and patience when provoked were virtues, and displaying temper vis-à-vis those not involved in a particular quarrel could lead to conveying feelings of shame. Aristocrats thus strove for harmony between members of the family due to affection and the financial ties they had, and an elite family's well-being and collective honour could indeed be threatened by disputes.[356] Strength and reason were connected to actions understood as virtuous for gentlemen, including piety, justice, and charity. Proper conduct and civility were also defining traits of the virtuous gentleman.[357] Together, these factors emphasise the differences between Pepys and Oxinden and the fact that in both cases, the context of honour was able to support their choices of emotional expression and their attempts at control.

The differences between Samuel Pepys and Henry Oxinden, such as the intensity of their emotional expressions and the way their emotions were conveyed, can indeed demonstrate how normative expectations reflected in writings about anger did not necessarily impact eldest brothers in the same ways, regardless of the similar status they held in the sibling hierarchy. The genre also highlighted the differences they had and influenced whether they expressed their emotions in face-to-face situations or in writing. Considering that it was possible that others might read the letter Henry Oxinden sent,[358] behaving according to religious expectations was more relevant than when privacy was certain. This could also help to explain why Pepys was willing to express his anger, as he did in his diary, considering he could have had some trust in it remaining private.[359]

The genre could also influence how the authors conveyed their feelings in other ways. For example, letters could give one more time to consider what emotions to express, or not to express, and how, whereas siblings engaged in conversations needed to make faster decisions about how to convey their feelings. As Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline Van Gent have noted, letters could establish a sense of emotional closeness and help those lower in the hierarchy express challenging feelings such as anger.[360] Perhaps those in lower positions could, like the person in power, craft a convincing letter in peace, highlighting closeness and thus impacting the ways in which the person in power expressed his anger. At the same time, being in close physical proximity, as in Pepys's case, provided the possibility of immediate feedback through facial expressions.

---

[356] Pollock 2007, 14–15, 19, 29; Mark 2018, 392–393. Chastisement, of course, was somewhat differed from a dispute, as rather than two people arguing, it involved one person expressing disappointment and potentially anger. Nevertheless, these themes were related to chastisement as well, and, furthermore, chastisement could lead to disputes in some cases.

[357] Foyster 1995, 35–36.

[358] Broomhall & Van Gent 2009, 147.

[359] Still, he occasionally used multiple languages and wrote in shorthand (Sangha 2016, 121). Early modern diaries were in general relatively private, even though they could have been meant to be made public (O'Day 2001, 140; Cambers 2007, 806–807, 815–816, 821–822).

[360] Broomhall & Van Gent 2009, 147.

JUSTIFYING ANGER: SAMUEL PEPYS

Women were believed to become angry more easily, as they were considered frailer and in possession of a weaker will, but by the end of the 17th century, men were more likely to be criticised for expressing the emotion of anger.[361] Even siblings in a position of power could feel the need to justify expressing anger while disciplining their brothers and sisters. Having control over emotions signified that a person had a sense of responsibility and morality. Thus, the wrong kind of anger could cause men and women to express shame. Emotions were, nevertheless, not something to get rid of or inherently bad, but rather something to control. Self-control, furthermore, contributed to a good reputation and honour, in addition to helping to construct early modern English ideas of manhood. While such a view was connected to the body, for example through lust, reason and self-control were considered imperative for men to fulfil their appropriate social roles. Moderate talk and courteous and affable behaviour, in addition to good manners and courtesy, were also expected in the gentry honour code.[362]

The fact that anger counted as a sin affected the ways in which it was approached, for example, by making it harder to find reasons to justify it. This recognition of sin everywhere has been seen as a defining feature of Western culture. With respect to emotions, such a perspective creates anxiety related to sin. Although anger was sometimes acceptable, harmony, moderation, and reconciliation were essential for honour.[363] However, even though resentment could arise as a reaction to instructions on how to behave, supervising and ensuring that people acted morally was seen as an act of kindness.[364] Of course, the need to justify expressions of emotions varied depending on the individuals and their unique contexts, but despite their various advantages associated with factors such as age and gender, eldest brothers still could not express emotions however they wanted. Justifying expressions of anger could also underscore the departure from the norms of chastisement and manifest as an attempt to make the emotions one expressed acceptable.

Samuel Pepys's diary provides examples of some reasons the eldest brothers could have provided to justify the way they chastised their siblings. This could be done by connecting justification to empathy or affection. Pepys justified different instances of chastising his brothers by assuring that he did not have malicious intentions and by giving reasons for why he acted this way. In some cases, this could take the form of an internal reflection. Justification was also connected to how siblings had duties and responsibilities towards each other, which influenced how they expressed their emotions. Pepys disliked that his brother John had not acquired the kind of learning at university which he would

---

[361] Pollock 2004, 578.

[362] Fletcher 1995, 136, 147; Fletcher 1999, 419, 423, 436; Foyster 1999, 31–32, 186; Korhonen 2005, 14–15.

[363] Pollock 2004, 581–582; Korhonen 2005, 24–25; Pollock 2007, 29.

[364] Pollock 2011, 144. The concept of kindness included, for example, courtesy, helping others, affection, goodwill, and kinship obligations (Pollock 2011, 124).

have wanted him. He wrote in 1663, "...I did give him a most severe reprimand... with great passion and sharp words, which I was sorry to be forced to say, but that I think it for his good..." [365] Here, at least in Pepys's own eyes, his chastisement appeared to come less from his ability and willingness to perform such actions than from simply having to act this way. The passage suggests that Pepys's understanding was that, while his place at the top of the sibling hierarchy gave him agency, it also forced him to behave in a certain manner. At the same time, the fact that he did not express anger voluntarily reflected a step back from taking responsibility for his actions.

Disagreement with an authority figure could also have had an impact on how siblings in a position of power over their brothers and sisters justified their disciplinary actions and the attached emotional expressions. Samuel Pepys's father noted that he did not approve of Pepys expressing anger by no longer giving his brother John financial assistance. This led Pepys to write about feeling justified in his actions, but this was not the case when his mother asked him to forgive his brother.[366] Ideals and expectations about proper sibling relationships could also influence the need to justify anger. For example, Pepys spent time with the five Houblon brothers in 1665/6, all of whom were merchants, and commented that it was wonderful to see them "...thus loving one to another..."[367] This reflected what Pepys felt was the ideal, but also that he was not necessarily willing to act in this way to conform to that ideal. While there was no direct link in Pepys's text between his admiration for other sibling relationships and his justification of his anger, his admiration of the Houblon brothers' relationship might have influenced his justification for the way he behaved.

Finally, the religious normative context also comes into play here, as an awareness of going against Anglican and Puritan norms, as expressed by Allestree and Downame,[368] could have caused Pepys to feel the need to justify himself in a private diary, regardless of how his position allowed him to act. Although he was not very pious, the religious context, in this case the Anglican and Puritan norms, both of which had been present in his life,[369] still could have had an effect on him. While Pepys had a proper reason for expressing anger, immoderate rage was not acceptable,[370] which could explain his need to justify why he expressed this particular feeling.

Because it was understood that it was possible to choose whether to dampen or enflame moderate anger, early modern English people believed that it was voluntary to express and cultivate it. Furthermore, expressing anger could be a source of pride, while others could come to regret it.[371] Besides needing to justify expressions of anger, siblings with the power to convey the emotion the way they wanted could also regret such expressions. Even those who chose to

---

[365] Pepys 1893, September 23, 1663.
[366] Ibid., March 21, 1663/4, April 30, 1664, October 15, 1664.
[367] Ibid., February 9, 1665/6.
[368] Such as warning about anger (Downame 1600, 50–51; Allestree 1659, 153).
[369] Loveman 2012, 48.
[370] Pollock 2004, 579, 586.
[371] Ibid., 574.

express themselves in a very strict and resentful manner could demonstrate empathy and the willingness to compromise by recognising when intense expressions of anger were appropriate and when a different approach was or should have been used. Due to the position of the eldest brothers, they could choose to reflect on and regulate their behaviour and emotional expressions with private contemplation, but this did not necessarily have an impact on how they behaved. This also highlighted their sibling hierarchy and their comparably greater freedom to express anger. For example, Samuel Pepys wrote in 1663 that "…having… been angry with my brother John, and in the heat of my sudden passion called him Asse and coxcomb, for which I am sorry, it being but for leaving the key of his chamber with a spring lock within side of his door".[372] Pepys, on the other hand, acknowledged that expressing anger as he did was not acceptable but also attempted to legitimise his behaviours nevertheless. This showed the influence of empathy towards his brother and the importance of the surrounding normative context, such as norms connected to chastisement. However, it is important to note that even though Pepys appears to have expressed remorsefulness in his private diary, he did not write about it to his brother. This suggests that some expressions of anger had considerable intentionality regarding how they could help to control siblings.

No one practice was considered the only way to accomplish the goals of chastisement. Different members of the same family with the ability to approach expressions of anger in this manner could have different methods and disagreements on the best course of action. The eldest brothers examined here, Samuel Pepys and Henry Oxinden, both expressed anger when disciplining their siblings. Conveying anger was done in ways that occasionally followed the norms of chastisement, but also went beyond them as intense emotional expressions. These expressions were a response to particular events and an attempt to influence the future actions of one's younger siblings. Taking this approach could require a certain position within the sibling hierarchy and the required authority. For example, age could have an impact on this, due to the normative expectation of the eldest siblings taking care of the younger ones, but primogeniture and a good financial situation could also have an effect. Rather than only fulfilling a duty or normatively occupying a position in which they could demand respect from the younger siblings, eldest brothers could also gain agency to act more freely through financial independence, and through the possible dependence of younger brothers and sisters. While the focus here has been on oldest brothers conveying anger, in Chapter 5, I will examine, among other things, the reactions of others to these kinds of emotional expressions and attempts to prevent them.

Both Pepys and Oxinden chastised their siblings and expressed anger or similar emotions in a way that supported their position as the eldest and reminded their siblings of that position. For them, power signified the opportunity to evaluate their siblings' behaviours and to express their views accordingly. It also meant that they had better opportunities to have an influence

---

[372] Pepys 1893, August 20, 1663.

on how the one being chastised acted. The precise ways in which Pepys and Oxinden expressed their anger while disciplining their siblings differed. Samuel Pepys took an intense and very direct approach, while Henry Oxinden was calmer. Oxinden's approach was closer to the normative understanding of chastisement, while Pepys's intense anger did not always follow these expectations. These differences could also be a function of the genre of the texts. Oxinden's expressions of anger gave his siblings more room to express themselves, but required the eldest brother to use other strategies to get his point across. This approach might have had the potential to maintain a different, and perhaps closer, sibling relationship compared with more intense expressions of anger. Pepys was a strong and controlling authority figure with the ability to express himself freely. Still, he was not beyond the impact that other people and social norms could have, for example, on reputation, which could necessitate conveying emotions regarding bad behaviour in private or the provision of a justification for the way he expressed his anger while disciplining his siblings. At the same time, chastising in the presence of another person, such as the father of the family, could be beneficial for the chastiser and increase his authority. However, things could also go the other way if the additional person did not agree with the chastisement. Although other siblings might not have expressed anger through chastisement, they could still convey the emotion or take another approach to emotional expressions in disagreements.

3.2   Sisters, power, and disputes

While the eldest brothers often chastised their siblings, they were not the only ones to do so. Initiating an argument might have been easier for brothers, considering that their gender gave them certain advantages [373] and thus influenced their ability to express emotions in certain ways. Siblings, furthermore, had varying responses to chastisement or disagreements, depending on individual contexts, such as the emotional content of the relationship, economic circumstances, the spouse's social status, and the age and gender of the other party.

In this section, I will examine the ways in which sisters expressed their emotions during disputes, as well as how power relations and gender influenced these expressions. I will keep intersectionality in mind and note the variety of influences that affected how these women acted and expressed themselves. While patriarchal structures gave women a different position compared to their brothers,[374] this did not preclude them from expressing certain emotions. Women did in fact express anger, but I will also examine other reactions by sisters to disputes. I will consider the perspectives of both the person initiating a disagreement and the person reacting to it. I will focus on Dorothy Osborne and

---

[373] Korhonen 2005, 17; Capp 2018, 17.
[374] Davidoff 2006, 20–21.

Alice Thornton, who embody two different ways of expressing emotions in individual circumstances. The writings of these women reveal examples of how women acted and expressed their emotions during disagreements and the types of strategies they employed.

Normative expectations of proper feminine behaviour also impacted the way some women wrote their texts. Even though women were seen as naturally more emotional, according to contemporary normative ideals, they needed to be meek, submissive, modest, dutiful, quiet, and not cry or complain.[375] Women also expressed anger and could fight for their rights, such as getting money that was due to them, for example, by appealing to the duties that the other party should fulfil to avoid exploitation.[376] However, discussions of disorderly women in the literature and in court records reflected patriarchal anxieties, with the latter including, for example, women brawling with and scolding others, as well as violent or dominating wives.[377] While chastisement was an acceptable way to discipline others, scolding highlighted female disobedience. A scold was often described as a married woman who was not submissive or modest in this relationship. Scolds were thought to quarrel with neighbours, thus disrupting communities, and to challenge or reject the superior position their husbands had over them. Scolds were, furthermore, a reminder for contemporaries of the patriarchy's failure to fully subjugate women.[378] There were some men who were accused of scolding, but in most cases, this was an offence committed by lower status women towards superiors or equals, while high ranking women were rarely prosecuted for it. The general ideals at that time were "living in quiet" and neighbourliness, which scolding violated.[379] Nevertheless, the word was not used to describe the women examined here. This did not mean, as I will show next, that they reacted passively to expressions of anger.

A SISTER'S INTENSE ANGER AND THE ORDER OF BIRTH: DOROTHY OSBORNE

Female wrath was occasionally seen as indicating women's inferiority and used to discount their expressions of anger. The normative understanding was that a man needed to control a woman to help her manage her anger, which she was naturally more inclined to feel. Although women were seen as more prone to anger and weaker in theory, disagreements regarding the validity of female anger in everyday life did not necessarily rely on these assumptions but on other context-specific factors. Gender did not necessarily predict how siblings responded to anger, and sisters were not just meek or discreet in how they conveyed emotions. Although women were raised to believe that the gender

---

[375] Weisser 2019, 106.
[376] Pollock 2004, 576–577. Pollock refers here to correspondence between the siblings Judith and Thomas Culpeper, sent around 1676, in which she complained to him about financial matters, and he promised to act in the future according to her wishes (Pollock 2004, 576–577).
[377] Underdown 1985, 119.
[378] Amussen 2018, 347–348.
[379] Underdown 1985, 120.

hierarchy was natural and to put the interests of the lineal family and their elder brothers first, many were still annoyed about their circumstances. Sisters could express resentment when brothers pressured them to enter into a marriage they did not want or did not provide them with portions or annuities, or when they had to depend on a sibling they did not like. Additionally, sisters conveyed resentment towards each other over failures to fulfil expectations and over sexual rivalries. Having half- or stepsiblings could also create tensions, for example, related to inheritance and resources. Furthermore, differences regarding the religious denominations to which siblings belonged or their levels of piousness could also create tensions. However, religion did not always cause resentment, as siblings with religious differences could also live harmoniously. We also need to remember that while sibling relationships were complex, and some had their difficulties, at the same time, there was still a strong sense of responsibility and a bond that tied them together.[380]

Dorothy Osborne was a gentry woman born in 1627 in Chicksands, who lived with her father and her second eldest brother Henry, with whom she had a tumultuous relationship[381]. In a letter to her future husband, William Temple, sent in 1653, she described how she and her elder brother Henry argued after she noted a man she called "The Emperor" had courted her. She explained that Henry criticised her, for example, by bringing up everyone she had refused to marry and claiming that even though she had good qualities, such as wit, she did not utilise them when it came to this situation. Furthermore, she noted that Henry gave her "…a pretty lecture…"[382] Even though this was similar to the ways in which the eldest brothers expressed anger while noting their disapproval, she was not a passive listener; instead, she also conveyed anger to her brother. She was not direct in describing how she took part in the argument, but still hinted at intense expressions of mutual anger.[383]

Although Henry attempted to use his power through expressions of anger to attempt to exert agency over his sister's behaviour, she resisted and defended herself by conveying the same emotion to him. Male authority could, after all, appear to be challenged by female anger[384] and, as this case showed, this also applied to younger sisters. Although from the point of view of intersectionality, she was in a disadvantaged position due to her age and gender, Dorothy Osborne still believed that she could argue in this manner with her brother. For example, when describing how she would have rather stayed at her current location than reside with her aunt, she wrote, "Here I have nobody but my brother to torment

---

[380] Pollock 2004, 580; Korhonen 2005, 17; Capp 2018, 61, 74–75, 87–88, 102–104, 112–113, 127, 129.
[381] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple 1653/4, Osborne 1901, 241; Dorothy Osborne to William Temple 1653/4, Osborne 1901, 268–269; Parry 1901, 19; Salzman 2000, xxvi; Capp 2018, 163.
[382] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 120.
[383] Ibid.
[384] Pollock 2004, 578.

me, whom I can take the liberty to dispute with…"[385] Despite the patriarchal society, women did not need to be uniformly submissive,[386] and the examination of expressions of anger highlights this. For Dorothy, in these instances, power and agency meant the ability to react and to defend herself. These responses also indicated that she had the capacity to persuade her brother, or at least the power to attempt to do so.

The intersections of several different factors could influence why a sister would have been willing or able to convey anger in this manner despite being a younger woman. Women who had never married were expected to remain dependent, living in a household headed by a man, for example, with their parents, brother, other kin, or to work as a servant, rather than to manage their own household. They often lived with their parents while they were under the age of 45 and as a relative, a lodger, or a servant after the parents had passed away. While marriage was a patriarchal institution, when a sister got married and became a mother, this could have a significant impact on the power relations between siblings.[387] Dorothy Osborne's plans to marry William Temple would have secured her future financially, or at least made her less likely to rely on her brothers. She would have had less of a need to have a good relationship with her brothers, giving her more agency to choose how to express her emotions. Of course, this did not mean abandoning civil behaviour, as she would still need to function as a respectable member of society.[388]

It should be noted, though, that Henry was not Dorothy's eldest brother, which meant that he had fewer advantages to help him get his way compared with Samuel Pepys, for example. This also underlines that brothers can also be viewed from an intersectional point of view, as age was a crucial factor determining how Henry could act. Henry could not control how Dorothy acted, even though he expressed anger in a manner that had the potential to help him have more power he could use to his advantage. Even if he had been the eldest, he might not have had absolute control. Even parents' anger, regardless of the feelings conveyed and the higher hierarchical position of the father and the mother, did not guarantee obedience.[389] The potential to express disobedience, even in a very hierarchical relationship, such as that between a parent and a child, highlighted the possibilities for action that Dorothy had as a sister.

The disagreements between Dorothy and Henry were connected to power struggles in other ways, too. Henry wanted to control whom Dorothy married to gain agency in her household. At the same time, Henry did not want Dorothy to love her husband. This was part of his attempt to control her; for example, if she

---

[385] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 124–125. She also commented later, "You are mistaken if you think I stand in awe of my brother. I fear nobody's anger" (Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 241).
[386] Wilcox, Hobby, Hind, & Graham 1989, 7–8.
[387] Fletcher 1995, 205; Froide 2005, 17, 19; Broomhall & Van Gent 2009, 156. For more on how never-married women were under surveillance in England, see Hill 2001, 116–125.
[388] Occasionally, she reported that they argued in a more civil manner, remembering proper behavior (Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 268–269), which could further help her express anger, even if it also restricted how she could express it.
[389] Korhonen 2005, 19.

loved him more than her husband, he would hold a better position in her household.[390] Those familiar relationships that were the most important were vulnerable to change once a woman got married and had children,[391] which could have influenced Henry's reaction.

Since women as wives were expected to occupy a subordinate position to their husbands, single women were threatening due to the relative autonomy they might have. Bridget Hill has noted that in England from 1660 to 1850, "[t]here was no acknowledged place for the single woman".[392] Many saw that the place of marriage in the lives of women was imperative, and, besides love, other factors, such as economic reasons or social pressure, meant that most women could not remain single. Furthermore, for women, marriage meant losing independence, for example, when it came to money, as the husband usually owned the money the family had.[393] Nevertheless, in some ways, Dorothy could have agency over her own life by marrying Temple, which entailed not being dependent on her brothers. Furthermore, the law of agency gave the wife access to her husband's money to buy necessities, although many wives went beyond this as well. Women also gained other privileges and protection. Thus, Osborne could gain further independence through marriage, especially when compared with her non-married situation.[394] She would gain the ability to act without having to please her brothers, even if her husband, as the head of the household, would still have some agency over her life.

Although Henry tried to prevent Dorothy Osborne's marriage, siblings could also help their brothers or sisters find a spouse. This was not just limited to brothers marrying their sisters off; women could play a part as well, for example, during marriage negotiations.[395] While sisters could help in this process, this was not always done for simple benevolence, but could instead be a function of certain power relations and emotional expressions between siblings. Constance Fowler, a gentlewoman from Staffordshire,[396] did what she could to persuade her brother, Herbert Aston, who was the second eldest brother and living in Madrid in the 1630s,[397] to marry. She expressed her affection in an intense manner and used it to attempt to control her brother. Furthermore, she threatened him with a possible future disagreement by writing that her emotional expressions would change if he did not act as she told him to. For example, in a letter from 1638/9, Constance referred to her wish for him to marry her friend Katherine Thimelby, whom she claimed to love very much.[398] She noted, "Oh, I hope you will not prove unconstant; and if you be the same you wer, when I vowed to you the best of my afection, you will be far from paying

---

[390] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple 1653/4, Osborne 1901, 260; Capp 2018, 165–166.
[391] Froide 2005, 52.
[392] Hill 2001, 11.
[393] Ibid., 6–8; Bailey 2003, 62; Froide 2005, 42.
[394] Bailey 2003, 72; Froide 2005, 42; Hintz 2005, 23–24.
[395] Eales 1998, 63–64; Capp 2018, 51–52.
[396] Capp 2018, 62.
[397] Clifford 1815, 85.
[398] For example, see Constance Fowler to Herbert Aston December 8, Tixall Letters 1815, 97; Constance Fowler to Herbert Aston, Tixall Letters 1815, 108, 109, 113, 117, 119.

my infinit afection with such hatefull ingratitude, as to make my life miserable".[399] The fact that she repeated similar wishes and threats multiple times[400] further emphasised her message.

Regardless of the various factors that could help a woman respond to anger with anger, gender and age could still have an influence on her position and therefore how she could express herself. For a sister, picking the correct time to convey anger could help shield her from certain repercussions. For example, she could react to or adjust her expressions based on how her brother conveyed his emotions. This might help limit negative responses to her feelings. For example, Dorothy Osborne was clear in one letter that she was not the one to blame for the beginning of a quarrel with her brother Henry.[401] In another letter from 1653 sent to her future husband, William Temple, she wrote concerning Henry, "We have had another debate, but much more calmly. 'Twas just upon his going up to town, and perhaps he thought it not fit to part in anger".[402] Adapting to her brother's emotions could give her power by providing a justification for expressing her emotions in the way she did. She had to strike a balance between the needs of her brother and her lover and navigate the various methods through which they could use their agency to try to influence her, in addition to finding ways in which to gain her own power. For example, she remarked on her brother's dislike of her future husband Temple and wrote to him, "…you are in no danger to lose your prisoner, since so great a violence as this has not broke her chains".[403] Still, she did not find this easy: "…I have found it a much harder thing not to yield to the power of a near relation…"[404]

Dorothy Osborne's case nevertheless highlights the fact that younger siblings were able to take an active part in disagreements. I will examine instances of avoiding anger in Chapter 5. However, even in relationships with a commanding eldest brother with intense expressions of anger and younger siblings who, in one way or another, benefitted from the relationship or even depended on it, younger brothers could still respond to anger and take part in quarrels. For example, Samuel Pepys described in 1663/4 how his younger brother John responded to his anger: "…he, like a simple rogue, made very silly and churlish answers to me, not like a man of any goodness or witt, at which I was as much disturbed as the other…"[405]

Instead of reacting to a difficult situation or conveying a hostile emotion, siblings could also believe that escalation would not be possible. Although women could respond to expressions of anger by their brothers by conveying the same emotion, sisters responded to disagreements in other ways as well. While younger brothers, or those in less powerful positions for other reasons, could

---

[399] Constance Fowler to Herbert Aston January 11, 1638/9, Tixall Letters 1815, 104.
[400] For example, see Constance Fowler to Herbert Aston December 8, Tixall Letters 1815, 97; Constance Fowler to Herbert Aston January 11, 1638, Tixall Letters 1815, 105; Constance Fowler to Herbert Aston, Tixall Letters 1815, 122, 124.
[401] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 120.
[402] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 131.
[403] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 121.
[404] Ibid., 122.
[405] Pepys 1893, March 21, 1663/4.

attempt to gain influence through chastising, the reactions they received could differ from those afforded to the eldest brothers. This could tie into their position in the sibling hierarchy, the potential practical impact they could have in the younger sisters' lives, and other individual variations, such as possible emotional differences in their personal relationships.

For example, the way Dorothy Osborne described interactions with her eldest brother John and her second eldest brother Henry differed. Dorothy expressed kindness for her eldest brother John, even when she felt she had every reason to be angry, in a letter sent to her future husband William Temple in 1653.[406] She consciously regulated how she expressed emotions according to normative expectations related to sibling. Still, Osborne also felt that this was not a forced emotional expression or a conscious attempt to express certain emotions. Rather, she used her personality as a justification for choosing to express kindness. She noted in the same letter, "…we shall never fall out, I believe, we are not apt to it, neither of us".[407] By upholding the belief in being unable to quarrel, she could help maintain this mode of behaviour as the established state of their relationship.

While Dorothy highlighted this potential, and although it is crucial not to dismiss the impact that affection could have on how they behaved, it is still possible that gender and age influenced her actions. Wanting to appear in a certain way to her future husband, including being a virtuous woman adhering to key ideals and respecting the position of her eldest brother in the normative context, could also have had an influence on her behaviour. The views that Scottish nobleman Archibald Argyll expressed about the sibling hierarchy and honour in his posthumously published advice to his children are also relevant to the idea that the eldest brother should have a certain position in England, too. He described this as follows:

> To your Eldest Brother, who is the Prince of your Family, shew your selves obedient and loving; he is my substitute, your Honour is bound up in his, in him it now rests, and may for a while not appear in its lustre; take heed therefore you do not by any disrespect quite extinguish it; your due observance of him will preserve it in the minds of all men, who are not strangers to the ancient worth and merit of Our House.[408]

Besides emphasising the commanding position of the heir, Argyll tied the behaviour of the other children to the concepts of personal and family honour and reputation.

Regardless of the relative freedom women could have concerning emotional expressions, letters posed a risk of misunderstanding or limiting the ways siblings conveyed their feelings. For example, Dorothy Osborne was not always content with her eldest brother, as she described the way in which John commented on an issue related to Temple as being expressed "…maliciously…"[409] However, she wrote in her next letter to Temple, "Your

---

[406] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple 1653, Osborne 1901, 143; Parry 1901, 19.
[407] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple 1653, Osborne 1901, 143.
[408] Argyll 1661, 22–23.
[409] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 143.

opinion of my eldest brother is, I think, very just, and when I said maliciously, I meant a French malice, which you know does not signify the same with an English one".[410] This might have reflected Temple's view of John's position and, therefore, impacted how Dorothy wrote about her eldest brother or even how she reacted. Even though Dorothy could have some agency to express her anger towards a man, she had to adapt the way she wrote about her feelings to the different men in her life.

AFFECTION AND DISPUTES: ALICE THORNTON

Linda Pollock has shown that it was possible for those in lower positions not to regret expressions of anger, or violations of the duty to speak mildly, vis-à-vis someone superior to them, depending on the specifics of the relationship.[411] Even though sisters like Osborne could convey their anger during disagreements, this was not the only emotion expressed during quarrels. Focusing on expressions of affection during disputes reveals complicated sibling relationships in which blood ties continued to connect the siblings emotionally, regardless of the difficult situations they faced. Furthermore, expressions of affection played a significant role in power relations, in addition to the influence of gender. Conveying affection was not necessarily something that came without question during quarrels. Rather, it could be influenced by, for example, the religious context. At the same time, those lower in the hierarchy of the family had limited possibilities to express anger,[412] which had an impact on how women expressed their emotions when quarrelling with their siblings.

Alice Thornton had a long disagreement and a legal battle over her father's will with her eldest brother Christopher, but they also similarly quarrelled about their mother's testament. Although he had been her eldest brother since 1651, he was not the eldest of the siblings, as she was still two years older than him.[413] Intersectionality reminds us of the influence of factors other than age, such as gender, on Thornton's possibilities in life. Indeed, considering the advantages that primogeniture gave the eldest brother, her older age did not seem to have made a difference.

Despite the disagreements in a letter to her husband in 1664, Thornton commented on how she should try to love her eldest brother Christopher because of the teachings of Christ, although she felt he was undeserving.[414] Besides exhibiting how disagreements did not always involve only certain kinds of emotions and how Thornton was not free to express emotions without constraints, this episode also demonstrated the influence of religion. Such a demonstration could reflect the virtue of charity and the ideals of action and

---

[410] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 146.
[411] Pollock 2004, 586.
[412] Korhonen 2005, 20–21.
[413] Thornton 1875, 57, 75–76, 120, 183–184; C.J. 1875, Pedigree of the family of Wandesford. Capp 2018, 159–162.
[414] Alice Thornton to William Thornton October 18, 1664, Thornton 1875, 291–292.

emotional expression that it required, such as kindness, wishing others well,[415] and "…cast[ing] out censoriousness and rash judging…"[416] However, Richard Allestree, the author of the conduct book *Whole Duty of Man*, also reminded the reader that siblings should love each other. [417] Considering the piousness Thornton expressed in her autobiography,[418] it is likely that this context had an impact on her choice to express affection instead of other emotions.

Considering how pious Thornton presented herself in her autobiography, the patriarchal expectations about the submissiveness of women, which Christian values underlined, could also have had an impact on her choice to act in this way. It should be noted, though, that Christopher controlled the part of the inheritance that Thornton felt was rightfully hers.[419] Staying on good terms with Christopher could be beneficial for Thornton for this reason.[420] Thornton's expressions of affection highlighted how context, including religious beliefs, could influence the emotions siblings expressed. In Chapter 5, I will examine how brothers and sisters themselves attempted to have an impact on what emotions their siblings expressed.

Overall, for women, wealth inheritance was more important than wages. Some gentry and middling-sort single women could, due to not having family and other sources of income, work as governesses, teachers, and lady's companions. These practices were influenced by the restrictions that the code of gentility put on them, such as not seeing trade as an option. Furthermore, at the upper levels of society, women's productive roles were usually connected to their positions within the marriage through managing the household. Women were much less of a financial burden for ordinary families, compared with the elite.[421] These factors further highlight the significance that inheritance might have had for Thornton.[422]

Siblings could, of course, have varied emotional reactions to testaments. While they could have fierce disagreements concerning wills, others reacted even to surprises with acceptance. For example, Henry Newcome described in 1678 how his brother Stephen had promised to leave him a hundred pounds, but his will only left him 40 pounds. Newcome remarked, "…but it is the Lord's will, and I desire to be content". [423] A great variety of factors could influence differences in how siblings reacted to these matters. For example, an already

---

[415] Allestree 1659, 329.
[416] Allestree 1659, 334.
[417] Ibid., 306.
[418] McPherson 2006, 185.
[419] Thornton 1875, 194–195, 269.
[420] As Capp has noted, sisters might have needed to express affection to their brothers to remain on their good side (Capp 2018, 61).
[421] Erickson 1993, 3; Vickery 1998, 8–9; Hill 2001, 45, 58–59; Capp 2018, 19. For more on women and work in the European context, see *Making a Living, Making a Difference: Gender and Work in Early Modern European Society*, published in 2017 and edited by Maria Ågren.
[422] The editor of the 1875 version of her autobiography noted that she "…struggle[d] with poverty…" (C.J. 1875, xii) due to the inheritance dispute and her husband not being well off (C.J. 1875, xii).
[423] Newcome 1852b, 226.

wealthy person might be less confrontational about getting less money than expected, but affection between brothers could also have had an influence.

Expressing disbelief in a sibling's affection was a powerful way to indicate hurt feelings during disputes. For women, expressing themselves in this manner also helped them justify themselves by noting that the other person did not act according to expectations. Despite Alice Thornton's unwillingness to express anger, she was unwilling to put up with everything. As noted in 1659, Christopher questioned the existence of a will their mother had made. This led Thornton to write that she suspected he had been pretending when he had expressed his love for her previously and that he had attempted to defraud her. She wrote about his affection similarly around the year 1668, when she indicated that he had been loving, but that his actions were unjust and made her sad, indirectly implying that this was not something a loving brother would do.[424] At the same time, this suggests that their disagreements did not prevent her from thinking that he loved her. The way in which Thornton doubted her brother's affection highlighted both the expectation that he should express this sentiment and her own emotions. It also emphasised that, through the expression of affection, power for her was an attempt to have an influence either on Christopher or on the readers of her autobiography. By writing in this manner, she could try to exert agency in the narrative of how the relationship and situation appeared to the reader, while at the same time appearing to be a virtuous sister[425] capable of maintaining a patriarchal hierarchy. On the other hand, considering that Thornton wrote her autobiography to her descendants,[426] this could help build a picture of her as the correctly behaving sister and him as the immoral brother.

Sisters could, furthermore, use expressions of affection to attempt to exert influence. Bernard Capp argued that sometimes, sisters' expressions of affection and gratitude towards their elder brother were connected to their financial dependency; for example, a sister could express affection to her brother to gain financial benefits.[427] Different ways of conveying affection were connected to disputes between a brother and a sister, and women could generally express affection to attempt to gain control over the situation. Furthermore, such behaviour could be a way to help siblings avoid escalating volatile situations or to appease one another.

Expressing affection to have an influence was not reserved only for sisters. Conveying love intensely could be a way for male siblings to attempt to gain agency. Dorothy Osborne described many quarrels with her brother Henry, who disapproved of her courtship with William Temple.[428] Osborne noted in a letter

---

[424] Add Ms. 88897/2, 165; Thornton 1875, 120; Capp 2018, 162.
[425] Such as the virtue of charity (Allestree 1659, 330).
[426] Wilcox, Hobby, Hind, & Graham 1989, 5; Capp 2018, 161.
[427] Capp 2018, 61. See also Geussens 2022.
[428] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple 1653, Osborne 1901, 120; Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 124–125; Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 139; Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 241; Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 268–269; Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 331; Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 332–333.

written in 1653 that Henry wanted to stay on good terms with her simply because he cared for her and loved her. She reported what he had told her she should take certain factors into consideration when marrying and wrote, "…many times [he] wishes me a husband that loved me as well as he does…" [429] and added "…nobody would believe they were from a brother; and I cannot but tell him sometimes that, sure, he mistakes and sends me letters that were meant to his mistress…"[430] Henry's expressing affection in a way that could be mistaken for that of a lover could help him maintain the relationship with his sister while attempting to dictate how she should get married and to whom. Osborne recognised that the way her brother expressed his emotions and spoke to her was an attempt to control her. She noted in the same letter, "Next week my persecution begins again…I shall be baited most sweetly, but sure they will not easily make me consent to make my life unhappy to satisfy their importunity".[431] Even though Osborne recognised that Henry would attempt to influence her in a pleasant manner, she still saw these efforts as tied to their disagreements and emotional states. Henry needed to rely on particular tactics to attempt to gain influence, but Osborne still had the agency to refuse him.

Affection was also connected to religious norms, which instructed siblings like Osborne to be calm and express love for each other. God's love and the expectation for its appreciation from the Christian communities of early modern period was of crucial importance in society. God's love was mobilised through *caritas*, or charity, which, as an important virtue, differed from sinful love. Everyday behaviours were expected to reflect charity. Indeed, love was seen as a social practice connected to different actions, rather than merely as a bodily feeling.[432] Richard Allestree, the 17th-century writer of an Anglican conduct book, noted that the virtue of charity, which included love and kindness to others, led to a meek and peaceable character. This meekness could also help calm an angry person. Allestree believed that an individual who was following the expectations of having a peaceable character would not take every small case to court, even if they had the law on their side, as this would disturb the opponent. If the offence was too great, and action was necessary, a peaceable person would remain friendly and accept the terms of an agreement. Furthermore, Allestree noted that siblings should express love to each other.[433]

Similarly, the Scottish nobleman Archibald Argyll also advised his children in his book, published posthumously in 1661, to "…maintain a mutual love and confidence" [434] and to have "…a constant amity to one another".[435] The concept of kindness was an essential value within the landed ranks and their kinship obligations. It included acting in a thoughtful manner and exhibiting courtesy, in

---

[429] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple 1653, Osborne 1901, 92.
[430] Ibid.
[431] Ibid., 92–93.
[432] Barclay 2020, 78–80.
[433] Allestree 1659, 306, 330–332, 345, 377–378; Alblas 1991, 92.
[434] Argyll 1661, 23.
[435] Ibid.

addition to expressing certain emotions, such as love.[436] Norms could impact how siblings chose to express their emotions and what feelings they conveyed. Highlighting various actions and traits connected to the virtue of charity could be a way to express affection or to highlight it. By connecting emotional expression and religion, siblings could influence the reader's perception of the writer and the nature of their actions related to sibling relationships.

Different Christian influences, such as the virtue of charity, were apparent in Alice Thornton's very piously Anglican[437] text and appeared to have affected what emotions she expressed towards her eldest brother[438] Christopher. In this way, she appeared morally superior to her brother and could exert agency over the narrative. What this moral superiority could mean was reflected in Richard Allestree's conduct book aimed at gentry women, for example. He called meekness "…a necessary feminine Vertu"[439] and emphasised, among other qualities, the significance of modesty, piety, and compassion.[440]

While Thornton had written about what had happened to her due to Christopher's actions in a negative manner,[441] she contrasted this with her own actions when describing instances after her husband's death in 1668.[442] Specifically, she remarked, "Butt I blesse God for His grace to me, in giving me to strive and indeavor affter the addorning of my spirritt and heart with all those Christian vertues of faith, humility, patience, meekeness, chastity, and charity…"[443] and noted that she wished not to be "…burdonsom to any; but doing good to all, harme to non… that soe I may… dye in His favour".[444] Thornton described affection as the motivation for her describing how she had helped her sister,[445] but as the virtue of charity was connected directly to affection,[446] this also tied the way she described herself to emotional expression. Her other actions and emotional expressions, described in her autobiography, also generally followed these religious expectations.[447] Thornton highlighted the actions the reader could interpret as connected to the virtue of charity and – through it – affection. While she did not criticise her brother's actions in this section of the book, the ways in which she described her brother's actions earlier exhibited a contrast to her appearing as a moral and virtuous person. It is possible that her religious beliefs were the guiding force behind her actions in real life, but as she expected her descendants to read the text,[448] she could also have wanted just to

---

[436] Pollock 2011, 124.
[437] McPherson 2006, 185.
[438] C.J. 1875, Pedigree of the family of Wandesford.
[439] Allestree 1673, 29.
[440] Ibid., 5–7, 48, 79.
[441] For example, see Thornton 1875, 267, 269.
[442] Thornton 1875, 261.
[443] Ibid., 270.
[444] Ibid., 271.
[445] Ibid., 270.
[446] Allestree 1659, 330. Allestree wrote, "If we have any the least spark of Charity, we cannot but wish all good to mens Soules…and therefore if we do not thus love one another, we are far from obeying that Command of loving, as he hath loved" (Allestree 1659, 330).
[447] For example, see Thornton 1875, 199.
[448] Capp 2018, 161.

appear good on paper.[449] Taking into consideration that Thornton eventually lost the battle for the will,[450] power in the end signified for her the capacity to have an influence on the readers of her autobiography.

The action of breaking up a sibling relationship did not always indicate a lack of affection. This also hinted at the importance of love in sibling relationships. Threatening to leave was a way to highlight affection, but also an attempt to influence a sibling and their actions. These kinds of situations demonstrated how both a brother and a sister could have agency and hold power. Marriage complicated sibling relationships, as they now had to manage time between different people and decide in which to be more invested. Similarly, when the family or part of it did not approve of the match, it could create tensions, as happened in Osborne's and Temple's relationship.[451] Dorothy Osborne wrote in 1653/4 that if she were to marry William Temple, her second eldest brother Henry would leave her "…not out of want of kindness to me, but because he [could not] see the ruin of a person that he love[d] so passionately, and in whose happiness he ha[d] laid up all his".[452] While Henry was the one trying to exert control, this also demonstrated how Dorothy actually held a lot of power over the situation. In this case, she had the agency to make decisions, and her brother had to resort to different means of attempting to change her mind. Here, then, for her brother, power meant only an attempt to have an influence, while Dorothy could get her way due to the contexts which supported this. While in the previous section, getting his or her way was connected to the eldest brothers and their position in the hierarchy, Dorothy's case highlighted that it could reflect women's actions and emotions as well.

This was not how all brothers reacted, as some stayed in each other's lives despite disagreements. Furthermore, individual circumstances dictated when breaking up the sibling relationship was even possible. Regardless of a dispute between Alice Thornton and her eldest brother Christopher regarding their father's testament,[453] he continued to be present in her and her family's lives during the dispute. Even after the event in 1659,[454] he continued to express occasional sympathy,[455] and even though she appeared to have been unsuccessful, she wished to attempt to express love for him.[456] This reflected the expectation of charity in Anglican writer Richard Allestree's conduct book, which emphasised the importance of maintaining a friendly demeanour towards the opponent during lawsuits and having a peaceable character in general.[457] Normative literature also highlighted the significance of restraint; disputing

---

[449] In a recent article, I have examined how the way Thornton described herself here was connected to lived religion, and how this articulation gave her ways to have a sense of control and appear pious (Ala-Hynnilä 2023, 163).
[450] Thornton 1875, 268–269.
[451] Hintz 2005, 3–4, 63, 78, 92; Harris 2016, 146.
[452] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple 1653/4, Osborne 1901, 270.
[453] For example, see Thornton 1875, 183.
[454] In addition to during and after sending the letter. See Thornton 1875, 92, 195, 225, 228.
[455] For example, see Thornton 1875, 183, 199.
[456] Alice Thornton to William Thornton October 18, 1664, Thornton 1875, 291–292.
[457] Allestree 1659, 330–332, 377–378.

neighbours were asked to have forbearance, and instead of quarrelling, it was better to tolerate the faults that members of the family might have.[458]

While the eldest brother had less of a need to consider his siblings when expressing anger, it was more likely that those in a less powerful position, for example, a younger sister, needed to pay attention to how others might react. The examples given here have reflected this, but they certainly do not rule out different responses or emotional expressions emerging during sibling disagreements. Like Dorothy Osborne, it was possible for sisters to express anger to their brothers during quarrels. Still, she described herself only as reacting to an attack and defending herself, rather than starting the dispute with her second eldest brother. Having a man outside of the family on whom she could rely in the future gave her the room to express herself in ways that might not have been possible for others. However, her responses during disagreements differed depending on the age of her brother, as she was much less willing to express anger towards her eldest brother. While it is possible that his position as the eldest had some effect, it is also likely that other factors, such as the nature of their relationship and his personality, especially compared with her description of her second eldest brother, played a role. This suggests that while sisters had options in how to express emotions during disagreements, complex individual contexts either helped or hindered this process. Nevertheless, while in a disadvantaged position, both sisters nevertheless used power. For them, it often meant the ability to react to chastisement or to influence the readers of their texts.

It was possible for some sisters to describe their anger quite directly, whereas others did not take this approach. Alice Thornton was not without the ability to resist her brother; she did, after all, have a legal dispute with him. However, she did not express anger directly, as Osborne had done, and she even chose to express affection instead. Still, as was the case with Osborne, her emotional expressions, or the threat of not conveying them in the future, gave her the opportunity to at least attempt to have agency. Even when she finally lost the legal case, she chose to highlight her own morality, indirectly hinting at the contrast with how her brother had acted. Some took this approach further, portraying themselves as the victim and the other party as the offender.

3.3   Appearing as a victim

Disputes between members of elite families could lessen their collective honour, and there was much gossip regarding whether intra-family relationships were a good or not. Not having quarrels out in the open was indeed crucial to protecting reputations.[459] While this tendency was reflected in the previous cases examined in this chapter, some took a different path. In this section, I will examine how siblings of different ages and genders could express emotions during disputes by

---

[458] Pollock 2007, 13, 15.
[459] Pollock 2007, 19.

describing themselves as morally righteous victims and the other parties as offenders and wrongdoers, creating a contrast between the two. I will examine how this could give sisters a way to express anger or similar emotions, as well as how eldest brothers could take this same approach. Additionally, I will analyse how siblings could express emotions by appearing as the victim by focusing on a variety of relevant factors, such as unfulfilled duties.

While chastising could require a certain position in the sibling hierarchy, which, for example, gender or age could bring, appearing as a victim was a more accessible way to express anger. Victimising oneself was a way to convey emotions and to express a certain picture of events to the person reading the text. Expressing anger in this way was connected to unfulfilled duties, expectations, and disobedience, which were also present in chastising, although in a different manner. I will introduce these themes through three examples, all of which highlight that the expectations siblings held had not been met. The sibling appearing as a victim emphasised these unmet expectations by noting that duties had not been fulfilled, help they had given had not been answered appropriately, or that they had not been treated according to expectations. The expression of anger in this way was possible, especially by highlighting that the rights of a brother or a sister were not being respected, which enabled that sibling to appear to be a victim. While the hierarchical positions of these writers were different, for all of them, power signified the opportunity to defend themselves in the eyes of the reader of the text and to maintain their honour. The ability to write or the necessary wealth to use a scribe enabled them to use the power of persuasion in this manner.

While similar elements were also present, for example, in Dorothy Osborne's and Henry Oxinden's letters, texts from three authors, Elizabeth Freke, James Yonge, and John Guise, provide particularly clear examples of different approaches to expressing anger by highlighting the author's position as a victim. The primary sources used in this dissertation, in which anger was expressed in this manner, include various autobiographies. However, one of the examples examined here was a diary, which highlights that this approach was not limited to one genre of writing.

Clifton Mark has noted that in 17th-century English normative literature, quarrels were often portrayed as having been caused by insults against gentlemen's honour and reputation, suggesting that they belonged to a lower class. An insult that targeted honour in this manner even obliged gentlemen to engage in a conflict, as it was seen as necessary to react to such offences; not doing so could impact a gentleman's honour. It could also be considered insulting if a gentleman were not paid respect in the way he expected. Additionally, Linda A. Pollock explained that honour also applied to women and those below landed ranks. In her analysis of the daily life of the elite, she has also shown that there were many opinions about honour, and that reconciliation, restraint, and moderation were important mediators here as well. For example, exhibiting restraint when being challenged to a duel could be seen as honourable by some

and dishonourable by others.[460] Acting as a victim gave one the opportunity to defend honour, but with moderation.

By describing a division between the offender and the offended sibling, the writer could justify the need to express anger while being less direct about it. This could also give siblings with less agency a chance to express anger. Furthermore, by expressing anger in any manner, a person could indicate the possession of immaculate values and morality and highlight how the other person was in the wrong.[461] Acting as a victim emphasized this. Expressing anger in this way was not limited to younger siblings, as the eldest brothers also took this approach.

This set of actions was also connected to power, as conveying anger by appearing as the victim had the potential to influence the recipient of the expression, who was often the reader of an autobiography rather than the involved sibling. Chastising aimed to have a direct impact on the sibling being chastised, while appearing as the victim could be more public. Expressing anger in this fashion highlighted the division of two opposites: the victim and the offender. Both men and women expressed anger towards their siblings in this manner, emphasising various aspects of their unique circumstances. Expressing anger by appearing to be a victim could also reflect men's struggles to keep up with their manhood when they had lost control.

RECIPROCITY, POWER, AND AGE: ELIZABETH FREKE

Expressing anger by highlighting the division between the victim and the offender is connected with defending a person's rights. Not expressing anger could be improper, especially when it came to money, reputation, and property, as landed people would not be respected if they did not seek compensation for injury. Similarly, both men and women knew their rights and held on to them. For example, some people expressed anger about not being treated according to their age, as adults and others would not be taken for a fool. Still, even if the offended person felt justified in their anger, the assumed offender did not necessarily agree. People could choose from multiple precepts, and the principles did not have a clear hierarchy. Such considerations could give both sides of an argument ways to justify their points of view and provoke further anger.[462]

When there was a proper justification, women could express anger without apology. Predictably, women with a position that gave them authority or those safe from repercussions were more prone to do so. Of course, women in other types of situations could express anger as well. [463] Appearing as a victim, furthermore, brought forward situations where sisters could express anger in ways other than as a response to the anger conveyed toward them. By directly declaring that they had been treated unfairly, the sisters could further highlight the emotional content of their message. Furthermore, stating that they had been

---

[460] Pollock 2007, 5, 8, 10–11, 27–29; Mark 2018, 392–395, 397, 399.
[461] Pollock 2004, 583.
[462] Ibid., 576, 582–583, 585.
[463] Ibid., 579.

wronged and explaining how this had been done might also elicit sympathy from the reader.

This approach of appearing as a victim to the reader could be related to the author's siblings not having fulfilled expectations related to reciprocity. Elizabeth Freke, who was the eldest of three sisters,[464] often conveyed self-pity and was prickly and prideful, and her relationship with her sisters was often disagreeable due to her having a difficult personality.[465] Still, the sisters had a mutual sense of responsibility. Furthermore, Freke had become a widow in 1706, the year she turned 64.[466] A woman could be the head of the household after becoming a widow and thus obtain a position of power over the family and servants. When women were widowed or had not yet married, or, in other words, were *feme sole*, they could have personal property and, in some cases, real estate. In early modern England, 12.9 percent of households were headed by widows. Widows had various opportunities, for example, concerning housing, and were overall in a better position than never-married women. Furthermore, widows could, according to common law, inherit at least one-third of the husband's property and continue his trade.[467] Freke's widowhood may have influenced her position within the sibling hierarchy.

When writing in her autobiography about her sister Lady Judith Austen in the year 1710, Freke noted that Lady Austen left her even though she was very ill,[468] which drew the reader's attention to her pitiable state. She remarked, "…I could nott butt resentt most unkindly…her affter I had pinched my self back and belly these severall years in these severall sums to serve her and hers…"[469] Furthermore, she listed instances where she had helped her sister, for example, by giving her furniture and money,[470] asked God to forgive Lady Austen, and noted in the end that her "…sister would nott bear my mallonchally one winter…"[471] The fact that Freke expressed her melancholy only at the end gave the reader the chance to first build a picture of her behaviour and emotional input into the relationship. It also made her request appear reasonable, even if her status and the demands she could make based upon it were not taken into consideration.

Siblings describing themselves as victims was also connected to ways in which birth order was tied to power and emotions. Although age could give room to convey feelings more freely, many other factors also influenced power relations, which, in turn, were reflected in how appearing as the victim enabled

---

[464] Anselment 1997, 72.
[465] Capp 2018, 71, 74–75. For example, she expressed gratitude towards her sister Lady Norton and noted her kindness, but also expressed her dislike towards needing help from her in the same entry (Freke 2001, 77; Capp 2018, 74–75). Additionally, she addressed her sister Lady Austen's "… unexpected kindness…" (Freke 2001, 252). This suggested tensions in their relationship, while also exhibiting more positive connotations.
[466] Anselment 2001, 15; Capp 2018, 71, 75.
[467] Earle 1989, 158, 160; Eales 1998, 12, 76; Froide 2005, 17–19; Greenberg 2005, as cited in Hammons 2006, 1390. See also Erickson 1993, 150–151.
[468] Freke 2001, 266.
[469] Ibid.
[470] Ibid., 266–268.
[471] Ibid., 268.

siblings to act. Freke emphasised her own actions, which, in her view, gave her the right to expect certain behaviour from her sister. Regardless, her text did not just reflect her attempt to display power and her evaluation of the nature of her sister's actions, but also her position as the eldest. Although she was aware of her place as the eldest daughter, for most of her life, she was often penniless and the last of the siblings to marry.[472] Furthermore, her monetary situation appeared to have improved, while her sister Austen's had gotten worse. [473] Thus, her expressing herself in this way could have been an attempt to gain back agency, as well as to change her sister's behaviour. For example, Freke presented herself as having helped her sister greatly, which not only made her look morally superior but could also provoke a sense of guilt. This also highlighted Freke's position as the eldest sibling, as she could now act according to the normative expectations established for that position, such as helping her siblings.

At the same time, Freke gradually began losing the independence she had acquired, as was apparent from her text in 1687 indicating that she refused help from her sister. Her health was failing, and she detested being dependent on her sisters' assistance.[474] Lady Austen's leaving her could have reminded Freke of this and impacted the way in which she expressed her anger. Her sisters' roles in her life as caretakers had an impact on their power relations, reducing her opportunities to influence them and giving her sisters more ways to exercise agency over her. This dynamic also gave the sister describing herself as a victim a way to justify why she felt this way. Although Freke was the eldest and therefore technically higher in the sibling hierarchy,[475] she not only blamed her sister for not being with her but also talked about herself highly. Intersectional viewpoints are also relevant here. Freke's case illustrates that while women were subordinate to men, their varied backgrounds created differences. Although Freke gained financial influence, her physical condition gave her sister the chance to use power over her. Finally, writing an autobiographical text and expecting others to read it could have influenced the way in which Freke conveyed her emotions. Because of the public nature of the text, norms and expectations related to anger, the virtues seen as contrary to them, and conventions related to sibling relationships may have affected its composition.

DIFFERING EXPECTATIONS AND DISOBEDIENCE

Men and women could justify how their siblings or family should treat them based on their general understanding of morality, proper normative behaviour, or personal values. Such justification could reflect the writers' own ideas about their positions within the family and about how to combine their own thoughts

---

[472] Capp 2018, 73–75.
[473] Freke 2001, 266–268; Anselment 1997, 62, 70; Anselment 2001, 15; Capp 2018, 74. While her husband Percy, who had quite freely used the assets she brought into the marriage, left her profits and rents that could be collected from his lands in Ireland, she had problems with realising the money (Anselment 2001, 15–16). It still appears that her monetary situation was somewhat different than it had previously been.
[474] Freke 2001, 77, 226, 242; Anselment 1997, 70–71; Capp 2018, 74–75.
[475] Capp 2018, 71.

with wider social norms. Appearing as the victim was possible by highlighting disobedience and some breach of what the offended sibling had expected from the emotional and practical relationship.

Discrimination due to parental favouritism and the eldest son's particular position within the family hierarchy sometimes caused tensions and resentment between siblings. Besides the heir, others could be preferred, for example, due to having a similar personality as one of the parents, but the youngest was also cherished by many. This did not mean, however, that the parents did not accept the eldest son's position as the heir. Furthermore, the favourites could also change over time, and both parents did not always favour the same child. Issues related to the special position of the eldest brother, parental favouritism, and expectations from the younger children were all connected to emotional expression. However, younger sons could also become resentful because they did not prosper after leaving home to work as apprentices or in a particular profession.[476] The division between an offender and a victim was not necessarily limited to siblings, which complicated power relationships between the parties involved.

James Yonge was the second son and a surgeon by trade, an occupation that paid well and was respected.[477] He expressed his anger in his journal by contrasting his own situation, his father's behaviour, and the circumstances of his elder brother John. He described how he had to live in more difficult circumstances than his brother and did not receive help or letters from his father.[478] When his father forced Yonge to become his apprentice[479] in the early 1660s, he noted how unhappy he was and wrote, "My elder brother was maintained like a prince, I clad with old turned clothes, sparrow-billed shoes, &c., and not one penny in my pocket".[480] This also suggested that his grudge was not just with his father. Yonge described working hard as an apprentice,[481] which could help build a positive image of himself for the reader, in contrast to how he was treated by his family. Yonge's expression of resentfulness could have been connected to what he thought of his position within the sibling hierarchy, but he also did not accept the way his father used his power. Yonge's father had agency over both brothers and a big impact on their lives, but this also empowered Yonge's elder brother and brought him into focus as a partial offender. Despite the influence his father and brother had, Yonge's ability to write about the situation in this manner reflected the independence, agency, and power he had gained later in life.

Yonge described himself as poor during this time, but one way for younger brothers to gain power over their own lives was to have independence rather

---

[476] Crawford 2004/2014, 215; Capp 2018, 16–17, 20–22, 27, 32, 38, 41.
[477] Poynter 1963, 15; Earle 1989, 71.
[478] Yonge 1963, 39, 53.
[479] Yonge complained that his father "…had no business for me but to write letters" (Yonge 1963, 53). His father later sent him on voyages on fishing ships (Poynter 1963, 13; Yonge 1963, 53–54, 60). He had previously been an apprentice to a surgeon of a ship (Yonge 1963, 27).
[480] Yonge 1963, 53.
[481] Ibid., 27, 39, 42, 52–54.

than to be at the mercy of those with money. While trade was not held in esteem in the way the gentry's administrative and military obligations or tenure of manors were, officially, nothing prevented men from taking part in it. Indeed, a younger son building a career in trade was seen as appropriate if they could not have an estate of their own, and thus inheritance for many younger sons took the form of a payment of apprenticeship fees. For example, between 1570 and 1646, the number of apprentices whose father was a knight, esquire, or a gentleman added up to 12.6 percent. Of course, esteemed companies with money that was not connected to manual labour had a proportionally higher number of apprentices from the upper levels of society. Those whose family backgrounds were lower than that of the gentry could also find success in this manner.[482]

Yonge was not alone in expressing his disapproval of parental favouritism. Philosopher Francis Bacon noted in the 1612 version of his work, *The Essays,* that parents often loved some children more, although he felt this was sometimes not deserved.[483] He explained that this was connected to age, as he saw that it was the middle children who did not receive as much attention, while the youngest children were spoiled and "…one, or two of the eldest respected…" [484] Additionally, he noted that this would cause brothers to compete and generate disagreements later in life.[485] On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that many mothers and fathers were equally devoted to and proud of all their children.[486]

Had Yonge been part of the gentry, his situation might have been quite different. Joan Thirsk argued that younger brothers belonging to the upper levels of society were not accustomed to working, even though there were ample opportunities. Still, raising them to not expect much and providing them with an ungenerous education was not an option, as the current heir could die. Furthermore, William Fleetwood, who was born in 1656 and first published his book *The Relative Duties of Parents and Children, Husbands, and Wives, Masters and Servants* in 1705, suggested that it was not decent for the gentry and aristocracy to take part in the trades or to have a low education.[487] These considerations could obligate the parents to act in a manner that did not take away all possibilities for the younger brothers to have power and independence.

Siblings could also express their sense of victimhood by emphasising differing expectations and non-normative behaviour. Here, too, people other than the siblings could play a role, acting against one of the siblings or helping one above the others. Although James Yonge was not a recipient of the benefits of primogeniture, he had clear expectations regarding how he should be treated regarding his and his siblings' inheritance. Yonge's parents were delighted when his younger brother Nathaniel married a merchant's daughter, Joan, in 1679, and they gave Nathaniel generous gifts, such as 100 pounds and a house, which

---

[482] Wrightson 1982/2003, 36; Crawford 2004/2014, 216.
[483] Bacon 1612, 29.
[484] Ibid., 30.
[485] Ibid., 31.
[486] Capp 2018, 18.
[487] Fleetwood 1722, 103, 106; Thirsk 1969, 368; Staves 1995, 204.

would come into his possession after the parents had died.[488] Compared with how he described the situation with his elder brother, Yonge was much more direct in his expressions of anger. When explaining that Nathaniel also got the house in which Yonge currently resided, he commented, "... [it was] a thing I so resented that it had almost broke my heart..."[489] Bernard Capp noted the role of parental bias here,[490] further emphasising the agency of the mother and father. Regardless, Nathaniel also gained power through the actions of his parents.

Yonge's comments about how these actions impacted his own family emphasised his anger and his sense that his father and younger brother were wrong to do this. Driving him out of his house was a display of power from his parents that benefitted his younger brother, and Nathaniel also gained even more agency over Yonge as his financial situation improved. Yonge noted how this incident defied his expectations related to sibling hierarchy. For example, Yonge explained that their father "...would never advance or settle a penny..."[491] for him or his elder brother when they married[492] and called this an "...unnatural act..."[493] In other words, their father's behaviour disturbed the balance of power in the family relationship. In the end, the involvement of others outside of the family worked in Yonge's favour. He noted how the reaction of the surrounding community eventually helped turn his father's head, as he gave Yonge money and changed his will by "giving [Yonge] what [he] seemed to expect".[494] Even though Yonge eventually got what he wanted, he had little influence on the situation himself, despite his age. By describing the situation to the reader of his journal in this manner, Yonge could take back some power, as he now had influence over the perception of the case by highlighting his position as a victim and the wrongdoings of his parents.

This situation could also have been disruptive to Yonge's patriarchal manhood, compared to what his younger brother could have gained had the father not changed his decision. While patriarchy meant male superiority, there were also differences between men. The ability to govern was learned, had to be used with moderation and wisdom, and was something obtained through marriage, property, and age. By obtaining this position, men could achieve patriarchal manhood. Such an achievement was attached to household status, which was largely associated with married middle-aged men. Unmarried men working as servants for other men were, on the other hand, understood to occupy a position of subordinate manhood. At the same time, men for whom attaining manhood in this manner was not possible had other ways of being manly. For example, underage boys were dependent on others and too young to attain full manhood, but they nevertheless exhibited traits attached to manliness and

---

[488] Yonge 1963, 160.
[489] Ibid., 161.
[490] Capp 2018, 170–171.
[491] Yonge 1963, 160.
[492] Ibid.
[493] Ibid., 161.
[494] Ibid.

learned them, for example, by observing adults.[495] This could be reflected in the differences between younger and elder brothers and in the kinds of hierarchical positions that existed in the family and between the siblings. Yonge's threat of losing the house he was promised is an example of how one's patriarchal manhood could be put at risk in this way.

Another way of expressing anger by dividing the siblings into the offended victim and the offender was to focus on disobedience. This was usually meant to preserve the power of those who could expect to be obeyed. Eldest brothers could convey their feelings in this manner instead of chastising their siblings, but other brothers could also do the same. The genre of writing could help to guide the emotional expression in this direction; brothers may have chastised their siblings first and then noted their disapproval in other forms of communication.

Expressing emotions through highlighting disobedience could be done by emphasising the author's own position and its subsequent violations. John Guise was the third baronet of Elmore[496] and the eldest man in the family, as his father had died a few years earlier. In addition, Guise only had two sisters.[497] Guise expressed his emotions when he was not given a say in whom his sister married, contrasting his actions with those of others and hinting at his anger by referring to power relations and hierarchical familial relationships. When his younger sister Rachel got married to Sir Roger Bradshaigh in 1697, Guise emphasised, "I neither consented to the marriage nor was at it".[498] Regardless of this, he still complimented her husband, calling him handsome and noting that he pleased her. Furthermore, he wrote that the Countess of Bridgwater had recommended Sir Bradshaigh to their mother.[499] After the father died, it was expected that the heir would help his sisters get married.[500] Guise's notion of not consenting to the marriage reflected his feelings of being left out, despite the expectation that he would take part in his sisters' life, considering his age and gender. It also showed how women could operate without asking for permission from men. By complementing the husband, Sir Bradshaw, Guise directed his emotions, such as feelings of being displeased, towards his sister.

Such an expression of being wronged is also associated with how Guise and others understood manhood in general and perceived related threats. Full manhood was seen as connected to governing people within the household, such as the wife, and patriarchy in general was predicated on the inferiority of women.[501] Although the situation between siblings was obviously different from that between a husband and a wife, Guise's authority as a man had been overlooked. However, a gentleman's honour was often displayed at home when he, as the head of his household, displayed his leadership and his expectations

---

[495] Shepard 2005, 291; Jordan 2011, 245, 247; Amussen 2018, 346, 350.
[496] Guise & Guise 1917, 142–143; Davies 1917, 96.
[497] Their father had died in 1695 (Davies 1917, 96). Guise & Guise 1917, 134.
[498] Guise & Guise 1917, 142. This inaction could also be a means of expressing his anger at least to the reader, especially since he does not provide another explanation for not going.
[499] Guise & Guise 1917, 142.
[500] Capp 2018, 51.
[501] Jordan 2011, 245; Amussen 2018, 345–346.

concerning conduct. Having control over those in the household who were in an inferior position was linked to reputation and honour.[502]

Highlighting disapproval could also indicate feelings of being disobeyed and not being listened to. In the case of Guise's other sister Annabella's marriage to Edward Blount, he expressed his emotions somewhat more indirectly. In this case, he conveyed his anger by aiming the blame at Blount. He described Blount as an esquire coming from a well-known but "…popish religion, which [Annabella] had allways shown a great aversion to".[503] Unlike before, Guise did not insert himself into the equation directly; rather, he hinted at his thoughts and emotions through criticism. For example, he noted Blount's unfavourable traits, such as not having money or land and being much older than Annabella, and accused this marriage of causing her to convert to Catholicism more than a decade later.[504] While Guise blamed the marriage on her husband, for example, through his tempting of her through his knowledge of Greek and Latin and noting that "…he was so cunning as to perswade my sister to marry him",[505] he also commented on his sister's role by suggesting that it was "…very hard to account for her choice".[506] Guise's choice of words conveyed his disapproval and associated emotions clearly. Blaming Annabella connected the dislike he expressed towards her husband to her as well. Both cases also demonstrated how complex power relations between siblings could be, and how women could have the ability to act regardless of their brothers' opinions. In addition, Guise's comments reflected his concern about the way this marriage could damage the family's reputation more broadly.

Even brothers who were the eldest men alive in the family did not necessarily just command or highlight their need to be obeyed, but also contrasted these expectations with the way they talked about themselves. Through this approach, they could attempt to justify their point of view instead of assuming that others would accept it without question. Like other siblings conveying emotions by appearing as a victim, Guise contrasted his and the opposing parties' actions by making himself appear better and more normatively correct. For example, he noted how he had helped his sisters financially, even though he felt that they were more well-off than him.[507] He also pointed out that the same year his sisters were married, his financial situation was in "…great disorder".[508] This could have contributed to the sisters appearing less restrained within the sibling hierarchy or less inclined to act according to the expectation of obeying their eldest brother. The genre of the text, an autobiography rather than a diary or a letter, and Guise's writing style of expressing anger in other ways than by chastising, separated him from the other eldest brothers analysed in this chapter and could have had an impact on the form of expression, for example,

---

[502] Fletcher 1995, 137; Foyster 1995, 31–32.
[503] Guise & Guise 1917, 142.
[504] Ibid., 142–143.
[505] Ibid., 142.
[506] Ibid., 142.
[507] Ibid., 140.
[508] Ibid., 141–142.

due to the more public nature of the text.[509] A memoir probably put much more temporal distance between the events described and the time of writing compared with letters, and Guise relied more on memories. Of course, it should be noted that it was not only the eldest brothers who felt they had the right to comment on their sisters' marriages.

Compared with the eldest brothers' comments, younger brothers might have to take a somewhat different approach depending on their individual contexts. Similarly to Guise, James Yonge expressed anger about his sisters' marriages in his journal and conveyed it by positioning himself as one of the victims, compared with Guise's position of not getting something he was owed. Yonge's position was different from that of Guise, as he had an elder brother, John, who was still alive. When his sister Ann Crymes remarried[510] in 1668/9, Yonge noted that she did this secretly and "...absolutely against the liking of all her relations".[511] He had a sense of superiority, at least vis-à-vis his sister, perhaps due to his gender and the agency it granted over women in his life. Furthermore, this tended to have an impact on his emotional expressions. Compared with Guise, as he was not the eldest son, he did not rely solely on his own position, but emphasised the reaction of others as well, which could have helped give him more authority. His disapproval and choice of words hinted at his emotions as well. He described her husband, Mr Richard Walter, as "...a Gent. of good estate, but a covetous sneak",[512] thus justifying his opinion and lending more weight to his words.

His situation, however, changed soon afterward, when John passed away in 1670. While Yonge referred to his brother John as the elder rather than the eldest, for example, in his description of John's discussion with their father, in which John noted that their mother wanted to make James "…elder and greater than [him]",[513] the context suggested that John was the eldest. Furthermore, Bernard Capp argued that John thought their mother wanted James to be the heir.[514] This suggests that James may have been the second eldest. In 1680, Yonge again described his feelings about the marriage of his sister Joanna: "It was done contrary to the good liking and against the consent of my Mother and self".[515] According to Capp, this indicated that Yonge thought he was the head of the family.[516] Indeed, here he highlighted his own feelings more than he had in his earlier observations about his other sister's marriage, making his comments more similar to those of Guise, as discussed above.

---

[509] For example, Guise could have wanted to position himself positively and the other side negatively to his possible intended audience to convey his anger, while at the same time not wanting to have too great of an impact on how the reader would perceive his family and its reputation. Furthermore, a memoir being a more public platform (Goldberg 1974, 71, Cambers 2007, 804), expectations related to the normative context could have impacted his writing style of refraining from expressing anger explicitly or intensely.
[510] Yonge 1963, 83.
[511] Ibid., 112.
[512] Ibid., 112.
[513] Ibid., 123.
[514] Capp 2018, 170.
[515] Yonge 1963, 165.
[516] Capp 2018, 172.

Although many siblings expressed anger or similar emotions in connection with attempting to appear as victims, there was a disparity between normative expectations and real life. By highlighting how their own behaviour was normatively correct and being less direct about expressing anger, siblings could, at least to some degree, follow the Anglican normative expectations related to expressions of anger. However, the Anglican chaplain Lancelot Blackburne still did not see this as an appropriate reason to convey the emotion of anger, about which he remarked, "When aggressor, partial, and unjust; when defendant, blind, and insufficient…",[517] further commenting that no matter what, anger would still destroy reason and lead to "…Rage and Madness".[518]

Appearing as the victim was a way for both older and younger brothers and sisters to express anger or similar emotions, while at the same time justifying their response and controlling the narrative. Within this theme of appearing as the victim, power was a way to influence the readers of the text and to maintain honour or to attempt to repair the writer's reputation. While this gave an opportunity for siblings in a less powerful position to express themselves, it was also a way for the eldest to convey their feelings. However, brothers and sisters in different hierarchical positions could express their emotions by highlighting different factors. While the eldest might be more likely to stress disobedience, all age groups could note how they had not been treated according to what they regarded as morally correct. Furthermore, siblings could highlight non-normative behaviour and differing expectations.

The concept of agency helps us understand these approaches to disagreements. Through narrative constructions of agency, those who felt wronged could gain a more active role during the narrated event. Even simply being the narrator gave one an active position.[519] Here, the authors of the primary sources were unable to exert active agency in the moment, as, despite their hierarchical positions, their siblings acted against their will. Their texts gave them a more active position, regardless of whether they actually influenced their siblings or readers or had no impact in this regard.

CONCLUSION

Hierarchy impacted the ways in which different groups of people expressed anger, while power structures and contexts influenced interpretation. Furthermore, anger was a way to forcefully communicate the point of view of those in control and of others as well.[520] This chapter has highlighted how the previously studied themes of power, disagreements, and emotions emerged in sibling relationships in ways that have not been analysed before. It has been noted that siblings expressed emotions through chastisement and by appearing as the victims during disagreements. Both ways of expressing anger attempted

---

[517] Blackburne 1694, 13.
[518] Ibid., 12–13.
[519] Pöysä 2015, 136.
[520] Pollock 2004, 574–577; Korhonen 2005, 7–8, 21.

to demonstrate how the writer was correct and their sibling was not, but chastisement focused more on the other party's faults. Appearing as the victim shifted attention to the impact of the offender's actions or words at a later date as this approach was taken in texts recording memories. In these cases, the audience also separated these two methods of expressing anger as acting as a victim was written in texts not usually meant only for oneself or a sibling to read. While chastisement aimed at an immediate impact on a person's behaviour, appearing as the victim was usually done to recount what had occurred to a less specific audience. Furthermore, this chapter has highlighted the different possibilities that sisters had to react to disagreements and noted that siblings faced a multitude of different contexts that impacted the influence they could have on each other.

The authors of the primary sources examined here represented different ages and genders. Birth order, personality, gender, and broader norms all played a part in influencing who could express anger to which sibling and how. Of course, other matters, such as temperament, the language used, and the nature of the relationship, could impact these expressions. A focus on intersectionality can help us understand the nuances in these relationships. Previous research on families who lived in early modern Europe, including the 18th-century Austrian Netherlands, has noted the influence of contexts such as age and gender on who could express emotions.[521] This dissertation expands on previous research by analysing how these themes appeared in England in particular cultural contexts, specifically in sibling relationships. This chapter has taken note of how those with power could use it in emotional expressions. It has also emphasised that those in lower power positions could influence either their siblings or the readers of their texts through emotional expressions or through the wordings of their texts. In this chapter, we have discovered that by expressing anger, brothers and sisters of different ages could attempt to maintain a powerful position or to increase agency, have more freedom to act, mould the situation to be more advantageous, and defend their honour and reputation. Anger was thus a communicative tool that could be harnessed for control. Age differences nevertheless created hierarchical differences between siblings, and their influence was apparent in how siblings communicated in their disagreements.

The power siblings used was understood in a number of ways. The differences in sibling hierarchies and other opportunities in life influenced this. For the eldest brothers Samuel Pepys and Henry Oxinden, power meant the ability to decide, within the influence of the normative framework, which action was an offence and to chastise their siblings for such behaviour. Their positions as the well-off eldest brothers meant they also had a better chance of having an influence on their younger siblings. When anger was expressed, the expectations and views of one of the parties appeared as more valuable and acceptable, while the other person was judged as being in the wrong. Social hierarchy ultimately influenced these classifications.[522] The influence of hierarchy on who could make

---

[521] Broomhall & Van Gent 2016, 64; Geussens 2022, 166. See also Crawford 2004/2014, 223.
[522] Korhonen 2005, 8.

the judgement in such cases appeared between siblings as well. This was apparent, for example, in the diary of Samuel Pepys, who was the eldest brother in a powerful position and expressed intense anger when disciplining his siblings.

Chastisement underscored the eldest brothers' role as guides in other siblings' lives, but both Pepys and Henry Oxinden also used this approach to wield power and exert agency over their younger brothers and sisters. Primogeniture usually gave the eldest brother the opportunity to demand respect from his younger siblings, in accordance with his age and gender, and empowered him to express anger in various ways, including in a more intense manner. Choosing to express anger in a less intense manner, as Henry Oxinden did, could be the result of affection, but the genre and expected audience of the text could also have an impact. Despite taking this approach to expressing anger, Oxinden was still able to make judgements on who was right and wrong and convey these opinions to his brother. At the same time, taking a more intense approach to expressing anger made the relationship appear more hierarchical. However, there were still limits to how the eldest brothers could act. The normative and social importance of the duties that the elder brothers and sisters were expected to fulfil could give younger siblings more freedom to act, as was the case with James Oxinden. Samuel Pepys's justifications for his expressions of anger speak to this as well. Brothers who were not the eldest could also chastise their younger siblings, which highlighted the significance of age differences in the sibling hierarchy and their impact on emotional relationships. However, the reactions that the eldest and the elder brothers received for chastisement could differ. For example, Dorothy Osborne's second eldest brother, Henry, chastised her, but she responded only with anger.

For Dorothy Osborne, power indeed was evident in her ability to react to chastisement with anger, despite her position within the sibling hierarchy. While normative expectations could impact the ways in which siblings conveyed their feelings during disputes, the two did not always go hand in hand. Regardless of the many religious texts[523] prescribing certain kinds of expressions of anger and behaviour[524] or expectations of respect towards the eldest brother,[525] siblings could act in a variety of ways, depending on their individual contexts. Younger siblings were usually in a less powerful position compared with their elders.[526] Although Dorothy Osborne was a younger woman, she still defied her second eldest brother's will, which was made possible by her future being somewhat secured and her brother not being the recipient of the benefits of primogeniture. Still, she reacted to the conflict rather than starting it. Alice Thornton's case highlights that although women could defy their eldest brother's will, this was not necessarily successful or a means of expressing anger. For Thornton, power was more connected to something that came after the events, such as her ability to defend her reputation in a written format, rather than during the moment itself.

---

[523] Such as Downame 1600, Allestree 1659, Blackburne 1694.
[524] For example, there could be a warning against anger (see, e.g., Blackburne 1694, 5).
[525] Capp 2018, 32.
[526] For example, see Capp 2018, 32; Glover 2000, 10–11; Johnson & Sabean 2011, 2.

Similarly, appearing as a victim gave brothers and sisters power and an opportunity to defend their reputations or honour and the ability to express anger. It gave siblings a chance to make and convey judgements on who was right and who was wrong. While the section on sisters highlighted the ability of those in lower positions to disagree with their brothers, this approach was possible for siblings of varying social positions. Appearing as a victim was connected to feelings of being wronged in some fashion. This could enable younger siblings to express their emotions in a manner that helped them justify their position to the reader. Such an approach helped them gain agency over the narrative. Discussing the matter in a manner that could expose these issues to outsiders would not always have been desirable, as the reputation and honour of the whole family could have been at stake. Occasionally, however, when the writer appeared to be the victim, such action could be beneficial, at least to an individual. The primary sources used here that showed the conveyance of anger by appearing as the victim were more likely autobiographies, while chastisement was typically expressed in a more private format.

Brothers expressing themselves in this manner included John Guise, an eldest brother whose opinion, and thus his position as the eldest, had been disregarded, and James Yonge, who had disagreements with both younger and elder brothers and differing opinions on how he should be treated. In both cases, the brothers portrayed themselves as victims in their texts, as they were vulnerable to disrespect towards their position in the sibling hierarchy and engaged in disagreements about how they should be treated. Elizabeth Freke, the eldest sister, represented how a sister could express herself by appearing as a victim. However, she did not claim that her rights had been violated, but rather that she had earned certain treatment through her actions, and that her expectations had not been met. While her actions also reflected her position as the eldest sister, they contrasted with how the brothers examined in this section talked about themselves.

As Dorothy Osborne's case demonstrated, sisters also expressed anger. The difference with Freke was that she conveyed her emotions to a younger sister. Two of the women whose writings were analysed here expressed their anger directly, while one did not. Freke was demanding with her anger, was elder, and expressed her anger to a sister; Osborne reacted rather than started the conflict; and Thornton chose to express affection rather than anger. Although power could mean different things for siblings of varying hierarchical positions, it was also used in similar ways. Overall, this chapter has highlighted the role that emotional expressions played in power relations between siblings, regardless of age, gender, or financial status.

4   ACTIONS AND EMOTIONS

In this chapter, I will examine the ways in which actions and emotional expressions were connected to each other and to duty, agency, power, and birth order. The various actions and expressions I will examine highlight both indirect and more direct emotional expressions and emotional practices. The link to emotions here was context dependent. I will mainly examine the texts of three women, Alice Thornton, Dorothy Osborne, and Elizabeth Freke and eight men, Samuel Pepys, Henry Newcome, John Bramston, Henry and James Oxinden, John Evelyn, Thomas Meautys, and William Stout. These texts were written between 1607 and 1702, with one exception, which dates from 1724.[527] In the first section, I will focus on actions related to helping, for example, by noting how power was connected to expressions of affection through helping, how gifts could become a burden, and how affection and helping were connected to duties associated with the birth order. In the next section, I will analyse letters and visiting as ways of expressing affection, using power, exerting agency, and fulfilling duties. In the final section, I will examine how actions and emotional expressions were connected to siblings who took care of ill brothers and sisters. Here, I will pay attention to duties and the inability to act, among other things. Throughout the chapter, I will analyse affection as a way of gaining agency, but also take note of how siblings expressed and maintained love in their relationships. As Ulla Koskinen has revealed, the desire to gain concrete benefits did not always drive people; affection, willingness to help, and normative obligations also played a role.[528]

4.1   Helping

In this section, I will examine how the ways in which siblings helped each other were connected with emotional expressions, mainly affection. Previous research

---

[527] Stout 1851, 65, 105.
[528] Koskinen 2021, 34–35.

has touched upon the role that helping and love played in sibling relationships. Bernard Capp has shown how sisters occasionally expressed affection to their brothers to keep receiving their help, but this could change if the ability to help was impacted. This did not mean that the emotional expression was insincere or that the only function of affection was to gain something. [529] Other studies have also addressed helping and affection more generally. For instance, Linda A. Pollock has shown that practical help and emotions existed side by side. For example, when the concept of kindness is taken into consideration, giving material assistance was a way to convey caring and to secure an emotional bond with the person being aided.[530] Here, I will expand on these observations to examine how brothers also expressed affection to get help, and how siblings expressed emotions or drew on the feelings they or their siblings had already expressed to exert agency. For example, brothers and sisters could attempt to get help by reminding their siblings of their affection. Furthermore, I will examine a variety of other ways in which siblings could express affection in connection with helping. I will note the duties the elder brothers had, how these duties influenced the way they expressed affection, and how they used affection during helping. For example, actions such as making sure siblings followed duties could be a way to help and express emotions. I will also consider, for example, how younger siblings could remind others of their affection to get help and also show that the younger siblings were not just the ones being helped, which reminds us of the complexities of power and agency in sibling relations. Helping could be defined as giving that was material, emotional, or spiritual and answered a need. Gifts could serve similar purposes. Due to the importance of reciprocity in the early modern period,[531] repayment was often expected.

HELPING AND AFFECTION IN EARLY MODERN ENGLAND

Although the traditional view in the literature is that informal support, or voluntary giving, declined after the Middle Ages, more recent analyses have uncovered that it was still significant in early modern England. In addition to institutionalised assistance, communities, kin, and family also provided help.[532] This included donating money or food, assisting the sick, giving emotional support, and providing social contacts.[533] The Anglican writer Allestree noted in his conduct book that all siblings should "…help forward the good of each other".[534] Family members could, furthermore, have duties towards each other. The responsibility of parents was to look after their children, who could repay this help by loving their parents, respecting their authority, and assisting them financially.[535] Similarly, the expectation was for elder siblings to take care of

---

[529] Capp 2018, 61.
[530] Pollock 2011, 142–143.
[531] Withington 2007, 296; Koskinen 2021, 24.
[532] Ben-Amos 2000a, 295–296, 298.
[533] Ibid., 297.
[534] Allestree 1659, 307.
[535] Ben-Amos 2000a, 301, 303.

younger ones, while at least the eldest brothers expected to be obeyed in return.[536] Although gender influenced women's abilities to assist, they could help the family by marrying well, thus forming alliances, or elite women could attempt to influence others at court to promote family matters. They could also act as mediators to maintain family relations, help in matters of politics and courtship, take care of the house and the children, and occasionally help financially.[537]

Expressions of affection were tied to helping in many ways. While this section will analyse expressions of affection as supporting the use of power and the place of duty in emotional sibling relationships, this does not mean that siblings did not love one another. Rather, affection could have a big impact on the decisions men and women made.[538] Bernard Capp has discussed some cases where the influence of affection in sibling relationships was especially apparent. For instance, he described how a knight from Yorkshire, Sir John Reresby, paid annuities to his siblings, even though he did not legally have to do so, partly because of his affection and partly because he felt obligated. Capp also remarked that while duties could have an impact, and the elder brother was often the one to help, affection could influence who was eventually the one to give assistance.[539]

Capp has indicated that while some have argued that it was possible to discern affectionate ties in relationships between brothers and sisters in various European countries only from the late 1700s onwards,[540] many factors suggest otherwise.[541] Women could, for example, maintain close emotional ties with their birth family because of the practical nature of many upper-class marriages and therefore feel emotionally connected to their siblings. Susan Broomhall, however, has pondered whether it was possible to expect that shared blood between relatives tied them emotionally together more strongly or if, in reality, kinship did not have an effect on their relationship or loyalty. In contrast, Patricia Crawford has suggested that the ideal was for siblings to love each other.[542] In this regard, the 17th-century Anglican conduct writer Richard Allestree advised that brothers and sisters needed to be kind, not argue, be tender, love each other, and help each other. Furthermore, siblings had to feel this affection deeply to avoid disputes that were especially prone to happen between them.[543]

---

[536] Capp 2018, 32.
[537] Froide 2005, 129–130, 132; Johnson & Sabean 2011, 5; Capp 2018, 63–65; Spicksley 2018, 238.
[538] For example, Alice Thornton wrote about helping her brother George because of her affection (Thornton 1875, 75).
[539] Capp 2018, 34, 36.
[540] See also Johnson & Sabean 2011. While Karl-Heinz Spieß does not deny that siblings belonging to the German high nobility of the late medieval period had affectionate ties, he argues that many factors created tensions or emotional distance between them, even if love between the siblings was the expectation according to norms (Johnson & Sabean 2011, 5; Spieß 2011, 47–59).
[541] We should also not forget to consider differences between European countries and the resulting variations in conventions and norms related to emotional expressions.
[542] Crawford 2004/2014, 209; Broomhall 2008, 4; Capp 2018, 62.
[543] Allestree 1659, 306–307.

Normative Christian literature also commented on love and helping. A general Christian view instructed that during a crisis, siblings should help and have affection for each other. Furthermore, charity was a crucial component of early modern English culture, but still a very broad concept. Overall, charity was understood as general harmony and was usually based on the need to display affection towards God and one's neighbour, as commanded in the Bible. It also included peace-making, observing the morality and spiritual progress of others, and avoiding violence. It was, of course, also related to the act of giving to the poor. Generally, charity was a much-discussed and contested concept.[544]

The core text of Anglicanism, *The Book of Common Prayer*, also highlighted the importance of the virtue of charity and reminded the reader that it is impossible to hate someone and love God simultaneously.[545] The virtue of charity, according to Allestree, included loving and being kind and required Christians to wish good things for others. However, wishes were not enough on their own if no compassionate action to help others was taken. According to Allestree, charity also made a person more willing to pray for others.[546] Alice Thornton, a gentlewoman from Kirklington,[547] discussed these themes in her autobiography. She also highlighted the multitude of factors that influenced how siblings chose to act. Thornton noted that she promised God, among other things, to be helpful and charitable, which then motivated her to help her sister financially.[548] She further remarked, "…affection, necessity, and charity, obleiged my assistance in these cases".[549] Helping was an emotional practice, as it was an action that could communicate emotions and influence their expression.[550]

At the same time, guides to morality and religious texts described kindness as linking people together, and in correspondence, benevolence, goodwill, and warmth were connected to it. Kindness signified thinking the best of people, being interested in the welfare of others, and helping when it was needed. Kindness needed to be shown to those to whom a person was closely connected by blood or friendship, and it was a duty towards members of the family.[551] Charity was also connected to both civility and kindness.[552] Christian communities were also linked by the key ethic of neighbourly love. While this ethic highlighted benevolence towards others, individuals nevertheless had their own kin groups that they would often prioritise. Regardless, ideals of

---

[544] Crawford 2004/2014, 218; Gurney 2018, 3–4, 6; Barclay 2021, 3.
[545] The Book of Common Prayers 1762, The First Sunday after Trinity, The Epistle. 1 S. John 4: 7; The Book of Common Prayers 1762, The Fifth Sunday after the Epiphany, The Epistle. Col. 3: 12; The Book of Common Prayers 1762, The Sunday called Quinquagesima, or the next Sunday before Lent, The Epistle. 1 Cor. 13. 1; Braddock 2010, 1, 89.
[546] Allestree 1659, 329–330, 332–333, 355–356, 358. Praying was also one way for siblings in a less powerful position to exert agency (Ala-Hynnilä 2023, 159–163).
[547] C.J. 1875, v–vi.
[548] Thornton 1875, 270–271
[549] Ibid., 270.
[550] Scheer 2012, 209–212, 214–215.
[551] Pollock 2011, 126–127, 136–137, 140–141.
[552] Ibid., 134–135.

neighbourly love prescribed that people should be generous and sympathetic and feel pity for those in less fortunate situations.[553]

Remembering the influence of various contexts that reflected intersectionality is important when considering these issues. Although sisters also helped, men were generally more likely to be in a position to choose or to be expected to do so.[554] Age could also have an impact in this regard, for example, through primogeniture. [555] Henry Oxinden was the eldest brother of six children, [556] whose father Richard died in 1629 [557] and mother Katherine in 1642.[558] He often helped his brother James Oxinden financially in the first half of the 17th century, and although he was not always pleased with how his brother acted,[559] he expressed that James had a free will and therefore the ability to do as he pleased. Henry helped his brother because of his affection, but he still upheld the requirement for James to obey him.[560] While not all eldest brothers were wealthy, Henry, at least initially,[561] had more money than his younger siblings, which in turn gave him increased power over them. Even though Henry acknowledged his love, he added, "though perhaps another brother may be nearer to you in affection then myselfe, yett you shall never find one more real and more desirous to doe you good then I am".[562] Besides affection, this is where his duties as the eldest brother came in, on top of other possible factors, such as sympathy and the capability to help.

The financial situation of siblings influenced who was able to help, regardless of age difference or gender. For sisters, marriage could be a significant factor. Married women had some agency concerning financial matters, and they could use their husbands' money at least to buy necessities. At the same time, for married women, or *feme covert* in legal speech, who constituted in 17th-century England more than 80 percent of all women,[563] unless there existed a separate settlement, the coverture in common law stripped them of the ability to manage real estate, make contracts, own property, and be able to purchase products on credit in their own name. The husband also owned the wages that a working woman might earn. Still, this also, in theory at least, obliged husbands to take

---

[553] Barclay 2020, 78–79.
[554] Crawford 2004/2014, 222.
[555] Glover 2000, 10–11; Johnson & Sabean 2011, 2; Capp 2018, 32
[556] Gardiner 1933a, 1; Gardiner 1933b, 84.
[557] Gardiner 1933a, 1; Gardiner 1933c, xx.
[558] Gardiner 1933a, 2.
[559] Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden March 5, 1636/7, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 119.
[560] Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden December 17, 1639, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 159.
[561] Later, he was the one who needed help when lawsuits brought him trouble, and his younger brothers were generous in their assistance. He specially mentioned his brother Richard and his brother-in-law Thomas Barrow in this regard. (Henry Oxinden to his wife September 1662, The Oxinden and Peyton Letters, 1642–1670 1937, 273; Henry Oxinden, The Oxinden and Peyton Letters, 1642–1670 1937, 279–280; Gardiner 1933c, xxvii–xxviii; Capp 2018, 37.)
[562] Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden December 17, 1639, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 159.
[563] Cressy 1999, 285.

care of their wives. Indeed, whether a man could afford to provide for his family was something many early modern autobiographers considered before entering into marriage.[564]

The interactions between Thomas Meautys and his sister Jane Cornwallis provide an example of how a sister could be the one helping her brother. The age difference between Meautys, a career soldier working in the Low Countries,[565] and Cornwallis is not known, but she married well and was wealthy.[566] Thomas Meautys was the one asking for money instead of his sister[567] and therefore had to be the one to find ways to communicate with her in a suitable way. He did so in his letter written in 1624/5, acting in an appropriate and normative manner, promising gratefulness and affection in return[568] and adding that her assistance would "…binde … myselfe all ways to dooe you servis".[569] Thomas Meautys's other sister Frances was also ranked above him, as she was the countess of Sussex. Meautys had a big quarrel with her beginning in early 1627 and noted that he saw her as attacking his reputation and honour in addition to wanting to take the matter to court. She died in November of the same year. What this shows is that noble women were indeed able to attack men and have an impact on their reputations.[570]

OLDER BROTHERS, DUTIES, AND HELPING

Emotional expressions were not always direct, and the way they connected to helping often reflected this. Previous research has considered how different actions could convey feelings in a more indirect manner, based on their context. For example, Anne Thompson has analysed how a member of the clergy wishing to be buried near his wife could express affection and tenderness in 16th-century England.[571] Anu Lahtinen examined how affection and actions were connected, showing that in the 16th-century Nordic context, helping financially and taking care of sick members of the family were both expected and seen as expressions of affection. At the same time, more selfish goals, such as political or financial

---

[564] Earle 1989, 159; Eales 1998, 76; Bailey 2003, 62–64, 69–71. The normative expectation was for the husband to bring money in and for the wife to maintain the domestic economy. Of course, while wives were more often at home, and institutional recognition was more readily given to men, this was not the whole story. Regardless of the coverture, wives had, to some extent, agency in economic matters. The law of agency allowed married women to use their money, for example to buy necessities, such as medicine, food, and clothing. Nevertheless, while women's subordination could be seen as limited when, for example, their economic role within the household was taken into consideration, this did not mean women had equality in society. (Amussen 1995, 51, 53; Vickery 1998, 7; Bailey 2003, 69–72.)
[565] Del Lungo Camiciotti 2014, 144, 147.
[566] Ibid., 137.
[567] For example, see Thomas Meautys to Jane Lady Cornwallis January 6, 1624/5, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 115.
[568] Thomas Meautys to Jane Lady Cornwallis January 18, 1624/5, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 115–116.
[569] Thomas Meautys to Jane Lady Cornwallis January 6, 1624/5, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 115.
[570] Pollock 2007, 11–12.
[571] Thompson 2019, 157.

gain, could also serve as motivating factors, even if affection was a more proper justification.[572] Contemporaries also recognised that giving was a way to express affection. For example, Elias Pettit, a student at Emmanuel College, Cambridge,[573] expressed his gratitude to his brother Henry in 1624 as follows: "Besides I have received from you … 2s. 6d. as a token of your love, for which together with the rest from tyme to tyme continued, I give you many thanks".[574]

As men commonly had more resources and wealth than their sisters, this also led to the expectation that they should help their brothers and sisters, for instance, through monetary assistance. Exceptions also existed, of course, as sisters were sometimes able to help.[575] While expectations such as these created pressures for men, money also gave one power and, therefore, there was a better likelihood of brothers having ways to exert agency over their siblings. Furthermore, as settlements and marriage portions relied on the generosity of the heir during the early modern period, due to these distributions being often reliant upon him, the eldest brother gained even more power over his siblings than before. The heir could also face contradictory demands, as he might not want to share the inheritance, while the father might expect him to look after the other siblings. This expectation could cause resentment, but it was also normatively appropriate to honour the father's will, which further reflected the hierarchical nature of the early modern English family.[576]

Sometimes, elder brothers had to take care of younger siblings in a more comprehensive manner. When the parents died, it was usually the relatives who were closest to the children who became their guardians.[577] Many brothers and sisters also replaced the role of a parent if the mother or father, or both, had passed away when some of the siblings were still young. This was not uncommon in the early modern period.[578] The eldest brother could perform his father's duties, such as taking care of younger brothers and sisters, even during the father's lifetime, if the father was not capable of handling these tasks himself.[579] Furthermore, it was expected that elder sisters would take part in raising their younger siblings, which could add some parental qualities to their

---

[572] Lahtinen 2021, 90. Lahtinen has additionally analyzed how in sources written in 16th-century Sweden, a good action could express affection, but the opposite could be true as well, as emotion could also motivate the action. Reciprocity, such as gratefulness, could be expected when affection was expressed through an action. On the other hand, taking care of each other could be expected within the family and seen as an expression of affection, and when this was not fulfilled, there could be financial consequences, such as being left out of a will. (Lahtinen 2021, 87.)

[573] Gardiner 1933a, 2.

[574] Elias Pettit to Henry Pettit November 1, 1624, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 18.

[575] Crawford 2004/2014, 222.

[576] Ibid., 215.

[577] Ben-Amos 2000a, 306.

[578] Crawford 2004/2014, 210–211; Capp 2018, 29. For example, in the Village of Terling in England, more than 10 percent of children had only one parent alive, while both parents of 21 percent of 1598–1740 Colyton pauper apprentices were still living (Crawford 2004/2014, 211).

[579] Capp 2018, 51.

position.[580] A Puritan preacher,[581] William Gouge, explained in 1622 that when children were orphaned, elder brothers and sisters, along with grandparents, aunts, uncles and others, assumed the role of parents. He noted that the duties of the parents transferred to them, including ensuring that the children were educated, finding them an occupation, marrying them off, and seeing that they were provided for.[582] While this parental role included duties, it also afforded more agency due to the increased authority the position might bring.

Although some of the eldest brothers resented their duties towards their siblings,[583] this kind of situation had the potential to work well in an affectionate sibling relationship. Ralph A. Houlbrooke has noted in his research that parents upheld sibling connections by conveying information about how the children were doing, having them gather together, and reminding them of their duties to each other. However, siblings might not have grown up together, for example, due to significant age differences, and therefore might not have this bond with their brothers and sisters, especially if their parents were not alive to act as a link between them.[584] Still, siblings who took on the duties of dead parents could also fulfil this role.

While taking care of younger siblings could be expected as a duty, elder brothers could also express affection in this manner. Furthermore, even if there were pressures for elder brothers to help, they could still express and highlight their emotions through their support. For example, the willingness of eldest brothers to adapt their lives by not marrying could underscore their attachment, affection, and the nature of their emotional relationship. Henry Newcome's elder brothers[585] took on a role in 1640/1[586] that replaced their parents. They became the caretakers of the family, decided not to marry yet, and wanted to keep the family under the same roof, at least until 1649.[587] Newcome described how the elder brothers acted tenderly and carefully towards the younger siblings during this time and emphasised their mutual affection. He remarked, "…God maintained such great love and concord amongst the children… the eldest brothers having the blessing of their love and faithfulness to the younger abundantly poured in upon them…"[588]

This kind of emotional approach could also affect the power dynamics in the sibling relationship. Bernard Capp has shown how Newcome's elder brothers' actions also demonstrated responsibility and solidarity towards their younger siblings.[589] Despite this and Newcome's description of a harmonious relationship,

---

[580] Capp 2018, 72.
[581] Harvey 2015, 58.
[582] Gouge 1622, 583.
[583] Samuel Pepys, for example, helped his siblings even though their father was still alive but also, according to Capp's analysis, resented his duties (Capp 2018, 143). I examine this case in more detail in Chapter 5.
[584] Houlbrooke 1984, 41; Cunningham 2014, 96.
[585] He does not specify which ones, only referring to "elder brethren" (Newcome 1852a, 6), but his eldest brother was Robert and his second eldest Stephen (Parkinson 1852, ix).
[586] Newcome 1852a, 6.
[587] Ibid., 6.
[588] Ibid., 6.
[589] Capp 2018, 30, 49.

of which affection clearly played a part, the eldest brothers nevertheless acted as substitutes for their parents. Replacing the parents gave the elder brothers a more powerful position within the sibling hierarchy, although there were also new duties towards the younger siblings. At the same time, Newcome noted, "…the elder brothers [were] careful and tender of all the younger, and the younger bow[ed] to and [were] ruled by them…"[590] Maintaining hierarchical structures did not rule out affectionate ties. Furthermore, the power gained did not have to be the end goal; elder brothers may have acted as parents because they thought it was best for their siblings.

While a fatherly position could afford some agency, the eldest brother did not need it to have control. Simply the fact that some siblings were closer to each other than others[591] ensured that eldest brothers in similar situations could behave very differently. As noted, affection could have a major impact on how men and women acted. Siblings did not always spend their childhood together, for example, due to age differences, but gender was also a factor, as upper-class boys and girls had different upbringings.[592] Generally, sisters and brothers could still form affectionate relationships, as was the case with the gentlewoman Alice Thornton and her then eldest brother, George Wandesford. She expressed her affection by complimenting him and described him as the eldest brother, who affectionately took care of her, going beyond expectations. She saw him as a father figure[593] and called him "…such a head and piller".[594] Thornton's description of her brother Christopher, who became the eldest after George died in 1651,[595] was quite different, with comparable expressions of affection and praise missing. Even though she did not express anger directly to him while they had a disagreement over their parents' wills, and he was still part of her life, their relationship remained tense.[596] This suggested that George acted according to the duties of the eldest brother, while Christopher was different.

When siblings were not used to receiving help, unexpected assistance could be interpreted as connected to emotional expressions. Henry Osborne, who had a tumultuous relationship with his younger sister Dorothy, sent her a "…trunke with Linnen…"[597] in 1655, after she had married William Temple, of whom Henry did not approve.[598] He continued, "…my sister seemed extreamely pleased with it, and said the Letter was very kinde and that it was more then shee expected from mee".[599] Helping did not, however, guarantee that the emotional expressions attached to it were favourable to the helper. Even though Dorothy appeared to have been pleased with Henry acting in his manner, he also noted

[590] Newcome 1852a, 6.
[591] Crawford 2004/2014, 225–226.
[592] Ibid., 223.
[593] Thornton 1875, 57.
[594] Ibid., 63.
[595] Ibid., 57.
[596] For example, see Thornton 1875, 75–76, 120.
[597] Osborne 1920, 344.
[598] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple 1653/4, Osborne 1901, 268.
[599] Osborne 1920, 344.

that she later wrote in an unkind manner of being unsatisfied.[600] The presence of their mother could have had an impact on the way Dorothy initially expressed herself.

Occasionally, one aspect of elder brothers expressing their affection through helping consisted of them ensuring that siblings acted according to their duties. Some normative texts guided the expression of affection in this direction. According to a model letter by J. Hill, an elder brother should give his younger brother moral advice and guide his actions, but also remind him that such guidance came from a place of love and was not meant to affect their relationship negatively.[601] The uncle of the Oxinden brothers, James Oxinden, who was knighted in 1608, remarked in a letter sent on May 11, 1607 to his younger brother Richard, who was the Oxinden brothers' father, that because he loved his brother, he had to remind Richard to perform his duty of writing to their father.[602] James appeared to have acted in this manner because he had Richard's best interests at heart. This was an emotional practice whereby James used the weight of expectations and his own agency to help his brother act in a way he saw as correct. In other words, it was a way to attempt to influence his brother's actions and emotions, in addition to conveying his own feelings of affection towards his brother.

While helping could be a way to express emotions as such,[603] focusing on the feelings that another person had conveyed could be critical to the exercise of agency. Although the eldest brother might often have been in a position to command rather than ask,[604] a gentler approach was also possible. He could use the help he had given and the emotional expressions of a younger sibling to exert agency over his behaviour, which connected the emotions to the action of helping. James Oxinden, who studied at St John's College, Cambridge, before working as a clergyman in Goodnestone,[605] had not acted according to his elder brother Henry's demands. In a letter sent in 1636, Henry, a landowner and East Kent squire,[606] relied on James's emotional expressions to pressure him to act differently. He stated, "…wherfore as you have acknowledged a great deale of love to mee, doe mee the kindnes to recall that monies you have put out and save mee of the inconvenience".[607] In addition to the emotion being a reason for the action, the action of asking for a change in behaviour was also an expression of emotion or a way to highlight it. Finally, Henry reminded his brother that this made him less willing to give monetary assistance to someone who acted as he

---

[600] Osborne 1920, 344.
[601] Hill 1698, 92.
[602] James Oxinden to Richard Oxinden May 11, 1607, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 6; Gardiner 1933a, 1.
[603] Broomhall & Van Gent 2009, 150.
[604] Capp 2018, 32.
[605] Gardiner 1933a, 1; Gardiner 1933c, xxv–xxvi.
[606] Winkelmann 1996, 14–15.
[607] Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden March 5, 1636/7, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 119.

had.[608] Later, when James did as Henry ordered, Henry was more than ready to find ways to help his brother.[609]

By using the word "kindness" in the letter discussed above, Henry could also have intended to remind James of its significance and thereby exerted agency over his younger brother. The concept of kindness was essential for the landed ranks in kinship obligations, Christian ethics, and human relationships. It combined courtesy, material assistance or the offer of it, goodwill, and love. It was closely connected to emotions, but could still be seen more as an action. Generally, kindness was based on courtesy and love in the biblical sense, demands of responsibility, and ideas of generosity.[610]

How Oxinden and other older brothers acted reflected the normative expectations of behaviour from a person with power and related expressions of affection. Love was connected to power relations at familial and local levels by emphasising the subordination of women and the power held by men. People were put in a place that was appropriate for them through God's love, and the grace of God should ideally lead to a loving, non-tyrannical monarch. This was also reflected in other contexts, including households, in which a compassionate use of power was expected from the man in a leading position. Those in subordinate positions, on the other hand, expressed affection by conveying the feeling in an appropriate manner while completing the duties they had or showing that they accepted their hierarchical position. Although women were subordinate to men, there were still instances where loving authoritatively was possible for them, too.[611] Younger siblings, whom I will now discuss, were often in these subordinate positions.

YOUNGER SIBLINGS, AFFECTION, AND HELPING

Elder brothers were not the only ones able to use helping as a tool for gaining agency. People at this time were very aware of whom they could expect help from and could react strongly, for example, by expressing anger if assistance was not given.[612] Younger brothers could use the affection that eldest brother had expressed to attempt to gain influence, but also to get help. This could tie together responsibilities, the expectation of reciprocity, and expressions of affection. Here, a person interpreted what they felt their sibling expressed, conveyed this interpretation to him or her, and used the interpretation to their advantage. James Oxinden often used his understanding of his eldest brother Henry Oxinden's emotions to his advantage when asking for money. In letters sent in the 1620s and 1630s, James saw his brother's assistance as a kind expression of affection,[613]

---

[608] Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden March 5, 1636/7, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 119.
[609] Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden December 17, 1639, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 159.
[610] Pollock 2011, 124.
[611] Barclay 2020, 80.
[612] Pollock 2011, 145.
[613] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden October 23, 1629, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 52–53; James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden August 14, 1631, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–

appealed to his love,[614] and maintained that his help was connected to his affection and his desire to take care of his brother.[615] When James lost a scholarship for his studies, he described being "…allmost affraid to write…"[616] but hopeful that Henry would not be angry with him. He needed money from Henry and wrote, "…I intreate you to be soe loving as you have always beene, and in this necessity to set to your helping hand, and this time not to deny".[617] The way in which James recounted his brother's actions and interpreted his emotions could give him the agency to influence how Henry would react. Belief in the sincerity of Henry's emotions enabled this approach, while highlighting affection could also have helped to maintain the emotion in their relationship. Emphasising this emotional connection could be especially critical here, since James was nervous about Henry's reaction to losing the scholarship.

Besides appealing to past expressions of affection, younger brothers could improve and maintain their chances of getting help and upholding the affection of an elder brother, reflective of their agency, by following normatively prescribed behaviour and the expectations of the elder sibling. As Henry Oxinden's affection and help were connected, his younger brother James needed to continue to uphold his love by acting in ways that could assist him in maintaining the emotion. His writing followed Henry's condition that Henry would only be able to continue to love James if James was respectful and took good care of his affairs.[618] Him acting according to the conditions Henry set was an immediate way to pay back the helper and maintain their affectionate connection. In September 1629, James wrote the following to Henry:

> I assure you that I spend none of your money idly, still remembringe your love and kindnes, for if I should, I should shew myselfe unthankfull unto you for your soe great love, for nothing can seeme more odious unto you then to heare it. I hope as yet that you heare nothing of my Tutor but that I am a good husband, which god grant I may continue, to requite your kindnesses.[619]

In addition to James acknowledging his position and duties, the letter also helped him indirectly express his attachment to his brother and his commitment to their relationship. The way he wrote also helped him convey his lower position in the sibling hierarchy.

Siblings could also convey their affection or attachment by highlighting in their writing how they had followed duties in the expected manner a long time

---

1642 1933, 73; James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden May 27, 1634, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 93.

[614] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden April 3, 1636, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 113.

[615] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden May 27, 1634, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 93.

[616] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden August 14, 1631, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 73.

[617] Ibid.

[618] Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 114; James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden November 25, 1639, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 157.

[619] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden September 15, 1629, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 48.

ago. This highlights the influence that genre could have. In the case of Henry Newcome, this manifested itself in shared affection and proper behaviour, such as obeying his elders in the sibling hierarchy, which was rooted in the care that his eldest brothers had given him after their parents died in 1641/2, the year when Newcome turned 15. Additionally, Newcome highlighted the notion that he and his brothers lived in harmony and had love between them.[620] The fact that Newcome described this time in his life in a very idealistic manner that followed normative expectations further emphasised this point[621] and indicated his acceptance of the situation and his position within the sibling hierarchy. It also connected the expression of his emotions to duties and expectations. Conveying emotions in this manner could help Newcome influence how readers of his autobiography perceived him, and, if he acted in this manner towards his eldest brothers, it may have had an impact on how his eldest brothers behaved. This made him appear to be a humble and exemplary brother who submitted to the role that society expected him to play. Acting according to his duties might have also helped Newcome maintain the help he had been given, but this did not mean that the brothers' mutual affection was not sincere.

Younger siblings could also be the ones providing assistance and expressing affection through helping, which, in turn, would have implications for the sibling hierarchy and the power that younger siblings could have over their elders. Younger brothers helped when they were more affectionate than the eldest brothers, for example.[622] Although women also helped by giving money, they typically had limited opportunities to do so.[623] However, gender was not always the main factor influencing dependencies and duties, as marital status and age could also have an impact. For example, a younger brother could be dependent on his elder sister, or a brother could find a place to stay through his married sisters.[624]

It is, indeed, essential to note that younger siblings could help their elder siblings even if they did not get anything in return; thus, helping did not necessarily bring power over the one being helped. Alice Thornton, the youngest sibling of six, remarked that she helped her brother George simply because of her love. To help George, she "…was willing to transferre £500 of [her] English portion to be receaved out of…"[625] George's Irish estates instead of his English one even though they no longer had control of them[626] in order "…to shew [her] deare affection towards [her] brother George in the time of his straights…"[627]

Previously given help might still have an influence on whether younger siblings helped older ones. Anu Lahtinen has argued that in this sense, reciprocity was linked to being calculative.[628] Such actions also emphasise the

---

[620] Newcome 1852a, 5–6; Parkinson 1852, ix.
[621] Capp 2018, 32, 36.
[622] Ibid., 36.
[623] Ibid., 63.
[624] Crawford 2004/2014, 223.
[625] Thornton 1875, 75.
[626] Ibid., 75; Capp 2018, 159.
[627] Thornton 1875, 75.
[628] Lahtinen 2021, 89.

connections among helping, power, and emotions. Furthermore, not everyone would have asked for help, as it was not necessarily easy to provide and could have been a burden.[629] Henry Oxinden's younger brothers helped him start a new career when he got into trouble due to lawsuits.[630] Their willingness to help their eldest brother was connected to their previously expressed affection and the expectation of reciprocity,[631] both of which obliged them to act. While this could also give the younger siblings agency over the eldest, reciprocal action was not guaranteed.

Troubles with money were also connected to perceptions of gender. Younger brothers helping the eldest siblings was not necessarily a function of only reciprocity or emotional motives. In the contemporary normative literature, masculinity was attached to economic independence and provision. Furthermore, economic worth, credit, and their connection to patriarchal ideas influenced how the status of men was perceived and how manhood was attached to the ideal head of the family. Economic impotence, such as the inability to pay debts, could even lead to exclusion from credit networks, as bonds of trust and dependability were decisive in society. Obviously, not all men were able to achieve economic independence. Instead, many were apprentices, servants, wage labourers, or simply too young. Men could thus also build their patriarchal identity in other ways. In this sense, it is important to acknowledge that contradictions existed.[632] Helping an elder brother, such as Henry Oxinden, to protect his reputation in this manner might also have influenced the younger Oxinden brothers' willingness to help him maintain his finances. Honour typically concerned an elite family as a whole, and members needed to support each other to maintain it. For example, not providing assistance to family members in need could pose a threat to the status and well-being of them all. Furthermore, their individual reputations could influence that of the whole family.[633]

Whether intentional or not, giving gifts was a way to create and uphold emotional and social connections, such as strengthening friendship or loyalty, in addition to obliging the recipient to reciprocate, even if just with lasting gratitude. A lack of reciprocity could have negative effects on relationships.[634] This, then, was a way in which gift givers could exert agency over their siblings. While significant age differences could make it difficult to establish a relationship, for example, when an elder sibling moved out while a younger one was still a child,[635] gift giving constituted one way to continue the relationship. While gifting was in part characterised by apparent freedom and spontaneity,

---

[629] Ben-Amos 2000a, 332.
[630] Henry Oxinden to his wife September 1662, The Oxinden and Peyton Letters, 1642–1670 1937, 273; Henry Oxinden, The Oxinden and Peyton Letters, 1642–1670 1937, 279–280; Gardiner 1933c, xxvii–xxviii; Capp 2018, 37.
[631] Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 114; Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden March 5, 1636, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 119; Lahtinen 2021, 89.
[632] Shepard 2000, 79, 82–83, 86, 105–106; Bailey 2003, 68.
[633] Pollock 2007, 16–17.
[634] Broomhall & Van Gent 2006, 149; Pollock 2011, 145; Heal 2014, 31.
[635] Capp 2018, 13.

conventions nevertheless guided how it should be done. The conventions of gift giving were influenced by their context. These included festive calendar events, life-cycle events, and visits.[636] In some ways, this apparent spontaneity also highlighted the difference between gifting and helping, as the latter typically answered a need. A gift could be an object but could also take the form of words, for example, such as book dedications or poems.[637]

The young age of the recipient of a gift could suggest that it was most likely not given to gain something, but rather to express emotions and to maintain a close relationship. The presents of the diarist John Evelyn's son John were a way for him to show his love. In addition to alluding to his affection in writing, John stated directly, "…I think on you almost every moment".[638] He also sent his younger sister Mary a gift from Paris in 1676, when she was 11. She repaid his actions by expressing thankfulness and her wish to see him.[639] Mary, who died at the age of nineteen in 1685, was the eldest daughter, while the son of John Evelyn John lived from 1655 to 1699.[640]

Expressing emotions by giving gifts might not always be received well, however, because of the burden the expectation of reciprocity placed on people. Even though a younger sister could be in a less powerful position in life, she might still be able to comment on this. In 1682, six years after Mary Evelyn thanked her brother for the gift that he had given her, John was still giving Mary presents. She noted that it was not proper to receive gifts without repayment, although John never mentioned needing anything from her. However, she also acknowledged that, since he gave her gifts out of his free will and benevolence, she could continue to accept them.[641] While Mary answered very politely to her brother by blaming herself for behaving improperly, she still put the responsibility on John and her understanding of his free will. This highlighted the ways in which gift giving was connected to agency and duty.

Norms such as those described in Richard Allestree's Anglican conduct book highlighted that once people were given something, it was important to be thankful, pray for the helper, and repay them if possible.[642] Furthermore, a lack of reciprocity regarding gifts could lead to feelings of being insulted or betrayed.[643] However, understanding that gift giving was an expression of affection or of similar emotions could have been a way for Mary to justify her lack of reciprocity. Susan Whyman also reminded us that the Evelyn siblings' letters remained formal to maintain their politeness when giving favours or receiving them.[644] For Mary, this communication presented an opportunity both

---

[636] Heal 2014, 60.
[637] Ibid., 43.
[638] John Evelyn to Mary Evelyn April 10, 1676, Add ms 78440, British Library, 2.
[639] Ibid.; John Evelyn to Mary Evelyn April 21, 1676, Add ms 78440, British Library, 3; Mary Evelyn to John Evelyn March 1, 1676, Add ms 78442, British Library, 47.
[640] Hunter & Harris 2003, 13; Whyman 2003, 257.
[641] John Evelyn to Mary Evelyn April 10, 1676, Add ms 78440, British Library, 2; John Evelyn to Mary Evelyn April 21, 1676, Add ms 78440, British Library, 3; Mary Evelyn to John Evelyn April 21, 1682, Add ms 78442, British Library, 48.
[642] Allestree 1659, 275–276.
[643] Ben-Amos 2000a, 332.
[644] Whyman 2003, 257.

to fulfil her duty concerning politeness and to harness that dutiful action to exert some agency over the situation. In other words, she was able to decide how to react to the requirement of politeness.

The connection between emotional practices, actions, and the body were reflected in emotional expressions and acts of helping. Even if siblings could not give something material to help, actions like praying or writing about gratefulness could also convey emotions. Intersectionality, furthermore, shifts our attention onto the multiple contexts crucial for understanding the power relations of siblings helping each other. As Crawford has shown, gender was not always the most influential factor affecting duties and dependencies; marital status and age also played important roles.[645] These factors helped to mould the context that shaped the sibling hierarchy, the ways siblings expressed their emotions, and the ways in which they used those expressions to exert agency over their brothers and sisters. Emotional expressions gave siblings opportunities to exert agency beyond the confines that otherwise restricted them. Still, it is important to remember that, according to Amy Froide, the material assistance that early modern English brothers gave to their single sisters was emphasised, while the support given by sisters was more of the emotional sort.[646]

This section has analysed siblings and emotions by examining both elder brothers and younger siblings and the influence that birth order could have on their experiences. While affection could help siblings gain agency, it is clear that emotions were not expressed solely for this purpose. Nevertheless, helping could give one power, considering the significance of reciprocity in early modern society.[647] Within the theme of helping and emotional expressions, the duties of the elder or eldest brothers and the ways in which their assistance could be an expression of affection were highlighted in the relations between Henry Newcome and his siblings. Henry Osborne's unexpected help to his sister, in contrast, demonstrated how affection could also be expressed by going beyond the expectations of individuals. In addition, James Oxinden's and his nephew Henry Oxinden's letters to their brothers showed how elder brothers could use the affection expressed by a younger brother and reminders of unfulfilled duties to their siblings to exercise agency over how their younger siblings behaved.

While this section has reflected the findings of earlier research, according to which subordinates often expressed their affection in connection with duty, gratitude, and obedience,[648] younger siblings also had ways to exert agency through helping. This was shown in their attempts to maintain the help they had been given or to influence the image presented to the reader. Furthermore, as mentioned above, earlier research has noted that, while sisters conveyed sincere affection, they also occasionally used expressions of affection to uphold assistance.[649] This section has also demonstrated that younger brothers such as James Oxinden and Henry Newcome could uphold the help and affection of an

---

[645] Crawford 2004/2014, 223.
[646] Froide 2005, 60.
[647] Lahtinen 2021, 89.
[648] Barclay 2020, 80.
[649] Capp 2018, 51–52.

older brother by acting according to duties or the expectation that the person helping had set. At the same time, while younger siblings might have been more likely to need help than to give it,[650] their position in some cases also had similarities to that of elder siblings. While the elder brothers were mostly the ones helping in the primary sources used here, scholars such as Bernard Capp have noted that younger siblings could also assist, for example, due to affection.[651] Such actions could give these siblings more agency, but this was not always the case, as there was no guarantee that the favour would be returned. The role of emotional expressions, in combination with pressures related to reciprocity, came through clearly in some of the primary sources, as it encouraged younger siblings to help. Furthermore, John Evelyn's letters to his sister Mary showed how giving gifts was also connected to reciprocity, but the pressure could be reduced if the perceived motivation for giving was affection.

4.2 Visiting and sending letters

Kin relationships could be valued even when the persons lived apart,[652] but distance created challenges for early modern families, for example, in communication. In 17th-century England, people could resolve some of these issues by visiting or sending letters.[653] Siblings wrote about the many reasons for wanting to maintain a relationship and the urge to resist emotional changes, despite living in different parts of England. These reasons included affection, an expectation to write, a longing for a past relationship that was more affectionate, and the need for help.[654] For visits, siblings obviously needed to have a living situation that would allow for them to take place. In this vein, Anglican conduct book writer Richard Allestree noted that affection made people always want to spend time with the person they loved.[655]

Distance influenced sibling relationships in a variety of ways. For some, a sudden lack of distance, for example, in the form of visits, could spark expressions of affection and bring the siblings closer together.[656] In some cases, distance did not necessarily have any effect on expressions of affection, as some siblings valued constancy, for example, in writing letters and conveying their

---

[650] Crawford 2004/2014, 215, 218.
[651] Capp 2018, 36.
[652] Froide 2005, 64.
[653] Besides correspondence and visiting, brothers and sisters could also send someone in their place to fulfil a duty to see a sick sibling and to express emotions (Allestree 1659, 355–356; Thornton 1875, 33, 159–160).
[654] For example, see James Oxinden to Richard Oxinden May 11, 1607, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 6; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis November 7, 1622, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 79–80; James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden August 14, 1631, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 73; Richard Oxinden to James Oxinden, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 5.
[655] Allestree 1659, 18; Alblas 1991, 92.
[656] Newcome 1852a, 6, 33.

love in that manner.[657] Reducing distance and spending time together could have significant effects on expressions of affection in sibling relationships. However, this did not mean that continued distance between siblings eventually reduced expressions of affection in all cases, at least when the people in question had previously established a close emotional relationship.[658]

Both Bernard Capp and Amy Harris have argued that 17th and 18th-century English siblings used correspondence to maintain and strengthen emotional bonds. Harris has reminded scholars that, even apart from the content of the letters, just their very existence worked as a uniting force and could replace emotional expressions conveyed face-to-face. Capp has also noted the significance of letters in maintaining sibling relationships among the elite and the middling sort. Wealthy gentlemen could maintain relationships by conducting extended visits, especially due to the significance of hospitality in the elite lifestyle. Middling sort and even some ordinary people with sufficient resources to travel more widely occasionally visited kin who lived far away. [659] Intersectionality draws attention to a variety of factors, such as wealth, that could have had an impact on who was able to visit and thereby influence their agency. These actions of visiting and sending letters were emotional practices, and as Monique Scheer has noted, letters are essentially connected to the body, for example, through the act of writing. [660] Scheer has also commented that mobilising within the concept of emotional practices can entail rituals and habits that "…aid us in achieving a certain emotional state",[661] using courtship as an example.[662] The maintenance of ties through visiting might serve similar goals.

In this section, I will expand on the previous research to examine further how letter writing and visiting worked to maintain emotional bonds, and how these practices were also connected to duty and power. I will note how siblings could express affection through visiting or by having someone else make the journey, how other emotions besides affection could be involved, and how surprise visits could convey feelings but also be a way of leveraging power. While the section on letters will analyse how two siblings expressed affection in letters, it will also focus on a case study of the correspondence of Thomas Meautys, in which his letters are shown to be connected to his perception of his sister's inaction and its ties to emotions and agency. To examine the significance

---

[657] For example, see Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis December 23, 1624, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 110–111; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis January 18, 1624/5, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 116; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis April 28, 1642, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 301–302.

[658] For example, Thomas Meautys continued to express affection for his sister Jane Cornwallis even though he was often abroad (see Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis October 17, 1614, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 27; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis November 7, 1622, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 79–80).

[659] Harris 2016, 66; Capp 2018, 48–50. See also Broomhall & Van Gent 2016, 64–67 and Toland 2017.

[660] Scheer 2012, 212.

[661] Ibid., 209.

[662] Ibid., 209.

of visiting, I will mainly use the letters sent by Henry and James Oxinden, the diary of John Evelyn, and the autobiographies of William Stout and Henry Newcome.

VISITING

Keeping in touch through letters was not always possible. Even the highest class of society could not always remain in contact in this way, even if money was not an issue. Out of early modern English women, only 11 percent were literate, with the gentry having higher numbers of literate women than other sectors of society.[663] Furthermore, some women, such as Elizabeth Oxinden, did not want to correspond because they felt their writing was not good enough.[664] Lorri Glover has pointed out that visiting was a physical way of expressing how crucial sibling relationships were and a way to convey feelings. She has also noted that visiting could provide comfort, companionship, safety, belonging and entertainment.[665] Besides visiting expressing emotions, siblings also wrote about how they thought it generated affection, which influenced the need to keep visiting.[666] How siblings could convey emotions in this manner was often dependent on hierarchical structures and duties, as will become apparent in this section. Visiting also influenced power relations between siblings, for instance, by enabling siblings to exercise agency or simply by affecting who was near and able to have immediate influence, which was different from communicating through correspondence.

Power relations can be seen in the themes of honour and civility guiding the behaviour of those with higher social standing. A gentleman could acknowledge the honour of others and convey his own by acting according to the conventions of civility. These norms concerned elite men, who constituted only a small part of society. Those whose rank was the same were equal, but their degree, or the position they had within the rank, could create differences. Honour, according to manuals of the time, could be comparative, reflecting rank and distinction between gentlemen. It could also be categorical and signify personal honour or reputation and belonging to a class that was built of honourable men, rather than to a particular position within it. Lacking this meant being part of a lower class. Gentlemen had categorical honour through birth, to an equal degree. Honour could be gained through virtuous behaviour and merit, but it could be lost by acting dishonourably. While categorical honour signified equality between gentlemen, they had many inequalities due to differences in wealth, achievement, and power. Recognising these differences was, nevertheless,

---

[663] Demers 2015, 23.
[664] Elizabeth Oxinden to Henry Oxinden, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 135.
[665] Glover 2000, 49–50. For visiting from the point of view of leave-taking and its connection to emotional expressions within sibling relationships in 18th-century England, see Toland 2017.
[666] Newcome 1852a, 33.

polite.[667] These expectations tended to have some influence on siblings visiting each other.

Generosity and hospitality were crucial components of a gentleman's honour and reputation. For much of 17th-century English gentry, an open house was ideal. The expectation was to be able to entertain both spontaneously and formally within their social circle, in addition to extending hospitality to the poor and tenants. This could also include paying a visit and welcoming guests in return.[668] For example, in 1691, Thomas Baron Fairfax advised young gentlemen to treat visitors well, asking them to "[b]e…Courteous…to Strangers…"[669] Parties could also be hosted. While this could be expensive and financially not very useful, it could also be beneficial in other ways, such as for networking purposes.[670] Husbands and wives did not necessarily pay a visit together. For example, wives sometimes attended births on their own, while their husbands might go alone on visits related to hunting or business.[671] Furthermore, hospitality, especially for ordinary people, was considered a form of gifting.[672]

Travel was on the rise in early modern England as carriage transport and roads improved. While people sometimes travelled for pleasure, the aftermath of the Civil War also drove people into exile.[673] A person's social position and financial situation, among other things, could impact how siblings could visit each other. The average yearly income for a family in 1688 was £1500 for baronets, £50 for lesser clergymen and £72 for higher clergy, £45 for shopkeepers, £42.5 for farmers, and £14 for common soldiers. Before railways, the fastest-moving transport in England that was most often used was the stagecoach. Fares for London stagecoaches between 1653 and 1750 were 1.15 pence per mile for travel outside of the stagecoach, or 2.34 pence per mile inside of it, on average. Furthermore, the advertised speed averaged 3.83 miles per hour and 3.12 miles per hour in winter. For example, in 1648, a trip from London to the south coast of England took three days on the Southampton coach. Among other travel options, post horses were also available for travellers to hire, costing a threepence per mile in 1609, a pound per 80 miles, or what the postmasters saw fit to charge. As post officials additionally required gratuities along the way, this mode of travel was more expensive than stagecoaches, but also faster. Horses could be hired for longer periods as well, by the day or the month, and some, of course, owned their own. It was also possible to hire a whole coach, although it was far more expensive and even costly for the elite. Furthermore, various privately owned means of transport existed, too, such as, for those who could afford it, travelling on their own coach.[674]

---

667 Mark 2018, 392, 395–397.
668 Fletcher 1995, 139.
669 Fairfax 1691, 62.
670 Koskinen 2021, 33.
671 Fletcher 1995, 139.
672 Heal 2014, 28.
673 Toland 2017, 66–67.
674 Parkes 1925/1970, 52, 54–55, 58–59, 66–67, 82; Lindert & Williamson 1982, 393; Gerhold 2014, 818, 820–821. See also Chartres 1977.

Visiting could lead to expressing emotion, while emotional expression, in turn, could lead to actions taken on the part of siblings to be physically in each other's presence again. In this way, while emotion led to action, the action was also a way to convey and highlight that emotion. Rekindling a relationship by visiting and keeping in touch would make issues of power again more relevant than before, not just through the renewed need to manage inter-personal power relations, but also through the demands of established expectations and the overall normative context.

Henry Newcome, a Presbyterian minister and the fourth eldest of eight children, was born in 1627. He and his brothers had a close network that they maintained with the help of their mutual affection. Newcome noted that affection between him and his siblings was great during their childhood, but they did not seem to be as close after they grew up.[675] Newcome went to university in Cambridge[676] and lived in the northwest part of England, first in Gawsworth[677] and after 1656 in Manchester. His brother Richard lived in the east of England, in Wymington, and went to Jesus College, Cambridge. Their eldest brother Robert also studied at Cambridge and afterwards taught in Congleton in Cheshire, in north-west England. He moved to their childhood home in Caldecote in eastern England after their parents died in 1641.[678]

Newcome and his brothers were able to rebuild a close relationship through visiting. He noted the following concerning the year 1651:

> Yet this day the Lord did help me; unexpectedly and unlooked for, this evening my eldest brother and brother Richard came to Gausworth to see me, which did refresh me wonderfully and filled me with joy. It was the great love that was raised at our being together this summer in my going to the commencement, that brought them down to me at this time.[679]

Afterwards, Newcome and his brothers kept seeing each other more often than previously.[680] While it was not an obligation to offer accommodation to a sibling, but rather a favour, refusing to do so was, regardless, considered offensive. Furthermore, repayment for this generosity was expected.[681] In addition to affectionate ties, such reciprocity and other norms could influence the continuity of someone being willing to offer a sibling a place to stay. Writing about each other more often after a visit than before also suggests that while Newcome noted affection as an influencing factor in keeping in contact with his brothers, these visits and emotions expressed during and after them also created expectations for when to visit and/or perhaps a need to see each other. Seeing each other increased interactions, which led to increased agency for the siblings in their relationships, and also to more opportunities to maintain affection.

---

[675] Newcome 1852a, 6, 33, 106–107; Parkinson 1852, ix; Delany 1969, 77; Capp 2018, 49.
[676] Newcome 1852a, 15.
[677] He remarked "…I removed to Gawsworth on April 8th, 1650, with my whole family…" (Newcome 1852a, 18).
[678] Newcome 1852a, 5–7, 44, 59; Parkinson 1852, ix–x, xiii.
[679] Newcome 1852a, 33.
[680] For example, see Newcome 1852a, 44, 59, 89.
[681] Crawford 2004/2014, 220.

The normative context guided visiting and influenced the way in which the siblings acted and used their power. As noted above, not being offered accommodation could be insulting, [682] and siblings could leverage this expectation to gain agency. In the case presented above, Newcome's brothers paid a surprise visit to him, and he expressed joy concerning their arrival. This did not give Newcome any time to prepare for the social occasion, whereas his brothers had the possibility to choose the situation and have some control, at least over whether they would visit and when. Still, to act in this way, they had to have some certainty of being welcome based on mutual affection. However, if the visiting siblings wanted to maintain a certain kind of emotional relationship, they could not force Newcome to react emotionally in the way they wanted, even though the normative context might influence this, which limited their freedom of action. While these influences on power relations were possible, this did not mean that their emotional expressions were performative. The motivation to visit could come from a sincere wish to maintain or develop an affectionate relationship, and the increased agency and its potential benefits could be the by-products of this desire.

Different living situations among siblings, such as visiting briefly or for an extended period, living near each other, or living together, could generate expressions of emotions and have different impacts on their power relations. The fact that the Newcome brothers continued to visit each other[683] could be a way to convey affection, while stopping the visits without a proper excuse might have indicated not wanting to have a relationship. Similarly, the fact that Newcome's brother stayed with him for months at a time, and he and his brothers wanted to live near each other,[684] could convey or highlight their love as well. Living next to each other was likely to influence the power dynamic related to expectations of reciprocity, as the financial burden connected to visits would have been lighter. Perhaps this nearness could make another kind of helping easier to provide – and also to ask for. According to Newcome, as he had already spent many months visiting his brother, he wanted his brother to live near him.[685] Still, Newcome and his brother did not want to live together. When a sibling was a visitor, he did not have the same status as the more permanent members of the household, even if the visit was a long one. If siblings lived together, the expectations of what roles each played might change. Although older brothers might allow their younger brothers to stay with them temporarily, married siblings did not often live together.[686]

Besides brother-sister households, single sisters could also live and work together. As this fact highlights, marriage was not the only reason households were established, even though a brother and a sister residing together could be

---

[682] Crawford 2004/2014, 220.
[683] For example, see Newcome 1852a, 44, 59, 89.
[684] Newcome 1852a, 33, 44; Newcome 1852b, 328.
[685] Newcome considered moving himself when his brothers asked him to because he thought people would be more accepting of his work in the new place of residence, and he knew his friends would be supportive (Newcome 1852a, 44; Newcome 1852b, 328).
[686] Crawford 2004/2014, 219; Capp 2018, 43.

compared to the household of a married couple.[687] Certain voluntary actions, such as siblings choosing to live together and modifying their power relations, could convey emotions, including affection. The roles of siblings living together impacted their positions within the household and their abilities to act within it. William Stout was the son of a yeoman and a businessman living in Lancaster in the north-west of England.[688] He lived with his sister Elin, who helped him in his shop.[689] Many women helped run the family business alongside the men of the family, but they typically had no ownership over it. Single women could also help finance the family business, as was the case with Elin and William Stout, too, as she had lent him £10.[690]

Stout's text highlights how his sister Elin living with him in 1691 was a choice, and that she voluntarily converted to being a Quaker,[691] which was his religion. He indicated that this "…tended to our mutual comfort and satisfaction",[692] which also indirectly conveyed his emotions. After he failed to find a Quaker wife, he noted that living with his sister, along with their maid, nieces, and nephews, was an alternative with which he could be satisfied.[693] While this was Stout's interpretation of the situation, his description of these actions reminded the reader of the affectionate and voluntary nature of their relationship. Liesbeth Geussens noted that, for women, remaining unmarried when they got older often kept them reliant on the support of the eldest brother, which, in addition to other factors influencing the inequality of their gender, contributed to their subordinate status in the family hierarchy.[694] Although Stout was not the eldest, this also applied to his relationships with Elin. Despite his emphasis on the voluntary nature of his and his younger sister's actions, his position was still better than that of Elin, and he had more agency than she did. Stout and Elin were not equal, as he was the employer and a man with better opportunities in life.[695] His affection[696] might, however, have had an influence on what this meant in reality.

Stout giving Elin a position comparable to a wife[697] instead of treating her like a servant could be seen as another manifestation of his affection. The fact that they were not legally bound together in the same way as a married couple[698] emphasised the voluntary and close nature of their relationship. However, their status as a quasi-married couple also reflected the power dynamic between them, including his position as head of the household and his power to influence Elin's life while she was living with him. On the other hand, Stout also noted that his

---

[687] Froide 2005, 55, 74.
[688] Capp 2018, 135.
[689] Stout 1851, 32, 34, 48, 52, 65, 81, 105.
[690] Hill 2001, 43–44.
[691] Stout 1851, 31–32, 52.
[692] Ibid., 52.
[693] Ibid., 64–65.
[694] Geussens 2022, 157–158.
[695] For example, see Eales 1998, 1, 3–4.
[696] Stout 1851, 52; Capp 2018, 137.
[697] Capp 2003, 151.
[698] For example, according to the law, women were under coverture (Erickson 1993, 100).

sister treated him more like a son by serving him in a diligent manner.[699] This is reminiscent of Andrea Brady's analysis indicating that a mother carefully looking after her child was evidence of an affective bond.[700] Indeed, Elin occupied figurative positions beyond just being a sister. Unmarried women could fulfil a maternal role by assisting their siblings' children.[701] Since Elin and Stout took care of their nieces and nephews,[702] she also fulfilled this kind of parental role. Intersectional viewpoints highlight the significance of paying attention to all these different contexts that influenced Elin's life with her brother and impacted her agency. Indeed, along with her gender, many other factors also affected her life with her brother.

The arrangement that Stout had with his sister, and the positions they held within it, were also tied to his work and her respective status. The loyalty of servants working in shops was important, as they had access to information that they could use to damage the reputation of their masters, who often could not supervise them closely.[703] By hiring his sister, especially one whom he had already witnessed working well in his shop,[704] Stout had someone he could trust, but who was also under his command and benefitted from his aid. An affectionate relationship might certainly build trust and a further willingness to enter into this kind of arrangement. On the other hand, Capp demonstrated in his research that tensions in Stout and Elin's relationship arose from their dual roles as both employee and employer and as siblings.[705]

Other siblings also took this approach. Ralph Josselin, a son of a yeoman and a minister, for instance, hired his sister in 1644 and recorded in his diary his decision to treat her as such and not as a servant. This was, however, not true for everyone. While some people exploited and looked down on kin who were servants, this was very context dependent and not consistent. Attitudes and reactions depended on many things, including class and status. Generally, most of those who were working as servants laboured under many constraints, including subordination and poverty, which could make the situation intolerable.[706] These points highlight the different positions occupied by servants and siblings, as well as the emotional adjustment that the one doing the hiring needed to make.

Occasionally, it was not just the sibling who visited or needed accommodation for an extended period of time, but the sibling's family. This could come out of a need rather than a voluntary desire, as with Elin and Stout. Thus, the change in who lived under whose roof could have an influence on how siblings expressed their emotions. It could also cause a loss of agency and create

---

[699] Stout 1851, 65.
[700] Brady 2008, 187.
[701] Froide 2005, 66.
[702] For example, see Stout 1851, 99–100.
[703] Ben-Amos 2000a, 311.
[704] Stout 1851, 29.
[705] Capp 2003, 150.
[706] Pepys 1893, November 12, 1660; Josselin 1908, 15; Eales 1998, 59; Capp 2003, 149–150; Capp 2018, 55, 88.

reciprocal structures. When the plague[707] threatened John Evelyn and his family in their neighbourhood in London[708] in August 1665,[709] Evelyn's emotional expressions were connected to how the disease separated his brothers and their families – and to the joy of reunion. His eldest brother George helped Evelyn's family by providing them with a place to stay at his home, south of London, in Wotton, Surrey.[710] Evelyn did not join them but instead stayed at their house "…to look after [his] charge".[711] Despite both him and his brother living in or near modern-day London, Evelyn described needing to work while his family was away, as he looked after Dutch prisoners of war who were wounded or sick.[712] Evelyn described their subsequent reunion in an emotional manner. He was able to visit his brother's house during Christmas, taking note of his brother's hospitability.[713] He expressed that they felt "…extraordinary mirth and cheer, all my brothers, our wives, and children, being together, and after much sorrow and trouble during this contagion".[714] Besides being motivated by the joy of a reunion, siblings also travelled to see each other during difficult times, such as illnesses, as it was easier to endure challenges with kin nearby.[715]

At this time, Evelyn was unable to see his family as often as he had previously, and he faced the added pressure of a dangerous situation, which also brought forth the need for all to adapt to a new situation, along with a general loss of agency for Evelyn's family. His brother played an important part in giving his family a safe place to stay. In this kind of life-and-death situation, Evelyn's brother's help could have been crucial for their survival. As reciprocity was expected, and not giving accommodation to a sibling could be offensive,[716] this could have generated a strong need to repay, which could have potentially influenced the power relations between the brothers. Having someone in his debt in this manner gave the eldest brother George leverage to demand that his brother act in a certain way, thereby granting him agency. Still, as George was the eldest, this act was probably also connected to the eldest brother's sense of duty to take care of the younger ones. Evelyn's family's need of help may have pressured George to act. At the same time, giving children for a brother or a sister to take care of implied a loss of agency for the parents. Living with aunts or uncles meant that parents did not have a similar agency over their children as before, but this situation also provided siblings of the parent with opportunities for

---

[707] This was probably the Great Plague of London, which happened during 1665–1666. Along with London, it impacted much of the rest of south-east of England, in addition to a few other places. (Hutton 1985, 229–230, 246–247.) About 100,000 Londoners had died by 1667 of the plague (Scott 2000, 166). Evelyn and his family lived in Deptford, which was then part of Kent (Evelyn 1908, 145).
[708] He lived in Sayes Court in Deptford, located then in Kent and now in south-east London (Evelyn 1915, 64).
[709] Evelyn 1908, 240.
[710] Dobson 1908, xi–xiii.
[711] Evelyn 1908, 240.
[712] Ibid., 240–241; Evelyn 1915, 66.
[713] Evelyn 1908, 241.
[714] Ibid., 242.
[715] Glover 2000, 50.
[716] Crawford 2004/2014, 220; Koskinen 2021, 24.

increased control. [717] While Evelyn's children lived with their mother at his brother's house, Evelyn did not have similar access to his children. Regardless, while George might have gained agency over his brother in this situation, the joy of reunion suggested that affection played a substantial part in his decision-making.

Regardless of examples where visiting was desired, for some, it was not desirable, and it might even have detrimental effects on sibling relationships. Accepting a request to visit might express emotion, but it could also be associated with reciprocity and other expectations. What agency siblings had concerning visits was also guided by the demands of the normative context connected to visiting and helping, such as the expectation to be loving and to help others in keeping with the virtue of charity. [718] Siblings could exert agency over their brothers and sisters while navigating the demands that the normative context imposed on their actions. They could also use their agency to compel their brothers and sisters to act according to their personal preferences, and therefore have an impact on whether visiting was actually a viable way to express affection for the one visiting. However, keeping a distance was not always a choice for siblings, as a profession, such as a military career,[719] or educational demands could prevent them from seeing each other in person, even if they had the resources otherwise to do so.

James Oxinden's and his eldest brother Henry's relationship, based on expressed affection, which they conveyed in their letters, regulated their behaviour and the boundaries related to visiting. They lived in England, Henry in East Kent near Canterbury in south-east England and James in Cambridge in eastern England, where he was studying.[720] James wrote to Henry in 1636 about wanting to leave Cambridge, since he was sick and afraid of the "…infectious ayre".[721] Justifying a visit with health benefits could promote the cause when the eldest brother, who had a powerful position in the relationship, was reluctant. Henry replied[722] that he normally only wanted his servants, children, and wife in his home, but he also noted that "…to doe you a curtesy I shall bee willing of your company…"[723] for up to six weeks.[724] Henry Oxinden's stance meant that his younger brother James could not act as he wanted, but had to regulate his actions according to his brother's powerful position in his life. Rules related to

---

[717] Lorri Glover has written of the way letting children live elsewhere was connected to power in the context of 18th-century America (Glover 2000, 39).

[718] Allestree 1659, 329–330, 332–333, 355–356, 358.

[719] For example, Richard Oxinden was first an apprentice and afterwards joined the military, being sent to Gelderland in the Netherlands (Gardiner 1933c, xxvii).

[720] Gardiner 1933c, xxv; Gardiner 1933d, Oxinden Family Pedigree; James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden May 27, 1634, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 93; James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden April 1, 1635, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 102–103; Winkelmann 1996, 14–15; Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden March 5, 1636/7, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 119.

[721] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden April 3, 1636, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 113.

[722] It is crucial to note that this was a draft reply, and it is possible the final letter he sent, if he sent it at all, could have been different.

[723] Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 114.

[724] Ibid.

hospitality also guided Henry's actions and could have made him more likely to accept James's request,[725] especially as he noted courtesy directly. Henry did not think that he was merely obeying the norms. He connected his actions to emotional expressions and gave further reasons for them. After accepting James's visit, Henry wrote the following:

> … I know by this time you have learnt there is a difference betweene Meum and Tuum, not only amongst strangers but amongst friends and Brothers, and that they are men of a senseles disposition that thinke [that] is done toward them out of love is done out of duty. I doubt not that you thinke, if not know, that I have alwaies had a regard unto your wellfare, and if you call them to mind, evident proofes thereof to my ability, and doubt you not…[726]

While courtesy had an influence on Henry's actions, his motivation was also connected to affection and wanting the best for his brother. Informing James of the reason for accepting his visit in this manner could give Henry agency and elevate him to the position of a morally righteous man who acted in the interest of his brother against his own preferences due to his affection. At the same time, while Henry expressed love for his brother, Ralph Houlbrooke argued that his behaviour showed that he focused emotionally on his nuclear family at the expense of the family into which he had been born, which was apparently typical for early modern England.[727] However, his emotions towards his siblings should not be ignored.

Henry, on the other hand, also made his own expectations known and exerted agency over James in connection with his and his brother's emotional expressions to set boundaries. Henry reminded James that people who stay longer than they should ruin the relationship, are immodest and shameless. He trusted that his brother would not be one of these people.[728] Staying for longer than the limits Henry had given would then, at least in his eyes, express these emotions that had the potential to have a negative effect on the relationship. Breaking expectations thus could be interpreted by the one having set them as conveying certain emotions. Warning of this could influence what emotions were expressed and provide another way to remind siblings of expectations. Finally, Henry set further boundaries by reminding James of the possible consequences. He noted, "…but my love and care of you is not extinguished but shall allwayes continue, till such time as you shall give the first occasion, either by too apparent ill husbandry or disrespect of mee…".[729] In addition to courtesy and his affection, it is possible that, as the eldest brother, he felt a sense of duty to take care of his younger siblings, and that this influenced his actions. At the same time, James's

---

[725] As mentioned above, the reputation and honour of a gentleman could depend on generosity and hospitality (Fletcher 1995, 139). These themes were also discussed in contemporary literature. Antoine de Courtin, for example, wrote about the proper way of receiving a visitor in his *The Rules of Civility*. While the original was written in French, the book was popular in England as well. (Courtin 1675, 124–128; Ustick 1929, 149; see also Heltzel 1928.)
[726] Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 114.
[727] Houlbrooke 1984, 42.
[728] Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 114.
[729] Ibid.

knowledge of Henry's duties as the eldest brother and of their mutual affection could also have guided him regarding whom to approach for accommodation. Anna Bryson has noted that, in the normative sense, visiting among equals was reciprocal, but for those in an inferior position, it was also a way to show respect.[730] Furthermore, as discussed above, siblings could expect reciprocity from accommodating their brothers and sisters.[731] Henry might have expected repayment in one form or another, and this may have given James a chance to highlight his position.

As previous research has revealed, visiting was a way to uphold sibling connections.[732] This section has explored in more detail how visiting expressed and highlighted emotions and how it was connected to power, agency, duty, and the normative context. The emotions conveyed were typically affection or related feelings, but siblings could also convey concern.[733] The four cases examined here demonstrate different ways in which siblings, visiting, emotions, and power were connected to each other. Henry Newcome's text shows how conveying affection could be considered a reason for visiting, and how visits could lead to expressions of love. However, his text also demonstrates that surprise visits could prompt expressions of affection -- but also might highlight the affection expressed in other ways in the relationship and give the visitor agency over whether the visit happened and when. Similarly, the continued and extended visits described in Newcome's text might express affection and emphasise the ongoing emotional connection between the siblings.

At the same time, living near each other or together could influence the roles the siblings had and affect how their emotions were expressed. Newcome's notion of wanting to live next to his brother rather than farther away could have influenced the siblings' agency over each other, as they now would have had more chances to interact. However, living together might, as in the case of William Stout and his sister Elin, transform the sibling relationship into one that resembled a married couple.[734] This could, in turn, influence siblings' power relations through changes in their roles. Mutual affection could, nevertheless, soften hierarchies. Choosing to live together could convey a close relationship and highlight the affection that was also expressed otherwise.

Henry Oxinden's correspondence demonstrates that visiting was tied to the need to have a mutual understanding of how it should be done and was not always considered desirable by both parties. Siblings who occupied a higher position in the sibling hierarchy because of their age or other factors could regulate how visits were made within the framework of normative expectations connected to hospitality and courtesy. Courtesy might demand that even siblings higher in the hierarchy would need to act in ways that they did not want to. Siblings could also express that their actions were motivated by emotions rather than just duties. While such expressions could be sincere, they could also

---

[730] Bryson 1998/2004, 139–140.
[731] Crawford 2004/2014, 220.
[732] Capp 2018, 48–50
[733] Pepys 1893, January 20, 1663/4, March 14, 1663/4.
[734] Capp 2003, 151.

constitute attempts to exert influence. On the other hand, Henry Oxinden's younger brother James's letters show how those with less agency could attempt to persuade a sibling to let him or her visit by justifying why they should be allowed to come. Expectations held by siblings in powerful positions could also influence which emotions siblings might express. Occasionally, the provision of housing was important for external reasons. For example, during a crisis, siblings could provide a place to stay to a sister's or brother's family, even when the sibling in question did not join them. John Evelyn's diary illustrates the joy of reunion in this type of case, as well as the influence of such events on the agency of the siblings.

LETTERS

Expressing emotions in letters was both an inner process and something that involved other people. Scheer acknowledges and uses letters in her concept of emotional practices. Writing, reading, and sending letters were practices that could sustain emotional connections if done often enough.[735] What was considered sufficient can be difficult to determine, as many letters may be missing from the preserved correspondence.[736] The need to write letters was also connected to the normative context. For example, not sending letters to family members was considered impolite,[737] and some siblings apologised for not writing often enough.[738] While it was possible for brothers and sisters to interpret not writing as a lack of affection,[739] love did not guarantee that siblings wrote letters to each other when they could not spend time together. For example, Richard Oxinden noted to his brother Henry that even though he loved him very much, he was not in the habit of writing to anyone. Emotional practices in letters also included depictions of bodies related to emotions, such as descriptions of crying or metaphors connected to the body.[740]

As travelling could be slow,[741] upholding a relationship was frequently not possible through visiting for siblings who lived very far apart, for example in different countries. Letters, however, could in some ways replace visiting. Gary Schneider has argued that correspondence included an "…imaginative recreation of orality…"[742] and a "…bodily presence…"[743] that was

---

[735] Scheer 2018, 235; van der Zande 2018, 229.
[736] Ruppel 2015, 253. Sophie Ruppel has noted that it was not uncommon for siblings from the early modern European high nobility to be in frequent correspondence with each other and provides an example of a sister who wrote about one letter a week to her brother (Ruppel 2015, 251).
[737] For example, see Richard Oxinden to James Oxinden May 14, 1607, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 6.
[738] Edward Peyton to Anne Oxinden July 27, 1635, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 105.
[739] For example, see Elizabeth Oxinden to Henry Oxinden, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 135.
[740] Richard Oxinden to Henry Oxinden, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 305; van der Zande 2018, 229.
[741] Gerhold 2014, 818, 820–821.
[742] Schneider 2000, 32.
[743] Ibid.

"…rhetorically inscribed in the letter…".[744] When siblings could not be physically near each other, letters could act as a material substitute or representation of the individual's physical aspects. Schneider has also noted how early modern letter writers and readers compared their correspondence to talking and hearing. Lorri Glover has additionally remarked how, in a way, it was possible for siblings to visit each other through their correspondence. [745] Still, siblings who were physically closer to each other had more opportunities to uphold their relationships and needed less time and resources to accomplish this. In contrast, brothers and sisters who used letters to maintain their relationships had to come up with effective ways to express their emotions, sustain an affectionate relationship, and exert influence.

It was also possible to generate a sense of closeness and social obligations through letters. In addition, writing and sending them could be a way to express emotions.[746] Through letters, siblings could not just emphasise direct emotional expressions, but also attempt to oblige the recipient to answer. For example, the Welsh writer and a priest's son, James Howell, who studied at Oxford University,[747] noted the emotional significance of receiving letters when he wrote to his brother, Thomas Howell, on April 1, 1617, about his arrival in Amsterdam[748]:

> …but I think I shall sojourn here about two moneths longer, therefore I pray direct your Letter accordingly, or any other you have for me: One of the prime comforts of a Traveller is to receive Letters from his friends, they beget new spirits in him, and present joyfull objects to his fancy, when his mind is clouded sometimes with Fogs of melancholy; therefore I pray make me happy as often as your conveniency will serve with yours…[749]

The father of the Oxinden brothers, Richard Oxinden, described sending letters to his elder brother James[750] in 1607 as a way to express affection. Both lived in England, one in London and the other in Wingham, in Kent.[751] Richard noted that it would have been impolite not to write[752] but also to connected the correspondence with affection by explaining: "…with your desire of this muteall entterchange of oure letteres, as the increase of oure never changable loves, the only meanes absence affordes to well affected mindes to shew there loving dispositione". [753] In this way, he emphasised the significance of the correspondence for their affection and generated the possibility of influencing how the recipient would act and express emotions.

---

[744] Schneider 2000, 32.
[745] Schneider 2000, 32–33, 39–40; Glover 2000, 52; Broomhall & Van Gent 2009, 152.
[746] Broomhall & Van Gent 2009, 147.
[747] Kaartinen 2013, 32.
[748] James Howell to Dr. Howell April 1, 1617, Howell 1650, 8, 10.
[749] Ibid.
[750] Gardiner 1933a, 1.
[751] James Oxinden to Richard Oxinden May 11, 1607, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 6; Richard Oxinden to James Oxinden May 7, 1607, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 5.
[752] Richard Oxinden to James Oxinden May 14, 1607, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 6.
[753] Richard Oxinden to James Oxinden May 7, 1607, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 5.

Even though some family members could expect correspondence[754] and highlighted its emotional significance, siblings did not always choose this action to convey their feelings. Richard Oxinden, who at the time was an apprentice to a cloth merchant,[755] wrote to his elder brother Henry in 1629, "…as i am at the writing of thes poore weeke lines unto you and i coold wish that i had saved the paynes of writing them soe that i might have ben soe happy not to tell it yow in Lines but in words…"[756] Later he also noted that he did not write even to the people he loved.[757] Richard also conveyed longing for his brother.[758] He wanted to remain in touch regardless of his preference to not write, but he did not have the agency to change the situation according to his wishes. On the other hand, such longing could also suggest that correspondence was not sufficient to satisfy Richard's emotional needs in this sibling relationship.

Knowing exactly how often siblings might expect letters could be difficult,[759] but, as already discussed, it is evident that some siblings regarded correspondence as crucial to their relationships and emotional expressions. Still, the distance between siblings did not mean that correspondence necessarily took place, even though some members of the family might have expected it.[760] When letter exchange was lacking, traces of siblings directly or indirectly indicating feelings of neglect were sometimes present. This also highlighted the significance of correspondence. Not writing as often as the other sibling expected could draw out certain emotions. Drawing attention in a letter to a lack of correspondence could express and highlight certain emotions, such as affection and longing, and give agency over the unresponsive sibling by providing the writer with a way to influence how the recipient would act. This could take the form of reminding the recipients of duties, emotional connections, and sympathy.

It was crucial for early modern people to uphold their honour, which could be endangered by not following social expectations, such as reciprocity.[761] Correspondence was strongly connected to reciprocity, as the expectation was for a letter to be answered. Avoiding the loss of honour by not acting in a reciprocal manner could, however, be avoided, at least to a degree, if a justification could be found that followed the dominant ideology.[762] Siblings reacted to accusations and took precautions so as not to be accused of neglecting letter writing and to preserve some agency over the matter. A Staffordshire Gentlewoman,[763] Constance Fowler, stated in her 1636 letter to her brother Herbert Aston, who at the time lived in Madrid,[764] that it was her uncle's fault

---

[754] O'Day 2001, 140.
[755] Gardiner 1933a, 1.
[756] Richard Oxinden to Henry Oxinden May 10, 1629, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 43–44.
[757] Richard Oxinden to Henry Oxinden, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 305.
[758] Richard Oxinden to Henry Oxinden May 10, 1629, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 44.
[759] Ruppel 2015, 253.
[760] O'Day 2001, 140.
[761] Koskinen 2021, 32.
[762] Ibid., 25, 38.
[763] Capp 2018, 62.
[764] Clifford 1815, 85.

that her letters had been delivered slowly.[765] She also added that she was worried that he might not receive many letters from her, and that he would think that she did not write to him.[766] Thomas Meautys' sister Jane Cornwallis also wanted him to write to her more. He was a career soldier who often lived in the Low Countries[767] and whose sister was wealthy, resided in England,[768] and gave Meautys money more than once.[769] Cornwallis had accused her brother of not sending her letters, as was apparent from his response in 1614. He defended himself by writing:

> …far be it from any thought of mine to neglect you, soe mucth as you charge me wth it in yor letter ; butt yf you haue nott receued soe often from me as I haue sent, lett yor charytie be soe mucth to yor absent brother as nott to macke an ill construcktion of his affectionate indevours…[770]

Meautys's text portrayed both not receiving letters and sending them as ways of expressing emotions. His use of the word "neglect" further highlights the place of letters in this emotional relationship, as it indicates that he held constancy in correspondence in high regard, but is also used as a way to defend himself. His notion of letters as an expression of affection could further shield him from his sister's accusations and give him the potential to exercise agency over the situation and his sister's attempt to exert influence. Along with an individual's potential need, the significance of reciprocity in early modern England society, including correspondence,[771] could influence this practice. At the same time, the writer of a text had agency and the opportunity to reinterpret the ways in which they had expressed emotions in the past.[772] Regardless of how Meautys had conveyed his feelings before, his letter was now a chance to gain or regain agency.

Even though Thomas Meautys did not at first appear to have been an active correspondent with his sister Jane Cornwallis,[773] after the letter cited above, it was rather he who complained several times that he had not received any letters from her for a long time.[774] Already in 1615, he wrote that he hoped she had not

---

[765] She sent letters to him through her uncle who lived in London and explained that, because he did not live in the city for now due to plaque, he would only send them to her brother when he visited London (Constance Fowler to Herbert Aston August 11, 1636, Tixall Letters 1815, 93).
[766] Constance Fowler to Herbert Aston August 11, 1636, Tixall Letters 1815, 93.
[767] Del Lungo Camiciotti 2014, 144, 147. Some letters he sent from England. For example, see Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis December 23, 1624, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 110–111.
[768] Del Lungo Camiciotti 2014, 137.
[769] For example, see Thomas Meautys to Jane Lady Cornwallis January 6, 1624/5, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 115; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis July 2, 1627, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 182.
[770] Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis December 7, 1614, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 31.
[771] Koskinen 2021, 24.
[772] Toland 2017, 65.
[773] Besides the letter examined above, see also Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis October 17, 1614, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 27.
[774] Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis October 17, 1614, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 27–28; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis October 2, 1615, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 32–33; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis May 9, 1616, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 36;

forgotten him, and that he felt discouraged after writing many times but not receiving replies. [775] A closer analysis of Thomas Meautys's letters to Cornwallis reveals how a sibling in a less powerful position could attempt to influence inaction and its connection to emotional expressions. Of course, affection for her could have contributed to his wish for her to correspond with him, but longing for her letters could also have been connected to material factors and issues regarding agency. Due to Cornwallis being wealthier and lending Meautys money from time to time, [776] maintaining a relationship could be especially beneficial for him, as it might help in receiving further assistance from her. Furthermore, her wealth and his money problems put Cornwallis in a powerful position. Still, even if he did not have material power over his sister, he could have influenced her in other respects.

Intersectionality draws attention to the fact that because of her wealth, Cornwallis was in a better position than her brother, despite being a woman. Although siblings were in differing positions because of inheritance, Nancy E. Wright and Margaret W. Ferguson have argued that siblings besides the eldest son were not cut off from the agency and liberty that private property would bring, according to liberal theory. While fathers might have given their eldest son the greatest part of their inheritance, according to the expectations of primogeniture, a widowed mother might not act similarly in her will but could give something to the other children, too. Widows, additionally, rewrote their wills many times, specifically to lessen the impact of primogeniture on their children's finances. Furthermore, children could inherit from other people besides their parents, potentially further levelling out financial inequality or increasing it. [777] In this case, Cornwallis's good financial situation due to her marriages gave her more agency.

Besides discussing the lack of letters, highlighting feelings of disappointment regarding the current state of the relationship by reminiscing on the past to an emotionally and physically distant sibling could further emphasise the message about insufficient contact. Such efforts could include an example of how the recipient of the letter should behave or express emotions and at the same time an attempt to appeal to the recipient's emotions. In this way, siblings with less power could at least try to influence the future of the relationship. In 1622, Meautys contrasted Cornwallis's previous letter-writing activity with her current lack of correspondence. He commented, "In regarde that you retourned noe

Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis May 6, 1639, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 289–290; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis April 28, 1642, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 301–302.
[775] Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis October 2, 1615, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 32–33.
[776] Del Lungo Camiciotti 2014, 137; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis January 6, 1624/5, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 114–115; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis September 18, 1625, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 134; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis July 2, 1627, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 182; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis July 25, 1627, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 184; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis June 2, 1636, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 277.
[777] Staves 1995, 194; Wright & Ferguson 2004, 11; Froide 2005, 119–120.

answer of my letters…I made my reckoninge that you (had) tacken your leaue of wryghttinge…"[778] He told her about finding many letters that she had written before, stating, "…it did much comfort mee to finde by those lines that I wounce had a sister whose loue & affection in those dayes was nott to bee eaqualysed…"[779] While this demonstrated that her affection was still important to him, it also indicated that he now saw it in a different light. Meautys had also noted his sister's affection on other occasions and spoke highly of it.[780]

The letter reminded Cornwallis of what he saw as her past correct behaviour and of how her current actions, which he strongly connected to her affection, did not match his expectations. In the same letter, he wrote that he felt he had never given her a reason to think he loved her any less[781] and reminded her that he had written while she had not, contrasting their actions and making himself look better. Meautys was an example of proper action, as he described himself and his expression of affection as how he wanted Cornwallis' letters to be as well. The expectation, at least according to Richard Allestree, was that siblings should love each other,[782] and Meautys portrayed himself as the only one acting accordingly at the moment. Still, by approaching the issue of wanting her to express affection by complimenting her previous actions, Meautys maintained a level of politeness, which was especially crucial considering her role in helping him financially and her more powerful position. This way, he could also hint at his understanding of her possible emotions, lack of emotional commitment, or indifference. Inaction could, in other words, be seen as an emotional expression. On the other hand, reciprocal structures could be maintained when both parties benefitted from them.[783] While there could certainly have been many reasons for how Cornwallis acted, and the analysis is complicated by not having access to her letters, if she did not benefit from the relationship, it might partly explain why she was more inactive.

Calling out inaction could indeed be done in a way that would provide siblings with ways to act without appearing impolite themselves. Edward Peyton, who studied for a year at Wadham College at Oxford and was a younger son of Lady Mary Peyton, Sir Roger Aston's co-heiress, admitted to not writing often to his sister Anne Oxinden, who had married Henry Oxinden, calling this negligent and apologising accordingly.[784] Nevertheless, he continued that he had been

---

[778] Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis November 7, 1622, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 80.

[779] Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis November 7, 1622, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 80. On another occasion, Meautys also expressed feeling discouraged after he had not received letters from his sister for a while (Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis October 2, 1615, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 32–33).

[780] For example, see Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis 1616, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 39; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis December 23, 1624, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 110.

[781] Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis November 7, 1622, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 80.

[782] Allestree 1659, 306.

[783] Koskinen 2021, 32.

[784] Gardiner 1933b, 84–85; Edward Peyton to Anne Oxinden July 27, 1635, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 105.

expecting Oxinden to write but now believed "…that [his] letters [were] not accepted of by [her]…"[785] He noted that if she wrote, he "… should bee two proud of them, comming from soe deare a Sister".[786] He softened the demand by expressing emotions for her and encouraged her to write by giving her a chance to exercise agency over his thoughts and emotions towards her. Accepting part of the responsibility for the lack of regular correspondence also softened the demand.

Writing about believing that a sibling had not intentionally neglected the duty to correspond gave the recipient room to correct her or his actions and provided the writer with a polite and soft way to bring up the issue. Meautys wrote in 1615 and 1622 that he wanted to believe in his sister Jane Cornwallis's willingness to write if she could. In 1614, he added that it was possible he just did not get her letters.[787] A great physical distance between siblings, such as living in different countries, might have helped to bring some relief from individual or societal expectations. The fact that Meautys and Cornwallis lived in different countries gave her a good opportunity to ignore him, but he mostly reported believing in her willingness to correspond.[788]

James Oxinden also wrote in 1635 of his eldest brother Henry not replying to him.[789] James was willing to believe his brother just did not accept his letters, but unlike Thomas Meautys, he gave his own actions and Henry's reaction to them as a reason for why Henry did not write. Henry noted, "…what blast blowne by the nipping winds of infamous mouths have thus shipwrackt my lettars by casting them uppon the rock of your discontent… pardon mee (Deere Brother), whose words arre as miserable as himself…"[790] James avoided some of the blame by emphasising Henry's discontent and his own ignorance of his wrongdoing. James and Henry's emotional relationships and related power and hierarchical structures were, regardless, different from those of Meautys and Cornwallis. Henry's position as the eldest brother may have influenced James's willingness to assume the submissive role of taking the blame, but as Cornwallis was a woman, it is possible that Meautys did not feel he had to act as humbly.

When considering all the factors that limited visiting,[791] it was easier for many siblings to write to each other. When visiting was not possible, correspondence helped them convey feelings or use affection. Correspondence

[785] Edward Peyton to Anne Oxinden July 27, 1635, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 105.
[786] Ibid.
[787] Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis December 7, 1614, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 31; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis October 2, 1615, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 32–33; Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis, November 7, 1622, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 80.
[788] The exception to this is discussed above (Thomas Meautys to Jane Cornwallis November 7, 1622, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 80).
[789] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden April 1, 1635, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 102; Gardiner 1933d, Oxinden Family Pedigree.
[790] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden April 1, 1635, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 102.
[791] For example, see Henry Oxinden's draft letter to James Oxinden, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 114.

was indeed seen by some, such as Thomas Howell and Thomas Meautys, as crucial in their relationships, and highlighting this point could also convey affection or similar emotions. However, correspondence was not the preferred method of communication for all. This was apparent from Richard Oxinden's letter to his brother, in which he noted that he wanted to visit. Not corresponding could have been due to many reasons, but those who wanted to continue to correspond, perhaps due to affection or a need for help,[792] could attempt to change the situation and gain control over their sibling. The nature of the relationship and its emotional content influenced how they might try to do this. Thomas Meautys was first accused of not writing to his sister Jane Cornwallis, but he was eventually the one attempting to influence Cornwallis's inaction in their correspondence. His case demonstrates that it was possible for siblings in lower hierarchical positions to write about the lack of correspondence directly, but the message could also be softened, for example, through compliments, emotional expressions, or a partial acknowledgement of responsibility. On the other hand, by indicating disappointment in the lack of correspondence and acting as an example of proper actions and emotional expressions, the writer, in this case Thomas Meautys, could further pressure siblings to change their actions. Thomas Meautys's letters also show that some writers gave the sibling who was not writing them the opportunity to explain themselves in ways that did not imply the attribution of blame.

4.3 Caring for the sick

In this section, I will examine the ways in which emotional expressions were connected to taking care of sick siblings, and how siblings expressed a variety of emotions in this way. I will discuss how this was tied to the duty or pressure to take care of younger siblings. Then, I will examine how the sickness of a sibling was connected to inability and inaction, such as loss of agency. While I note the connection between directly expressed emotions and actions, it is also possible to analyse actions themselves as expressing emotions in certain situations. According to Andrea Brady, since there were many cases in which emotions were not explicitly expressed in texts, we may need to make further deductions. In Brady's view, people saw providing practical help, including taking care of the sick, as an emotional attachment. She has explained this by using the example of a maid whose meticulous care of her child could be read as an indication of a loving and affective bond, arguing that, similarly, concern for each other's well-being could signify affection.[793] An example of this from the late 17th century is how Katharine Dyke helped her sick sister Dorothy Palmer, who was worried about whether she could travel to where her daughter lived. Dyke offered to stay

---

[792] As mentioned above, Bernard Capp has discussed how sisters expressed affection to gain help, although they did not convey the emotion only because of this need (Capp 2018, 61).
[793] Brady 2008, 187.

with her, which made Palmer happier. Bernard Capp has likewise argued that this case constitutes an example of affectionate ties between siblings.[794]

HEALTH AND EMOTIONS

In the early modern period, a balance between the four humours (blood, black and yellow bile, and phlegm) was thought to signify health. The regular movement of fluids was considered imperative, and a corrupt fluid, or the inertia or overly rapid movement of fluids, was supposed to lead to illness. A strong emotional reaction, for example, due to grief, was also seen as a cause of illness. While women of the early modern period often cared for sick people they knew, they also looked after bodies in other ways, such as preparing them to be buried and delivering babies. Many of the activities that maidservants needed to perform were connected to the body as well, such as tending to the sick and children, cooking, washing linen, and emptying chamber pots. Women also worked as nurses, midwives, and healers. Gentlewomen sometimes gave those around them medical help, in addition to ordinary women having an awareness of healing comparable to men. The way men and women gained medical knowledge differed, as women usually could not access universities and guilds. Recipe books were, however, used and written by and for literate men and women.[795]

Medical teachings contained the idea that sadness had to be controlled because it could have harmful effects on the body, even potentially leading to death. During the 16th and early 17th centuries, it was thought that although any extreme emotion could be dangerous, the effects of sadness could be particularly strong and even lethal. This was one reason why people had to regulate sadness. Melancholy was a disease that people understood mainly as an emotion that was involved in connotations related to ethics, spirituality, and medicality. It was also connected to delusion or fixation in the early modern period. Since melancholy was defined as a disease, its connection to the body and related emotional practices was different from sadness. The 17th-century English writer Robert Burton, for example, described melancholy in 1621 as something that "goes and comes vpon every small occasion of sorrow…"[796] and that while everyone experienced it at some point, it also turned into a disease once it became prolonged.[797] He further described it in terms of "…sorrow, neede, sicknesse, trouble, feare, griefe, passion, or perturbation of the Minde..."[798] and "...opposite to pleasure, mirth, joy, delight…"[799]

Normative expectations concerning emotions, such as grief and sadness, could be diverse. For example, Christopher Sutton, an author of two popular

---

[794] Bramston 1845, 352; Capp 2018, 76.
[795] Lindemann 1999, 17; Weisser 2015, 19–20, 34, 53–55, 81. See also Newton 2018.
[796] Burton 1621, 16.
[797] Ibid., 16–18; Gowland 2006, 84; Sullivan 2013, 160; Telles-Correia & Gama Marques 2015, 1–2.
[798] Burton 1621, 16.
[799] Ibid.

early 17th-century Christian books, maintained that grief could be felt, albeit not too deeply, but expressing distress could threaten manhood. Olivia Weisser has indeed found cases of men downplaying their feelings or justifying reactions that were considered unmanly. Women were seen normatively as being more emotional, and men as more rational. [800] However, men still occasionally described emotional reactions to death. Regarding the death of his brother Tom in 1663/4, Pepys wrote "…and he poor wretch lying with his chops fallen, a most sad sight, and that which put me into a present very great transport of grief and cries…"[801]

Helping during an illness was expected of Christians due to the virtue of charity connected to affection and kindness. According to the 17th-century Anglican conduct book writer Richard Allestree, charity included not just feeling sympathy for those in pain, but also action to help them. Charity also extended more broadly to other actions towards bodies, such as giving food or clothes to those in need.[802] Furthermore, Allestree felt that it would be inhumane, and against Anglican values, not to act according to these precepts; therefore, such actions should come naturally and easily to all. [803] Indeed, helping during sickness was seen as being driven by more than just expectations. Weisser has noted that an early modern woman, Anne Dormer, saw her sister's compassion and love as gifts from God during difficult times and as something that helped her endure these hardships. While Anglican expectations influenced the reactions to suffering, so did other factors, such as social rank, marital status, and individual circumstances.[804]

AFFECTION, DUTY, AND RECIPROCITY

Both men and women described taking care of their siblings during illness. This practice is connected to emotional expressions ranging from affection to sadness.[805] The elder siblings could often take care of the younger ones and even be expected to do so. Furthermore, everyone was expected to help during crises.[806] These expectations were reflected in siblings expressing emotions by taking care of their sick brothers and sisters. Even though Elizabeth Freke was the eldest sister, she was the last to marry and financially well off only later in life.[807] This likely affected her status in the sibling hierarchy and her agency within it. In 1684, Freke's husband left for Ireland, leading to her struggling with money.[808] Freke then went to Tenterden to her sister, Lady Judith Austen, when she was ill, having given birth to a dead child in October 1684. She noted, "I staide

---

[800] Sutton 1846, 156–157; Atkinson 1985, 207; Weisser 2015, 95–96, 100.
[801] Pepys 1893, March 15, 1663/4.
[802] Allestree 1659, 355–356; Alblas 1991, 92.
[803] Allestree 1659, 357.
[804] Weisser 2019, 103–104, 106.
[805] This is explained in the present section. For example, see Thornton 1875, 52; Evelyn 1908, 269.
[806] Crawford 2004/2014, 218, 222–223; Capp 2018, 32, 36, 72.
[807] Capp 2018, 71, 74.
[808] Freke 2001, 52–53; Capp 2018, 73.

with all the kindness imaginable till the 15 of June following".[809] This mention of kindness explicitly connected Freke's lengthy stay with her sister to emotions.

While elder siblings, especially brothers, could help more often, and although they might have had more obligations, for siblings of all ages and age differences, emotions also played a role in the help they provided, as a more affectionate sibling tended be more likely to help.[810] Despite their duty to take care of a sick sibling, these cases also revealed direct emotional expressions, along with specific ways in which actions could convey feelings. Some siblings took care of their sick brothers and sisters without any obvious material benefits, thereby conveying and highlighting their emotional expressions.

As with the gentry, the elder brothers of the mercantile and professional classes also often supported their sisters. William Stout, a businessman and the son of a yeoman, had a close and affectionate relationship with his sister Elin, and they were willing to protect, take care of, and trust each other.[811] While Stout noted that Elin first lived with other members of their family at the end of the 17th century, he and Elin lived with each other for a long time, specifically from 1699 onwards until her death in 1724.[812] She assisted him in his shop[813] and worked as a housekeeper together with a maid.[814] Even though living together was rare for siblings who had already married, it was more common among those who had not. Furthermore, never-married women were expected to have a subordinate role in economic matters, working for others but not independently. Similarly, authorities saw that working for a brother or widowed sister put a never-married woman in the position of a dependent worker.[815] Even though the internal dynamics of the relationship between William Stout and his sister Elin were in reality much more nuanced than those of a master and a worker, in this context, their hierarchical order was clear.

At the same time, it is important to examine the relationship between William and Elin Stout and the emotions expressed within it from the point of view of reciprocity, which was a crucial component of early modern societies.[816] Unmarried sister-brother couples could have a reciprocal relationship, with the brother providing housing and the sister free housekeeping. Indeed, the brothers most commonly helped their adult single sisters by giving them a space to live and financial assistance.[817] Elin helped her brother by providing him with services,[818] and Stout got a good worker in return.[819] Furthermore, Elin had a

---

[809] Freke 2001, 53.
[810] Crawford 2004/2014, 218, 222–223; Capp 2018, 36.
[811] Capp 2018, 54, 135, 137.
[812] Stout 1851, 32, 34, 48, 52, 65, 105.
[813] Ibid., 81. Elin helped her brother at first in 1688 by assisting during market days, going to fairs with him, and looking after him and his shop when he was sick (Stout 1851, 21–22). He was satisfied with the help she provided, as he, for example, complimented her for working hard in his text (Stout 1851, 21–22).
[814] Stout 1851, 52, 65.
[815] Crawford 2004/2014, 219; Froide 2005, 28.
[816] Koskinen 2021, 24.
[817] Froide 2005, 60.
[818] Crawford 2004/2014, 218–219.
[819] Stout 1851, 29.

place to live and a brother who claimed he was "…tender to her; who was very infirm of body and subject to many infirmities".[820] Amy Froide has written that the poor health[821] of Elin Stout was used to justify not marrying her off, but rather retaining her as a useful part of the natal family.[822] However, the reciprocal relationship did not remain the same throughout their time living together, as Elin's condition eventually grew worse, and she was increasingly unable to fulfil her previous tasks at the shop. Stout responded by hiring a man named John Marshall to assist him instead.[823] Although Stout could not cure his sister, he had the agency to influence what the end of Elin's life would be like. While her illness occasionally flared up, she always recovered, until 1724, when she finally passed away. Stout stated, "I was very much affected with sorrow for the loss of my dear and only sister…"[824] but also explained that as she had been sick for a long time, he "…was often freely resigned to the will of God, for her ease, either by life or death".[825]

Reciprocal structures could be maintained when both parties benefitted from them, but Ulla Koskinen observed that people were not necessarily driven only by the benefit gained but also by normative obligations, along with affection and an overall willingness to help. On the other hand, acting reciprocally according to norms could yield social benefits, such as being seen as trustworthy.[826] Even though the expectation may have been for Stout to take care of Elin, his behaviours, such as acting tenderly and writing, directly expressed his affection. Whether this was an attempt to influence the reader of his text or a so-called "sincere" expression of affection may be up for debate. Furthermore, while Elin was not useful to him in a material sense when she was too sick, she was still able to express affection and provide companionship, even though Stout did not describe this directly in his text. As noted in the previous section, their genders influenced the hierarchical structure. As a man, he was able to have more agency and work to gain a financial position that could enhance his power and ability to influence his family. As a woman, Elin needed a man to secure her future, and unlike in many other cases, she did not marry but stayed with her brother. However, the relationship changed when they lived together, and she was thus able to influence the power dynamic. He also gave her agency by consulting her when he was considering selling his business, for example.[827]

A promise of reciprocal action could express and/or emphasize emotions. The need to pay back was not forgotten, even when people described affection as a driving force for taking care of sick siblings. Furthermore, this highlights that helping even close siblings had the potential to be beneficial for to the helper and

---

[820] Stout 1851, 65.
[821] Stout described how she "…was seized with a violent fit of her common distemper, of pain in her breast and back, and shortness of breath, which she had been afflicted with often before…" (Stout 1851, 105).
[822] Froide 2005, 184.
[823] Stout 1851, 81.
[824] Ibid., 105.
[825] Ibid., 105.
[826] Koskinen 2021, 32, 34–35.
[827] Stout 1851, 88.

again connected to agency. During the early modern period, family members were often present in the final days and the time leading up to death,[828] which was also often evident in descriptions of siblings dying.[829] Alice Thornton, a gentlewoman born in Kirklington in 1625/6,[830] described the death of her elder sister, Lady Catherine Danby, after she gave birth to her sixteenth child in 1645. She noted how virtuous Lady Danby had been and explained that she had gone into labour earlier than she thought she would have.[831] Lady Danby had a difficult birth and was unable to sleep and eat well afterwards. Thornton remarked that she was with her and described taking care of her sister and her sister's emotional reaction to this care:

> All her words weere full of sweeteness and affection, giveing me manny hearty thanks for all my paines and caire I tooke with her, and watching a whole weeke together; if she lived she would requite my love; with an abundant of affectionate expressions to this purpose. My greife and sorrow was soe great for her, that I had brought myselfe into a very weake condition, in so much as my mother came to Thorpe with Dafeny Lightfoote, a cairefull servant, to helpe with my sister, and sent mee home who was allmost spent in that time. Att which time I tooke my last leave of my dearest and only sister…[832]

Lady Danby understood that Thornton acted because of her affection, and Thornton correspondingly saw that Lady Danby spoke to her lovingly because she had helped her. The affection expressed by Lady Danby was tied to a response to an action for the care she received. At the same time, her promise of potential future actions also described how she thought she would express emotion.[833] Like Stout, Thornton could not help her sister to survive, but she had the agency to be there for her as emotional support. This also connected to agency through the impact of reciprocity. Even if it was not the intention, and even though Lady Danby ended up dying, a younger sibling having the chance to do something for an elder one could give the former leverage for the future, including pressure for the sick person to pay them back. Their relationship was

---

[828] Houlbrooke 1984, 202.

[829] For example, see Bramston 1845, 32; Pepys 1893, March 13, 1664, March 15, 1664.

[830] C. J. 1875, v–vi.

[831] Thornton 1875, 49–50. Thornton explained that her sister's husband was unable to be with her, and that the troubles that came with the civil war and the "horrid rudnesse of the soldiers and Scotts quartered then amongst them" (Thornton 1875, 49) caused this.

[832] Thornton 1875, 52.

[833] Besides expressing emotions through taking care of her sister, Thornton also connected these expressions to her physical health. Olivia Weisser has argued that an affectionate bond between siblings had, according to the writers themselves, a positive influence on their health. Weisser has discussed, for example, how Anne Dormer and Elizabeth Freke both described how seeing their respective sisters improved their physical and, in Dormer's case, mental health. Furthermore, she has contended that Freke probably felt hope and relief or other similar emotions that then influenced her physical state. (Weisser 2019, 104.) There was also the early modern idea that emotions had a concrete impact on the body, such as the blood heating from anger (Weisser 2019, 105). Furthermore, Thomas Wright argued in his early 17th-century text *The Passions of the Minde* that certain emotions, such as moderate "…Pleasure and Delight…" (Wright 1604, 60), or actions such as laughter, could have positive effects on physical health, but other emotions, such as sadness, along with excessively intense laughter, were more dangerous (Wright 1604, 25, 34, 59–61). A belief in the healing power of affection may even have influenced how siblings helped their sick brothers and sisters.

clearly emotionally close, and Thornton appeared to have helped her sister because of her affection for her. This would have influenced whether she would have chosen to utilise the benefits of reciprocity to her advantage if her sister had survived.

The normative context and beliefs of the time concerning health could also partly explain why and how Lady Danby and Thornton expressed affection. Many early modern women were, at least outwardly, calm and patient during illnesses, and hardship was not supposed to be something to be mournful over, but rather a sign from heaven. Furthermore, women in 17th-century England often believed that visitors expressing compassion about an illness could help the patient recover, and that if someone close to them was sick, that could make them ill as well. Early modern medical theory also posited that physical recovery was more likely when certain emotions were felt, for example, those related to having a cheerful attitude. It also claimed that emotional outbursts could lead to illness.[834] Thornton described both her and her sister's emotional expressions according to these ideas, as she noted that Lady Danby was calm and affectionate, and she herself was sick from grief. This highlights how the normative context influenced how they conveyed their feelings.

INACTION AND INABILITY

It was possible to express emotions by highlighting an unintentional inability to act and, through it, an inability to exercise agency. Such a phenomenon could emphasise a loss of agency as well. In 1678, Henry Newcome explained that he had received a letter describing that his elder brother, Stephen, was sick. Newcome stated, "…I am senseless, as well as useless, I should be greatly affected with it".[835] This conveyed his emotional state, as he expressed his inability to help, but also indicated how he thought his brother's death would impact him in the future. Besides expressing this sense of uselessness, he prayed to God. He remarked, "I did pray as well as I could for [Stephen]…"[836] for God to remember his brother's virtues. Stephen died a few weeks later.[837] His prayer could be interpreted as a way to attempt to help, at least in some way, to have some agency over the situation.[838] Furthermore, his reference to God served as a way to regulate his emotions. It transferred the responsibility for action to God, turning the event into something that Newcome simply had to accept.

While the 17th-century conduct book writer Richard Brathwaite advised that people should exercise caution in what was given and who deserved it, speaking, for example, about hospitality, he also highlighted the importance of generosity.[839] As noted above, reciprocity was also crucial in early modern society. Because of this wider context and the eagerness of some siblings to help

---

[834] Weisser 2015, 3; Weisser 2019, 98–100.
[835] Newcome 1852b, 226.
[836] Ibid.
[837] Ibid.
[838] Ala-Hynnilä 2023, 161–162.
[839] Brathwaite 1630, 65–68.

their brothers and sisters, the inability to help sick siblings could be viewed as a way to convey emotions or at least lead to the expression of emotions. The inability to act might lead to a loss of a sense of agency, but it did not necessarily mean a complete lack of the ability to act or to influence siblings. While brothers and sisters could help a sick sibling by visiting them,[840] the inability or lack of desire to see a brother or sister could also convey or highlight certain emotions. Although Alice Thornton had mixed feelings about her youngest brother John's childhood illness, she was very direct at expressing her affection. She explained that when John was ill with smallpox at the age of six, Thornton, 16 years old at the time in 1642,[841] followed their mother's orders not to see him.[842] Those who were severely ill were put on bed rest and, if possible, isolated to their own rooms to give them a calm environment, but also to prevent the spreading of the disease. This was, however, not always welcomed by patients and was even compared to being in a prison.[843]

While Thornton's possibilities to act were limited, she was not deprived of agency and tried to find a way to evade her brother's isolation. She could not prevent herself from remaining in contact with John and sent him letters using their dog because of her love for him.[844] Since, according to Thornton, she caught the illness herself because of this,[845] her actions meant that her expression of love had harmful physical consequences. Seeing how the disease influenced her brother's body also led to a better understanding of the situation and a change in her emotional expressions, as she now conveyed fear.[846] As they were both children, their mother's agency in keeping them apart was crucial, but so was Thornton's disobedience. This may have reflected not only Thornton's affection, but also her position as the elder sister who was expected to take care of her younger siblings.[847] The sickness also negatively influenced her agency.

Siblings could attempt to influence their sick siblings to get them to try different things to get better, for example, because of their emotional connection. Predictably, such efforts were not always successful, but often failed to have an effect. These attempts to convince siblings to act in a certain way could express or highlight their emotions. John Evelyn expressed concern for his sick younger brother Richard over a lengthy period, from before November 1668 to Richard's death in March 1669/1670.[848] In various parts of his diary, he expressed his close emotional connection with Richard. He called him "[m]y poor brother…"[849] and "[m]y dear brother…"[850] and discussed his grief by noting before Richard's death,

---

[840] This was the case, for example, with Alice Thornton, as examined above (Thornton 1875, 52).
[841] Thornton 1875, 32–33; C. J. 1875, Pedigree of the Family of Wandesford.
[842] Thornton 1875, 33.
[843] Newton 2020, 4.
[844] Thornton 1875, 33.
[845] Ibid.
[846] Ibid.
[847] Capp 2018, 72.
[848] Evelyn 1908, 3, 263, 265, 268–269.
[849] Ibid., 263.
[850] Ibid., 268.

"I solemnly set the next day apart to beg of God to mitigate his sufferings".[851] After Richard had died, Evelyn detailed his "…unspeakable grief…"[852] in addition to describing how he had greatly loved his brother.[853] Evelyn's actions reflected direct emotional expressions. Besides helping him by taking time to pray, he also visited his brother and contacted his friend Samuel Pepys. Evelyn brought in Pepys to help encourage Richard to undergo an operation to remove his bladder stone, which he refused, as Pepys had had the same treatment before.[854]

Bringing in Pepys could help Evelyn attempt to influence his brother through both Pepys's personal experience and his position in society and his family. Evelyn's seniority might also have given him more credibility to persuade his brother to act. It is crucial to note, however, that Richard himself was well off, had married well, and lived in a mansion, and was thus not dependent on John or others.[855] He could choose to act as he wanted, and his elder brother respected this decision instead of trying to force him to act, even in matters of life and death. A focus on intersectionality demonstrates that while Richard was younger than his brother, other factors compensated for his juniority. On the other hand, besides expressing Evelyn's affection, this action could also convey the expectation of the Christian norm that during crises, siblings should assist each other.[856]

Many factors could have influenced Richard's opinion of the operation and his refusal to act according to his brother's wishes. Doctors had ways of easing patients' reactions to surgery, such as hiding instruments or reassuring them of their skills. However, Mary Lindemann has indicated that some did not seek outside aid but rather the help of their family, for example, due to fear of, or aversion towards, surgeons. She has also explained that in early modern Europe, surgery imposed the risk of tetanus and infections and was usually painful. Furthermore, even in later centuries, it was generally accepted that a lithotomy required an experienced and talented surgeon.[857]

A variety of accidents and illnesses could happen quickly and without a warning and have an impact on the way siblings express their emotions and their connections to actions. Unexpected events could mean loss of control over a situation but also reflected the larger theme of not being able to have an influence over what happened to a sick sibling. Religious literature referred to as the *Ars Moriendi*, or the art of dying, commented on such accidents. The 15th century saw the emergence of manuals guiding in the *Ars Moriendi*, and Protestant writers continued upholding these traditions in the 17th century. The ideal death, according to the *Ars Moriendi*, would be peaceful and include prayer, the absence

---

[851] Ibid., 269.
[852] Ibid.
[853] Ibid.
[854] Ibid., 263, 265, 269.
[855] Evelyn 1908, 146; Evelyn 1915, 55–56, 61–62.
[856] Crawford 2004/2014, 218.
[857] Lindemann 1999, 206, 217; Stanley 2003, 30, 86; Walker 2015, 274. See also Tefekli & Cezayirli 2013.

of despair and fear, and the hope for a new life after death. The ideal death would happen in bed and follow the advice of the *Ars Moriendi*. Commentators warned against a disorderly death, such as an accident. At the same time, Reverend Richard Stretton also commented in his letter to Ralph Thoresby that although Thoresby's father died suddenly, he was prepared.[858]

Sudden death was something early modern people dreaded, as it would not leave time for a last visit. When dying, reaching a state that was emotionally and spiritually proper was considered crucial for the pious. Witnesses were typically needed for death to be ideal, as they were there to see the final moments and to hear the final words, in addition to assuring those close to the deceased that she or he had entered heaven. Sudden death meant that the dying person could not prepare properly. Other texts besides religious ones, such as those by news writer John Chamberlain, also commented on these issues. Dying suddenly was not regarded as a good death, especially if the deceased had acted rashly prior to the event. Of course, real life often differed from these ideals, and many deaths were disorderly. These included accidental deaths, deaths outside of the home, and deaths that occurred in one's own bed but without proper preparation.[859] William Perkins, a Protestant theologian, scholar, and very popular religious writer in England,[860] noted that if a person had prepared for death, dying suddenly was not necessarily bad.[861] When examined from this point of view, norms concerning ideal death were significant in emotion management and in dealing with feelings related to death. They could, at least partly, explain how siblings reacted to accidents. A sudden death was emotionally, of course, very different. Furthermore, these norms highlighted various dangers to health and their potential impact on the lives and emotions of all, not just those of the pious.

Sounds of sickness, like cries or vomiting, or witnessing suffering were described in many sources as eliciting compassionate reactions from both men and women.[862] Samuel Pepys, the eldest brother of four siblings from a middling-sort family,[863] was typically very much in control and accustomed to exercising power. A sudden bout of illness that he witnessed, however, was connected to a loss of agency. He did not generally express much affection towards his younger brothers and sister. However, when he saw his brother John was suddenly hurt, this prompted him to express emotions intensely and in a manner that could be seen as unusual to him and which appeared even to surprise him. Writing about a conversation he was having with John in February 1666/7, Pepys wrote the following:

> I looking another way heard him fall down, and turned my head, and he was fallen down all along upon the ground dead, which did put me into a great fright; and, to see my brotherly love! I did presently lift him up from the ground, he being as pale as

[858] Richard Stretton to Ralph Thoresby September 25, 1679, Letters of Eminent Men, Addressed to Ralph Thoresby 1832, 1, 3; Wunderli & Broce 1989, 264–265; Heinz 1999, 72–73; Harding 2013, 78.

[859] Harding 2013, 78; Weisser 2019, 103; Capp 2022, 10, 19.

[860] Patterson 2014, 3, 5.

[861] Perkins 1611, 32–33.

[862] Newton 2018, 116, 119.

[863] Hill 1985, 259; Capp 2018, 143.

death…he did presently come to himself, and said he had something come into his stomach very hot. He knew not what it was, nor ever had such a fit before. I never was so frighted … and I did continue trembling a good while and ready to weepe to see him, he continuing mighty pale all dinner and melancholy, that I was loth to let him take his journey tomorrow; but he began to be pretty well… and then home, and find my brother pretty well.[864]

While the help that Pepys gave his brother, for example, by lifting him up, was a way to express his emotions, he also conveyed his sadness through the action of trembling. Furthermore, he connected the fear the situation caused him to express to how he conveyed his love, as he saw that his brother's involuntary action influenced his emotional expression. Compared with the times when Pepys noted taking care of his sister Pall, which were more indicative of a sense of responsibility as the eldest brother rather than affection,[865] here, his concern, sympathy, actions, and opinions regarding his need to act in certain ways became intertwined with his expression of love.

While feelings were certainly seen as significant in men's lives as well, and they were discussed extensively in the normative literature,[866] the general thought was that men were more rational than women, which placed upon them the demand for emotional control. Lack of reason was a risk for manhood, but so was displaying weakness through exhibiting emotional distress, for example, by crying.[867] As Pepys's text displays, reality was typically more complex than expectations, as will also be apparent in the other cases examined in this section. A private diary may have given Pepys a chance to express emotions he could not convey *in situ*, with other people present. Even so, he did not note crying, but only almost doing so.

Even if brothers and sisters were unable to be present themselves, the inability to visit could be patched up by someone else going to see a sick sibling. This is also connected with emotional expression, as siblings could convey their feelings through someone else as a substitute for their presence. For siblings whose circumstances gave them a sense of duty towards their brothers and sisters, usually the elder ones,[868] this could be a way to fulfil these duties. For both older and younger siblings, such a visit could also help to uphold their mutual emotional connection. Furthermore, in the 1600s, the expectation was that the sick would be visited. This had religious, social, and physical implications; for example, if the visitor was too melancholic, it could have a negative impact on the recovery. People's expectations also had an impact, such as expressing pity properly and sincerely and giving the right amount attention.[869] The Anglican writer Richard Allestree also explained that, according to the virtue of charity, which included affection in its definition, the general expectation was to visit those who were imprisoned or ill.[870]

---

[864] Pepys 1893, February 7, 1666/7.
[865] Ibid., October 11, 1667.
[866] Korhonen 2005, 21.
[867] Foyster 1999, 30, 103.
[868] Crawford 2004/2014, 218; Capp 2018, 32, 72.
[869] Weisser 2015, 106, 108–111.
[870] Allestree 1659, 355–356.

Since the Anglican gentlewoman Alice Thornton was not able to be present herself when her brother John was sick, as she was far away in Yorkshire and he in London, she found other ways to help and fulfil expectations. Instead of going herself, she sent her son-in-law Mr Comber to visit her brother in 1666.[871] Thornton described how John asked Mr Comber to convey his affection for his sister and expressed gratefulness about her having sent him over. Furthermore, Thornton stated that John had also noted feeling better when he heard the news of his sister and expressed his wish to see her.[872] This helped John, as his love for her affected him physically, but her existence also helped him indirectly. Sending someone else over altered the power dynamics. While Mr Comber was, in a way, a vessel for Thornton's influence, his own presence affected the kind of impact his visit had, which reduced Thornton's agency over the situation. Although it is not clear whether her brother interpreted her action of sending Mr Comber as an emotional expression, the act was certainly tied to John's emotional expressions. Thornton did not describe Mr Comber as the recipient of John's conveyance of emotion, but rather as a replacement for her in this situation. It is, however, imperative to acknowledge that this was second-hand knowledge, with several possibilities for the interpretation of someone else's emotion to be impacted. Additionally, Thornton expected her descendants to read her autobiography,[873] which may have affected how she wrote about both her sister and brother.

Not all actions were necessarily difficult to do, even when grief led to inaction. After Samuel Pepys's brother Tom had died, he began on the next day, the 16th of March 1664, to take care of matters related to his brother's funeral.[874] He noted that although his "...heart [was] still heavy to think of [his] poor brother…"[875] he was still able to yield to his desire to go to listen to some music, although it ended up not pleasing him.[876] His sadness was, however, something that could potentially restrict, prevent, or otherwise affect his actions.[877] Even if he did attend this kind of entertainment, he also felt that he was not able to do everything in the same manner as before, depending on the nature of the action. As he explained, "…to my office, there to do a little business, but God knows my heart and head is so full of my brother's death and the consequences of it, that I can do very little or understand it".[878] His inaction was an expression of his sadness. At the same time, he was in a position to be able to change his routine, in part due to his financial status, which gave him agency. His reaction was thus not necessarily possible for all siblings and highlighted his privileged position within the family and society. Finally, for Pepys, witnessing with his own eyes a

---

[871] C.J. 1875, xiii.
[872] Thornton 1875, 159–160.
[873] Capp 2018, 161.
[874] Pepys 1893, March 16, 1663/4.
[875] Ibid.
[876] Ibid.
[877] The effect of sadness on the ability to act is seen in other contexts as well. John Evelyn describes how grief affected a husband who mourned the loss of his wife. He notes that because the grief he felt was so great, he could not go on a long journey from London to Cornwall (Evelyn 1908, 314–315). This trip would only be possible after the husband had his sadness under control (Evelyn 1908, 315).
[878] Pepys 1893, March 16, 1663/4.

particular event, such as a death or, as noted earlier, an accident,[879] was the factor which led him to contemplate his inability and to note his inaction. In this case, he remarked two days later, "…I had real grief for a while, while he was in my sight, yet presently after, and ever since, I have had very little grief indeed for him".[880]

At other times, siblings expressed emotions by highlighting failed future actions. In this case, the emotions expressed could be connected to disappointment. William Stout's brothers Richard and Thomas, who were ten and five, died after contracting smallpox in 1680.[881] Stout described how Richard's "...death very much affected me…",[882] because he had hoped that Richard would have become an assistant to him, or the other way around, after Stout's apprenticeship was finished.[883] Stout was somewhat vague about expressing his emotions. Indeed, for men, expressions of grief, such as tears, and conveying feelings in general, were supposed to be controlled. While grief was acceptable to convey, some saw publicly expressed or unrestrained grief as improper for men.[884] Not all agreed with this, instead approving of more freely and intensely expressed emotions. However, most members of the elites nevertheless followed the expectation of moderation.[885] Although Stout was a middling sort, this normative context could have influenced his text. Stout's notion of that the death of his brothers affected him conveyed his emotions and conveyed some of the practical consequences. Here, his failed future action was tied to how he expressed emotions, and the way in which he conveyed his emotion was focused on himself, as he had lost the help or co-operation his brother could have given him. While an emotional attachment could have influenced how he expressed himself, he also lost agency as an elder brother over his younger brother, with whom he could have had a beneficial relationship. Regardless of who would have acted as the assistant to which brother, Stout would still have enjoyed the advantage that his seniority brought.

Occasionally, because of present inaction, men and women needed to encourage or appeal to their brothers or sisters to act. These appeals and the concrete ways of attempting to influence siblings could highlight and convey connected emotions. For example, emphasising a wish for a sibling to act in a certain way while expressing an emotion connected the action and the emotion. The linkage drew attention to the emotion and brought more power to the expression. Some helped the dying out of the goodness of their hearts, while others did it for their own gain, for example, to influence the will.[886] Furthermore, the dying person could use the emotions expressed, such as affection, as a reason to make changes to a testament, or to express affection by giving a sibling a part

---

[879] Pepys 1893, February 7, 1666/7.
[880] Pepys 1893, March 18, 1663/4.
[881] Stout 1851, 9.
[882] Ibid., 10.
[883] Ibid., 9–10.
[884] Capp 2014, 82, 88.
[885] Ibid., 89.
[886] Houlbrooke 1984, 202.

of the inheritance.[887] The dying sibling could also be helped on the spiritual side, for example, by reading the Bible and praying.[888] Besides indirect ways of influencing the dying concerning the will, siblings could use the eldest brother and his power within the sibling hierarchy as an intermediary to make an impact.

John Bramston, a lawyer born in 1611 who was knighted in 1661, described his younger brother Francis's death in 1683 and explained how his sisters conveyed their emotions about these matters. When his sisters noted that Francis might not have made a will, Bramston acted quickly and asked his brother to make one[889]:

> When I came my sisters told me they feared he had made noe will, and desired me to moue him to it, which I did that night, first askeing him for his will... I tould him there were two things he must not denie me, one, as he was a good Christian, the other as a wise man, which were to take the communion, the other to make his will...[890]

The sisters were able to express themselves quite directly, which may have been facilitated by the nature of their relationship with Branston or his personality. Bramston's position and agency as the eldest brother may have impacted the effectiveness of the plea and caused him to be chosen to convey it in the first place. Considering his position and the fact that their mother and father had died many years earlier,[891] Branston had certain duties towards his siblings, which may have made it easier for them to appeal to him directly in this matter.

In some cases, inaction was less connected to sickness than to what was best for the siblings overall. For example, emotions could be expressed by highlighting neglected duties. Henry Newcome, a revenant who lived in Manchester,[892] noted in his diary on November 9th, 1661 that he had written to his younger sister Rose. He expressed sadness and indicated that he felt he should have taken the time to sit down with her to have a serious conversation. He added, "Someth: I might have said that might have done her good".[893] This also reflected how he felt he possessed the ability to have an impact on her life, or at least should have tried to, which, in turn, may have tied in with his position within the sibling hierarchy and the responsibilities he had. Thus, his expression of sadness was tied either to the role he felt he had as an elder brother or to his work as a minister. The quotation suggests that he saw this way of using power as the elder brother to attempt to influence his sister as something that could have a positive effect on her life, and thus regarded his own emotional expression as connected to this.

Siblings often described the way in which they helped their sick brothers and sisters by simply noting that they had visited them, sometimes specifically indicating the length of time they had stayed, as was the case with Elizabeth Freke. This could, especially in connection with emotional expressions and other

---

[887] Lahtinen 2021, 80, 89.
[888] Houlbrooke 1984, 202–203.
[889] Braybrooke 1845, viii–x; Bramston 1845, 29–33.
[890] Ibid., 32.
[891] Ibid., 34; Braybrooke 1845, viii.
[892] Newcome 1852, 106–107; Parkinson 1852, xiii–xiv.
[893] Newcome 1849, 17.

actions, be a way of expressing and highlighting their feelings. While there were expectations of norms and even potential benefits of helping sick siblings due to reciprocity, emotional expressions were also part of all this. Although Alice Thornton's sick sister, Lady Danby, promised to repay assistance with emotional expressions, siblings like William Stout also helped without any material benefit, continuing to assist sick siblings even when they could not be repaid. Lady Danby eventually passed without repaying her sister, and indeed, it is probable that Thornton did not help her sister out of a desire for material gain but instead out of love. Norms and duties could also influence such behaviours, of course, and so could hierarchical structures.

Inaction and inability were significant themes as well. Inability and inaction could be ways and reasons to express emotions, and siblings could note their inability to act, or a failed future action caused by death, as discussed by Stout, which highlighted emotions and the loss of a relationship with clear power differences. Writing about inaction due to death could convey certain emotions, including grief, as was the case with Pepys when his brother died. Pepys's diary also demonstrates how loss of control could be connected with sudden illnesses, while John Evelyn's text shows an inability to influence a sibling to get help for her or his sickness and its connection to emotional expressions and agency. The latter example also shows that when a younger brother was well off, he could often act as he pleased, especially when the commanding elder brother was not the eldest sibling. On the other hand, it was possible to send someone else to visit a sick sibling. By acting in this manner, Alice Thornton gained the opportunity to exert agency over her sick sibling, while also losing some of it by not being present herself. Brothers and sisters could also appeal to their siblings to act to emphasise various existing emotions, as John Bramston's case demonstrates.

CONCLUSION

Siblings, emotions, and actions – in other words, different emotional practices – were connected to each other and to the normative context, as well as notions of duty, reciprocity, expectations, and agency. These factors influenced all the themes examined in this chapter. The four main ways to express emotions through actions explored in this chapter were helping, visiting, correspondence and caring for the sick. Besides helping itself often being an expression of affection, it could at the same time be used to get help. Siblings could use affection in connection with the action of helping to exert influence. Helping was most often possible for elder siblings, although younger ones acted in this manner as well,[894] thereby conveying their affection.

While this chapter has also examined other emotions, love was a very significant conveyed emotion. The place of sincere affection should not be downplayed. Nevertheless, earlier research has drawn attention to how affection and hierarchy were connected to family history. As was evident in relationships between married couples or between parents and their children, for example,

---

[894] Capp 2018, 36.

love existed in connection with hierarchy. Love both contributed to the construction of hierarchies and existed within them in the early modern period. Influencing this was the fact that hierarchy, order, and society, as well as other factors, such as class, gender, and honour, within these categories had great cultural significance in early modern England. This fundamentally reflected the belief that God held power over all, including control over the lives of individuals.[895] God, furthermore, was the most important force when it came to love. Minister James Janeway noted in a biography of his brother John that God should be loved more than family, as He was "…most worthy of [it]…".[896] For the pious, this could inform the way in which they attempted to construct their relationships and how they tried to focus their emotions. Affection was often significant in influencing how siblings acted. However, even if a relationship was loving, that did not mean it was equal, or that the emotion would lead to equality. Such sustained inequality was also the lens through the early modern person viewed the relationship between affection and hierarchy.[897] This observation highlights the fact that while affection could, in some ways, even out inequalities and give those not in power opportunities for control, it was still very much tied to hierarchies.

While duties, norms, and emotions had an influence, too, elder brothers were mostly in a better hierarchical position than their younger counterparts, which gave them agency. The elder siblings examined here mostly acted from the position of the helper, and they either gave orders or had the chance to do so, regardless of whether the younger siblings obeyed them. The eldest brothers examined provided different examples of how their agency and affection could be tied together. For example, Henry Newcome's elder brothers took care of their younger siblings in place of their parents, adapted their lives accordingly, and described their mutual affection. The older brothers expressed their affection through helping by making sure that the younger siblings abided by their duties. Henry Oxinden's uncle James explicitly noted that affection was the reason why he guided his younger brother on how properly to write to their father. Some used affection to highlight what they wanted. Henry Oxinden appealed to the affection of his brother James to persuade him to act according to Henry's wishes. Of course, this did not mean that Henry acted in this way just to gain a benefit for himself. At the same time, unexpected assistance could also be interpreted as being connected to emotional expressions, as was the case with Henry Osborne and his sister Dorothy.

Even if siblings were not highly placed within the family hierarchy, they still had agency and the opportunity to express affection through helping. However, this could take the form of persuasion rather than giving orders. The younger siblings examined here provided examples of how siblings in this situation could act and how emotional expressions helped them gain agency. Younger siblings like James Oxinden attempted to use the affection expressed by

[895] Korhonen 2002, 58, 64; Lahtinen 2021, 82–83.
[896] Janeway 1674, 34.
[897] Korhonen 2002, 68–71; Lahtinen 2021, 90.

the eldest brother to get help and thus gain agency over the actions of that brother. On the other hand, Henry Newcome attempted to influence the reader of his autobiography by highlighting that he had followed his duties and acted well to maintain an emotional connection with his siblings. In Mary Evelyn's case, her agency was also connected to dutiful behaviour. Gift giving highlighted the agency of the gifter, in Evelyn's case an elder brother, but also the fact that a sibling with less influence could gain agency by responding to reciprocity and acting properly.

Katie Barclay has shown that men in leadership positions were expected to act according to the expectation of rule with benevolence, while those in subordinate positions expressed affection in connection with gratitude, duty and obedience.[898] This was true for the siblings examined in Section 4.1 as well, but the cases there also highlight how siblings expressed emotions through helping, how elder siblings used their positions to their advantage, and how younger siblings also possessed agency. The cases underscore the differing positions attributable to age and the influence of age differences on how siblings could approach helping. However, it is crucial to remember that both elder and younger siblings had opportunities for control and action, and that affection could aid in these endeavours. The role of sincere affection and its potential impact on actions should also not be forgotten. Taking intersectionality into consideration highlights the multitude of contexts that could increase or inhibit the agency of these siblings.

As earlier research has discovered, visiting and writing letters could constitute expressions of emotion as such.[899] A closer examination has, however, revealed more nuances in how siblings expressed or highlighted their emotions and how these actions were connected to duties and expectations in sibling relationships. The cases examined in this study have revealed the ways in which visiting could influence agency, how visiting could be used to gain agency, how a powerful position in a sibling hierarchy could be used to restrict visiting, and how acting against the rules that governed visiting or reluctantly accepting a visit could express emotions. Furthermore, expectations could influence and be used to influence siblings. Visiting was not always desirable, as a sibling with more influence could limit it. Expectations of proper behaviour could demand compliance, even from siblings with more power, but when a sibling did not want visitors, accepting a visit could be a way to express affection. This did not mean that the sibling being visited lacked ways to impose boundaries. Henry Oxinden's letters to his brother James highlight this. At the same time, a surprise visit, like the one described by Henry Newcome, might not ensure that these kinds of limits could be maintained. Some siblings preferred visiting to correspondence. Visiting, living near each other, or living together, as William and Elin Stout did, could affect agency by changing the roles of the siblings and thereby influencing their emotional expressions. Henry Newcome's

---

[898] Barclay 2020, 80.
[899] Glover 2000, 49–50; Broomhall & Van Gent 2009, 147.

autobiography describes how conveying a desire to live near a sibling could, in addition to practical considerations, be understood as an expression of affection.

The section on letters explained how letters were significant to siblings and explored the ways in which they attempted to maintain correspondence, or revive it, with the help of emotional expressions. Highlighting the significance of mutual correspondence, as was done in the letters of James Howell and the father of the Oxinden brothers, Richard Oxinden, could convey emotions and set expectations about the continuity of the letter-writing. Much of the section focused on examining the case of Thomas Meautys and his sister Jane Cornwallis. While Meautys did not possess much power over his sister, he still had opportunities to try to influence her, with the help of emotional expressions, for example. Like Howell and Oxinden, Meautys valued correspondence, as became apparent from his defending himself against Cornwallis's accusations of not writing and his criticising of his sister for not writing either. Writing to his sister about not getting letters was an attempt to exert influence over how she acted.

Taking care of a sick sibling was connected to duties and reciprocities in several ways. Caring for an ill sibling without gaining much in return could highlight affection, for instance, when a reciprocal relationship became more one-sided because of a sibling's illness, as was the case when William Stout's sister became ill. Still, duties could also have an impact, of course. Furthermore, Alice Thornton's visit to her sick sister, Lady Danby, demonstrates how a promise of reciprocity from an ill person in return for being cared for could be tied to emotional expressions and further highlight the significance of reciprocity.

In addition to action being an expression of emotions, inaction and inability were recurring themes, especially in sending letters and caring for the sick. Inability was also mentioned in connection with the inability to respond to help in a concrete manner. Furthermore, a surprise visit might lead to some sense of loss of agency. Regularity in correspondence could be expected, and thus not writing often enough or drawing attention to that fact could express emotions and connect with expectations and duties, as Thomas Meautys did in his letters. Actions such as expressing disappointment about the current state of a relationship while highlighting past affection or portraying oneself as an example of proper letter writing and emotional expression could be used to attempt to exert influence. Loss of control was an overarching theme in taking care of siblings in a variety of contexts. Samuel Pepys's diary shows how a bout of illness had an impact on the emotional expressions between siblings. Issues related to inability and inaction could also contribute to a perceived loss of agency. Relevant examples covered here include sending someone else to visit a sibling instead of going oneself, as Alice Thornton did, conveying emotions through an inability to act, such as when Henry Newcome described his reaction to a sibling's sickness, or highlighting failed future action, as when William Stout wrote about the passing away of his little brother and of his plans for their future.

5   AVOIDING, CHANGING, AND REPLACING EMOTIONAL EXPRESSIONS

Linda A. Pollock has noted that early modern English letter writers did not often apologise for expressing anger; rather, the social context gave them room to feel justified in conveying the emotion.[900] She also found that early modern English letter writers did not criticise each other for expressing anger.[901] However, in daily life, it was considered honourable to be harmonious, practice moderation, and be ready to reconcile disputes.[902] Between siblings, it was occasionally necessary to take preventative measures to attempt to avoid being the target of expressions of anger, to appease when avoiding anger was not possible, or to apologise. While many of the cases examined in this chapter were connected with anger, other emotions, such as affection and sadness, were also mentioned.

The focus of Chapter 3 was on persons being offended, taking part in disagreements, and reminding others of their shortcomings. This chapter, in contrast, will emphasise the actions of the offender. It will focus on the means that siblings used to calm situations down and to attempt to prevent arguments rather than discussing disputes that were already ongoing. Section 3.2 covered some instances that touch on the themes of this chapter, but there, the focus lay mostly on sisters as participants in disagreements rather than on how they tried to avoid arguments or to make them disappear.

In this chapter, I will examine the writings of James and Henry Oxinden, William and Thomas Booth, Samuel Pepys, Constance Fowler and her brothers, Henry Newcome, Dorothy Osborne, Alice Thornton, Thomas Meautys, and John Evelyn between the years 1627 and 1684.[903] Specifically, I will examine the ways in which siblings expressed themselves with the aim of avoiding, changing, and replacing emotional expressions, and how these actions connected more broadly

---

[900] Pollock 2004, 581.
[901] Ibid., 586. Pollock refers to evidence found in various letters (Pollock 2004, 586).
[902] Pollock 2007, 29.
[903] Thomas Meautys to Jane Bacon July 2, 1627, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 180–182.

to sibling relationships. The focus will lie not on how siblings conveyed their feelings but on how siblings could prevent or change how emotions would be expressed. I will emphasise what brothers and sisters could do to affect how their siblings expressed their emotions and how this connected to power. I will examine different strategies that siblings used to avoid becoming the target of expressions of anger or further escalating a conflict by appeasing other siblings. I will also analyse how they forgave and apologised to each other. While the chapter will examine how siblings acted before disagreements and how they attempted to end them, it will not be limited to discussing quarrels alone. Rather, I will also consider acts of consolation between siblings as a way to attempt to replace emotions and the ways in which these different actions were connected to power and duty. I will examine situations that had the potential to escalate into mutual or one-sided expressions of anger and resentment. All of these dimensions were connected to the ways in which many men and women lower in the sibling hierarchy could try to exert influence when a more direct approach was not possible. A more indirect approach could be considered necessary in various situations that could have the potential to escalate, depending on individual contexts.

5.1   Avoiding being the target of expressions of anger

Lisbeth Geussens has remarked on how the 18th-century Merode siblings from the Austrian Netherlands wrote about their expectations of harmony and solidarity.[904] Indeed, not all siblings wanted to engage in quarrels; rather, many did what they could to avoid them. While attempting to avoid being the target of expressions of anger could be done by the siblings themselves highlighting concord, this was not a common theme among the writers of the primary sources used in this dissertation. In this section, I will examine how siblings expressed themselves to avoid becoming the targets of particular emotional expressions and how these actions connected to power relations. I will consider the effect of age by noting how not only younger but also older siblings relied on these strategies. The situations examined here were ones where there was clear potential for disagreements rather than those where siblings simply acted or expressed emotions in a certain way to maintain a close relationship.

John Downame, a Puritan writer, explained that it was better to prevent than to cure anger. This could be done, for example, by acting according to the virtue of charity, having sympathy, being humble and patient, avoiding angry people, and not doing too many things at the same time.[905] The language used and the emotions expressed were both significant as siblings navigated through potentially perilous waters. While expressing affection was a strategy for maintaining relationships between siblings, attempting to avoid anger could also

---

[904] Geussens 2022, 158.
[905] Downame 1600, 60–62, 66, 71.

function in this way. Furthermore, the normative context influenced how siblings expressed their frustrations while avoiding anger. Attempting to avoid being the target of emotional expressions was also connected to emotives and sincerity.

Religious normative texts highlighted what emotions were acceptable and in what way by, for example, giving advice on how to act, how to convey emotions to avoid anger, or how to feel or express it less intensely. The Anglican writer Richard Allestree highlighted the role of the virtue of meekness, or "...patience, and gentleness towards all…",[906] connecting it to reason and control and describing it as a duty defined in opposition to anger. He also connected the virtue of charity, in part, to upholding meekness and peacefulness, which would promote an unwillingness or inability to quarrel. Additionally, virtue of charity would make a person less likely to make faults seem bigger than they were or to see faults where there were none.[907]

It is often not possible to determine whether the influence, agency, or control that siblings could gain from writing in a certain manner was intentional. Furthermore, the conventions of the letter-writing genre, as well as broader social norms, could greatly influence the contents. Nevertheless, James Oxinden was more direct than most in his two letters sent in 1635 and 1636. He noted that writing in a certain way could be effective, even if his brother knew that he was attempting to influence his actions and emotions. In a letter sent in 1635 to his eldest brother Henry, he reflected on whether the letters he sent were having any effect.[908] A year later, he asked for money: "Let not (I pray you) my not forceable writing unto you make you weake in sending to me, for I protest I have had soe much bloud taken from mee that I am scarse able to write at all".[909] James recognised the influence his words could have. It is possible that the mutual affection that the brothers had expressed[910] helped James approach the topic in this manner, despite writing to his eldest brother. Expressing certain emotions, such as anger, could be difficult for a person due to the influence of age, gender, or rank. Writing about emotions in letters could, however, help with the process, as discussing difficult topics might be easier in letters due to the distance correspondence had and created and because of the emotional intimacy that letters could create.[911]

DIRECT APPROACHES

As discussed in Chapter 3, younger siblings also expressed anger towards their elder siblings. Similarly, the eldest brothers could respond to anger with attempts to resolve the situation, just as younger siblings often did. Henry Oxinden's less

---

[906] Allestree 1659, 266.
[907] Ibid., 150–153, 266, 331–332, 335–336.
[908] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden April 1, 1635, 102.
[909] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden April 3, 1636, 113.
[910] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden September 15, 1629, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 48; James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden January 14, 1632, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 82; Henry Oxinden to James Oxinden letter draft, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 119.
[911] Broomhall & Van Gent 2009, 147.

intense chastisement examined in Chapter 3 hinted at this, but that case reflected Henry's current disappointment with how his brother had acted. However, Henry also tried to avoid conflict with his brother. According to a letter written by James Oxinden, his eldest brother Henry did not want him to come home from university in 1632, as it would have been against the wishes of the family and, therefore, sadden their mother. James agreed to this and assured his brother that he would not want to anger his family or cause grief.[912] Rather than Henry avoiding the anger expressed to him, he helped James avoid causing it in the first place. As James's response suggested, both parties acted in ways that could help avoid conflict. Henry was direct in reminding James of the consequences his unwanted actions would have. His directness highlighted his position as the eldest brother. In addition, Henry's mention of their mother was a way to channel her authority as a parent and further incline James to obey.

A direct approach could also help younger siblings try to dissuade the eldest brother from believing that they felt anger. In this way, a younger sibling could attempt to influence her or his older sibling's perception of her or him and try to avoid appearing in a negative light, thus minimising the likelihood that the eldest brother would respond to anger with anger. Furthermore, siblings could remind each other of the emotions they expected their siblings to express and attempt to influence this. At the same time, such an effort highlighted what emotions were expected or valued. James Oxinden threatened in 1632 to remove expressions of affection from his relationship with his eldest brother Henry by remarking that if Henry thought he felt disdain, he would not believe he had ever felt affection for him.[913] This placed the fault on Henry rather than portraying the situation as James's choice, which, in turn, could help influence how Henry conveyed his emotions and therefore also impact his actions. When Henry chastised James, he too discussed affection, but by threatening to take the emotional expression back if James did not act properly.[914] I discussed this case in Chapter 3. While siblings could indeed directly warn against expressions of anger or disagreements, more subtle approaches were also taken.

SYMPATHY

Younger siblings could attempt to avoid being the target of expressions of anger by appealing to sympathy or, in other words, acknowledging the possibility that words might hurt or cause anger. They could also appeal to the recipient's sense of duty while attempting to justify their own actions. Furthermore, appeals to sympathy could be used to highlight need and distress. This could also be a way to acknowledge the younger sibling's lower position and to act according to the expectations established for that position by speaking in a humble manner. Further highlighting a lower position in the sibling hierarchy and acknowledging

---

[912] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden January 14, 1632, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 82.
[913] Ibid., 81–82.
[914] Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 114.

the other person's higher standing could be another way to avoid anger. Depending on the situation, appealing to sympathy could also constitute a part of the appeasement process.

William Booth wrote in a letter sent to his elder brother John in 1628 that he had borrowed money from his cousin and hoped his brother would pay this back. He recognised that John might not react to this news well emotionally: "…I would not haue beene soe troblesome vnto you, had not my want requiered it, therefore I preay you be not angrie, let me intreate you to remember my love and servis to all at Morton Overton…"[915] This could remind John of the expectation to help siblings who needed it[916] and appeal to a sense of duty that this expectation and his apparently superior financial position could create. The letter's wording also pointed out that William was aware of both the emotional and practical reciprocity that came with the help. Furthermore, he attempted to influence the kind of emotional reaction his elder brother would have. William did not just refer to his brother's duties but also wrote about his urgent need,[917] which could be interpreted as an appeal to his brother's sympathy. In addition, the letter highlighted that William had no choice and, therefore, was not the one to blame, which indicated an intention to sympathise with his brother for causing trouble with this request.

Individual situations determined the specifics of how siblings could write in this manner. While Booth had subtly hinted at not being the one to blame, other younger brothers could make similar points more aggressively, appealing to sympathy to avoid being the target of expressions of anger while also attempting to get help. James Oxinden wrote in a somewhat similar manner to Booth when he appealed to his eldest brother Henry's sympathy to get help and maintain their emotional relationship in 1632. James, who depended on Henry's help, noted that he felt he needed to write because of his difficult financial situation. In the first part of the letter, he expressed himself in a desperate manner, but he also conveyed subtle frustration, irritation, and similar emotions.[918] He also hinted that this situation was his brother's fault:

> …this I am sure they cannot bee more greife to you to reade them then to mee to write, and were not my fortunes call'd in question I would not soe farre passe the bounds of modesty as to be soe urgent with you… let it bee lawfull for mee at this time to use those words which before I thought unlawfull… if you doe not at this time with a more gentle winde blow more favorable uppon mee, I looke not but to bee for ever to be drownde in the sea of dispaire, being allready allmost oute of hope to repaire that which I have lost by your delaying ; and surely if you had but knowne how much it did stande uppon yours and mine one credit, you could have beene more carefull to supply my wants… [919]

In a very similar letter written a few years later, in 1635, James also directly noted that his letters had not succeeded in appealing to his brother's compassion.[920]

---

[915] William Booth to John Booth September 28, 1628, F.c.12, Folger Shakespeare Library.
[916] Crawford 2004/2014, 218; Capp 2018, 32.
[917] William Booth to John Booth September 28, 1628, F.c.12, Folger Shakespeare Library.
[918] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden 1632, 81–82.
[919] Ibid., 81.
[920] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden April 1, 1635, 102–103.

This letter shared some similarities with Henry Oxinden's chastising of James, which was examined in Chapter 3, as both attempted to influence each other's actions. Nevertheless, Henry was quite direct in writing about James's bad behaviour and hinted at his anger.[921] It is true that a level of frustration appears to shine through James's text as well, but his attempts to keep Henry from expressing anger towards him were nevertheless more important and more emphasised. These nuances highlight differences in the hierarchical positions of the brothers and their influence on emotional expressions.

By describing how difficult the situation was in a lively manner, James could appeal to his brother's sympathy and attempt to justify the way he wrote. Besides diverting blame from himself, he also carefully directed it towards his brother. The tone in which he wrote was not simply accusatory; after all, he would not have gained anything from angering his brother, but rather intended to be understanding and sympathetic. Of course, this had the potential to have an impact and to be quite persuasive. Furthermore, James's and Henry's mutual affection made it more likely that James could take this approach and expect his brother to answer with emotional expressions that did not endanger their relationship. While Booth hinted at his lower position in his own letter, James Oxinden highlighted this point even more. For example, in the letter discussed above, James asked his eldest brother Henry to allow him to write as he did, begged him to see his request in a good light, and acknowledged that the way he wrote might not be proper.[922] The letter also referred to James's understanding of expectations and norms, pointing to the wider normative context of sibling relations and letter-writing conventions concerning respect in the use of language.

Making compromises and helping even when it was not profitable or materially advantageous was a way for siblings to navigate their way through situations that had the potential to turn tense or hostile if not handled correctly. Men and women could face situations in which it was necessary to determine whether it was more beneficial to focus on their own situation or to concentrate on upholding the sibling relationship. Sympathy, affection, and the need to remain on friendly terms could also affect such choices. Thomas Booth acknowledged in a letter to his brother John Booth in 1684 that their uncle had left him £20 in his will but had not given anything to his brother Charles. He wrote, "…itt will bee taken kindly if I give him something [that] was his…"[923] This ambiguous phrase could be interpreted as hinting at the outside pressure for him to give some of the money to his brother or refer to Charles' anticipated reaction to receiving the money. Thomas also discussed how he hoped Charles would react: "...tell my Br[other] Charles I hope hee and I shall not differ & what hee has a mind too hee shall find mee very reasonable to gratifie him w[i]th".[924] This also hinted at his understanding of the potential of the situation to create

---

[921] Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden March 5, 1636/7, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 119.
[922] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden 1632, 81.
[923] Thomas Booth to John Booth September 9, 1684, F.c.20, Folger Shakespeare Library.
[924] Ibid.

differences between the brothers. Acting in this manner could also help siblings promote others' impressions of them as generous and thoughtful. Compared with William Booth and James Oxinden, Thomas Booth's case highlighted anger to a lesser extent, but it still exemplifies the situation's potential to create disagreements.

The conventions of letter-writing influenced how James Oxinden, as well as William and Thomas Booth, wrote to their siblings. These conventions impacted the content of the correspondence, especially the greetings at the beginning and the end of the letters. The contents of letters could also be based on established models, and matters could be discussed according to standard themes. The formality, the form of the letters, and the amount of deference included in them varied depending on for whom and for what purpose they were written.[925] James Oxinden and William and Thomas Booth could write in ways that had the potential to influence and give them agency, even if various conventions and norms influenced how they wrote their letters. A more direct expression of emotions or downright rudeness might also be dangerous to the writer's reputation, considering the potential for complete outsiders to get hold of the letter.[926] Still, not all correspondence was polite, as we will now see.

TRUTH AND LIES

Honour and truth were themes that intertwined with many others already discussed, specifically in connection with expectations on the normative level. Honour was defined as being linked to reputation and an internal consciousness of integrity, while gentility could be understood as consisting of a certain social position and behaviour that was virtuous. Truthfulness, furthermore, was associated with gentility and honour. Honesty thus did not just involve telling the truth, but included other qualities as well, such as respectability, probity, being just, and honour. The general belief was that gentlemen were truthful and that their words were the only confirmation needed to accept what they stated. Disbelief vis-à-vis such a person could signal that his position as a gentleman was not accepted, while believing him could be a way to honour him. Some might have taken advantage of this presumed trust to push the truth in various directions and influence the knowledge of others.[927]

Various normative texts reminded gentlemen of the need to remain honest and of what would happen to liars, but in reality, the situation was not as straightforward. While it is impossible to know who and how many were actually telling the truth, the early modern view was that English gentlemen were in fact not as honest and virtuous as the normative literature presumed. To be sure, certain exigencies concerning gentlemen's activities on the public stage were thought to exist, such as the need for them to adapt their behaviour to suit

---

[925] Whyman 2009, 21–23; Sarasti-Wilenius 2011, 122–123, 125. Raija Sarasti-Wilenius, for example, discusses how boys from a 17th-century Swedish family learned how to write letters (Sarasti–Wilenius 2011, 114, 122–128).
[926] Letters might, for example, be intercepted while in transit (Earle 2016, 4).
[927] Hobbes 1651, 77; Shapin 1994, 65–67, 70.

the situation, which could justify acting somewhat differently from expectations. For example, while the normative texts did not recommend superiors lying to inferiors, superiors might nevertheless be able to act as they pleased. Thus, in reality, the expectation to tell the truth was contingent upon the wider social setting.[928]

Similarly, younger siblings might not disclose all information. James C. Scott has noted that while a subordinate might have accepted a superior chastising them in a respectful manner, he or she would talk about the situation very differently with their equals. He used the term "hidden transcript" to indicate discourses of people in subordinate positions that those in power were not able to observe. However, this did not necessarily mean that what subordinates said behind the backs of those in power reflected freedom and authenticity. According to Scott, the "public transcript", in turn, referred to the need of those in subordinate positions to act amicably or in ways the superior expected because of fear, caution, or desiring something from them.[929]

Despite the significance of honesty, younger siblings could attempt to avoid anger by trying not to divulge information that could lead to expressions of anger. The consequences of a secret being revealed could be catastrophic, but taking the risk could be worth it for some, as acting in this way could provide freedom to behave and express emotions in ways that would not necessarily be possible otherwise. Still, as the risk could be high, men and women who did not rely heavily on their siblings or had some other means of getting by if the relationship turned sour could have better opportunities to take this approach. Furthermore, as women had fewer chances in life than men and therefore also fewer opportunities to find other means to take care of themselves in case they lost financial support, they might have been less likely to act in this way. Siblings could also rely on each other while leaving out others. This could be especially relevant to younger siblings and their relationships with their eldest brothers or other siblings with the power to exert influence over their lives. This could, for example, be a way to balance the younger siblings' own needs and the eldest brothers' orders by finding ways to act and express emotions more in accordance with the younger ones' wishes.

In the normative context, lying was indeed seen in a negative light overall, although the term did not usually refer to all kinds of untruths.[930] Apart from outright lies, depending on the situation, secrecy could be understood as either benign or harmful. Dissimulation, in turn, referred to intentionally withholding the truth, while simulation was the same, but entailed an utterance or action that was positive.[931] For example, Francis Bacon remarked, "Dissimulation is but a faint kind of Policy, or Wisdome… it is the weaker Sort of Politicks that are the great Dissemblers".[932] According to Bacon, simulation, on the other hand, was

---

[928] Shapin 1994, 70, 101–103.
[929] Scott 1990, 2, 4–5, 115.
[930] Shapin 1994, 106.
[931] Bacon 1908, 15; Shapin 1994, 103.
[932] Bacon 1908, 14.

"…a Vice, rising either of a naturall Falsenesse or Fearefulnesse…"[933] He also suggested that both made a person not be trusted, and that it was best to be open.[934] In this vein, Samuel Pepys's diary revealed his negative reaction to finding out that his siblings had kept secrets from him in several instances.

Pepys was a strict eldest brother to his three siblings, who were usually not in the position to talk back to him. However, it is important to remember that Pepys's diary offers only his perspective on how his siblings acted. Pepys wrote about his anger upon discovering that his brothers John and Tom had criticised him in their private correspondence in 1663/4.[935] He described how they were "…carrying on plots against me to promote Tom's having of his Banbury' Mistress, in base slighting terms…"[936] This referred to a possible match for a wife they had considered for Tom, whom Pepys considered at this point to be unacceptable.[937] Even though we do not have access to the letters, it is evident that they provided a way for John and Tom to describe their feelings about their eldest brother and to pursue matters he had rejected, while at the same time avoiding angering him. Pepys's tendency to react to behaviour that he did not approve of with a strict chastisement might have led to this. Furthermore, the general understanding was that expressions of anger about unacceptable behaviour by the head of the household were justifiable.[938] This could have influenced the way in which Pepys's siblings reacted to his anger, at least to his face, as they could not have accused him of acting wrongly according to the prevailing norms, which, in turn, could have led to keeping secrets. They did not necessarily accept their brother's action, however, as their talking behind Pepys's back suggested. This was a way for the younger brothers to exercise freedom from their brother's influence. While the potential for letters not to be private could mean that some people chose to write in a careful and polite manner, this was clearly not the route everyone took. Still, Pepys's case demonstrates how the latter choice could risk causing friction. However, as the contents of Tom's and John's letters are not known, the degree of their impoliteness is unclear.

The Puritan writer John Downame advised that chastising too much and punishing every little matter too severely would make inferiors better in hiding their faults or shamelessly defending them.[939] The younger brothers' behaviour during the incident discussed above and Pepys's enthusiasm for chastising his siblings[940] reflect Downame's advice. At the same time, the normative literature also expressed how open a gentleman should be. For example, Richard Brathwaite, the writer of the conduct book *The English Gentleman*, published in 1630, warned a man operating in a public setting about being too open.[941] As there could be situations in which withholding the truth was acceptable in the

---

[933] Bacon 1908, 16.
[934] Ibid., 17.
[935] Pepys 1893, March 19–21, 1663/4.
[936] Ibid., March 20, 1663/4.
[937] Ibid., December 21, 1662.
[938] Pollock 2004, 582.
[939] Downame 1600, 51.
[940] For example, Pepys 1893, August 25, 1661.
[941] Brathwaite 1630, 137; Shapin 1994, 105–106.

normative sense, while lying was seen in a more negative light overall, it is possible that this also had an impact on how Pepys's brothers reacted or what they saw as appropriate themselves.

While Chapter 3 focused on ongoing disagreements and direct and indirect expressions of anger, this section has discussed the times before quarrels. A variety of situations had the potential to turn sour and could require acting in certain ways and expressing emotions to avoid becoming the target of expressions of anger or similar feelings. While attempting to avoid expressions of anger could be beneficial for many siblings lower in the hierarchy, in particular situations, elder brothers, too, could take this approach, even if they had the power to express themselves more freely compared with their younger siblings. This was apparent in Henry Oxinden's letters, in which he warned his younger brother, James, against coming home. On this occasion, James agreed not to anger their family. On the other hand, James could be direct in avoiding expressions of anger, too. For instance, he wrote to Henry that he should not believe that James felt disdain. More subtle approaches were also possible. Appealing to sympathy gave chances for siblings in lower hierarchical positions to avoid expressions of anger. James Oxinden was again direct in noting that he was not able to appeal to Henry's compassion. At the same time, William Booth was more indirect in his letter to his elder brother John, as he reminded John of his urgent need, which could help him to appeal to his brother's sympathy. Similarly, helping without an obvious material advantage or compromising could help one navigate potentially volatile situations, as was apparent in Thomas Booth's letter to his brother John. Siblings with less power could also rely on not disclosing certain information to avoid potentially volatile situations. Keeping secrets provided room to act, but could also be risky. While Samuel Pepys's brothers Tom and John were able to criticise Pepys in their correspondence, Pepys also expressed intense anger after discovering these letters.

5.2   Changing and replacing emotional expressions

The theme of changing emotional expressions is often connected to the relationship between two people and the influence they could exert on what feelings were conveyed. In this section, I will examine the different ways in which siblings expressed themselves in order to replace or change emotions. Appeasing, apologising, forgiving, and consoling all featured in communication that aimed at some change in the emotional expression of the other party. In practical terms, siblings might present information to appease, compliment others in ways that are connected to apologising, or offer consolation through visiting. Such strategies could relate to a range of emotions, including anger and sadness, and could be employed by both men and women and older and younger siblings. I will also discuss how these themes are connected to power and duty.

APPEASING

When siblings could not avoid being the target of expressions of anger, they could attempt to resolve the situation or appease the other party. These were ways of trying to exert agency and take control of the situation. One way to appease was to present information that could take the focus away from matters that caused resentment or justified actions. For example, in 1662, by bringing up information that was pleasing to his eldest brother, in this case about a candidate for his wife, Pepys's younger brother Tom could help influence Pepys's angry reaction to Tom's disobedience in leaving town without permission. Because of this information, the situation and Pepys's expressions of anger changed, and the focus shifted to how the brothers should now act.[942] In another example, Dorothy Osborne thanked her future husband, William Temple, in 1653 for providing her with arguments that could help her if she and her elder brother Henry would once again quarrel over her connection to Temple.[943] Due to the specificity of the disagreement, she had time to prepare for the future and to justify her actions in a manner that would help her brother accept the situation.

Siblings could express anger during an argument without forgetting the normative expectations of appropriate language and behaviour. Sticking to this way of expressing anger could help them to resolve the situation, or at least to prevent it from escalating. Alternatively, this could be a way to appear to act appropriately so as to give a good impression or to seem virtuous. Deviating from these norms could also be a disadvantage, as it would show the other person as more proper and therefore hand power over them. This subject was discussed in the normative literature. The Puritan writer John Downame's religious text noted that the ways to extinguish anger in others included not responding, but rather remaining silent, answering in a mellow manner, or giving advice or admonitions.[944] Dorothy Osborne sometimes described her arguments with her elder brother Henry with reference to these kinds of themes. When they disagreed about Temple again in 1654, Dorothy wrote, "…he renounced me, and I defied him, but both in as civil language as it would permit and parted in great anger with the usual ceremony of a leg and a courtesy, that you would have died with laughing to have seen us".[945] Their intention was not necessarily to make up, but rather to express anger within normatively acceptable parameters, but the courteous actions could still help to calm the situation down. This, however, changed when Henry went too far. As Dorothy remarked, "I had no patience for this", referring to the way Henry described Temple, and noted, "I forgot all my disguise…"[946] This suggests that she did in fact attempt to discuss the matter with her brother calmly and without expressing anger, but that Henry's words escalated the situation.

---

[942] Pepys 1893, August 23, 1662.
[943] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 134.
[944] Downame 1600, 76, 79–81.
[945] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 268–269.
[946] Ibid., 268.

APOLOGISING AND FORGIVENESS

Apologising and forgiving were additional ways of attempting to avoid further confrontation and the emotions possibly attached to it. In other words, these were ways to attempt to influence the nature of the relationship. Besides employing them as a reaction, men and women could also use apologies as a proactive preventative measure to attempt to influence the emotional reactions of their siblings. Apologising and forgiving were means of avoiding further angering the other party. Forgiving, apologising, and blaming others enabled siblings to maintain a relationship that would at the very least appear better and closer than would otherwise be possible, either to outsiders or to the members of their family. Such strategies gave them the ability to protect themselves, for example, by maintaining a good relationship with the eldest brother or, more generally, the reputation of the family. Although harmony was preferred, disputes nevertheless arose. In such cases, reconciliation was highlighted, and other people might then attempt to calm down the situation. At the same time, reminding the quarrelling parties of honour or virtues such as moderation could also be used to make peace. Honour could be appealed to during quarrels to influence actions. In addition, it could be considered dishonourable to decline to accept an apology.[947]

Religious normative texts also commented on these issues. In 17th-century England, the idea of living in charity encouraged men and women to avoid disputes, to resolve them as quickly as possible, and to remain patient. Anglican writer Richard Allestree noted the significance of preserving and restoring peace. He explained that the virtue of charity made a person averse to wanting revenge and receptive to answering with love instead. He also wrote that it was better to prevent quarrels than to try to resolve them.[948] However, as it was not always possible to live in concord, he added that forgiveness was the "...most Christian grace".[949] Furthermore, while Allestree indicated that "Malice and Revenge [were] the most restless, tormenting passions that can possess the mind of a man...",[950] the virtue of charity, in contrast, caused a lack of interest in revenge.[951] These expectations of proper actions and emotions related to virtues that were to be extended to enemies as well, such as love and forgiveness. Similarly, the Anglican chaplain Lancelot Blackburne explained that, even if there was a reason to be angry, instead of expressing the emotion or seeking revenge, it was appropriate to respond with kindness and forgiveness. The Puritan writer John Downame, in turn, advised in his book that even though he saw that anger could be just, even when that was the case, the offended party should forgive quickly, according to God's example. He also noted that small faults could be ignored and forgiven.[952]

---

[947] Pollock 2007, 18, 20, 24.
[948] Allestree 1659, 336–337, 376–377; Pollock 2007, 25–26.
[949] Allestree 1659, 345.
[950] Ibid., 344.
[951] Ibid., 330, 336.
[952] Downame 1600, 19, 51; Allestree 1659, 336, 379; Blackburne 1694, 7–8.

Expectations did not just come from formal sources or society at large, but also from other people. This had an effect on sibling relationships, and on the emotional expressions and power relations within them, as various people would attempt to exert agency and control. For example, individual circumstances dictated when apologising was necessary. While Dorothy Osborne wanted to marry William Temple, her brother Henry was not keen on this idea. However, besides arguing and making up with Henry, she had to take Temple into consideration. In 1653, Dorothy revealed that she did not agree with Temple that Henry's kindness would have "…anything of trouble in't…"[953] and that she could be both a good sister and a "…perfect friend" towards Temple. [954] Furthermore, in 1653/4, she asked for forgiveness from Temple for reacting in a sympathetic and forgiving way towards Henry, who had begged her to forgive him after the siblings had had an argument. She stated, "If this be a fault in me, 'tis at least a well-natured one".[955] Dorothy could not just express how she felt, but had to juggle between her brother's emotions and her lover's needs, for example, by justifying her emotions. Temple also helped to set up a framework that restricted her actions. She was in a situation in which her brother's appeals to her sympathy had such an impact on her that she feared they would have a negative effect on her relationship with Temple. She had to find a way to act and express emotions between these two forces.

Correct timing in apologising and forgiveness could be essential when younger siblings sought to avoid an expression of anger from their eldest brother or the further escalation of the situation. For younger siblings, this could necessitate relying on the support of other people to improve their chances of receiving a positive reaction from their eldest brother. While a letter that James Oxinden wrote to his eldest brother Henry in 1629 hinted at him being careful to choose the correct timing for his actions,[956] the same feature was more apparent in a letter he had written two years later. In that letter, James reported that he was in a dire financial situation because his brother had not contacted him and asked for his quarterage:

> That misfortune of losing the Scholler's place makes me allmost affraid to write unto you, but I hope that you having heard (i doubt not) that it was not any defect of me, you will have me pardoned soe that my letters may have free access and accepted as they were before… I intreate you to be soe loving as you have always beene, and in this necessity to set to your helping hand, and this time not to deny.[957]

James conveyed his understanding of his brother's anger through his own fear of how Henry would react. His hope of having been forgiven gave him the courage to write. It also provided the correct timing to avoid further anger, as asking for

---

[953] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple, Osborne 1901, 98.
[954] Ibid.
[955] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple 1653/4, Osborne 1901, 241.
[956] This is especially evident in his notion "…I have made bold to trubble you with these few lines…" (James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden October 23, 1629, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 52).
[957] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden August 14, 1631, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 73.

money earlier might have met with less chance of success and had the potential to escalate the situation. However, as James was not sure of his brother's emotions, his attempt to defend himself and remind Henry of his love for James could help him avoid Henry's expressions of anger. This could also help James redirect what emotions his brother would express in the future. At the same time, Henry's duty as the eldest brother to take care of his younger siblings[958] worked in James's favour.

The act of complimenting, such as highlighting normatively correct behaviour and emotions, could help siblings apologise and possibly achieve other future goals as well. Specifically, complimenting could provide a way for younger siblings to attempt to influence their elder brothers to act according to the praise they had been given. In a letter sent on May 27, 1634, James Oxinden apologised to his eldest brother, Henry, who had been helping him financially.[959] Although the reason for this apology is unknown, he again ended the letter by asking for money while expressing his gratitude.[960] He admitted that he was at fault, had acted wrongly, and feared that Henry was angrier than before.[961] He noted, "…for myself after serious consultation is a sufficient iudg to condemn mee of my folly, of which I am now (O si praeteritos revocet mihi Jupiter annos) hartilie (i feare to late) sorie for it… having so grosslie offended you…"[962] However, he did not just write about himself but instead turned the conversation to Henry's qualities: "…the tendernes of your nature, which is soe apt to forgive..."[963] He continued by describing how he did not doubt that Henry had "…[b]rotherly care…and… indulgent affection…"[964] for him and would therefore offer to help again. Of course, the fact that this was a letter that other people might also see may have influenced the way in which James wrote.

In this letter, James Oxinden referred to the expectation of sibling affection, to the sense of duty to help younger siblings that an elder brother in a better financial position could be expected to have, and to ideals of forgiveness. While the letter constituted an attempt to influence someone higher in the sibling hierarchy, it also reminded Henry of James's needs and what he wanted from his eldest brother. Besides painting Henry in a good light, James also portrayed himself positively as a polite and generally good brother. His statement that he did not want the disagreement with Henry to continue was a way to convey his desire for his brother to avoid expressing certain negative emotions. In a similar way, complimenting his brother would help draw attention away from unwanted matters and emotions and highlight the qualities upon which James hoped his brother would focus in their relationship. Susan Broomhall and

---

[958] Capp 2018, 32.
[959] For example, Henry Oxinden draft letter to James Oxinden March 5, 1636/7, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 118–119.
[960] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden May 27, 1634, The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 1933, 93.
[961] Ibid., 92–93. Even though expressing affection played a part in James's apology, as discussed in chapter three, other themes took the center stage.
[962] James Oxinden to Henry Oxinden May 27, 1634, 92–93.
[963] Ibid., 93.
[964] Ibid., 93.

Jacqueline Van Gent have noted that expressing gratitude or service to elder siblings could be an acknowledgement of younger siblings' hierarchically subordinate status and a way to compel the elders to act responsibly in accordance with the expectation to take care of their younger siblings.[965] In other words, for younger siblings, such an action was a way to recognise the power of the other party and to use it to benefit themselves. Here, normative expectations related to the duties of elder siblings could work in favour of younger siblings.

Besides forgiving each other, men and women could blame other people when their quarrels were connected to their siblings. This way, they could divert attention away from their own families for various reasons. Bernard Capp has argued that because Alice Thornton wrote her autobiography for her descendants, on multiple occasions, she blamed others to try to avoid tarnishing the reputation of her brothers.[966] Blaming others could also transform the emotional landscape that could otherwise be connected to siblings and control the narrative. For example, Alice Thornton blamed her brother Christopher's father-in-law over the years, rather than her brother, when her and her brother were quarrelling over their father's testament.[967] Even if Christopher had an extensive influence in the sibling hierarchy, she still contended that there was an authority figure in his life with the power to make him act against his natal family. While Christopher was a strong authority figure in her life, by blaming her father-in-law, she also highlighted his power and influence on the emotions the siblings expressed. Researchers have had different interpretations of Christopher's personality. While Ralph Houlbrooke described him as a greedy man, Bernard Capp saw him as mistrusting the relatives of Thornton's husband.[968]

When writing about the year 1658, Thornton recalled that earlier, before Christopher was the heir, his actions had been honourable, as he had demanded money for both himself and Thornton. She wrote the following in this regard:

> …[this] did much move my deare mother and myselfe, not to left it apeare in publick as a wittness against him… out of our tenderness of affection to my poore brother, whose case, as well as our owne, we did lament, he beeiug of too good a nature, and soe much imposed uppon by cunning pollocy…[969]

This statement also highlights her contemporary perception of Christopher as being manipulated and worthy of her sympathy. As she saw that someone else stood behind his actions, this gave more room for her to express emotions such as affection and sympathy towards her brother, and to direct emotional expressions of blame towards others. Her style of writing also served as a commentary on how she believed his father-in-law had acted. By blaming his father-in-law, Thornton could make it easier to continue to have a positive relationship with her brother.

---

[965] Broomhall & Van Gent 2009, 149.
[966] Capp 2018, 161.
[967] For example, Thornton 1875, 182–183, 199.
[968] Capp 2018, 162; Houlbrooke 1984, 55.
[969] Thornton 1875, 198–199.

Blaming others required an acknowledgement of a disagreement, which could have an influence on how others perceived the family. While she made a public statement of not believing that her brother was at fault, Thornton simultaneously chose to keep other matters private. This silence on some matters could be interpreted as a way of expressing affection. While Thornton blamed others, she still thought that Christopher had also acted wrongly. For example, in a letter to her husband in 1664, she noted that she would attempt to love her brother even though he did not deserve it.[970] In her autobiography, she added that she would not talk about certain matters related to disputes regarding her brother "…which afforded [them] too much troubles and sorrowes…"[971] This suggested that there was a limit on how far she was willing to blame others for his actions that affected her emotionally.

Compassion played a crucial role in forgiveness in some sibling relationships. In addition, other emotions, such as affection, could also be involved. On the other hand, attempts to gain sympathy were also connected to control and power. This was the case with Dorothy Osborne and her second eldest brother, Henry. He attempted to secure his own future after their father's death by expressing disapproval of Osborne's and William Temple's relationship. He wished to live with Osborne and her future husband, and to have a better position in the household, he wanted her to marry someone over whom she had more agency. This would give him, too, a more powerful position within Osborne's future household and enable him to retain some of the power he had presently, while living with her and their sick father, a more desirable prospect than living under his eldest brother after their father's death. Besides, Henry genuinely cared for Osborne and wanted her to be happy and healthy.[972]

After Dorothy quarrelled with Henry in 1653/4, he pleaded for forgiveness while crying, confessing his love, and reminding her of their close long-term relationship.[973] His behaviour had an influence on the way his sister reacted. Dorothy responded to Henry's pleading for forgiveness by remarking, "Nothing is so great a violence to me as that which moves my compassion. I can resist with ease any sort of people but beggars".[974] Here, her reaction gave Henry control over her. As she appeared to have no choice in how she acted, this helped her attempt to justify her reaction to Temple. Of course, this, too, would have been dependent on the situation. For Osborne and Henry, their closeness[975] could have worked in Henry's favour. In this vein, some contemporaries reported a gender division concerning compassion. Catholic priest Thomas Wright noted in 1604 that pity came more naturally to women, as "…the tendernesse of their complexion moveth them more to compassion".[976]

---

[970] Alice Thornton to William Thornton October 18, 1664, Thornton 1875, 291–292.
[971] Thornton 1875, 76.
[972] Capp 2018, 165–166.
[973] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple 1653/4, Osborne 1901, 241.
[974] Ibid.
[975] For example, see Dorothy Osborne to William Temple 1653/4, Osborne 1901, 92; Dorothy Osborne to William Temple 1653/4, Osborne 1901, 98.
[976] Wright 1604, 40; Firth-Godbehere 2015, 1.

Forgiving a sibling was not necessarily a singular moment, but rather a process in which actions could reflect the willingness to express this emotion, while at the same time conveying anger, whether orally or in writing. This highlighted the significance that various actions could have on the emotional relationship between siblings, and how not fulfilling them could also convey anger or similar emotions. What these actions consisted of could vary from person to person and from situation to situation. Furthermore, both anger and forgiveness could be present at the same time. Therefore, forgiveness as a process could allow at least an elder brother to keep taking advantage of anger in an attempt to maintain control.

Brothers could also express forgiveness through actions over a period of time. Two years after deciding to refuse to help his brother John financially after discovering a correspondence criticising him,[977] Samuel Pepys began to forgive his brother. He wrote in April of 1666:

> ...I very busy all the afternoon till night, among other things, writing a letter to my brother John, the first I have done since my being angry with him, and that so sharpe a one too that I was sorry almost to send it when I had wrote it, but it is preparatory to my being kind to him, and sending for him up hither when he hath passed his degree of Master of Arts.[978]

Some months later, Pepys stated, "Then as to John I tell him I will promise him nothing, but will supply him as so much lent him... declaring that I am not pleased with him yet..."[979] As he specified, this still did not mean that he had completely forgiven his brother, but it suggested that Pepys saw not helping or corresponding as part of his expression of anger. It is crucial to note, however, that Pepys did other things for his brother, even during this time,[980] which linked specific actions to his process of forgiveness.

While Pepys described expressing intense anger to his brother even in the letter cited above, he still saw the action of sending the letter as an act of kindness and consciously behaved in this manner to initiate the process of forgiving his brother. In other words, it was an action that indicated an emotion. The way he described it almost hinted at Pepys believing that the action was a precursor to the emotion, but it is more likely that he was writing about externally shifting his emotional expressions and actions to match his movement towards forgiveness. Forgiving in this manner, after a long period of time, could help the brothers adjust to a change in their relationship. It could also constitute an attempt by Pepys to control his brother by indicating that his forgiveness did not mean that his brother had permission to act as he pleased. In addition, all of these actions pointed to Pepys's duties as the eldest brother and the assumption that the fulfilment of at least some of them also depended on the behaviour of the

---

[977] Pepys 1893, March 19–21, 1663/4, April 30, 1664.
[978] Ibid., April 28, 1666.
[979] Ibid., June 17, 1666.
[980] He remarked in April 1664, "...I will not yet seem the least to pardon him nor can I in my heart. However, he and I did talk how to get him a mandamus for a fellowship, which I will endeavour" (Pepys 1893, April 27, 1664).

younger sibling. It should be noted, however, that immoderate anger, such as the threat of violence or lasting anger, was not considered normatively acceptable.[981]

Some siblings acknowledged that they did not know how to change their relationships with their sister or brother for the better. They could also express regret, disappointment, or other similar emotions towards the current state of their brother-sister relationship and convey their desire for a change, thus highlighting the problems that existed. Through this process, they might have had an influence on their brother's, sister's, or other people's perceptions of the relationships with their siblings during quarrels. Dorothy Osborne appeared distressed[982] regarding her quarrels with her brother Henry over her plans to marry William Temple, and she connected this to their affectionate relationship. After a severe fight with Henry that resulted in them not talking to each other, she noted that "...before we were thought the kindest brother and sister..."[983] Besides reflecting on their previous relationship, this was also a way for her to express emotions in a more subtle manner. In this case, she expressed a yearning towards an emotional change in their relationship. She wrote, "'Tis a strange change, and I am very sorry for it...one of my great misfortunes..."[984] and discussed how she did not know how to change the situation.[985] Thus, she painted the past as rosy and as something to strive for and the present in a negative light. By reminding her audience of the past in this manner, she was likely attempting to have an influence on the situation. For a woman or other siblings in a less powerful position, highlighting one's own morality or negative change could help illuminate the complexity of the current state of the relationship while at the same time justifying their own point of view.

Dorothy Osborne expected her letters to her future husband William Temple to have a certain degree of privacy.[986] This gave her some freedom, but letter-writing conventions and expectations were still able to influence how she wrote. A great variety of contexts could influence letters. Research has shown, for example, that French romances had an impact on Osborne.[987] Furthermore, while writers usually did not discuss using a guide or a manual to help with letter writing, advice literature on how to correspond was popular in early modern England. In women's letters, other influences were often more important, including marital relationships and family traditions. At the same time, sufficient familiarity between correspondents could give room for letters to be less conventionally formulated.[988]

---

[981] Pollock 2004, 586.
[982] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple 1653/4, Osborne 1901, 241.
[983] Dorothy Osborne to William Temple 1653, Osborne 1901, 121.
[984] Ibid.
[985] Ibid.
[986] Hintz 2005, 5.
[987] Ibid., 64; Hannan 2016, 12.
[988] Hannan 2016, 11–13, 108–109.

CONSOLATION

Changes in life could naturally have a great impact on the emotions men and women expressed and to whom. For example, when the heir changed due to death, this could have an impact on the hierarchy and what feelings were conveyed. Alice Thornton's brother George, who was the eldest living man in her family[989] and occupied a fatherly position in her life, accidentally drowned in a river on the 31st of March 1651.[990] Thornton, who expressed deep affection for him and grief about his death, experienced significant emotional and financial changes as the second eldest brother, Christopher, became the heir. This also meant that her ability to influence the eldest brother had changed. Her relationship with Christopher was not as close as her bond with George, and even though he was in her life, they fought over their father's testament in court.[991]

Besides its impact on hierarchy, death also changed life in many more concrete ways. People directly experienced the death of someone they knew more often than we do today, due to the higher mortality rate and the epidemics that came periodically. Once death took place in a household, certain behaviours were expected. In wealthy families, ways of showing grief included wearing a mourning dress, enfolding rooms with black clothes, and hanging mourning escutcheons. However, not everyone could afford such gestures, and the poorest families expressed their grief through their behaviours, for instance, by changing daily routines and the ways they spoke.[992]

Consolation was also connected to change. It was another method through which siblings could attempt to replace particular emotional expressions with others and thus gain influence and control. Because sadness was perceived as a potentially physically dangerous emotion, it was crucial to treat or change in some way. This could happen through consolation, whereby a person communicated their sadness to a listener who would be sympathetic and give advice to help alleviate the emotion.[993] Although women were thought to be naturally more compassionate than men, civility required compassion from all, and it was also seen as a Christian virtue. However, it was to be conveyed with moderation, keeping in mind the importance of self-control over emotional expression. Furthermore, many early modern English people thought that it was not civil to shed compassionate tears.[994]

The notion of "fellow-feeling" was understood as emotionally partaking in both the positive and negative life events of others. While terms such as compassion and sympathy were similar to fellow-feeling, they did not indicate shared joy but rather sadness for someone's suffering. The intensity of fellow-feeling was dependent on the depth of affection in the relationship.[995] A literary

---

[989] C.J. 1875, Pedigree of the Family of Wandesford.
[990] Thornton 1875, 57, 65.
[991] Ibid., 57, 63–64, 183, 199, 228.
[992] Houlbrooke 1984, 202; Brady 2008, 185; Harding 2013, 77.
[993] Sullivan 2013, 160.
[994] Capp 2014, 77, 79, 82, 91.
[995] Newton 2018, 113–114.

genre in early modern England, the *consolatio*, published in the form of treatises, sermons, and epistles and often written by divines, highlighted the importance of consolation from the Christian perspective.[996] Furthermore, at the end of the 17th century, Edward Pelling, an Anglican clergyman,[997] commented on the significance of charity connected to benevolence and kindness to "…do others all the good we can, over and above…"[998] He continued, "'Tis a Virtue that…that moves and works upon the Affections, that extends our Compassion…"[999] Various other rituals associated with death sought to counter emotions perceived as negative and to raise solidarity in the face of death.[1000]

Andrea Brady has argued that consolation in a communal gathering could be viewed as an emotional practice to help process and address sadness. For example, rituals associated with death, such as a funeral, were emotional practices that could help the participants transition out of sorrow.[1001] In addition, Monique Scheer has noted that a ritual, as understood in practice theory and emotional practices, was not just a way to control and channel emotions, but to generate, name, train, and adjust them.[1002] While consolation between siblings did not always happen in the form of a communal gathering or a ritual, such as a funeral, it was still connected to practices and played a role in emotion management. When successful, consolation gave siblings the chance to have an influence on the emotional expressions and behaviours of their brothers and sisters.

Similarly to a funeral, visiting a sibling to console them could be considered an emotional practice. It also gave siblings in a lower hierarchical position an opportunity to have influence, regardless of whether that was intentional, to display normatively correct behaviour,[1003] and provided a way to express emotions, such as sympathy, to the person being consoled. For elder brothers, visiting gave them an opportunity to fulfil their obligations of taking care of younger siblings. John Evelyn, a country gentleman and a diarist, visited his elder brother George in 1664 with the intention of comforting him, as he felt dejected after hearing that George's wife had died.[1004] Previously, in 1657/8, after Evelyn had expressed great grief about the death of his son Richard and also written about the death of his other son George,[1005] his brothers had come to "…condole with us".[1006] While Evelyn did not reveal the effects of his brothers' visit, Henry Newcome, a Presbyterian minister who lived in Manchester,[1007] did.

---

[996] Gowland 2006, 101–103.
[997] Pollock 2011, 136.
[998] Pelling 1693, 6.
[999] Ibid., 7.
[1000] Brady 2008, 187.
[1001] Ibid.
[1002] Scheer 2012, 210. Geoffrey Parker has also analysed what kinds of coping mechanisms 17th century people around the world had in addition to crises and reactions to them (Parker 2013, 591–603).
[1003] For example, according to the virtue of charity (Allestree 1659, 329–332, 335).
[1004] Dobson 1908b, xi–xii; Evelyn 1908, 231.
[1005] Evelyn 1908, 196–197.
[1006] Ibid., 197.
[1007] Newcome 1852a, 106–107; Parkinson 1852, xiii–xiv.

He described being in great distress, as he had faced difficult times. Among other worries, he felt sad about his child's sickness and was afraid to go back home in case something happened to the child. However, a visit from his brothers Richard, Robert, and Stephen in 1658 provided him with both comfort and joy.[1008]

Siblings also consoled one another by indicating that they wanted their siblings to visit and used different methods to make this happen. Herbert Aston, the second eldest son of a Catholic English family, lost his wife on July 9, 1658.[1009] His younger sister and the youngest sibling in the family, Constance Fowler, a gentlewoman with a very close and affectionate relationship with Aston[1010] and the eldest brother Walter, who became the second Lord Aston after their father died in 1639 and lived at the family estate in Tixall in Staffordshire,[1011] sent him letters indicating their wish for him to visit them and console him this way. The way in which this was done reflected their positions in the sibling hierarchy. Fowler wrote the following:

> …if I had any powre with you, I would trye if I could obtaine of you to come abroade amongest your frindes… I shall not beg no more of you for any ones sake, but hers only deare to you, to alter your resolution of solletrynes, and seeke some deversion from your too deepe sad thoughts; for your owne judgment must needs tell you, elce you are your owne willfull execusioner…but if you denye me and the rest of your best frindes this our soe just request, I am sure we shall have cause to say, we have lost a kinde brother, and as such, you will be truly lamented…[1012]

Walter, on the other hand, wrote the following in a letter dated September 8:

> …as iff you had an intentyon to seclude your selfe from all things of divertyon, from whence will enevytably follow a decay in your health, and by yt a most sad condylyon to your frends and children. I am willing to allow your losse to be as greate as can bee, and you to excell, iff I should not rather call exceed, all others in passyon, as shee in merritt. Yett I cannot but wish, nay rest assured, you will not do yt wrong to your reason, to make him a servant wheare he ought wholy to bee master… wee all desyre ye same thing, itt is your company and sotyety…This wee desyre is a duty on you, and I know itt is hard to bee obeyed wth you; but you knowing how much ioy itt will bee to us all, and merytoryous to your selfe, will master your passyon, and make us all happy…[1013]

The fact that Walter mentioned duties and obedience, although not in the context of appearing to attempt to force Aston to do anything, reminded him of Walter's position as the eldest brother. The impact of the birth order was also reflected in the way Walter wrote about allowing Aston to express grief, while reminding him to control his emotions, as grieving the dead too much was not advisable, according to physicians and clergymen. One reason for this was to avoid painful sadness, which could also be prevented by moderating affection.[1014] Although by using the word "we", Walter referred not only to himself but also to his sister

---

[1008] Newcome 1852a, 89.
[1009] Aston 1815, 182; Clifford 1815, 86; Samson 2019, 599.
[1010] Burke 1866, 14; Capp 2018, 62.
[1011] Clifford 1815, 116.
[1012] Constance Fowler to Herbert Aston, Tixall Letters 1815, 171–172. According to the author of *The Anatomy of Melancholy,* Robert Burton, grieving madness was common when someone close to a person had died (Burton 1621, 212–213; MacDonald 1981/1983, 77).
[1013] Walter Aston to Herbert Aston September 8, Tixall Letters 1815, 174.
[1014] MacDonald 1981/1983, 77.

and daughters, who wrote to Aston about the same subject,[1015] he was the author of the letter, and thus it was ultimately his position and authority that it conveyed. The youngest sister, Constance, on the other hand, begged her brother to act as she wanted. The power she thought she might have over him was probably rooted in the affection that she expressed for him and described him as expressing for her.[1016] Both Walter and Constance appealed to Aston to look after his health, using the emotional impact that his well-being had on them as a way of trying to exert influence. Walter's and Constance's attempts to use consolation to exercise control over their brother thus reflected their different positions, while also highlighting similar emotional strategies in their writing styles.

The Christian context was especially important for consolation. Many used prayer to console themselves or others. Historian Olivia Weisser has discussed how some women could bear tough times because their faith shaped their understanding of their own emotions and of the ways in which they should be expressed and felt. For example, when sick, some women prayed to God not to have emotions that could be interpreted as negative, but to be repentant, humble, and obedient, or even thankful for illnesses that they faced.[1017] Besides soothing themselves through prayer, siblings could also console each other in this manner. Thomas Meautys, a soldier who worked for the Prince of Orange in the Low Countries,[1018] expressed his distress about the fact that her sister's child was sick in a letter he sent to her in 1616. He also reassured her that, since the illness was ague, she should not believe her child was in danger and offered to pray for both her and her child.[1019]

Siblings could also rely on the guidance of the *Ars Moriendi* to comfort each other. In the instructions for how to die well in his popular 17th-century work *Disce Mori,* the Anglican author Christopher Sutton[1020] gave a "...consolatory admonition..."[1021] regarding overly intense grief, but grief as such was not a forbidden emotion. Sutton noted that life was uncertain, and that instead of lamenting over its ordeals, the focus should be on changing the initial grief to joy.[1022] He noted that joy was an appropriate emotion to feel when someone died. According to Sutton, the "...happy hope of the resurrection…"[1023] could bring comfort and heal excessively intense grief. He wrote that the dead were at peace with God in Heaven, and that death was not a permanent separation; the reunion in the afterlife would be filled with joy. He also noted that accepting death as God's will and remembering that grieving after a death did not benefit anyone would bring comfort and help in sadness. Sutton added that it would be

---

[1015] Walter Aston to Herbert Aston September 8, Tixall Letters 1815, 173.

[1016] She noted Aston's affection, for example, in a letter she dated August 11, 1636 (Constance Fowler to Herbert Aston August 11, 1636, Tixall Letters 1815, 87).

[1017] Weisser 2019, 101–102. In contrast, others, such as Alice Thornton, interpreted their physical ailments as punishment for the sins they had committed (Weisser 2019, 102).

[1018] Del Lungo Camiciotti 2014, 144.

[1019] Sir Thomas Meautys to Jane Lady Cornwallis 1616, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 38–39.

[1020] Atkinson 1985, 207; Sutton 1846, xliii.

[1021] Sutton 1846, 171.

[1022] Ibid., 155, 171.

[1023] Ibid., 160.

improper to seek consolation in vanities because such worldly desires only brought momentary delights, and that a Christian could find consolation in God, whose love was better than worldly pleasures.[1024] Along with the *Ars Moriendi,* other guidance on what constituted a good death also existed. Reports about deaths written by John Chamberlain, a newswriter in early 17th-century England,[1025] reflected this same sentiment. Unlike the authors of religious literature, Chamberlain was more concerned about life before than after death. In his texts, a good death included dying late in life, leaving support for dependants, being calm when dying, and leaving a good reputation.[1026]

The *Ars Moriendi* was relied on in various family relationships for guidance on how to console. William Stout attached norms related to what constituted a good death to his father's passing in 1679/80 and added, "…the sweet frame of mind and melody of heart…it was very comfortable to us, and an assurance of his peace with God and future happiness"[1027] when his father was ill.[1028] When Alice Thornton's mother was dying, she remarked that she could seek comfort in her Christian faith.[1029] Belief in God and the afterlife could help alleviate anxieties about illnesses and dying and thus have an effect on which feelings were conveyed and in what ways.[1030]

Through letters of condolence, the pious were not only able to express their sympathies, but could also give advice on spiritual matters, such as reminding the reader not to grieve too much, as the dead person was now experiencing the joys of heaven.[1031] Siblings used these types of letters, which reflected the traditions of the *Ars Moriendi,* to present death as something that should be connected to joy. This had the potential to influence the emotions siblings expressed to each other during crises. Changing or replacing the emotional expression of sadness was, nevertheless, the responsibility of the person potentially expressing it. The normative expectation of favouring the expression of joy over sadness gave siblings lower in the hierarchy chances to take part in influencing how their siblings expressed their emotions. Nevertheless, siblings could also help each other achieve this goal. The correct death of a spouse, according to the rules of the *Ars Moriendi*, could also be used as consolation between siblings. Furthermore, this could be a chance to remind a brother or a sister of what these norms required and to guide them in expressing emotions in the expected way. At the same time, such a reminder could act as a further attempt to console. Managing how siblings expressed their sadness contributed to ensuring that the family and the individuals within it maintained a good image.

[1024] Sutton 1846, 159–160, 162–163, 173–174, 176.
[1025] Capp 2022, 5. These ideas of a good and bad death were, of course, not representative of how everyone saw the matter, but rather reflected Chamberlain's own thoughts. However, he also wrote about what he had heard from others and their ideas, which conveyed a broader understanding of how to die well. (Capp 2022, 16.)
[1026] Capp 2022, 7–8.
[1027] Stout 1851, 7–8.
[1028] Sutton 1846, 162; Stout 1851, 7–8; McPherson 2006, 186; Vogt 2012, 1712.
[1029] Thornton 1875, 113.
[1030] Weisser 2019, 100.
[1031] Willen 1995, 38.

A letter that Thomas Meautys sent to his sister Jane Cornwallis in 1627 addressed these themes. Even though the birth order of Meautys and his sisters is not known, his gender had a more positive influence on his possibilities in the world when compared to his sisters. Still, he occasionally asked Cornwallis, who had become a rich widow in 1611 before remarrying the youngest son of a successful family,[1032] for financial assistance.[1033] Although these material circumstances affected his position and his power within the sibling hierarchy, when Cornwallis's husband died, Meautys still took the time to combine his consolatory message with a reminder to her of the proper ways to express emotions in her situation.

Meautys began the letter that he sent in July 1627 by expressing his sympathy about the death of his sister's second husband[1034] and consoled her, for example, by noting that he had had a good death. He stated, "…you did send me a consolation ever to bee rejoysed for, and that is, the peacable, quiet, and relygeous end that he made att his departure out of this worlde…"[1035] This also expressed his emotions regarding the proper death of his sister's husband. His own expression of emotion was one way to signal to her that she had expressed her sadness correctly. His thoughts about a good death reflected the influence of the *Ars Moriendi*, in which the importance of both religiousness and peacefulness was noted.[1036] Meautys continued by describing how his sister had appropriately expressed her emotions:

> Sister, whereas you wright me in your letter that he hath left you behind him his widdow, full of greefe and sorrow, to morne for yourself and not for him, indeed I was glad to hear you saye soe ; for a man to lament the departure of a freind with extremytie of greefe, when his own eye is a wittnes, and his hart lykewyse tells him, that his freind hath exchanged his sosietie for a more happy one, and hath left this worlde, soe full of troble and misery e, to goe tacke possession of a kingdom, the joyes of which are not to be expressed, that person that shall sorrow soe much for the los of his freind, certainly he cannot be esteemed a trew freind at all…[1037]

Meautys also noted that "…we will all of us greeve with you, but, as we ought, with a moderate and discreet greef, for other wyse we should appear brutal to the worlde…",[1038] while also pointing out that grief was not a forbidden emotion. He added, "…surely a sorrow is allowed to every one of us to sorrow for our friends… "[1039] Besides attempting to influence how she expressed her emotions, these expressions also conveyed his sympathy. While Meautys's attempt to comfort his sister was an action that aimed to change or replace emotions in a way that reflected Sutton's understanding of the *Ars Moriendi* and the prospect

---

[1032] Del Lungo Camiciotti 2014, 137.

[1033] For example, see Cornwallis, Jane 1842, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 114–115.

[1034] Sir Thomas Meautys to Jane Lady Bacon July 2, 1627, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 180–182.

[1035] Ibid., 180.

[1036] McPherson 2006, 186; Wunderli & Broce 1989, 264.

[1037] Sir Thomas Meautys to Jane Lady Bacon July 2, 1627, The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis 1842, 180–181.

[1038] Ibid., 181.

[1039] Ibid., 181.

of joy noted above, Meautys could also have been attempting to prevent a change to something he did not feel was appropriate. This demonstrates how acts of comforting could be connected to changing emotions and the uses of power between siblings.[1040] Although Meautys reminded Cornwallis of how joy was associated with death and tried to control her expressions of sadness, he did not deny her the right to convey her grief. His attempt to gain control over her emotional expressions also acted as a form of consolation. The conventions of the *Ars Moriendi* gave him authority in his attempt to change Cornwallis's emotional expressions, but also limited what he could say.

The influence of the conventions of the *Ars Moriendi* on how Thomas Meautys wrote his letters is clear. Even if the structure of the *Ars Moriendi* was not as apparent in the consolations offered by the other letter writers examined in this section, the impact of more general letter-writing conventions should not be forgotten. Although the beginnings and endings of letters, in particular, were guided by conventions, letters could still have fluidity rather than rigidly following strict rules. At the same time, letter writing could remain expressive even when using learned or planned phrases.[1041] Indeed, strict conventions or the influence of the *Ars Moriendi* did not mean that the correspondents were not sincere in wanting to console their siblings.

Siblings of all ages and both genders resorted to a variety of ways to try to change or replace emotional expressions. All of these were in themselves attempts to exert influence, but they were connected to power in other ways as well. Appeasing, in particular, could be associated with situations in which it was necessary to calm things down. This was possible by presenting pleasing information. For instance, Samuel Pepys chastised his brother for going out of town without telling him, but when Tom explained why he had left, this appeared to calm the situation down. Behaving in a normatively correct way could also help to appease, as was the case in the quarrels between Dorothy Osborne and her second-oldest brother Henry. Forgiveness could be facilitated in various ways as well, for example, through compliments. Forgiveness could, however, require correct timing. James Oxinden only dared to approach his eldest brother Henry after he believed Henry had heard enough good things about him and would thus forgive him. Forgiveness, furthermore, was not necessarily a single action at a given point in time, but rather a process, and it could be expressed through various actions, as was apparent in Samuel Pepys's process of forgiving his brother. While expressions of both appeasing and forgiveness could be connected to elder and younger siblings alike, the elder ones were often in a better position to demand an apology and to later forgive, because of their higher position in the sibling hierarchy. Still, elder brothers also pleaded for forgiveness from their younger siblings, as was the case during Dorothy Osborne's and her second-oldest brother Henry's disagreements. Consolation, on the other hand, could be provided through visiting or writing, and it was also

---

[1040] In a recent article, I have analysed how Meautys could also gain control through teaching correct religious behaviour (Ala-Hynnilä 2023, 156).
[1041] Hannan 2016, 106.

connected to the *Ars Moriendi*, which aimed to replace sadness with joy. This objective was most apparent in Thomas Meautys' letters to his sister Jane Cornwallis.

CONCLUSION

While Chapter 3 examined siblings' behaviours and emotions during disagreements, this chapter has focused on the actions that preceded such disagreements and on various attempts to end quarrels. Specifically, this chapter has analysed not only disagreements but also consolation as a way of changing siblings' emotional expressions. While anger was a crucial emotional expression in the analysis provided in this chapter, as well as in Chapter 3, other feelings were also significant. As Bernard Capp has noted, women generally had more reasons to stay on good terms with their brothers and to express affection in pursuit of that goal rather than vice versa.[1042] Still, brothers in less powerful positions also needed to find ways to avoid, change, or replace emotions. For example, while eldest brothers were more likely to use anger to control their siblings, as seen in Chapter 3, younger brothers were likely to try to avoid provoking that emotion in their elder brothers. At the same time, intersectionality reminds us that birth order was not the only factor that affected these actions.

Henry Oxinden's letters to his younger brother James provide an example of how an eldest brother could attempt to avoid a quarrel. In Chapter 3, we saw how Henry Oxinden expressed emotions much more calmly than Samuel Pepys, which could help to avoid a further escalation of the situation. On one occasion, Henry also acted in a way that could help his brother James avoid being considered the target of expressions of anger. Indeed, while this was a case where an eldest brother was involved in preventing a feeling from being conveyed, the focus on who needed to avoid becoming the target of expressions of anger remained on the younger sibling with less power. This emphasised the impact of age on siblings' abilities to act. To protect their own interests, younger siblings had to find ways to adjust to how their eldest brothers chose to express themselves, for instance, to maintain the relationship and the benefits that came with it, or to appear in a certain way to others. Avoiding being the target of expressions of anger could help brothers and sisters discuss divisive and difficult topics without harming the sibling relationship. Strategies to avoid being the target of expressions of anger were thus essential for maintaining and building sibling relationships. They could also be employed to convey needs and to attempt to prevent adverse emotional reactions.

Being the target of expressions of anger could be avoided in many ways. Younger siblings could appeal to the sympathy of their elder brothers and connect this to a sense of duty. For instance, James Oxinden wrote directly that he had failed to appeal to his brother's sympathy but also noted his own difficult situation. William Booth also wrote to his elder brother John about his urgent need to get help in paying a debt and asked John not to hate him, but rather to

---

[1042] Capp 2018, 61.

remember his affection. Individual relationships determined how this could be done, as some younger brothers could be more forceful and even shift blame for a bad situation to the person from whom they were asking for help. Although James Oxinden wrote in this way, he would not have wanted to anger his brother, but rather to appeal to his sympathy to receive the help he wanted. Thoughtful behaviour, such as siblings of various ages giving money to each other, could help to avoid conflict, as was the case in Thomas Booth's letters. Finally, younger brothers could also keep secrets from their eldest brothers. Samuel Pepys's younger brothers Tom and John had criticised Pepys in their correspondence, which gave them the freedom to act beyond the control of their brother but also risked angering Pepys if he found out about the correspondence.

Efforts at appeasement during a tense situation could give siblings the opportunity to exert influence on the emotional context. Samuel Pepys's younger brother Tom had angered Pepys by leaving town without telling him, but presented pleasing information that changed Pepys's emotional expressions. On the other hand, both Dorothy Osborne and her second-oldest brother Henry acted in a normatively correct and polite manner during their quarrel, which may have helped to calm the situation down. This also demonstrates that there were some older siblings and sisters who took part in attempts to change emotional expressions. Osborne's disagreements with her brother also further highlighted other ways in which women could act within the themes examined in this chapter. Sisters could forgive in response to the other party's appeals for compassion, but they could also face conflicting expectations and attempts to control their behaviour, which could lead them to apologise just to navigate such pressures.

In seeking to change or replace emotions, younger brothers could effectively apologise by choosing the correct timing. James Oxinden dared to approach his eldest brother Henry only after he thought Henry had heard good things about him. Eldest brothers, in contrast, usually had more power and were more likely to be in a position to forgive rather than to apologise. Furthermore, they often had the opportunity to turn forgiveness into a process and to maintain control throughout it, as was apparent in Samuel Pepys's diary. For some, apologising or forgiveness was not necessary, as in the case of Alice Thornton, who blamed someone other than her brother. At the same time, some, like Dorothy Osborne, felt that they could not find a way to resolve a tense situation with their siblings.

Finally, themes unrelated to disagreements were also connected to attempts to change emotional expressions. Consoling was initiated by all siblings, regardless of their place in the birth order. It was sometimes done by visiting, as described by John Evelyn in his diary, and brothers or sisters could also request for a sad sibling to pay visit to console him or her. Constance Fowler's and her eldest brother Walter Aston's attempts to console their brother Herbert Aston were demonstrations of this, but the way in which they approached the matter also reflected their positions within the sibling hierarchy. Furthermore, references to the religious norms of the *Ars Moriendi* were a way to lean on the authority of the norm to change siblings' emotional expressions through

consolation, but such references also limited what could be written. This was apparent in Thomas Meautys's letters to his sister. The letters referencing the *Ars Moriendi* also remind us that a variety of conventions guided how the texts were written. Duties and expectations dictating how siblings should act could do the same.

All of the actions examined here were connected to agency, control, and power. The various strategies used to avoid being the target of expressions of anger and to change and replace emotions attested to the power of the stronger sibling involved, his or her ability to express emotions within the relationship more freely, and the need for weaker parties to find ways to navigate these realities. At the same time, these strategies also highlighted the ways in which siblings lower in the hierarchy wielded some form of control in their lives and underlined the limits of the control exercised by siblings higher in the hierarchy. This can be seen in how the sibling with less power may have acted against the will of more powerful siblings or persuaded him or her to behave as they wanted. Many of the cases examined here reflected expectations regarding respectful behaviour and an individual's proper place and role in social interactions, which depended on sibling and gender hierarchies, age, and religious and other norms. However, in some cases, respect between siblings was tied to dependence and could disappear quickly when independence was achieved.[1043] Various, often religious, normative expectations related to anger, the virtue of charity, and lying influenced how siblings navigated the related power relations. On the other hand, expectations came from various directions, and, along with broader social norms, pressure for how to express emotions and to act in certain ways was also exerted by particular individuals.

[1043] Capp 2018, 39.

6   CONCLUSION

The study of family history has focused mostly on vertical relationships,[1044] and previous research on early modern English siblings has tended to describe their relationships in a rather general manner.[1045] The focus of previous research on sibling hierarchies has often been on primogeniture and its influence on family relationships.[1046] This dissertation has added to this literature by deepening our understanding of power relations between siblings. Furthermore, the connection between emotional expressions and power relations in early modern English sibling relationships has not received much attention in previous scholarship. It is therefore crucial to produce more research examining horizontal ties and the ways in which power relations and hierarchy impact them as well. While previous research into early modern English siblings has noted the significance of feelings to a limited degree,[1047] this dissertation more carefully examined emotional expressions, particularly by focusing on how English brothers and sisters conveyed their feelings in the long 17th century. It should be emphasised that the focus of this dissertation has been on written language or, in other words, on how siblings tried to express and convey their feelings, rather than on the emotions themselves. This written language also includes descriptions of actions that could convey feelings as well.

This dissertation has emphasised that emotional expressions played a key role in moulding power relations between siblings. Furthermore, while primogeniture was a crucial influencing factor in power relations between siblings, this dissertation shows that they were not quite simple. Indeed, siblings' possibilities to have an impact on each other's lives varied, but all had some kind of opportunity to exert an influence on their siblings' actions and on how they conveyed their feelings. Emotional expressions could give siblings agency, but also guide or necessitate actions. These actions took place within complex contexts that impacted the siblings' agency and their interactions.

[1044] Stone 1977/1979.
[1045] Capp 2018; Harris 2016.
[1046] Crawford 2004/2014.
[1047] Capp 2018.

Using content analysis as a method to discover different themes in the primary sources, this study has created three distinct categories, as reflected in Chapters 3, 4, and 5. Chapter 3, which focused on analysing disputes, and Chapter 4, which examined actions, addressed the research question of how siblings expressed emotions, while the sub-sections within these chapters discussed smaller categories under this broader question. These included, for example, chastising, appearing as a victim, helping, and caring for the sick, but themes such as inability and inaction also featured in conveying feelings. The topic of Chapter 5, avoiding, changing, and replacing emotional expressions, focused more on answering the research question "how did men and women try to influence the emotions their siblings expressed". The sub-sections elaborated on this by analysing, among other things, sympathy, consolation, and apologising.

Besides showing how emotions were expressed or influenced, these categorisations also revealed more generally what the authors of the primary sources considered important to write about and when they found it important to express emotions. Furthermore, the concept of emotional practices was salient throughout. It helped to focus the analysis on actions and highlight the diverse ways in which emotions could be expressed. Emotional practices manifested themselves in descriptions of verbal communication, such as chastising or having an argument, and in such actions as writing, sending, and receiving letters, visiting, helping, and caring for the sick. These practices provided answers to the research question of "how emotions were expressed" by demonstrating that this was possible through actions. The analysis then revealed more specific ways in which these actions took place.

In addition to focusing on different ways of conveying feelings, this dissertation has shown how these emotional expressions were used to gain or uphold power. Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that siblings used not just their own emotional expressions, but also feelings that others had conveyed, to attempt to exert agency and to wield influence over emotions expressed by others. Lisbeth Geussens has noted in her analysis of 18th-century siblings from one family in the Austrian Netherlands that expressions of emotions could help negotiate or govern hierarchies.[1048] This dissertation has supported these results and shown how similar processes were at work in 17th-century England. In particular, it was emphasised that all siblings could find ways that had the potential to give them influence over emotional expressions.

It is important to note that, despite the numerous ways in which emotional expressions could be used to gain control, emotional language was not just a means to an end. Rather, although it is not possible to know whether emotional expressions were ultimately "sincere", emotional closeness between siblings certainly existed. Furthermore, even if siblings had duties towards each other, which could influence how they acted, they could also express emotions, such as affection, through or in connection with these duties. It is thus imperative to acknowledge that the aim here was not to evaluate whether this was an

---

[1048] Geussens 2022, 156.

intentional goal, but rather to show that emotional expressions had the potential to give agency and power regardless of the precise intention behind them.

There was a great variety of contexts, personalities, and other factors that affected all siblings, including age, financial situation, marital status, personality, and gender. Research into early modern Orange-Nassau siblings has taken note of the impact of these types of contextual factors on a person's ability to express emotions, while another study has highlighted that the surrounding context influenced dependencies and duties among early modern English brothers and sisters,[1049] Here, I have examined similar processes from the perspective of 17th century England, accentuating emotional expressions and power relations among siblings. While the analysis here has noted the influence of age and gender, for instance, it has also demonstrated that the various contextual factors did not confine siblings to strictly fixed patterns of emotional expression and related power relations, but that these patterns were in constant flux. In considering the complexity of surrounding contexts and the multitude of ways in which people, both high and low in societal hierarchies, could exercise power, this dissertation has drawn on previous discussions of the key theoretical concepts. The notion of intersectionality has appropriately shifted the focus onto how multiple privileges, or the lack thereof, have influenced individual lives.[1050] In addition, theoretical concepts of power, including Foucault's idea that power is everywhere and Boulding's focus on the power of the weak,[1051] have highlighted that everyone could have at least some control.

Previous research has shown, for example, that, despite the existing patriarchal structures, early modern English women found ways to act within these constraints.[1052] Similar dynamics can be seen in this study, as those with less power, including women and younger men, could still have agency and control. Although the primary sources did not contain many texts from women, the sisters examined tried to exert agency and use power through, and in connection with, emotional expressions, in both direct and more subtle ways. They may have acted submissively at times, but they could also stand their ground. This again highlights the fact that while there were restrictions on all women, they did not act and express emotions in the same manner, but used varied means to attempt to exercise control.

On the other hand, brothers also wrote about actions that deviated from the standards of normatively appropriate manhood. For example, reactions to sick siblings revealed that while the expectation was for men to maintain control over their emotions, and that expressing emotional distress could undermine their manhood,[1053] brothers nevertheless showed concern over their siblings. At the same time, perhaps expressing these kinds of emotions to siblings might have been acceptable if the men in question could trust that information about them would not spread further and affect their or the family's reputation.

[1049] Crawford 2004/2014, 223; Broomhall & Van Gent 2016, 64; Geussens 2022, 156, 166.
[1050] Crenshaw 1991, 1242, 1245.
[1051] Foucault 1978, 92, 95, 101; Foucault 1982, 219; Boulding 1990/1989.
[1052] Capp 2003, 26.
[1053] Foyster 1999, 30, 103.

Research on the history of siblings has revealed that sisters used emotional expressions to receive assistance.[1054] This dissertation has examined how this was done in practice and highlighted the ways in which the same dynamics also applied to younger brothers in 17th century England. For example, brothers upheld assistance by acting according to expectations while expressing affection. Despite this, we need to remember that younger brothers were nevertheless born into a better power position than their sisters.[1055] Although sibling relationships could be defined in part as horizontal, they nevertheless reflected hierarchies built on fundamental factors such as primogeniture and a patriarchal society. Indeed, there was a hierarchy among siblings, even though emotional expressions granted opportunities for all involved to attempt to have some level of agency and control within that hierarchy.

While emotional expression gave opportunities to exert agency over all siblings, particular members of the family, often the eldest brothers, still had the best power positions and the greatest potential to wield influence over the most significant matters. A Scottish nobleman, Archibald Argyll, emphasised the position the eldest son held in the family and the importance of other siblings to obey and love him.[1056] Indeed, this was reflected in some of the primary sources examined here, such as the diary of Samuel Pepys. However, the behaviours of the eldest brothers were not uniform, thus highlighting the significance of individual contexts. Furthermore, the examination of emotional expressions in this study revealed major differences in how dominant siblings tended to behave. While some held on to power tightly and expressed emotions intensely, others gave siblings with less power more space to act and to convey their feelings, too. Although the primary sources examined here revealed older brothers using and upholding power through chastising, which is not surprising, considering the hierarchical structures that primogeniture typically maintained, it is not impossible to imagine, for example, Jane Cornwallis, a wealthier sister than her brother, being able to express herself in this manner as well. While this might reflect gender norms or the type of relationship she had with her brother, it might also remind us of the limitations of the sources.

Situations could also change, and the eldest brother getting into financial trouble could radically influence the power relations. Eldest brothers could also write about a loss of control and lack of influence, for example, when faced with the sickness or death of a sibling. Furthermore, siblings could use similar methods to wield power, regardless of their age. While younger brothers would occasionally employ emotional expressions as an indirect tactic to have agency, by withholding the truth, for example, elder brothers could also take part in emotion management by forgiving and consoling, among other things.

At the same time, social norms, expectations, and duties influenced all siblings, including those with power. Normative Anglican and Puritan literature contained rules of behaviour that could – but did not necessarily have to –

[1054] Capp 2018, 51; Geussens 2022, 166.
[1055] Davidoff 2006, 20–21.
[1056] Argyll 1661, 22.

influence how siblings expressed themselves. While these texts were not always an accurate representation of the societal pressures impacting how siblings could express emotions, they cast light on the wider context within which brothers and sisters operated. The primary sources analysed here were also occasionally written in a way that followed these instructions.

This dissertation has also shown how ideas about honour and reputation may have influenced how siblings expressed emotions. For example, while expressions of anger could be acceptable in some situations in 17th century England, prevailing social norms highlighted harmony, moderation, and reconciliation as essential to upholding honour.[1057] This might, at least in part, have forced the eldest brothers to explain and justify any intense expressions of anger. Earlier research has also noted how privacy and preventing outsiders from hearing private discussions between family members could be a key determinant of a person's reputation. [1058] This could influence how siblings expressed emotions as well, as privacy during chastisement could be significant and limit how the sibling with power could act.

Norms, however, did not just restrict how siblings could act; siblings could also utilise them for their own benefit to express emotions and have control. For example, the norms concerning a good death, as articulated in the *Ars Moriendi*, were used to control emotional expressions and thus wield power, rather than just being applied as a guide for how to behave. Furthermore, duties could oblige elder brothers and sisters, in particular, to help their younger siblings,[1059] but elder siblings could also use a sense of duty and connected emotional expressions to assert control. For example, supervising that siblings acted according to their duties could sometimes be a way to express affection through helping. Reciprocity is interlinked with these themes by obliging action, but it could also, for example, be perceived as a reason for conveying feelings or sparking a promise for future emotional expressions. At other times, a departure from the religious norms could be noteworthy and connect to the powerful position that a sibling occupied. In the future, comparing the primary sources used in this dissertation with a larger sample of contemporary literature about norms and expectations would provide a better understanding of the extent to which those norms were actually followed. Although there has been some research on the emotional norms of the early modern period,[1060] there is certainly room for more.

The focus of this dissertation was only on siblings of the gentry and middling sort. This limitation was necessary to be able to examine expressed emotions in sufficient depth and complexity. However, this choice also limited the source material to a select few autobiographies, diaries, and collections of letters. The dissertation did not attempt to provide a comprehensive look at all the ways in which siblings could exert power and agency through their emotional expressions. While the lives and expressed emotions of people from lower social

---

[1057] Pollock 2004, 581–582; Pollock 2007, 29.
[1058] Fletcher 1995, 144.
[1059] Capp 2018, 32, 72.
[1060] For example, see Korhonen 2005.

strata would be important to examine, there are not enough sources with sufficient descriptions of emotions written by the persons themselves for this type of research to be conducted in the same manner as in this dissertation concerning 17th-century England. Of course, some research into these groups has been done, for example, by Bernard Capp concerning English siblings and Hanna Kietäväinen-Sirén in the Finnish context,[1061] but more remains to be explored.

Taking into consideration to whom the emotions were expressed was an important part of the analysis presented here. Genre had a significant impact on who the target was. Diaries were usually meant only for the author but could also be aimed at others to read; letters could be used to express emotions directly to a particular person or to describe how they had been expressed to someone else; autobiographies had the potential to have a wider audience, although this certainly was not always the case.[1062] The potential and/or intended audience could affect how siblings expressed their emotions and what feelings they conveyed or chose not to write about. Although correspondence aimed at only one person could allow for more freedom of expression, the other person's expectations could still influence what was written about and how. Beyond this, each genre had its own conventions, which could also influence how siblings conveyed their feelings. However, siblings also used the knowledge of a possible audience to their advantage. In autobiographies intended for others to read, brothers and sisters of all ages could try to influence readers other than their siblings by appearing morally superior or portraying themselves as victims. This also allowed for particular actions to be justified in certain ways. The opportunities thereby opened up for those lower in the power hierarchy support the argument that, over time, the development of the printing press provided new openings for the spread of a broad variety of ideas.[1063]

The case introduced at the very beginning of this study, featuring Constantine Fowler and her brother Herbert Aston in 1636, highlights the central theme of every sibling being able to exert some agency through, or in connection with, emotional expressions. Fowler's gender and younger age were not an issue, as she exercised control over Aston's life with the help of intense expressions of affection. The case also highlights the significance of context, as Aston was not the eldest brother in his family and therefore lacked the kind of control that the first-born heir might have had. However, his sister Constantine was also not dependent on him.[1064] The research has demonstrated that while hierarchies and power relations between siblings existed in 17th-century England, they were flexible and influenced by emotional expressions. In other words, this work has painted a picture of early modern English society as hierarchical but far from rigidly fixed. This dissertation has added to the history of the family by further elaborating on what sibling relationships in early modern England were really

---

[1061] For example, Kietäväinen-Sirén 2015, Capp 2018, 40–47.
[1062] Wilcox, Hobby, Hind, Graham 1989, 17; O'Day 2001, 140; Cambers 2007, 815–816, 821–822.
[1063] See for example Eisenstein 1983/2005.
[1064] see Constance Fowler to Herbert Aston August 11, 1636, Tixall Letters 1815, 87–88 and Capp 2018, 62.

like through a close examination of emotional expressions and their connections to power and duty. At the same time, it has reminded historians of the significance of sibling relationships in this body of literature. It has also enhanced our understanding of the nature of hierarchies in English society during the long 17th century, including the possibilities for action enjoyed by the gentry and middling sort older and younger men and women.

SUMMARY IN FINNISH

Englantilaisen varhaismodernin ajan perheen historian tutkimus on perinteisesti keskittynyt käsittelemään avioparia tai vanhempien suhteita lapsiinsa. Tutkimus on kuitenkin lisääntyvissä määrin kiinnittänyt huomiota myös sisaruksiin sekä heidän merkityksiinsä toistensa elämässä. Toisaalta sisarusten keskinäisiin valtasuhteisiin ja niihin liittyviin tunneilmaisuihin keskittyvää tutkimusta on vähemmän. Avioparin sekä vanhempien ja lapsien suhteet olivat hyvin hierarkkisia, kun taas sisarusten välejä voidaan kuvata horisontaalisiksi, eli suhteiksi, joissa valtarakenteet olivat tasaisempia. Tästä huolimatta he eivät olleet tasa-arvoisia ja moni seikka, kuten ikä, taloudellinen tilanne ja sukupuoli vaikuttivat valtasuhteiden rakentumiseen sisarusten välille. Väitöskirja tarkastelee sitä, miten kategoriat kuten valta ja velvollisuus yhdistyivät tunne-ilmaisuihin sisarusten suhteissa ja miten siskot ja veljet pyrkivät vaikuttamaan toistensa tunneilmaisuihin Englannissa pitkällä 1600-luvulla. Väitöskirja korostaa tunneilmaisujen merkityksen sisarusten välisissä suhteissa sekä tuo esille sen, kuinka sisarusten suhteet ovat voineet olla hyvin tärkeitä läpi elämän. Toisaalta olennaista myös on, että vaikka tunneilmaisut ottivat osaa valtasuhteisiin, ei tunteita ilmaistu vain saavuttaakseen jotain. Vilpitön rakkaus, suru ja viha olivat aina myös osa sisarusten elämää.

Väitöskirjassa tarkastellaan alempaan aateliin ja yhteiskunnan keskitasoon (*middling sort*) kuuluvia perheitä. Alkuperäisaineiston ytimen muodostavat yhdeksän henkilöiden itsensä kirjoittamaa aineistokokoelmaa eli egodokumenttia, joissa on mukana päiväkirjoja, omaelämäkertoja sekä kirjeitä. Näihin kuuluvat kolme naista: Alice Thornton (omaelämäkerta), Elizabeth Freke (omaelämäkerta), Dorothy Osborne (kirjeet) sekä kuusi miestä: Samuel Pepys (päiväkirja), Oxindenin perheen veljekset (kirjeet), Henry Newcome (omaelämäkerta), William Stout (omaelämäkerta), John Evelyn (päiväkirja) ja Thomas Meautys (kirjeet). Näitä käsitellään tuoden esimerkkejä siitä, miten sisarukset toimivat, mutta tutkimus ei kuitenkaan sulje pois sitä, että täysin poikkeaviakin toimintatapoja on voinut olla käytössä. Lähteet ovat yhden henkilön kuvaus toiminnasta ja ne ovat hyvin subjektiivisia. Usein ne ovat myös hyvin yksipuolisia vain yhden sisaruksen kuvauksia tilanteesta eikä muiden veljien tai siskojen kantaa asioihin ole mahdollista saada. Toisaalta ne edustavat montaa eri tekstilajia, joissa on kaikissa omat konventionsa ja genren mahdollinen vaikutus onkin huomioitu analyysissä. Esimerkiksi kirjoittajan odotus tekstinsä yksityisyyden tasosta sekä tekstille tarkoitettu yleisö voivat vaikuttaa sisältöön. Näitä pääasiallisia alkuperäislähteitä on täydennetty muilla egodokumenteilla sekä kontekstia kartoittavalla varhaismodernin ajan kirjallisuudella, kuten uskonnollisilla teksteillä.

Vanhimman pojan oikeus periä suurin osa vanhempiensa omaisuudesta, eli esikoisoikeus, on merkittävissä määrin synnyttänyt hierarkkisia rakenteita sisarusten välille ja se on jo aiemmin kiinnostanut tutkijoita. Esikoisoikeus antoi monesti huomattavasti valtaa ja toimijuutta vanhimmalle pojalle sekä normatiivisten odotusten että usein paremman taloudellisen aseman kautta. Pitää

kuitenkin muistaa, että vanhin velikin saattoi joutua taloudellisiin vaikeuksiin, joka puolestaan vaikutti hänen valta-asemaansa. Toisaalta tämä ei ollut ainoa tapa saada valtaa vaikuttaa muihin sisaruksiin. Sisaruksilla saattoi olla muista syistä kuten avioliiton kautta hyvä taloudellinen asema, mutta myös ikä saattoi tuoda arvovaltaa.

Tunneilmaisut ottivat osaa myös hierarkkisessa asemassa korkealla olleiden sisaruksien toimintaan monella tapaa. Samuel Pepysillä oli korkea asema perheen hierarkiassa ja hän käskytti sisaruksiaan oman arvonsa tuntevasti. Hän läksytti nuorempiaan heidän toiminnastaan, jonka hän oli arvioinut vääräksi sekä yksityisesti että muiden henkilöiden läsnä ollessa ilmaisten paheksuntansa intensiivisellä tavalla. Yksityinen tilanne, johon ottivat osaa vain Pepys ja läksytettävä sisarus antoivat Pepysille tilaa ilmaista itsensä vapaasti nojautuen vanhimman veljensä asemaansa. Se myös tuki hänen auktoriteettiaan. Perheen isän ottaessa myös osaa läksytykseen saattoi Pepys edelleen ilmaista tunteensa intensiivisesti, mutta myös tukeutua isänsä auktoriteettiin vahvistaakseen entisestään sanomaansa.

Ei sanoa, että tämä oli kaikkien tapa toimia ja vahvassa hierarkkisessa asemassa olleet vanhimmat veljet saattoivatkin vastaavassa tilanteessa ilmaista mielipiteensä huomattavasti lievemmin. Tällaisessa tilanteessa tunneilmaisuja saatettiin käyttää auktoriteetin tukena ja keinona suostutella vastapuolta toimimaan käskytyksen sijaan. Henry Oxinden oli vanhin veli, joka intensiivisen vihan sijaan muistutti kirjeissään veljelleen Jamesia seurauksista, mikäli hän ei käyttäytyisi hyvin, mukaan lukien Henryn antaman avun sekä hänen ilmaisemansa rakkauden loppuminen. Esimerkiksi persoonallisuus saattoi vaikuttaa eri tapojen valintaan näiden kahden veljeksen välillä, mutta myös genrellä saattoi olla vaikutusta, sillä Pepysin päiväkirja oli kirjeisiin verrattuna todennäköisemmin yksityisempi. Toisaalta Pepyskin lopulta puolusti intensiivisesti ilmaistua paheksuntaansa perustelemalla toimintansa esimerkiksi sillä, että hän pyrki toimimaan veljiensä parhaaksi. Siskonsa läksytystä hän ei kuitenkaan pyrkinyt oikeuttamaan.

Patriarkaalisen yhteiskunnan rakenteet antoivat luonnollisesti veljille paremmat mahdollisuudet toimia kuin heidän siskoilleen. Kuvaukset erimielisyyksistä toivat kuitenkin esille sekä naisen, kuka alistui kohtaloonsa, mutta myös siskon mahdollisuuksia toimia sekä sen, miten tunneilmaisut ottivat tähän osaa. Kuten Henry Oxinden, myös Alice Thornton yhdisti kiistan ja rakkauden ilmaisun toisiinsa. Hän ilmaisi kirjeessään aviomiehelleen, että vaikka hänen vanhin veljensä Christopher ei sitä ansainnut, Jumalan tahto velvoitti Thorntonia ilmaisemaan rakkautta joka tapauksessa. Toisaalta Thorntonin eri ajankohtana omaelämäkerrassaan ilmaisema epäusko hänen veljensä Christopherin rakkautta kohtaan oli keino ilmaista tunteita ja saada vaikutusvaltaa veljeensä tai teoksensa lukijaan. Siskoilla oli myös mahdollisuus ilmaista vihaa veljilleen. Dorothy Osborne kiisteli toisiksi vanhemman veljensä Henryn kanssa siitä, kenen kanssa Osborne avioituisi. Huomattavaa kuitenkin oli, että hän ei kirjeissään tulevalle aviomiehelleen koskaan kertonut aloittaneensa riitoja vaan puolustaneen itseään. Henryllä ei muun muassa syntymäjärjestyksensä vuoksi

ollut vaikutusmahdollisuuksia samalla tapaa kuin vaikka Christopherilla. Toisaalta Osbornen mahdollisuuksia toimia veljensä tahdon vastaisesti tuki esimerkiksi se, että hänen taloudellinen toimeentulonsa olisi hänen tulevan avioliiton myötä turvattu.

Itsensä kuvaaminen sisaruksen vääränlaisen käytöksen uhrina omaelämäkerrassa antoi myös monenlaisessa hierarkkisessa asemassa olleille sisarukselle keinon saada valtaa narratiivin kontrollin kautta. Tässä korostui etenkin kiistan kohteena olleen tapauksen jälkeen omaelämäkerrassa saatu mahdollisuus vaikuttaa lukijan käsitykseen tapauksesta sen kuvauksen kautta. Tunneilmaisut tukivat näissä heidän sanomaansa. Niille sisaruksille, joilla oli korkea hierarkkinen asema ainakin teoriassa tämä toi esille heidän asemansa antamien oikeuksien loukkauksia. Esimerkiksi John Guise kertoi loukkaantumisestaan, kun hänen siskonsa olivat menneet naimisiin ilman, että hänen mielipidettään oli huomioitu. Toisaalta myös annettu apu saattoi johtaa odotuksiin muiden käytöksestä. Elizabeth Freke valitti nuoremman siskonsa olleen haluton huolehtimaan hänestä, vaikka hän oli auttanut siskoaan rahallisesti. Vanhempia suosiminen saattoi nostaa toisen, muuten heikommassa asemassa olleen sisaruksen parempaan valta-asemaan. James Yonge kuvasi kuinka hänen vanhempansa suosivat hänen nuorempaa veljeään. Yonge ei vanhemmasta iästään huolimatta kyennyt vaikuttamaan tilanteeseen vaan yhteisön painostus muutti tilanteen hänen parhaakseen. Asian käsittely päiväkirjassa antoi hänelle kuinkin mahdollisuuden tuoda esille hänen oma käsityksensä tilanteesta sen mahdollisille lukijoille. Toisaalta hän oli mielestään sorrettu myös nuorempana ja siten hierarkiassa teoriassa heikompiosaisena veljenä. Hän kuvasi päiväkirjassaan, kuinka paljon paremmin hänen vanhempansa kohtelivat hänen vanhempaa veljeään. Myös siis nuoremmat sisarukset saattoivat asettaa rajoja sille, mitä he pitivät oikeudenmukaisena.

Monique Sheerin *emotional practices* -käsite on väitöskirjassa olennaisessa asemassa. Käsitteen korostama toiminnan ja kehon suhde tunneilmaisuihin näyttäytyy monella tapaa läpi tutkimuksen esimerkiksi kirjeiden kirjoittamisen kautta. Erityisesti luvussa neljä keskitytään tarkastelemaan tunneilmaisuja ja toimintaa sekä niiden yhteyttä vallankäyttöön ja toimijuuteen. Niille sisaruksille, joille avun tarjoaminen oli mahdollista, auttaminen oli keino saada lisää toimijuutta eli keinoja vaikuttaa muiden sisarusten toimintaan. Näissä tapauksissa auttava, usein vanhempi sisarus, saattoi ilmaista rakkautta keinona vaikuttaa entistä paremmin sisaruksiinsa ja korostaaksensa omaa kantaansa. Toisaalta auttaminen vanhemman asemaan astumisena äidin ja isän kuoltua antoi näille veljille vahvemman valta-aseman. Tämä oli totta myös Henry Newcomen ja hänen sisarustensa suhteissa, vaikka Newcome myös kuvasi heidän välistään rakkautta.

Nuorempi sisarus oli usein, mutta ei aina, apua saava osapuoli. Nuorempi veli James Oxinden vetosi vanhimman veljensä Henryn aiemmin ilmaisemaan rakkauteen sekä käyttäytyi odotusten mukaisesti vanhinta veljeään kohtaan ylläpitääkseen Henryltä saamaansa apua ja hänen rakkauttaan. Vaikka lahjojen vastaanottaminen oli painotukseltaan erilaista verrattuna auttamiseen, liittyivät

molemmat vastavuoroisuuteen. Vanhemman veljensä lahjoja vastaanottanut Mary Evelyn tunsi painetta vastata veljensä Johnin anteliaisuuteen. Mary pystyi kuitenkin täyttämään vastavuoroisuuden velvollisuuden antamalla tilanteessa vastuuta veljelleen ja hänen valinnalleen antaa lahjoja. Rakkauden ilmaisu saattoi lisätä sekä vahvemmassa että heikommassa asemassa olevan sisaruksen toimijuutta, mutta sitä ilmaistiin myös vilpittömästä läheisyydentunteesta siskoja ja veljiä kohtaan. Nämä eivät myöskään ole toisiansa poissulkevia.

Vierailu ja kirjeiden lähettäminen olivat myös tekoja, jotka itsessään ilmaisivat tunteita ja loivat sisaruksille tilaisuuksia saada toimijuutta. Vierailun kautta sisarukset ylläpitivät läheisiä suhteita ja ilmaisivat rakkautta, mutta etäisyys myös saattoi vaikuttaa negatiivisesti suhteeseen. Se ei kuitenkaan välttämättä vaikuttanut sisarusten väliseen läheisyyteen tai siinä ilmaistuun rakkauden määrään. Vierailujen tekeminen saattoi johtaa läheisen sisarussuhteen elvyttämiseen, mutta samalla se toi osapuolille uusia mahdollisuuksia vaikuttaa sisarusten elämään. Myös yllätysvierailun avulla vierailla sisaruksilla oli mahdollisuuksia vaikuttaa ainakin vierailun aikaan ja paikkaan, kun taas vastaanottavalla oli paine hyväksyä vierailu kohteliaisuussyistä.

Sisarukset asuivat joskus myös yhdessä, joka saattoi muokata heidän keskinäisiä roolejaan ja sen kautta vaikuttaa heidän hierarkiaansa ja toimijuuteensa. Toisaalta pidempiaikainen vierailu saattoi olla keino auttaa. John Evelynin vanhin veli George majoitti Johnin perhettä Lontoon ulkopuolella ruton riehuessa kaupungissa Johnin jäädessä Lontooseen. John kuvasi suurta jälleennäkemisen riemua, ja onkin todennäköistä, että George toimi rakkaudesta veljeään kohtaan. Tämä saattoi kuitenkin myös luoda odotuksen vastavuoroisuudesta, antaa Georgelle mahdollisuuksia vaikuttaa veljeensä ja vähentää Johnin perheeseensä kohdistuvaa toimijuutta. Kaikki sisarukset eivät kuitenkaan suhtautuneet vierailuihin myötämielisesti, mutta suostuivat pakon edessä. Tässä tilanteessa korkeammalla hierarkkisella asemalla oli hyötyä, sillä se antoi majapaikan tarjoavalle sisarukselle toimijuutta asettaa vierailun ehdot. Luonnollisesti heihin kuitenkin myös vaikuttivat sisarusten välinen rakkaus, normatiivinen paine auttaa ja vierailijan mahdolliset vaikutuspyrkimykset.

Kirjeet olivat monelle sisarukselle tärkeä keino ilmaista rakkautta ja ylläpitää läheistä suhdetta. Kirjoittamalla kirjeiden olennaisesta asemasta sisarussuhteessa oli mahdollista ilmaista rakkautta, mutta myös sitouttaa vastaanottajaa vastaamaan viestiin. Sisarukset myös reagoivat voimakkaasti, jos heitä syytettiin siitä, että he eivät olleet lähettäneet kirjeitä. Constance Fowler esimerkiksi syytti kirjeiden toimitustapaa ja siihen osallisena olevaa setäänsä siitä, että hänen veljensä ei ollut saanut hänen kirjeitään. Thomas Meautys puolestaan totesi, että hän oli kirjoittanut siskolleen Jane Cornwallisille kirjeitä siskon vastakkaisista syytöksistä huolimatta. Hän puolustautui ja pyrki vaikuttamaan siskon mielipiteeseen korostamalla rakkautta osana kirjeiden lähettämistä siskolleen. Tilanne kuitenkin kääntyi päälaelleen. Thomas Meautys käyttikin eri keinoja pyrkimyksissään saada kirjeitä paremmassa taloudellisessa asemassa olevalta siskoltaan. Hän korosti pettymyksen tunteitaan, muistutti siskoaan siitä, kuinka heidän suhteensa oli ennen ollut rakastava ja läheinen ja totesi, että hän oli valmis

uskomaan, että hänen siskonsa ei tahallaan jättänyt kirjoittamatta. Etenkin Thomas Meautysin kirjeiden tarkastelu paljasti hänen vaikutuspyrkimyksiään, mutta samalla myös siskon toimimattomuus korostui.

Samantapaisesti sairaista sisaruksista huolehtiminen nosti usein esille veljien ja siskojen kyvyttömyyden vaikuttaa sekä sairauteen että sairaaseen sisarukseen. Onnettomuudet ja äkilliset sairaskohtaukset vaikuttivat omalla tavallaan tunneilmaisuihin ja toimijuuteen. Vanhimmalla pojalla Samuel Pepysillä oli vahva hierarkkinen asema perheessään. Hän kuvasi kuinka hänen veljensä John sai sairaskohtauksen heidän viettäessään aikaa yhdessä. Pepys ilmaisi pelkoa ja rakkautta veljeään kohtaan sekä tunnetilan jatkuvuutta läpi päivän. Riippumatta hänen vahvasta asemasta perheessään, oli tämä tilanne, joka rajoitti hänen toimijuuttaan.

Kykenemättömyys auttaa sairasta sisarusta saattoi ilmaista tunnetta tai johtaa sen ilmaisuun sekä vaikuttaa toimijuuteen. Vaikka John Evelyn oli vanhempi kuin veljensä Richard, ei hän kyennyt suostuttelemaan veljeään menemään leikkaukseen. Richardin kykyä tehdä omat päätöksensä ja olla huomioimatta Johnin tahto tuki hänen hyvä taloudellinen asemansa. Huolta ja rakkautta veljeään kohtaan ilmaissut John otti yhteyttä ystäväänsä Samuel Pepysiin, kuka oli läpikäynyt saman leikkauksen mihin John halusi Richardin menevän. Vaikka Pepysin kokemukset ja arvovalta saattoivat antaa Johnille lisää mahdollisuuksia pyrkiä vaikuttamaan veljensä toimintaan, joutui John lopulta tyytymään rukoilemaan Jumalaa auttamaan veljeään. Alice Thornton puolestaan oli kykenemätön toimimaan nuorena vanhempiensa vaikutuksesta. Asuessaan vielä kotona hän ei saanut lupaa nähdä sairasta pikkuveljeään Johnia, mutta kuvasi rakkauttaan häntä kohtaan ja siitä johtuvaa halua olla yhteydessä Johniin. Thornton lähetti lopulta kirjeitä veljelleen koiransa avulla, mutta sairastui itse ja koki toimintansa olleen tähän syypää. Tämä myös muutti hänen tunne-ilmaisunsa rakkaudesta pelkoon. Joskus omaa kyvyttömyyttä toimia pystyi paikkaamaan muiden avulla. Alice Thornton ei jälleen päässyt vierailemaan sairaan veljensä Johnin luona heidän kasvettuaan aikuisiksi, mutta hän lähetti vävynsä herra Comberin sen sijaan. Vaikka Thornton saattoi Comberin kautta pyrkiä vaikuttamaan veljeensä tunteiden ilmaisun lisäksi, vähensi hänen oma kyvyttömyytensä saapua paikalle hänen toimijuuttaan. Joskus sisarukset myös ilmaisivat pettymyksensä koskien kyvyttömyyttä toteuttaa sisaruksiinsa liittyneitä tulevaisuuden suunnitelmia. Toisilla puolestaan oli tarve kehottaa sisaruksia toimimaan heidän toimimattomuutensa vuoksi.

Vastavuoroisuus oli usein tärkeää 1600-luvun Englannin ihmissuhteissa. Esimerkiksi Alice Thorntonin sairas sisko Lady Danby korosti kuinka Thorntonin toiminta ilmaisi rakkautta, mutta Danby myös lupasi toivuttuaan vastata tähän rakkauteen. Hän ei kuitenkaan koskaan saanut mahdollisuutta, vaan kuoli pian. Tulee huomata, että Thornton ei ilmiselvästi toiminut vain hyötyäkseen vastavuoroisuudesta. Sairaan sisaruksen hoivaaminen saattoi korostaa takaisinmaksun tarpeettomuutta sekä sitä kautta sisarussuhteen läheisyyttä. Hoivaavalla sisaruksella oli myös tilaisuus vaikuttaa siihen, millainen kuolemansairaan sisaruksen loppuelämä oli ja ilmaista rakkautta hoivaamisen kautta.

Toisaalta normatiiviset odotukset ja velvollisuudet saattoivat myös vaikuttaa. Esimerkiksi William Stout piti huolta hänen kanssaan asuneesta siskostaan Elinistä hänen ollessa kuolemansairas. Vaikka heidän suhteensa oli ennen ollut hyvinkin vastavuoroinen, ei Elin voinut enää auttaa. Stout kuvasi kuitenkin pitäneensä hyvää huolta siskostaan loppuun asti ja surreensa suuresti hänen kuolemaansa. Tämä korosti hoivaamisen ilmaisevaa rakkautta.

Kun sisarusten läksyttämisen ja uhriutumisen käsittely korostivat uhrin, loukkaantuneen henkilön ja muiden väärintekemisiin puuttuvan sisaruksen näkökulmaa, sen analysoiminen miten sisarukset välttelivät, muuttivat tai korvasivat tunneilmaisuja toi esille loukkaajan tai mahdollisen loukkaajan. Toisaalta myös muut kuin riitoihin liittyvät teemat nousivat esille. Lohduttaminen oli myös tapa pyrkiä vaikuttamaan sisaruksen tunneilmaisuihin ja muuttamaan sitä erilaiseksi. Tunneilmaisujen välttämisessä, muuttamisessa ja korvaamisessa tärkeä teema oli kuitenkin aika ennen riitoja tai niiden lopettamiseen pyrkiminen. Tavat pyrkiä välttämään vihan ilmaisun kohteena olemista liittyivät usein heikommassa hierarkkisessa asemassa olleiden sisarusten toimintaan, mutta myös muut saattoivat toimia sillä tavalla. Henry Oxindenin Samuel Pepysiin verrattuna vähemmän intensiivisempi tapa ilmaista tunteita liittyen nuorempien sisarusten huonoon käytökseen saattoi myös auttaa riidan eskaloitumisen estämisessä. Kuitenkin hän myös varoitti nuorempaa veljeään Jamesia toimimasta epätoivotulla tavalla, pyrkien näin estämään konfliktin syntymisen kokonaan. James myös kommentoi pyrkimyksiään välttää riidan syntyminen hyvinkin suoraan, pyytäen veljeään olemaan uskomatta, että hän tuntisi vihaa.

Sympatiaan vetoaminen oli nuoremmille sisaruksille keino välttää vihan ilmaisun kohteeksi joutumista. Se millä tavalla tätä lähestyttiin, vaihteli tapauksen mukaan. William Booth vetosi kirjeessään vanhemmalle veljelleen Johnille pakottavaan tarpeensa saada apua velan maksuun, mutta samalla pyysi veljeään olemaan vihaamatta häntä ja muistamaan hänen rakkautensa Johnia kohtaan. Boothin lähestymistapa oli suhteellisen hienovarainen, kun taas James Oxinden totesi suoraan epäonnistuneensa vetoamaan veljensä Henryn sympatiaan. Aiemmassa kirjeessä hän myös vihjasi vaikean taloudellisen tilanteensa olleen Henryn syytä sekä kuvaamalla tilanteensa vaikeutta pyrki hän herättämään veljensä sympatian. Thomas Boothin lähestymistapa puolestaan toi esille kompromissien ja auttamisen osuutta potentiaalisten riitatilanteiden välttämiseksi. Esimerkiksi sympatia tai rakkaus saattoivat vaikuttaa tämän lähestymistavan valitsemiseen. Hän toi esille kirjeessään veljelleen Johnille heidän setänsä jättäneen heidän veljensä Charlesin perinnöttä. Hän kuitenkin halusi antaa Charlesille myös jotain ja toivoi että hän ja Charles olisivat aiheesta yhtä mieltä. Sympatiaan vetoamisen lisäksi asioista kertomatta jättäminen oli keino saada vapautta keskustella asioista, jotka muuten saattaisivat johtaa riitaan. Samuel Pepys kirjoitti päiväkirjassaan siitä, kuinka hänen veljensä Tom ja John olivat kritisoineet häntä keskinäisessä kirjeenvaihdossaan. Heikommassa hierarkkisessa asemassa olleet veljet löysivätkin tavan kommunikoida vapaammin, mutta tapa ei ollut vailla riidan riskiä. Tulee huomata, että tässä on mahdollista tarkastella vain Pepysin näkemystä asiasta.

Vaikka riidan välttäminen oli joissain tapauksissa mahdollista, sisarukset pyrkivät myös eri tavoin lepyttämään jo alkanutta riitaa. Tiedon antaminen sekä käytöksen oikeuttaminen saattoivat auttaa tässä. Samuel Pepysin veli Tom suututti veljensä lähtiessä kaupungista ilman lupaa, mutta kertoessaan tehneensä tämän, jotta hän löytäisi vaimon, Pepysin tunneilmaisut muuttuivat. Toisaalta korrekti ja kohtelias käytös saattoi auttaa riidan purkamisessa tai ainakin tilanteen rauhoittamisessa. Dorothy Osborne ja hänen toisiksi vanhin veljensä Henry kertoivat riidelleensä, mutta kuitenkin käyttäytyneensä kohteliaasti. Suoranainen anteeksipyyntö ja -anto oli myös mahdollista ja yksilöllisesti määräytyneet tilanteet vaikuttivat siihen, milloin anteeksi pyytäminen oli tarpeellista. Dorothy Osborne kuvasi toisiksi vanhimman veljensä Henryn kanssa käymiään riitoja kirjeissään tulevalle miehelleen William Templelle. Hän kirjoitti Henryn pyytäneen anteeksi käytöstään siskolleen, mutta Osborne pyysi itse anteeksi Templeltä sympaattisuuttaan ja anteeksiantavaisuuttaan veljeään kohtaan. Sympaattisuudella ja rakkaudella saattoikin olla merkittävä rooli anteeksiannossa. Osborne kuvasikin Templelle myös sitä, kuinka hän ei voinut olla olematta sympaattinen Henryä kohtaan, kun hän aneli anteeksiantoa.

Oikean ajoituksen löytäminen anteeksi antamiselle ja -pyytämiselle saattoi myös olla tärkeää. James Oxinden uskalsi lähestyä vanhinta veljeään Henryä vasta kun hän uskoi, että Henry oli kuullut muilta, että Henryn ei tulisi syyttää häntä hänen epäonnestaan. Jamesin kirjeet Henrylle myös osoittavat, kuinka kehuminen auttoi anteeksi pyytämisessä. Se antoi nuoremmalle, heikommassa valta-asemassa olevalle sisarukselle tavan pyrkiä vaikuttamaan. James pyysi Henryltä anteeksi tuntemattomasta syystä kirjeessään, mutta samalla kehui Henryä ja hänen anteeksiantavaista luonnettaan. Toisaalta muiden ihmisten syyttäminen sisarusten välisistä riidoista saattoi ohjata huomion muualle ja vaikuttaa sisarusten välisiin tunteisiin kohdistamalla syyllisyyteen liittyvät tunneilmaisut muualle. Alice Thornton riiteli veljensä Christopherin kanssa heidän isänsä testamentista, mutta usein syytti Christopherin appea veljensä sijaan tästä riidasta. Thornton ilmaisikin sympatiaa Christopheria kohtaan, joka saattoi myös auttaa ylläpitämään suhdetta hänen veljensä kanssa.

Anteeksianto saattoi olla myös pitempiaikainen prosessi, joka saattoi auttaa vanhinta ja hyvässä hierarkkisessa asemassa olevaa veljeä ylläpitämään valta-asemansa. Samuel Pepys kuvasi päiväkirjassaan, kuinka hän aloitti anteeksiannon prosessin kirjoittamalla pitkästä aikaa veljelleen Johnille ja myöhemmin totesi, että hän ei ollut vielä antanut anteeksi, mutta kuitenkin auttoi veljeään. Kaikki sisarukset eivät kuitenkaan tienneet kuinka suhteen voisi korjata paremmaksi. Dorothy Osborne korosti niitä ongelmia, joita hänen suhteessa veljeensä Henryyn oli kirjoittamalla pettymyksestään suhteeseen tulevalle miehelleen William Templelle. Hän totesi hänen välinsä Henryyn olleen ennen hyvät ja totesi ettei hän tiennyt kuinka muuttaa tilanne.

Tunneilmaisujen muuttamiseen pyrkiminen ei liittynyt vain lepyttelyyn sekä anteeksipyyntöön ja -antoon vaan myös riitoihin liittymättömät teemat nousivat esille lohdutuksen kautta. Vierailu oli teko, jonka kautta sisarukset

saattoivat lohduttaa toisiaan ja antoi alemmassa hierarkkisessa asemassa olleelle sisarukselle keinon vaikuttaa siskon tai veljen tunneilmaisuihin. John Evelyn kuvasi päiväkirjassaan, kuinka hän vieraili veljensä Georgen luona Georgen vaimon kuoltua sekä kuvasi hänen veljiensä tehneen samoin hänen lastensa kuoltua. Henry Newcome puolestaan kuvasi, kuinka hänen veljiensä vierailu hänen lapsensa sairastuttua toi hänelle iloa ja lohtua. Lohdutus oli mahdollista myös pyrkimällä saamaan surullinen sisarus käymään vierailulla. Kun Herbert Aston menetti vaimonsa hänen nuorin sisaruksensa Constance Fowler sekä hänen vanhin veljensä Walter Aston pyysivät Herberttiä vierailemaan luonaan, jotta hän ei surisi yksin kotonaan. Tavat, joilla he tekivät tämän, heijastivat heidän asemaansa sisarushierarkiassa. Fowler pyysi Herberttiä toimimaan haluamallaan tavalla ja vetosi tunteisiin, kun taas Walter mainitsi velvollisuudet ja tottelevaisuuden. *Ars moriendiin* eli oikeanlaiseen kuolemaan liittyvät konventiot nousivat esille lohdutuksessa. Siihen nojaaminen antoi heikommassa hierarkkisessa asemassa olevalle sisarukselle mahdollisuuden pyrkiä vaikuttamaan sekä vastapuolen toimintaan että tunneilmaisuihin. Thomas Meautys lohdutti siskoaan Jane Cornwallisia hänen toisen miehensä kuoleman jälkeen tavalla, joka heijasti *ars moriendin* konventioita selvästi. Vaikka nämä konventiot ohjasivat hänen tekstiään tiettyyn suuntaan, antoivat ne samalla hänelle mahdollisuuden pyrkiä vaikuttamaan sisaruksen tunneilmaisuihin näihin konventioihin nojaten.

Väitöskirja on korostanut sitä millä tavoin sisarukset ilmaisivat tunteita ja miten he pyrkivät vaikuttamaan toistensa tunneilmaisuihin. Analyysikappaleiden aiheet, eli riidat, teot sekä tunteiden välttäminen ja muuttaminen, kertovat tutkimuksen temaattisista kategorisoinneista. Vaikka väitöskirja toi esille hierarkiassa korkealla olevien sisarusten valtaa, korosti se myös sitä, että heikommassa asemassa olevilla oli erilaisia keinoja saada valtaa ja toimijuutta. Tunneilmaisuilla oli tässä merkittävä osansa. Olennaista on huomata, että vaikka sisaruksella olisi huonompi valta-asema toisesta näkökulmasta tarkasteltuna, monet eri kontekstit vaikuttivat heidän toimijuuteensa tai sen puuttumiseen mukaan lukien syntymäjärjestys ja taloudellinen tilanne. Vanhin veli oli yleisesti paremmassa hierarkkisessa asemassa ja se heijastui hänen mahdollisuuksiinsa ilmaista tunteita sekä käyttää tunneilmaisuja keinona vahvistaa valtaansa. Toisaalta vanhimmalla veljellä oli myös mahdollisuus valita toisenlainen lähestymistapa tunneilmaisuihin ja vallankäyttöön. Nuoremmat sisarukset olivat usein huonommassa asemassa. Tunneilmaisut antoivat heille monia eri mahdollisuuksia vaikuttaa sisaruksiinsa.

SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Manuscript Sources

British Library

Add Ms 78440, EVELYN PAPERS. Vol. CCLXXIII. Mary Evelyn, daughter of John Evelyn the diarist: Correspondence and papers: [1675]–1685. Western Manuscripts.

Add Ms 78442, EVELYN PAPERS. Vol. CCLXXV. Family letters to John Evelyn junior, son of John Evelyn the diarist, and his wife Martha (Spencer): 1673–1726. Western Manuscripts.

Add Ms 88897/2, Alice Thornton: "An Account of memorable Affaires, and Accidents, on my selfe, & Family; & Children with Deliverances, and Meditations thereon Since my Widdowed condition since Sept: 17th 1668". With a note on the fly-leaf, "A Manuscript written by my Dear Grandmother Mrs Thornton". Western Manuscripts.

Folger Shakespeare Library

F. c. 20., Autograph letters signed from Thomas Booth, London, to John Booth [manuscript], 1683–1689.
https://luna.folger.edu/luna/servlet/view/search?q=call_number=%22F.c.20%22

F. c. 12., Autograph letters signed from William Booth, London, to John Booth [manuscript], 1628–1647 (bulk 1628–1629).
https://luna.folger.edu/luna/servlet/view/search?q=call_number=%22F.c.12%22

Printed Primary Sources

Allestree, Richard (1659), Whole Duty of Man. London: T. Garthwait.
https://www.proquest.com/books/practice-christian-graces-whole-duty-man-laid/docview/2248510005/se-2

Allestree, Richard (1671), The Gentleman's Calling. London: Robert Pawlett.
https://books.google.fi/books?id=LsA6AQAAMAAJ

Allestree, Richard (1673), The Ladies Calling. Oxford: Printed at the Theater.
https://www.proquest.com/docview/2240913220

Argyll, Archibald (1661), Instructions to a Son. London: Printed at Edinburgh and reprinted at London for D. Trench.
https://www.proquest.com/docview/2240960962

Aston, Herbert (1815), An Account of the Death of the Honble Mrs Herbert Aston. In Tixall Letters. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown. https://books.google.fi/books?id=2iAJAAAAQAAJ

Bacon, Francis (1612), The Essaies of Sr Francis Bacon Knight, the Kings Solliciter Generall. London: John Beale. https://www.proquest.com/books/essaies-sr-francis-bacon-knight-kings-solliciter/docview/2240900407/se-2

Bacon, Francis (1908), Of Simulation and Dissimulation. In Bacon's Essays, edited by Alfred S. West. Cambridge: At the University Press. https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Bacon%27s_Essays

Bailey, Nathan (1726), An Universal Etymological English Dictionary. London. https://archive.org/details/universaletymolo00bailuoft

Blackburne, Lancelot (1694), The Unreasonableness of Anger. London: Thomas Bennet. https://www.proquest.com/books/unreasonableness-anger-sermon-preachd-before/docview/2248572797/se-2

Bramston, John (1845), The Autobiography of Sir John Bramston. London: Camden Society. https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000587628

Brathwaite, Richard (1630), The English Gentleman. London: John Haviland. https://www.proquest.com/books/english-gentleman-containing-sundry-excellent/docview/2248565997/se-2

Burton, Robert (1621), The Anatomy of Melancholy. Oxford: Henry Cripps. https://www.proquest.com/books/anatomy-melancholy-vvhat-is-vvith-all-kindes/docview/2240893301/se-2

Courtin, Antoine de (1675), The Rules of Civility. London: J. Martyn & John Starkey. https://books.google.fi/books?id=IQIqMwEACAAJ&hl=fi

Descartes, René (1650), The passions of the soule. London: A. C. https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/A81352.0001.001

Descartes, René (1985), Philosophical Writings, Volume 1. Translated by John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff, Dugald Murdoch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Downame, John (1600), Spiritual Physicke. London: Gabriel Simson. https://www.proquest.com/books/spiritual-physicke-cure-diseases-soule-arising/docview/2240884572/se-2

Evelyn, John (1908), The Diary of John Evelyn. Edited by Austin Dobson. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited. https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.175078

Fairfax, Thomas (1691), Advice to a Young Lord Written by his Father. London: Printed for, and are to be Sold by R. Baldwin. https://www.proquest.com/docview/2240891114/11836752

Filmer, Robert (1680), Patriarcha; or the Natural Power of Kings. London: Ric. Chiswell. https://oll-resources.s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/oll3/store/titles/221/0140_Bk.pdf

Fleetwood, William (1722), The Relative Duties of Parents and Children, Husbands and Wives, Masters and Servants. London: E. Bell, J. Darey, A. Bettesworth, F. Fayram, J. Pemberton, J. Hooke, C. Rivington, F. Clay, J.

Batley, and E. Symon.
https://books.google.fi/books?id=c8EsAAAAYAAJ

Freke, Elizabeth (2001), The Remembrances of Elizabeth Freke, 1671–1714. Camden Fifth Series Volume 18. Edited by Raymond A. Anselment. London: Cambridge University Press.

Gouge, William (1622), Of Domesticall Duties: Eight Treatises. London: William Bladen.
https://www.proquest.com/docview/2264186500/C751917ED92547B3PQ/2

Guise, Christopher and Guise, John (1917), Memoirs of the Family of Guise of Elmore. In Autobiography of Thomas Raymond and Memoirs of the Family of Guise of Elmore. Camden Third Series Vol. XXVIII. Edited by G. Davies. London: Office of the Royal Historical Society.
https://archive.org/details/autobiographyoft00raymrich

Hill, John. (1698), The Young Secretary's Guide: Or, A Speedy Help to Learning. London: H. Rhodes.
https://books.google.fi/books?id=lWuSjeXxPjUC&hl=fi

Hobbes, Thomas (1651), Leviathan. London: The Electric Book Company Ltd.
https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=5302410

Howell, James (1650), Epistolae Ho-Elianae. London: Humphrey Moseley.
https://www.proquest.com/books/epistolæ-ho-elianæ-familiar-letters-domestic/docview/2240849403/se-2

Johnson, Samuel (1755), A Dictionary of the English Language. London: W. Strahan. https://johnsonsdictionaryonline.com/1755page/title-v1-1

Josselin, Ralph (1908), The Diary of the Rev. Ralph Josselin. Edited by E. Hockliffe. Camden Third Series Vol. XV. London: Royal Historical Society.
https://archive.org/details/diaryrevralphjo00hockgoog/

Letters of Eminent men, Addressed to Ralph Thoresby (1832), Volume 1. Edited by Joseph Hunter. London: Henry Colburn and Richard Bentley.
https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000767346

Locke, John (1695), An Essay Concerning Humane Understanding. London: Awnsham and John Churchil. https://archive.org/details/b30323873

Locke, John (2003), Two Treatises of Government. In Two Treatises of Government and a Letter Concerning Toleration. Edited by Ian Shapiro. New Haven: Yale University Press.
https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3420119

Newcome, Henry (1693), A Plain Discourse About Rash and Sinful Anger. London: Tho. Parkhurst.
https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A70719.0001.001/1:1?rgn=div1;view=toc

Newcome, Henry (1849), The Diary of the Rev. Henry Newcome, from September 30, 1661, to September 29, 1663. The Chetham Society.
https://archive.org/details/diaryrevhenryne00heywgoog

Newcome, Henry (1852a), The Autobiography of Henry Newcome, M.A. Vol. I. Edited by Richard Parkinson. In series Remains Historical & Literary Connected with the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Chester, Vol. XXVI. The Chetham Society. https://archive.org/details/autobiographyhe05newcgoog

Newcome, Henry (1852b), The Autobiography of Henry Newcome, M.A. Vol. II. Edited by Richard Parkinson. In series Remains Historical & Literary Connected with the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Chester, Vol. XXVII. The Chetham Society. https://archive.org/details/autobiographyhe04newcgoog

Osborne, Dorothy (1901), The Love Letters of Dorothy Osborne 1652–54. Edited by Edward Abbott Parry. Toronto: The Publisher's Syndicate Limited. https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/100294470

Osborne, Henry (1920), Henry Osborne's Diary. In Notes and Queries, Series 12, Volume 7, pp. 304–346. Transcribed by G. C. Moore Smith. https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Index:Notes_and_Queries_-_Series_12_-_Volume_7.djvu

Pelling, Edward (1693), A Practical Discourse Upon Charity in its Several Branches: And of the Reasonableness and Useful Nature of this Great Christian Virtue. London: E. I. https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo2/A53959.0001.001

Pepys, Samuel (1893), The Diary of Samuel Pepys. Edited by Henry B. Wheatley. London: George Bell & Sons. https://www.gutenberg.org/files/4200/4200-h/4200-h.htm

Perkins, William (1611), A salve for a sicke man. London: John Legat. https://www.proquest.com/books/salve-sicke-man-treatise-containing-nature/docview/2264178307/se-2

Phillips, Edward (1658), The New World of English Words. London: Nath. Brooke. https://www.proquest.com/books/new-world-english-words-general-dictionary/docview/2240968430/se-2

Phillips, Edward and Kersey, John (1706), The New World of English Words. London: J. Phillips. https://archive.org/details/The_New_World_of_English_Words_Or_A_General_Dictionary/

Phillips, Edward and Philobibl, J. (1720), The New World of Words: or Universal English Dictionary. London: J. Phillips. https://books.google.fi/books?id=tp4NAAAAQAAJ

Reresby, John (1875), The Memoirs of John Reresby of Thrybergh, Bart., M. P. for York, &c. 1634–1689, Written by Himself. Edited by James J. Cartwright. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. https://archive.org/details/memoirssirjohnr01reregoog/

Sprigg, William (1659), A Modest Plea, for an Equal Common-Wealth, Against Monarchy. London: Giles Calvert. https://www.proquest.com/books/modest-plea-equal-common-wealth-against-monarchy/docview/2240953378/se-2

Stout, William (1851), Autobiography of William Stout. Edited by J. Harland. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. https://archive.org/details/autobiographywi00stougoog

Sutton, Christopher (1846), Disce Mori: Learn to Die. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. https://books.google.fi/books?id=EdsHAAAAQAAJ&hl=fi&

The Manchester Guardian (1850), Autobiography of a Lancashire "Friend". – No. I. https://www.proquest.com/hnpguardianobserver/docview/473734483/fulltextPDF/6723474052DF4DC1PQ/1?accountid=11774

The Oxinden Letters, 1607–1642 (1933), Edited by Dorothy Gardiner. London: Constable and Co. Ltd.

The Oxinden and Peyton Letters, 1642–1670 (1937), Edited by Dorothy Gardiner. London: The Sheldon Press.

The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis (1842), London: S. & J. Bentley, Wilson, & Fley. https://archive.org/details/privatecorrespon00baco

Thornton, Alice (1875), The Autobiography of Mrs. Alice Thornton. Durham: Andrews & Co. https://archive.org/details/autobiographyofm00thorrich

Tixall Letters (1815). London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown. https://books.google.fi/books?id=2iAJAAAAQAAJ

Wright, Thomas (1604), The passions of the minde in generall. Corrected, enlarged, and with sundry new discourses augmented. London: Valentine Simmes. https://www.proquest.com/books/passions-minde-generall-corrected-enlarged-with/docview/2240875700/se-2

Yonge, James (1963), The Journal of James Yonge 1647–1721, Plymouth Surgeon. Edited by F. N. L. Poynter. Hamden Connecticut: Archon Books. https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/001557480

SECONDARY SOURCES AND RESEARCH LITERATURE

Ala-Hynnilä, Sara (2023), Sisarukset, eletty uskonto ja valta 1600-luvun Englannissa. In Eletty reformaatio. Protestanttisen uskonnollisuuden muotoja uuden ajan alun Euroopassa, edited by Sini Mikkola and Päivi Räisänen-Schröder. In series Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran toimituksia 243. Helsinki: Suomen kirkkohistoriallinen seura.

Alblas, Jacques B. H. (1991), Richard Allestree's "The Whole Duty Of Man" (1658). In Holland: The Denominational and Generic Transformations of an Anglican Classic. Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis/Dutch Review of Church History, Vol. 71, No. 1. pp. 92–104. Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/002820391X00050

Amussen, Susan Dwyer (1995), The Gendering of Popular Culture in Early Modern England. In Popular Culture in England c. 1500–1850, edited by Tim Harris. Basingstoke: MacMillan Press Ltd.

Anderson, Michael (1980/1986), Approaches to the History of the Western Family 1500–1914. In series Studies in Economic and Social History. Basingstoke: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

Anselment, Raymond A. (1997), Elizabeth Freke's Remembrances: Reconstructing a Self. Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 57–75. University of Tulsa. https://doi.org/10.2307/464040

Anselment, Raymond A. (2001), Introduction. In the Remembrances of Elizabeth Freke, 1671–1714. Camden Fifth Series Vol. 18, edited by Raymond A. Anselment. London: Cambridge University Press.

Anselment, Raymond A. (2014), Introduction. In My First Booke of My Life by Alice Thornton, edited by Raymond A. Anselment. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=752248&site=ehost-live

Archer, Ian W. (2000), Social Networks in Restoration London: The Evidence from Samuel Pepys' Diary. In Communities in Early Modern England: Networks, Place, Rhetoric, edited by Alexandra Shepard & Phil Withington. In series Politics, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Arnade, Peter and Howell, Martha (2019), Introduction. In Rereading Huizinga: Autumn of the Middle Ages, a Century Later, edited by Peter Arnade, Martha Howell, and Anton van der Lem. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvnwbznh

Atkinson, David W. (1985), The Devotionalism of Christopher Sutton: The Universal Christianity of a Pious Protestant. In Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Vol. 54, No. 3, pp. 207–217. http://www.jstor.org/stable/42974083

Austin, J. L. (1962/1975), How To Do Things With Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://academic.oup.com/book/5162

Austin, Michael (1999), The Genesis Narrative and the Primogeniture Debate in Seventeenth-Century England. Journal of English and Germanic Philology, Vol. 98, No.1, pp. 17–39. https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/genesis-narrative-primogeniture-debate/docview/217929533/se-2

Bailey, Joanne (2003), Unquiet Lives: Marriage and Marriage Breakdown in England, 1660–1800. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e000xww&AN=120593&site=ehost-live

Baker, Geoff (2010). Reading and Politics in Early Modern England: The Mental World of a Seventeenth-Century Catholic Gentleman. Manchester: Manchester University Press. https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e000xww&AN=515137&site=ehost-live

Barclay, Katie (2017a), Performance and Performativity. In Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction, edited by Susan Broomhall. Early Modern Themes Series. London: Routledge.

Barclay, Katie (2017b), Family and Household. In Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction, edited by Susan Broomhall. Early Modern Themes Series. London: Routledge.

Barclay, Katie (2017c), Natural Affection, the Patriarchal Family and the "Strict Settlement" Debate: A Response from the History of Emotions. The Eighteenth Century, Vol. 58, No. 3, pp. 309–320. https://doi.org/10.1353/ecy.2017.0027

Barclay, Katie (2020), Love and Other Emotions. In The Routledge History of Women in Early Modern Europe, edited by Amanda L. Capern. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429355783-4

Barclay, Katie (2021), Caritas: Neighbourly Love & the Early Modern Self. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198868132.001.0001

Ben-Amos, Ilana Krausman (2000a), Gifts and Favors: Informal Support in Early Modern England. The Journal of Modern History, Vol. 72, No. 2, pp. 295–338. https://doi.org/10.1086/315991

Ben-Amos, Ilana Krausman (2000b), Reciprocal Bonding: Parents and Their Offspring in Early Modern England. Journal of Family, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 291–312. https://doi.org/10.1177/036319900002500302

Berry, Helen and Foyster, Elizabeth (2007), Introduction. In The Family in Early Modern England, edited by Helen Berry and Elizabeth Foyster. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511495694

Blaak, Jeroen (2002), Autobiographical Reading and Writing: The Diary of David Beck (1624). In Egodocuments and History: Autobiographical Writing in its Social Context Since the Middle Ages. Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren. http://hdl.handle.net/1765/17065

Blaak, Jeroen (2009), Literacy in Everyday Life: Reading and Writing in Early Modern Dutch Diaries. Translated by Beverley Jackson. Egodocuments and History Series, Vol. 2. Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004177406.i-426

Blommaert, Jan (2005), Discourse: A Critical Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511610295

Boddice, Rob (2014), Introduction: Hurt Feelings? In Pain and Emotion in Modern History, edited by Rob Boddice. In series Palgrave Studies in the History of Emotions. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Boddice, Rob (2018), The History of Emotions. In series Historical Approaches. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bos, Jacques (2009), The Rise and Decline of Character: Humoral Psychology in Ancient and Early Modern Medical Theory. History of the Human Sciences, Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 29–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/0952695109104422

Botonaki, Effi (1999), Seventeenth-Century Englishwomen's Spiritual Diaries: Self-Examination, Covenanting, and Account Keeping. The Sixteenth Century Journal, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 3–21. https://doi.org/10.2307/2544896

Boulding, Kenneth E. (1990/1989), Three Faces of Power. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Bourke, Joanna (2003), Fear and Anxiety: Writing about Emotion in Modern History. History Workshop Journal, Vol. 55, No. 1, pp. 111–133. https://doi.org/10.1093/hwj/55.1.111

Braddock, Andrew (2010), The Role of the Book of Common Prayer in the Formation of Modern Anglican Church Identity: A Study of English Parochial Worship, 1750–1850. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=483985&site=ehost-live

Brady, Andrea (2008), "A Share of Sorrows": Death in the Early Modern English Household. In Emotions in the Household, 1200–1900, edited by Susan Bromhall. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230286092_11

Braybrooke, Richard (1842), Biographical Notices. In The Private Correspondence of Jane Lady Cornwallis. London: S. & J. Bentley, Wilson, Fley. https://archive.org/details/privatecorrespon00baco

Braybrooke, Richard (1845), Preface. In the Autobiography of Sir John Bramston. London: Camden Society. https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000587628

Broomhall, Susan (2008), Emotions in the Household. In Emotions in the Household, 1200–1900, edited by Susan Broomhall. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230286092

Broomhall, Susan (2015), Spaces for Feeling: Emotions and Sociabilities in Britain, 1650–1850. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315732145

Broomhall, Susan and Van Gent, Jacqueline (2009), Corresponding Affections: Emotional Exchange Among Siblings in the Nassau Family. Journal of Family History, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 143–165. https://doi.org/10.1177/0363199008330734

Broomhall, Susan and Van Gent, Jacqueline (2016), Gender, Power and Identity in the Early Modern House of Orange-Nassau. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315584140

Bryson, Anna (1998/2004), From Courtesy to Civility: Changing Codes of Conduct in Early Modern England. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burke, Bernard (1866), A Genealogical History of the Dormant: Abeyant, Forfeited, and Extinct Peerages of the British Empire. London: Harrison. https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_K3MaAAAAYAAJ

Burke, Peter (1993), The Art of Conversation. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Burke, Victoria E. (2016), Reading Friends: Women's Participation in "Masculine" Literary Culture. In Early Modern Women's Manuscript

Writing: Selected Papers from the Trinity/Trent Colloquium, edited by Victoria E. Burke and Jonathan Gibson. Abingdon: Routledge. https://search-ebscohost-com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=1480775&site=ehost-live

Buxton, Antony (2015), Domestic Culture in Early Modern England. In series Studies in Early Modern Cultural, Political and Social History, Vol. 24. Woodbridge: Boydell Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781782046035

Cambers, Andrew (2007), Reading, the Godly, and Self-Writing in England, circa 1580–1720. Journal of British Studies, Vol. 46, No. 4, pp. 796–825. https://doi.org/10.1086/520261

Capp, Bernard (2003), When Gossips Meet: Women, Family, and Neighbourhood in Early Modern England. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199255986.001.0001

Capp, Bernard (2014), "Jesus Wept" but Did the Englishman? Masculinity and Emotion in Early Modern England. Past and Present, Vol. 224, No. 1, pp. 75–108. https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtu011

Capp, Bernard (2018), The Ties that Bind: Siblings, Family, and Society in Early Modern England. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198823384.001.0001

Capp, Bernard (2022), Re-Assessing the Ars Moriendi: Good and Bad Deaths in Early Modern England. The Seventeenth Century, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 5–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/0268117X.2022.2113821

Campe, Rüdiger and Weber, Julia (2014), Rethinking Emotion: Moving Beyond Interiority. In Rethinking Emotion: Interiority and Exteriority in Premodern, Modern, and Contemporary Thought, edited by Rüdiger Campe and Julia Weber. In series Interdisciplinary German Cultural Studies, edited by Scott Denham, Irene Kacandes and Jonathan Petropoulos, Vol. 15. Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110259254

Chakravarti, Ananya (2015). The Affective (Re)turn and Early Modern European History. Historical Reflections, Vol. 41, No. 2, pp. 88–96. https://doi.org/10.3167/hrrh.2015.410207

Chartres, John A. (1977), Road Carrying in England in the Seventeenth Century: Myth and Reality. The Economic History Review, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 73–94. https://doi.org/10.2307/2595500

C. J. (1875), The Preface. In the Autobiography of Mrs. Alice Thornton, edited by C. J. Durham: Andrews & Co. https://archive.org/details/autobiographyofm00thorrich

Clifford, Arthur (1815), Tixall Letters. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown. https://books.google.fi/books?id=2iAJAAAAQAAJ

Coffey, John (2000), Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1558–1689. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Coster, Will (2001/2017), Family and Kinship in England, 1450–1800, Second Edition, Seminar Studies. London: Routledge.

Courtenay, Thomas Peregrine (1849), Memoirs of Life, Works, and Correspondence of Sir William Temple. In Critical and Historical Essays, Contributed to the Edinburgh Review, Vol. 2. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. https://books.google.fi/books?id=L5MHAQAAIAAJ

Crawford, Patricia (2004/2014), Blood, Bodies and Families in Early Modern England. London: Pearson Education Limited. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=4045428.

Crenshaw, Kimberle (1991), Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color. Stanford Law Review, Vol. 43, No. 6, pp. 1241–1299. https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039

Cressy, David (1986), Kinship and Kin Interaction in Early Modern England. In Past & Present, No. 113, pp. 38–69. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/past/113.1.38

Cressy, David (1999), Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e000xww&AN=18314&site=ehost-live

Cunningham, Hugh (2014), Children and Childhood in Western Society Since 1500. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315835495

Davis, Kathy (2008), Intersectionality as Buzzword: A Sociology of Science Perspective on What Makes a Feminist Theory Successful. Feminist Theory, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 67–85. https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700108086364

Davison, Kate Jalava, Marja Morosini, Giulia, Scheer, Monique, Steenbergh, Kristine, van der Zande, Iris and Fetheringill Zwicker, Lisa (2018), Emotions as a Kind of Practice: Six Case Studies Utilizing Monique Scheer's Practice-Based Approach to Emotions in History. Cultural History, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 226–238. https://doi.org/10.3366/cult.2018.0175

Davidoff, Leonore (1995), Worlds Between: Historical Perspectives on Gender and Class. New York: Routledge.

Davidoff, Leonore (2006), The Sibling Relationship and Sibling Incest in Historical Context. In Sibling Relationships, edited by Prophecy Coles. London: Karnac. https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=366756&site=ehost-live

Davidoff, Leonore and Hall, Catherine (1987/2002), Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780–1850, Revised Edition. Abingdon: Routledge. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=1144634

Davies, G. (1917), Introduction. In Autobiography of Thomas Raymond and Memoirs of the Family of Guise of Elmore. Camden Third Series, Vol.

XXVIII, edited by G. Davies. London: Office of the Royal Historical Society. https://archive.org/details/autobiographyoft00raymrich

Daybell, James (2001), Female Literacy and the Social Conventions of Women's Letter-Writing in England, 1540–1603. In Early Modern Women's Letter Writing, 1450–1700. In series Early Modern Literature in History, edited by James Daybell. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230598669_5

Daybell, James (2006), Women Letter-Writers in Tudor England. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Daybell, James (2015), Social Negotiations in Correspondence Between Mothers and Daughters in Tudor and Early Stuart England. Women's History Review, Vol. 24, No. 4, pp. 502–527. https://doi.org/10.1080/09612025.2015.1015325

Daybell, James (2016), The Scribal Circulation of Early Modern Letters. Huntington Library Quarterly, Vol. 79, No. 3, pp. 365–386. https://doi.org/10.1353/hlq.2016.0020

Dekker, Rudolf M. (2002), Introduction. In Egodocuments and History: Autobiographical Writing in its Social Context since the Middle Ages. Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren. https://repub.eur.nl/pub/17065

Del Lungo Camiciotti, Gabriella (2014), The Construction of Epistolary Identity in a Gentry's Communication Network of the Seventeenth Century: The Case of Jane Lady Cornwallis Bacon. Journal of Early Modern Studies, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 133–149. https://www-proquest-com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/scholarly-journals/construction-epistolary-identity-gentrys/docview/1640703114/se-2?accountid=11774

Delany, Paul (1969), British Autobiography in the Seventeenth Century. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Limited. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315673455

Demers, Patricia (2005), Women's Writing in English: Early Modern England. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442627376

Dobson, Austin (1908a), Preface. In The Diary of John Evelyn, edited by Austin Dobson. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited. https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.175078

Dobson, Austin (1908b), Introduction. In The Diary of John Evelyn, edited by Austin Dobson. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited. https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.175078

Dowd, Michelle M. and Eckerle, Julie A. (2016), Introduction. In Genre and Women's Life Writing in Early Modern England, edited By Michelle M. Dowd and Julie A. Eckerle. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315584324

Dror, Otniel E., Hitzer, Bettina, Laukötter, Anja and León-Sanz, Pilar (2016), An Introduction to History of Science and the Emotions. Osiris Vol. 31, pp. 1–18. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26562746

Eales, Jacqueline (1998), Women in Early Modern England, 1500–1700. London: UCL Press Limited. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=235439

Earle, Peter (1989), The Making of the English Middle Class: Business, Society and Family Life in London 1660–1730. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. http://ark.cdlib.org/ark:/13030/ft8489p27k/

Earle, Rebecca (2016), Introduction: Letters, Writers and the Historian. In Epistolary Selves: Letters and Letter-Writers, 1600–1945, edited by Rebecca Earle. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315256184

Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. (1983/2005), The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe, Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511819230

Elias, Norbert (1939/1978), The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners, translated by Edmund Jephcott. New York: Urizen Books.

Erickson, Amy Louise (1993), Women and Property: In Early Modern England. London: Routledge. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=166869

Evelyn, Helen (1915), The History of the Evelyn Family: With a Special Memoir of William John Evelyn. London: Eveleigh Nash. https://archive.org/details/historyofevelynf00eveluoft

Ezell, Margaret J. M. (2016), Domestic Papers: Manuscript Culture and Early Modern Women's Life Writing. In Genre and Women's Life Writing in Early Modern England, edited by Michelle M. Dowd and Julia A. Eckerle. Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315584324-3

Fairclough, Norman (1989/2001), Language and Power. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Ferguson, Margaret W. and Suzuki, Mihoko (2015), Women's Literacies and Social Hierarchy in Early Modern England. Literature Compass, Vol. 12, No. 11, pp. 575–590. https://doi.org/10.1111/lic3.12281

Firth-Godbehere, Richard (2015), For "Physitians of the Soule": The Roles of "Flight" and "Hatred of Abomination" in Thomas Wright's The Passions of the Minde in Generall. Ceræ: An Australasian Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies, Vol. 2, pp. 1–30. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4747117/

Fitzmaurice, Susan M. (2002), The Familiar Letter in Early Modern English: A Pragmatic Approach. Pragmatics & Beyond New Series, Vol. 95. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.95

Fletcher, Anthony (1995), Gender, Sex and Subordination in England 1500 - 1800. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=52962&site=ehost-live

Fletcher, Anthony (1999), Manhood, the Male Body, Courtship and the Household in Early Modern England. History, Vol. 84, No. 275, pp. 419–436. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-229X.00116

Foucault, Michel (1978), The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction, translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, Michel (1982), The Subject and Power. In Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics, edited by Hubert L Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow. Brighton: The Harvester Press.

Foyster, Elizabeth A. (1999), Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage. In series Women and Men in History. London: Longman.

Frevert, Ute (2011), Emotions in History: Lost and Found. Budapest: Central European University Press. https://directory.doabooks.org/handle/20.500.12854/46289

Frevert, Ute, Scheer, Monique, Schmidt, Anne, Eitler, Pascal, Hitzer, Bettina, Verheyen, Nina, Gammerl, Benno, Bailey, Christian and Pernau, Margrit (2014), Emotional Lexicons: Continuity and Change in the Vocabulary of Feeling 1700-2000. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199655731.001.0001

Froide, Amy M. (2005), Never Married: Singlewomen in Early Modern England. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199270606.001.0001

Gammerl, Benno (2014), Transitory Feelings? On Challenges and Trends within the History of Emotions. Contemporanea, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 335–344. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24653777

Gardiner, Dorothy (1933a), The Elder Generation and the Youth of Henry Oxinden of Barham. In The Oxinden Letters, edited by Dorothy Gardiner. London: Oxford University Press.

Gardiner, Dorothy (1933b), Henry Oxinden of Barham's Married Life. In The Oxinden Letters, edited by Dorothy Gardiner. London: Oxford University Press.

Gardiner, Dorothy (1933c), General Introduction. In The Oxinden Letters, edited by Dorothy Gardiner. London: Oxford University Press.

Gardiner, Dorothy (1933d), Oxinden Family Pedigree. In The Oxinden Letters, edited by Dorothy Gardiner. London: Oxford University Press.

Gardiner, Dorothy (1933e), Preface. In The Oxinden Letters, edited by Dorothy Gardiner. London: Oxford University Press.

Gerhold, Dorian (2014), The Development of Stage Coaching and the Impact of Turnpike Roads, 1653–1840. The Economic History Review, Vol. 67, No. 3, pp. 607–891. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0289.12048

Gestrich, Andreas (2012), Solidarische Rivalen: Geschwisterbeziehungen in der Frühen Neuzeit aus der Sicht der Emotionsgeschichte Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft, Vol. 15, p. 11–23. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11618-012-0289-5

Geussens, Liesbeth (2022), Striking a Balance: Sibling Emotionality and the Negotiation of Power in an Eighteenth-Century Noble Family of the Austrian Netherlands. Journal of Family History, Vol. 47, No. 2, pp. 154–171.

Gibson, Jonathan and Burke, Victoria E. (2004/2016), Introduction. In Early Modern Women's Manuscript Writing: Selected Papers From the Trinity/Trent Colloquium, edited by Jonathan Gibson and Victoria E. Burke. Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315257204

Gilmore, Leigh (1994), Autobiographics: A Feminist Theory of Women's Self-Representation. In series Reading Women Writing. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Glover, Lorri (2000), All Our Relations: Blood Ties and Emotional Bonds Among the Early South Carolina Gentry. In series Gender Relations in the American Experience. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Goldberg, Jonathan (1974), Cellini's Vita and the Conventions of Early Autobiography. MLN, Vol. 89, No. 1, pp. 71–83. https://doi.org/10.2307/2907777

Gowland, Angus (2006), The Problem of Early Modern Melancholy. Past & Present, No. 191, pp. 77–120. https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtj012

Grant, Ruth W. (2012), John Locke on Custom's Power and Reason's Authority. The Review of Politics, Vol. 74, No. 4, pp. 607–629. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034670512000770

Greenberg, Lynne A. (2005), Introductory Note. In Legal Treatises, Vol. 1. In series The Early Modern Englishwoman: A Facsimile Library of Essential Works, Series III. Essential Works for the Study of Early Modern Women: Part I, edited by Betty S. Travitsky and Anne Lake Prescott. London: Routledge.

Gurney, Evan A. (2018), Love's Quarrels: Reading Charity in Early Modern England. In series Massachusetts Studies in Early Modern Culture. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvk3gkqs

Gusdorf, Georges (1956/1980), Conditions and Limits of Autobiography, translated by James Olney. In Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical, edited by James Olney. Princeton: Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400856312.28

Gut, Przemysław (2018), The Cartesian Theory of Emotions and Early Modern Philosophy. Ruch Filozoficzny, Vol. 74, No. 3, 2018, pp. 119–140. https://doi.org/10.12775/RF.2018.031

Habakkuk, John (1994), Marriage, Debt, and the Estates System: English Landownership 1650–1950. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hackett, Helen (2012), Women and Catholic Manuscript Networks in Seventeenth-Century England: New Research on Constance Aston Fowler's Miscellany of Sacred and Secular Verse. Renaissance Quarterly, Vol. 65, No. 4, pp. 1094–1124. https://doi.org/10.1086/669346

Hammons, Pamela (2006), Rethinking Women and Property in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England. Literature Compass, Vol. 3, No. 6, pp. 1386–1407. https://compass.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1741-4113.2006.00385.x

Hannan, Leonie (2016), Women of Letters: Gender, Writing and the Life of the Mind in Early Modern England. In series Gender in History. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
https://doi.org/10.7228/manchester/9780719099427.001.0001

Harding, Vanessa (2013), The Last Gasp: Death and the Family in Early Modern London. In Death and Dying in Ireland, Britain and Europe: Historical Perspectives, edited by James Kelly and Mary Ann Lyons. Ireland: Irish Academic Press.
http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=651920&site=ehost-live

Harland, John (1851a), Concluding Note by the Editor. In Autobiography of William Stout. London: Simpkin & Marshall.
https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/008729555

Harland, John (1851b), Introduction. In Autobiography of William Stout. London: Simpkin & Marshall.
https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/008729555

Harris, Amy (2016), Siblinghood and Social Relations in Georgian England: Share and Share Alike. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Harris, Frances (2002), Transformations of Love: The Friendship of John Evelyn and Margaret Godolphin. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=422597

Harvey, Karen (2015), Love and Order: William Gouge, Of Domesticall Duties (1622). In Patriarchal Moments: Reading Patriarchal Texts, edited by Cesare Cuttica and Gaby Mahlberg. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
https://doi.org/10.5040/9781472589163.ch-008

Heal, Felicity and Holmes, Clive (1999), "Prudentia ultra Sexum": Lady Jane Bacon and the Management of Her Families. In Protestant Identities: Religion, Society, and Self-Fashioning in Post-Reformation England, edited by Muriel C. McClendon, Joseph P. Ward and Michael Macdonald. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Heal, Felicity (2014), The Power of Gifts: Gift Exchange in Early Modern England. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199542956.001.0001

Heinz, Donald (1999), The Last Passage: Recovering a Death of Our Own. New York: Oxford University Press.
http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=55495&site=ehost-live

Heltzel, Virgil B. (1928), The Rules of Civility (1671) and its French Source. Modern Language Notes, Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 17–22.
https://doi.org/10.2307/2914493

Hemphill, Dallett C. (2011), Siblings: Brothers and Sisters in American History. New York: Oxford University Press.
https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=728902

Hendrix, Scott (1995), Masculinity and Patriarchy in Reformation Germany. Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol. 56, No. 2, pp. 177–193. https://doi.org/10.2307/2709834

Heywood, Thomas (1849), Introduction. In The Diary of the Rev. Henry Newcome, from September 30, 1661, to September 29, 1663. The Chetham Society. https://archive.org/details/diaryrevhenryne00heywgoog

Hill, Bridget (2001), Women Alone: Spinsters in England 1660–1850. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hill, Christopher (1985), The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill Volume One: Writing and Revolution in 17th Century England. Brighton: The Harvester Press Limited.

Hillard, Derek, Lempa, Heikki and Spinney, Russell (2020), Introduction. In Feelings Materialized: Emotions, Bodies, and Things in Germany, 1500–1950, edited by Derek Hillard, Heikki Lempa and Russell Spinney. In series Spektrum: Publications of the German Studies Association, Vol. 21. New York: Berghahn. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1k3nqr9

Hintz, Carrie (2005), An Audience of One: Dorothy Osborne's letters to Sir William Temple, 1652–1654. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442670778

Houlbrooke, Ralph A. (1984), The English Family 1450–1700. London: Longman.

Hubbard, Eleanor (2015), Reading, Writing, and Initialing: Female Literacy in Early Modern London. Journal of British Studies, Vol. 54, No. 3, pp. 553–577. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24702120

Hunt, Margaret R. (1996), The Middling Sort: Commerce, Gender, and the Family in England, 1680–1780. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e000xww&AN=6866&site=ehost-live

Hunter, Michael and Harris, Frances (2003), Introduction. In John Evelyn and His Milieu, edited by Frances Harris and Michael Hunter. London: The British Library. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3543979

Hutton, Ronald (1985), The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales 1658–1667. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ikegami, Eiko (2012), Emotions. In A Concise Companion to History, edited by Ulinka Rublack. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Irish, Bradley J. (2021), Envy in Early Modern England. ELH, Vol. 88, No. 4, pp. 845–878. https://doi.org/10.1353/elh.2021.0034

James, Carolyn (2017), Letters. In Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction, edited by Susan Broomhall. Early Modern Themes Series. London: Routledge.

Johnson, Christopher H. and Sabean, David Warren (2011), From Siblingship to Siblinghood: Kinship and the Shaping of European Society (1300–1900). In Sibling Relations & the Transformations of European Kinship 1300–1900,

edited by Christopher H. Johnson and David Warren Sabean. New York: Berghahn Books.

Jordan, Jennifer (2011), "To Make a Man Without Reason": Examining Manhood and Manliness in Early Modern England. In What is Masculinity?: Historical Dynamics from Antiquity to the Contemporary World, edited by John H. Arnold and Sean Brady. England: Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230307254_12

Juhila, Kirsi and Suoninen, Eero (1999), Kymmenen Kysymystä Diskurssianalyysistä. In Diskurssianalyysi liikkeessä, edited by Arja Jokinen, Kirsi Juhila and Eero Suoninen. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Kaartinen, Marjo (2013), Cosmopolitēs — James Howell, maailmankansalaisuus ja 1600-luvun Englanti. In Kosmopoliittisuus, monikulttuurisuus, kansainvälisyys: kulttuurihistoriallisia näkökulmia, edited by Anne Ollila and Juhana Saarelainen. In series Cultural History – Kulttuurihistoria 11. Turku: University of Turku, kulttuurihistoria. https://www.utupub.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/118587/Kosmopoliittis uus-monikulttuurisuus-kansainv%C3%A4lisyys.pdf?sequence=4&isAllowed=y

Karkulehto, Sanna, Saresma, Tuija, Harjunen, Hannele, and Kantola, Johanna (2012), Intersektionaalisuus metodologiana ja performatiivisen intersektionaalisuuden haaste. Naistutkimus,Vol. 25, No. 4, pp. 17–28. https://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:ELE-1615364

Kelly, Kristin. A. (2002), Private family, Private Individual: John Locke's Distinction Between Paternal and Political Power. Social Theory and Practice, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 361–381. https://doi.org/10.5840/soctheorpract200228320

Kertzer David I. and Barbagli, Marzio (2001), Introduction. In the History of European Family Volume 1: Family Life in Early Modern Times 1500-1789, edited by David I. Kertzer and Marzio Barbagli. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kietäväinen-Sirén, Hanna (2015), Erityinen ystävyys: Miehen ja naisen välinen rakkaus uuden ajan alun Suomessa (n. 1650–1700), PhD diss. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-6095-7

Korhonen, Anu (2002), Constructing Emotion in a Culture of Hierarchies: A Love Story. In Time Frames: Negotiating Cultural History, edited by Anu Korhonen and Kirsi Tuohela. Vaajakoski: Gummerus Kirjapaino Oy. https://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi-fe2015121524340

Korhonen, Anu (2005), Kiehuva veri: vihaisuus uuden ajan alun Englannissa. Historiallinen Aikakauskirja, Vol. 103, No. 1, pp. 5–25. http://hdl.handle.net/10138/26082

Koskinen, Ulla (2021), Hyvää tahtoa ja hyödyn tavoittelua: Vastavuoroisuuden tutkiminen historiassa. In Varhaismodernin yhteiskunnan historia: Lähestymistapoja yksilöihin ja rakenteisiin, edited by Raisa Maria Toivo and Riikka Miettinen. Tallinna: Gaudeamus.

Koskinen, Ulla and Lahtinen, Anu (2011), Siskot, veljet ja erityisen hyvät ystävät. In Kirjeet ja historiantutkimus, edited by Maarit Leskelä-Kärki, Anu Lahtinen and Kirsi Vainio-Korhonen. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Kounine, Laura (2017), Emotions, Mind, and Body on Trial: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. Journal of Social History, Vol. 51, No. 2, pp. 219–230. https://doi.org/10.1093/jsh/shx005

Lahtinen, Anu (2021), Rakkaus 1500-luvun aatelisperheissä. In Perheen jäljillä: Perhesuhteiden moninaisuus Pohjolassa 1400–2020, edited by Johanna Ilmakunnas and Anu Lahtinen. Tampere: Vastapaino. https://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi-fe202201148351

Lahtinen, Anu, Leskelä-Kärki, Maarit, Vainio-Korhonen, Kirsi and Vehkalahti, Kaisa (2011), Kirjeiden uusi tuleminen. In Kirjeet ja historiantutkimus, edited by Maarit Leskelä-Kärki, Anu Lahtinen and Kirsi Vainio-Korhonen. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Lang, Johannes (2018), Review: New Histories of Emotion. Reviewed Works: The History of Emotions: An Introduction by Jan Plamper, translated by Keith Tribe; Emotional Lexicons: Continuity and Change in the Vocabulary of Feeling 1700–2000 edited by Ute Frevert et al. History and Theory, Vol. 57, No. 1, pp. 104–120. https://doi.org/10.1111/hith.12048

Laslett, Peter (1963), Locke's Two Treatises of Government: A Critical Edition with and Introduction and Apparatus Criticus. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, Jan and Stearns, Peter N. (1998), Introduction. In An Emotional History of the United States, edited by Peter N. Stearns and Jan Lewis. New York and London: New York University Press.

Lindemann, Mary (1999), Medicine and Society in Early Modern Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lindert, Peter H. and Williamson, Jeffrey G. (1982), Revising England's Social Tables 1688–1812. Explorations in Economic History, Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 385–408. https://doi.org/10.1016/0014-4983(82)90009-2

Loveman, Kate (2012), Samuel Pepys and "Discourses Touching Religion" Under James II. The English Historical Review, Vol. 127, No. 524, pp. 46–82. https://doi.org/10.1093/ehr/cer407

Loveman, Kate (2022), Women and the History of Samuel Pepys's Diary. The Historical Journal, Vol. 65, No. 5, pp. 1221–1243. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X21000716

MacDonald, Michael (1981/1983), Mystical Bedlam: Madness, Anxiety, and Healing in Seventeenth-Century England. In series Cambridge History of Medicine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Macfarlane, Alan (1979), Review of the Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800 by Lawrence Stone. History and Theory, Studies in the Philosophy of History, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 103–126. https://doi.org/10.2307/2504675

MacKinnon, Dolly (2021), "A Child Drew the Lots": Children and Youth Experiencing the English Civil War. Parergon, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp.131–155. http://doi.org/10.1353/pgn.2021.0073

Mark, Clifton (2018), The Natural Laws of Good Manners: Hobbes, Glory, and Early Modern Civility. The Review of Politics, Vol. 80, No. 3, pp. 391–414. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0034670518000219

Marshall, Peter (2003), Reformation England 1480–1642. London: Hodder Arnold.

Martín-Moruno, Dolores and Pichel, Beatriz (2019), Introduction. In Emotional Bodies: The Historical Performativity of Emotions, edited by Dolores Martín-Moruno and Beatriz Pichel. In series History of Emotions, edited by Susan J. Matt and Peter N. Stearns. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. https://doi.org/10.5622/illinois/9780252042898.001.0001

Maslak, Mary Ann (2008). Introduction. In The Structure and Agency of Women's Education, edited by Mary Ann Maslak. Albany: State University of New York Press. https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e000xww&AN=217506&site=ehost-live

Matt, Susan J. (2014), Recovering the Invisible: Methods for the Historical Study of the Emotions. In Doing Emotions History, edited by Susan J. Matt and Peter N. Stearns. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3414322

Matt, Susan J. and Stearns, Peter N. (2014), Introduction. In Doing Emotions History, edited by Susan J. Matt and Peter N. Stearns. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3414322

McKay, Elaine (2005), English Diarists: Gender, Geography and Occupation, 1500–1700. History, Vol. 90, No. 2, pp. 191–212. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-229X.2005.00329.x

McMahon, Darrin M. (2014), Finding Joy in the History of Emotions. In Doing Emotions History. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3414322

McPherson, Kathryn (2006), "My Deare Sister": Sainted Sisterhood in Early Modern England. In Sibling Relations and Gender in the Early Modern World: Sisters, Brothers and Others, edited by Naomi J. Miller and Naomi Yavneh. In series Women and Gender in the Early Modern World. Aldershot: Ashgate Cop.

Meise, Helga (2002), The Limitations of Family Tradition and the Barrier between Public and Private: Karoline von Hessen-Darmstadt's "Schreib = Calender" between Almanac and Diary. In Egodocuments and History: Autobiographical Writing in its Social Context since the Middle Ages. Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren. http://hdl.handle.net/1765/17065

Mendelson, Sara and O'Connor, Mary (2006), "Thy Passionately Loving Sister and Faithfull Friend": Anne Dormer's Letters to her Sister Lady Trumbull. In Sibling Relations and Gender in the Early Modern World: Sisters, Brothers and Others, edited by Naomi J. Miller and Naomi Yavneh. In series Women and Gender in the Early Modern World. Aldershot: Ashgate Cop.

Miller, Naomi J. and Yavneh, Naomi (2006). Introduction: Thicker than Water: Evaluating Sibling Relations in the Early Modern Period. In Sibling Relations and Gender in the Early Modern World: Sisters, Brothers and Others, edited by Naomi J. Miller and Naomi Yavneh. In series Women and Gender in the Early Modern World. Aldershot: Ashgate Cop.

Morosini, Giulia (2018), Mobilizing Emotions in the Italian Renaissance Military. In Emotions as a Kind of Practice: Six Case Studies Utilizing Monique Scheer's Practice-Based Approach to Emotions in History, edited by Kate Davison, Marja Jalava, Giulia Morosini, Monique Scheer, Kristine Steenbergh, Iris van der Zande and Lisa Fetheringill Zwicker. Cultural History, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 226–238. https://doi.org/10.3366/cult.2018.0175

Mortimer, Geoff (2002), Eyewitness Accounts of the Thirty Years War 1618–48. Houndmills: Palgrave.

Muldrew, Craig (1998), The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England. In series Early Modern History: Society and Culture. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Nandi, Miriam (2021), Reading the Early Modern English Diary. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-42327-8

Newton, Hannah (2018), Misery to Mirth: Recovery from Illness in Early Modern England. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198779025.001.0001

Newton, Hannah (2020), "Out of Bed, But Not Yet Abroad": Spatial Experiences of Recovery from Illness in Early Modern England. Early Modern Literary Studies, Vol. 22, Special Issue 29: Door-Bolts, Thresholds, and Peep-Holes: Liminality and Domestic Spaces in Early Modern England, pp. 1–20, 3A. https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/out-bed-not-yet-abroad-spatial-experiences/docview/2638773902/se-2

Nunn, Catherine (2003), Henry Newcome and his Circle: Presbyterianism in South-East Cheshire in the 1650s. Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, for the Year 2000, Vol. 150, pp. 7–31. https://www.hslc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/150-3-Nunn.pdf

O'Day, Rosemary (2001), Tudor and Stuart Women: Their Lives Through Their Letters. In Early Modern Women's Letter Writing, 1450–1700. In series Early Modern Literature in History, edited by James Daybell. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

O'Neill, Kevin (2011), "Pale & Dejected Exhausted by the 'Waste of Sorrow'": Courtship and the Expression of Emotion, Mary Shackleton, 1783–1791. In

Sexed Sentiments: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Gender and Emotion, edited by Willemijn Ruberg and Kristine Steenbergh. Amsterdam: Brill. https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=348482&site=ehost-live

Ojala, Hanna, Palmu, Tarja and Saarinen, Jaana (2009). Paikalla pysyvää ja liikkeessä olevaa. Feministisiä avauksia toimijuuteen ja sukupuoleen. In Sukupuoli ja toimijuus koulutuksessa, edited by Hanna Ojala, Tarja Palmu and Jaana Saarinen. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Olney, James (1980), Autobiography and the Cultural Moment: A Thematic, Historical, and Bibliographical Introduction. In Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical, edited by James Olney. Princeton: Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400856312.28

Parker, Geoffrey (2013), Global Crisis: War, Climate Change and Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century. New Haven: Yale University Press. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3421144

Parkes, Joan (1925/1970), Travel in England in the Seventeenth Century. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Parkinson, Richard (1852), Introduction. In The Autobiography of Henry Newcome, M.A., Vol. I, edited by Richard Parkinson. In series Remains Historical & Literary Connected with the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Chester, Vol. XXVI. The Chetham Society. https://archive.org/details/autobiographyhe04newcgoog

Parry, Edward Abbott (1901), Introduction. In The Love Letters of Dorothy Osborne 1652–54, edited by Edward Abbott Parry. Toronto: The Publisher's Syndicate Limited. https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/100294470

Patterson, W. B (2014), William Perkins and the Making of a Protestant England. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199681525.001.0001

Pederson, Randall, J. (2014), Unity in Diversity: English Puritans and the Puritan Reformation, 1603–1689. Brill's Series in Church History, Vol. 68. Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004278516

Pepperell, Nicole (2016), The Unease with Civilization: Norbert Elias and the Violence of the Civilizing Process. Thesis Eleven, Vol. 137, No. 1, pp. 3–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/0725513616638480

Perry, Ruth (2004), Novel Relations: The Transformation of Kinship in English Literature and Culture, 1748–1818. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511484438

Plamper, Jan (2012/2015), The History of Emotions: An Introduction, translated by Keith Tribe. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=1903256

Plamper, Jan, Reddy, William, Rosenwein, Barbara and Stearns, Peter (2010), The History of Emotions: An Interview with William Reddy, Barbara

Rosenwein, and Peter Stearns. History and Theory, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 237–265. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2303.2010.00541.x

Pollock, Linda A. (2004), Anger and the Negotiation of Relationships in Early Modern England. The Historical Journal, Vol. 47, No. 3, pp. 567–590. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X04003863

Pollock, Linda A. (2007), Honor, Gender, and Reconciliation in Elite Culture, 1570–1700. The Journal of British Studies, Vol. 46, No, 1, pp. 3–29. https://doi.org/10.1086/508396

Pollock, Linda (2011), The Practice of Kindness in Early Modern Elite Society. Past & Present, Vol. 211, No. 1, pp. 121–158. https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtq056

Poynter, F. N. L. (1963), Introduction. In The Journal of James Yonge 1647–1721, Plymouth Surgeon, edited by F. N. L. Poynter. Hamden, CT: Archon Books. https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/001557480

Pöysä, Jyrki (2015), Lähiluvun tieto. Näkökulmia kirjoitetun muistelukerronnan tutkimukseen. In series Kultaneito XVII. Vantaa: Suomen kansantietouden tutkijain seura.

Reddick, Allen (2010), Past and Present in Samuel Johnson's Dictionary of the English Language. International Journal of Lexicography, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 207–222. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecq005

Reddy, William (1997), Against Constructionism: The Historical Ethnography of Emotions. Current Anthropology, Vol. 38, pp. 327–351. https://doi.org/10.1086/204622

Reddy, William (1999), Emotional Liberty: Politics and History in the Anthropology of Emotion. Cultural Anthropology, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 256–288. https://doi.org/10.1525/can.1999.14.2.256

Reddy, William (2000), Sentimentalism and Its Erasure: The Role of Emotions in the Era of the French Revolution. The Journal of Modern History, Vol. 72, No. 1, pp. 109–152. https://doi.org/10.1086/315931

Reddy, William (2001), The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511512001

Ricken, Norbert (2006), The Power of Power—Questions to Michel Foucault. Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 38, No. 4, pp. 541–560. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2006.00210.x

Riswick, Tim and Engelen, Theo (2018), Siblings and Life Transitions: Investigating the Resource Dilution Hypothesis Across Historical Contexts and Outcomes. The History of the Family, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 521–532. https://doi.org/10.1080/1081602X.2018.1532309

Rosenwein, Barbara H. (2002), Worrying About Emotions in History. The American Historical Review, Vol. 107, No. 3, pp. 821–845. https://doi.org/10.1086/532498

Ruppel, Sophie (2015), Family Politics, Family Networks and the "Familial Self": Sibling Letters in Seventeenth Century German High Aristocracy. In Mapping the "I": Research on Self-Narratives in Germany and

Switzerland, edited by Claudia Ulbrich, Kaspar von Greyerz and Lorenz Heiligensetzer. In series Egodocuments and History. Leiden: Brill. https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e000xww&AN=919105&site=ehost-live

Salzman, Paul (2000), Early Modern Women's Writing: An Anthology, 1560–1700. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e000xww&AN=56463&site=ehost-live

Samson, Alexander (2019), The Literary Glocal: Sir Walter Aston Between Staffordshire and Madrid. The Huntington Library Quarterly, Vol. 82, No. 4, pp. 597–617. https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/literary-glocal-sir-walter-aston-between/docview/2549090088/se-2

Sangha, Laura (2016), Personal Documents. In Understanding Early Modern Primary Sources. Routledge Guides to Using Historical Sources. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315622101

Sangren, P. Steven (1995), "Power" Against Ideology: A Critique of Foucaultian Usage. Cultural Anthropology, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 3–40. https://doi.org/10.1525/can.1995.10.1.02a00010

Sarasti-Wilenius, Raija (2011), Kirjeen rooli lapsuudesta aikuisuuteen. Gyldenstolpe-perheen latinankielinen kirjeenvaihto (1660–1708). In Kirjeet ja historiantutkimus, edited by Maarit Leskelä-Kärki, Anu Lahtinen and Kirsi Vainio-Korhonen. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Scheer, Monique (2012), Are Emotions a Kind of Practice (And Is That What Makes Them Have a History)? A Bourdieuian Approach to Understanding Emotion. History and Theory, Vol. 51, No. 2, pp. 193–220. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2303.2012.00621.x

Scheer, Monique (2018), Comment. In Emotions as a Kind of Practice: Six Case Studies Utilizing Monique Scheer's Practice-Based Approach to Emotions in History, edited by Kate Davison, Marja Jalava, Giulia Morosini, Monique Scheer, Kristine Steenbergh, Iris van der Zande and Lisa Fetheringill Zwicker. Cultural History, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp 226–238. https://doi.org/10.3366/cult.2018.0175

Schmidt, Jeremy (2010), Charity and the Government of the Poor in the English Charity-School Movement, circa 1700−1730. Journal of British Studies, Vol. 49, No. 4, pp. 774–800. https://doi.org/10.1086/654915

Schneider, Gary (2000), Affecting Correspondences: Body, Behavior, and the Textualization of Emotion in Early Modern English Letters. Prose Studies, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 31–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/01440350008586715

Schreier, Margrit (2012), Qualitative Content Analysis in Practice. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Scott, James C. (1990), Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts. New Haven: Yale University Press. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3420907

Scott, Jonathan (2000), England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=73917&site=ehost-live

Shapin, Steven (1994), A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Shepard, Alexandra (2000), Manhood, Credit and Patriarchy in Early Modern England c. 1580–1640. Past & Present, No. 167, pp. 75–106. https://doi.org/10.1093/past/167.1.75

Shepard, Alexandra (2005), From Anxious Patriarchs to Refined Gentlemen? Manhood in Britain, circa 1500–1700. Journal of British Studies, Vol. 44, No. 2, pp. 281–295. https://doi.org/10.1086/427128

Smith, Sidonie and Watson, Julia (2001), Reading Autobiography: A Guide for Interpreting Life Narratives. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816669851.001.0001

Sodano, Joel P. (2017), Uneasy Passions: The Spectator's Divergent Interpretations of Locke's Theory of Emotion. The Eighteenth Century, Vol. 58, No. 4, pp. 449–467. https://doi.org/10.1353/ecy.2017.0036

Sowerby, Scott (2013), Making Toleration: The Repealers and the Glorious Revolution. In series Harvard Historical Studies, Vol. 181. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674075917

Spieß, Karl-Heinz (2011), Maintenance Regulations and Sibling Relations in the High Nobility of Late Medieval Germany. In Sibling Relations and the Transformations of European Kinship, 1300–1900, edited by Christopher H. Johnson and David Warren Sabean. New York: Berghahn Books.

Spicksley, Judith M. (2018), Never-Married Women and Credit in Early Modern England. In Women and Credit in Pre-Industrial Europe, edited by Elise M. Dermineur. Turnhout: Brepols.

Stanley, Liz (2004), The Epistolarium: On Theorizing Letters and Correspondences. Auto/Biography, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 201–235. https://doi.org/10.1191/0967550704ab014oa

Stanley, Peter (2003), For Fear of Pain: British Surgery, 1790–1850. In series Clio Medica 70, The Wellcome Series in the History of Medicine. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B. V.

Starnes, DeWitt T. and Noyes, Gertrude E. (1946/1991), The English Dictionary From Cawdrey to Johnson, 1604-1755, New edition with an introduction and a select bibliography by Gabriele Stein. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series III, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, vol. 57. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Pub. Co. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=395364&site=ehost-live

Staves, Susan (1995), Resentment or Resignation? Dividing the Spoils Among Daughters and Younger Sons. In Early Modern Conceptions of Property, edited by John Brewer and Susan Staves. London: Routledge.

Stearns, Peter N. (2014), Modern Patterns in Emotions History. In Doing Emotions History. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3414322

Stearns, Peter N. and Stearns, Carol Z. (1985), Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards. The American Historical Review, Vol. 90, No. 4, pp. 813–836. Oxford University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1858841

Stone, Lawrence (1977/1979), The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500–1800, Abridged Edition. New York: Harper Paperback.

Sullivan, Erin (2013), A Disease Unto Death: Sadness in the Time of Shakespeare. In Emotions and Health, 1200–1700, edited by Elena Carrera. In series Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions, Vol. 168. Leiden: Brill. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=1316690

Tadmor, Naomi (2001), Family and Friends in Eighteenth-Century England: Household, Kinship and Patronage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511496097

Tadmor, Naomi (2010), Early Modern English Kinship in the Long Run: Reflections on Continuity and Change. Continuity and Change (Special Issue), Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 15–48. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0268416010000093

Tague, Ingrid (2007), Aristocratic Women and Ideas of Family in the Early Eighteenth Century. In The Family in Early Modern England, edited by Helen Berry and Elizabeth Foyster. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511495694

Tefekli, Ahmet and Cezayirli, Fatin (2013), Review Article, The History of Urinary Stones: In Parallel with Civilization. The Scientific World Journal, Vol. 2013. https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/423964

Telles-Correia, Diogo and Gama Marques, João (2015), Melancholia Before the 20th Century: Fear and Sorrow or Partial Insanity? Frontiers in Psychology, Vol. 6. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00081

Thirsk, Joan (1969), Younger Sons in the Seventeenth Century. History, Vol. 54. No. 182, pp. 358–377. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-229X.1969.tb02329.x

Thompson, Anne (2019), Parish Clergy Wives in Elizabethan England. Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004353916

Toland, Lisa (2017), Late-Adolescent English Gentry Siblings and Leave-Taking in the Early Eighteenth Century. In Emotion, Ritual and Power in Europe 1200–1920: Family, State and Church, edited by Merridee L. Bailey and Katie Barclay. In series Palgrave Studies in the History of Emotions. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-44185-6_4

Trigg, Stephanie (2017), Affect Theory. In Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction, edited by Susan Broomhall. Early Modern Themes Series. London: Routledge.

Tuomi, Jouni and Sarajärvi, Anneli (2009), Laadullinen tutkimus ja sisällönanalyysi. Helsinki: Tammi.

Underdown, D. E. (1985), The Taming of the Scold: The Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England. In Order and Disorder in Early Modern England, edited by Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ustick, Lee W. (1929), Seventeenth Century Books of Conduct: Further Light on Antoine de Courtin and the Rules of Civility. Modern Language Notes, Vol. 44, No. 3, pp. 148–158. https://doi.org/10.2307/2913278

Vanderveken, Daniel and Kubo, Susumu (2001), Introduction. In Essays in Speech Act Theory, edited by Daniel Vanderveken and Susumu Kubo. In series Pragmatics and Beyond New Series. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.77

van der Zande, Iris (2018), Seventeenth-Century Dutch Sailors' Wives and the Mobilization of Emotions Through Letters. In Emotions as a Kind of Practice: Six Case Studies Utilizing Monique Scheer's Practice-Based Approach to Emotions in History, edited by Kate Davison, Marja Jalava, Giulia Morosini, Monique Scheer, Kristine Steenbergh, Iris van der Zande and Lisa Fetheringill Zwicker. Cultural History, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 226–238. https://doi.org/10.3366/cult.2018.0175

Vickery, Amanda (1998), The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Vogt, Christopher P. (2012), Dying Well in Historical Perspective: The Ars Moriendi Tradition of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. In On Moral Medicine: Theological Perspectives on Medical Ethics, edited by Therese M. Lysaught, Joseph Kotva, Stephen E. Lammers, and Allen Verhey. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=4859414

Walker, Katherine A. (2015), Pain and Surgery in England, circa 1620–circa 1740. Medical History, Vol. 59, No. 2, pp. 255–274. https://doi.org/10.1017/mdh.2015.2

Wanklyn, Malcolm and Jones, Frank (2005/2014), A Military History of the English Civil War: 1642–1649. London: Routledge. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=1733924

Wallis, Patrick, Webb, Cliff and Minns, Chris (2010), Leaving Home and Entering Service: The Age of Apprenticeship in Early Modern London. Continuity and Change, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 377–404. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0268416010000299

Weisser, Olivia (2015), Ill Composed: Sickness, Gender, and Belief in Early Modern England. New Haven: Yale University. https://doi.org/10.12987/yale/9780300200706.001.0001

Weisser, Olivia (2019), Affective Responses to Illness and Death. In The Routledge History of Women in Early Modern Europe, edited by Amanda L. Capern. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429355783

Wheatley, Henry B. (1893), Previous Editions of the Diary. In The Diary of Samuel Pepys, edited by Henry B. Wheatley. London: George Bell & Sons. https://www.gutenberg.org/files/4200/4200-h/4200-h.htm

White, R. S. (2017), Language of Emotions. In Early Modern Emotions: An Introduction, edited by Susan Broomhall. Early Modern Themes Series. London: Routledge.

Whyman, Susan E. (1999), Sociability and Power in Late-Stuart England: The Cultural Worlds of the Verneys, 1660–1720. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whyman, Susan (2003), Advice to Letter-Writers: Evidence from Four Generations of Evelyns. In John Evelyn and His Milieu, edited by Frances Harris and Michael Hunter. London: The British Library. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3543979

Whyman, Susan E. (2009), The Pen and the People: English Letter Writers 1660–1800. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilcox, Helen, Hobby, Elaine, Hind, Hilary and Graham, Elspeth (1989), Her Own Life: Autobiographical Writings by Seventeenth-Century Englishwomen. London: Routledge. https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=95308&site=ehost-live

Willen, Diane (1995), "Communion of the Saints": Spiritual Reciprocity and the Godly Community in Early Modern England. Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies. Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 19–41. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0095139000018512

Winkelmann, Carol L. (1996), A Case Study of Women's Literacy in the Early Seventeenth Century: The Oxinden Family Letters. Women and Language, 1996, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 14–20. https://www-proquest-com.ezproxy.jyu.fi/scholarly-journals/case-study-womens-literacy-early-seventeenth/docview/198809664/se-2?accountid=11774

Withington, Phil (2007), Company and Sociability in Early Modern England. Social History, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 291–307. https://doi.org/10.1080/03071020701425338

Woods, Robert (2006), Children Remembered: Responses to Untimely Death in the Past. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press. http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=242374&site=ehost-live

Wright, Nancy E. and Ferguson, Margaret W. (2004), Introduction. In Women, Property, and the Letters of the Law in Early Modern England, edited by Andrew Buck, Margaret W. Ferguson and Nancy E. Wright. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jyvaskyla-ebooks/detail.action?docID=4672267

Wrightson, Keith (1982/2003), English Society 1580–1680. London: Routledge.

Wunderli, Richard and Broce, Gerald (1989), The Final Moment Before Death in Early Modern England. The Sixteenth Century Journal, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 259–275. https://doi.org/10.2307/2540662

Ågren, Maria, ed. (2017), Making a Living, Making a Difference: Gender and Work in Early Modern Europan Society, edited by Maria Ågren. New York: Oxford University Press.