Joachim Eibach
(University of Bern)

Doing House and Neighbourhood

(ESSHC Conference, Vienna, 24 April 2014)

Introduction

Just as in the past, neighbours today can be either good or bad. Good neighbours are a treasure. Bad neighbours are a nuisance! Friendly neighbours look after our children. They may lend us a bottle of milk or their battery-jumper-cable. While we are on holiday they take care of our cat and collect our mail. We may even watch a World Cup match together. On the other hand, neighbours are notoriously jealous. They complain about trees being too high. And during summer, they have a barbecue every other weekend with their friends. We can certainly live our lives without neighbours! Not only today, but in ancient times too classical authors warned their readers of the menace of evil neighbours and guests. Hence, in the first chapter of the Odyssey, Telemachos complains about intrusive men who invade his father's house in Ithaca. The men court his mother, the alleged widow of the noble, but lost warrior and housefather Odysseus. Their loud and wanton behaviour in the hall threatens to spoil the honour of Telemachos' father's house.[1]

One may conclude that trouble with neighbours, or on a more general scale neighbourhoods, have always been there. Sources from the early modern period are full of examples of conflict, but also of mutual support among neighbours. But this impression of a historical constant is wrong, for neighbourhoods certainly have a history. And the examination of changes in neighbourly relations can tell us a lot about the transformation from a pre-modern to a modern society. Further, during the early modern period the history of neighbourhood was in many aspects intertwined with the history of house and household. Hence, in many respects for the contemporary actors and actresses 'doing house and household' implied 'doing neighbourhood'.

[1] Homer, Die Odyssee, translated by Wolfgang Schadewaldt, 4th ed., Berlin 2012, p. 10-21.

Although all of us have experienced neighbourly relations in one or the other way, but on further inspection, it is not so clear, what the essence and characteristics of neighbourhood are. If we look up definitions in encyclopaedias of the 18th century, the first answer comes in a surprisingly modern way. In the articles of two leading German encyclopaedias of the period, *Zedler's Universal-Lexikon* of 1740 and *Krünitz' Oeconomische Encyklopaedie* of 1805, the definition of 'neighbour' and 'neighbourhood' refers primarily to the spatial aspect of proximity. According to *Zedler*, neighbours are "those who dwell near to each other" (*diejenigen, so nahe bey einander wohnen*). Krünitz holds that the term 'neighbour' "actually means a nearby dweller" (*bedeutet eigentlich einen Nahewohner*).[2] In both articles, neighbourly relations are mainly characterised as nasty and problematic for the "housefather" (*Haus-Vater, Hauswirth*). Thus, with reference to the Roman author Cato[3], the unknown authors of both encyclopaedias advise prospective buyers of real estate to thoroughly enquire about the character of their future neighbours before making a purchase. If the result of the enquiry was that the neighbours had the reputation of being 'contentious', 'begrudging', 'frivolous', 'unfaithful' or 'thievish', the buyer should immediately change his plans.[4]

This very sceptical view on neighbourhood and neighbourliness corresponds with the contents of the contemporary paterfamilias literature (*Hausväterliteratur*) which from the 1950s onwards became rather notorious through the works of Otto Brunner. The ideal of this genre was the autonomous and self-sufficient house or household under the authority of a noble pater familias.[5] However, as we know today after several decades of research, the sociocultural reality of both domestic and neighbourly relations was very different. I will return to the problem later on. For now, we may note that during the age of enlightenment the perspectives of educated authors on neighbourly relations appear to fall somewhat short. In particular, they fall short in the light of historiographical and ethnological research on house, household and neighbourhood in pre-modern Europe.

---

[2] Johann Heinrich Zedlers Grosses Vollständiges Universal-Lexikon, Art. ‚Nachbar, Nachbarn, Nachbauer', Halle and Leipzig, vol. 23, 1740, p. 53-56; D. Johann Georg Krünitz, Oeconomische Encyklopaedie oder allgemeines System der Staats-, Stadt-, Haus- und Landwirthschaft (…), Art. ‚Nachbar', Berlin 1805, vol. 99, col. 679. Both sources are available online.

[3] It is not mentioned which one of the two famous Catos is quoted: Cato the elder or Cato the younger.

[4] Zedler: „daß er sich erstlich nach denen Nachbarn, was es vor Leute sind, mit Fleiß erkundigen solle, und falls er in Erfahrung gebracht, daß es zänckische, haderhafftige, mißgünstige, leichtfertige, untreue, diebische, oder sonst lose Leute seyn möchten, das Kauffen lieber gar unterlassen" (col. 53-54).

[5] Philip Hahn, Geliebter Nachbar oder böser Nachbar? Die Bewertung der Aussenwelt in der ‚Hausväterliteratur', in: Zeitensprünge, 14 (2010), pp. 456-76, 456-59.

<u>Definitions</u>

With regard to definition, English and German-speaking research on neighbourhood and neighbourly relations emphasises the following three, partly inter-connected, aspects[6]:

1. The spatial aspect of proximity: Neighbours are 'near' or 'next-door neighbours' and often referred to as such explicitly in the sources. In the Anglo-American sense, 'neighbourhood' can also mean the wider social environment of the house or residence, or a district within a city.

2. An either informal or formalised, law-based type of community which we can find both in towns and in rural society, but depending on the region more often in the villages of late medieval and early modern Europe. A neighbour has certain rights and privileges. In this respect, the legal status of village 'neighbours' corresponds to the legal status of the citizens or burghers in the towns.

3. A specific type of reciprocal social relation, interaction and economy of 'mutual favours'[7] with a strong normative connotation, mostly referred to as 'good neighbourhood'. During the age of Reformation the notion of 'good neighbourhood' was understood with reference to the biblical commandment: 'Love your next'. By contrast, during the following centuries the aspects of moral obligation and mainly pragmatic reasons to keep good relations with next-door neighbours gained ground.[8] This important semantic change is witnessed by the contents of the above mentioned articles in the encyclopaedia of the 18th century.

---

[6] For a summary of the English research see Keith Wrightson, The 'Decline of Neighbourliness' Revisited, in: Norman L. Jones / Daniel Wolf (eds.), Local Identities in Late Medieval and Early Modern England, Basingstoke 2007, pp. 19-49; Emily Cockayne, Cheek by Jowl. A History of Neighbours, London 2012; with regard to the urban sphere during the late middle ages see Pascale Sutter, Von guten und bösen Nachbarn. Nachbarschaft als Beziehungsform im spätmittelalterlichen Zürich, Zurich 2002, p. 47-56; the development of the German-speaking research over the past decades is witnessed by serveral articles: Karl-Sigismund Kramer, Art. Nachbar, Nachbarschaft, in: Handwörterbuch zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte, vol. 3, Berlin 1984, col. 813-15; Robert Jütte, Das Stadtviertel als Problem und Gegenstand der frühneuzeitlichen Stadtgeschichtsforschung, in: Blätter für deutsche Landesgeschichte, 127 (1991), pp. 235-69; Rita Voltmer, Art. Nachbarschaft, in Enzyklopädie der Neuzeit, vol. 8, Stuttgart 2008, col. 1007-09; Karl Heinz Burmeister, Art. Nachbarschaft, in: Historisches Lexikon der Schweiz (www.hls-dhs-dss.ch/textes/d/D16403.php); see also the very useful selected bibliography by Eric Piltz, Dresdner Auswahlbibliographie zur Nachbarschaft in der Stadt der Vormoderne: www.cosimus.de/page11.html.

[7] Bernard Capp, When Gossips Meet. Women, Family and Neighbourhood in Early Modern England, Oxford 2003, p. 56; see also Wrightson, Decline, p. 25.

[8] Wrightson, Decline, p. 31.

The use of the term 'house' instead of the established term 'household' in the title of this paper may come surprising. Most speakers in this session and probably also at this conference would prefer the term 'household' which was established by social historians from the 1960s onwards.[9] At first sight, the meaning of the term 'house' seems clear and evident. Obviously, it has something to do with a building. However, the early modernists among us know that the notion of 'house', at least in the sources from German-speaking countries, is oscillating and sometimes ambiguous. The term calls for an explanation at least as much as its counterpart 'neighbourhood'. During the early modern period, *das Haus* ('house') could take on at least three different meanings:

1. a building, albeit with specific forms, functions, and a material culture that differed from region to region; the connotation of a real building is a charming facet of the term in its various uses

2. a contemporary hierarchical model, used by different authors to delineate authority and society at the micro and the macro level

3. a label for family identity or a dynasty as a genealogical construct, such as for example 'the house of Habsburg' or in Spanish 'la casa de Austria'

It would be interesting to compare the meanings and uses of the source term 'house' in different European languages. Evidently, the meaning of '*das Haus*' in the German context differs from the one of 'house' or 'house and home' in the English language. Following this line, different legal traditions and legal conceptions also come into play. Every 'house' encompassed at least one household and a head of the household. But the position and power of the typically, but not always, male head of the household[10] varied. However, it would be insufficient to conceptualise 'house' only or primarily with regard to the household economy or as a merely functional unit. Notions of 'house' were linked to authority in the micro-space of the socially heterogeneous household-family, and beyond that to perceptions

---

[9] Pathbreaking: Peter Laslett, Household and Family in Past Time, Cambridge 1972.
[10] See Ariadne Schmidt, Reconsidering the ‚First Male-Breadwinner Economy': Women's Labor Force Participation in the Netherlands, 1600-1900, in: Feminist Economics 18 (2012), pp. 69-96; see also Margaret R. Hunt, Women in eighteenth-century Europe, Harlow 2010.

of honour and spatial settings. So, we are dealing not only with a frequently used and mostly normative term of contemporary language, but also with social space and social practice.

The noun *'Haus'* and the related verb *'Hausen'* (to house) were, among others, certainly concepts of the elite or more precisely of different elites. However, we find these terms and numerous related compounds such as 'the peace of the house' (*Hausfrieden*), 'evil housekeeping' (*Übelhausen*), 'household' (*Haushaltung*) or 'household matters' (*Hauswesen*) also in the indictments and complaints of peasants or artisans in local and lower ecclesiastical courts.[11] Moreover, we find a whole range of elaborate rituals in the cultural contexts of conflict regulation, social integration and social control with a stupendous awareness of spatial boundaries of the house. We have numerous proofs which show that the material culture of the house in both pre-modern and modern times had great significance. This applies to the practice and perceptions of both the house-dwellers themselves and their neighbours, friends and guests. Against the backdrop of the new research interest in the construction of social space, specific modes of communication and the history of material culture, 'house' becomes an interesting analytical tool and category for the study of communication in the domestic micro-space.

Social Openness: the open house

That said, we are approaching a central aspect of 'Doing House and Neighbourhood'. Compared to modern ideas and practices of privacy, a relevant feature of all dwellings during the early modern period was their openness. Openness in at least two ways: materially and socially.[12] The aspect of openness refers mainly to the immediate social environment of the house, but also to the increasing observations of domestic life by law-based institutions and experts, in particular by different types of secular and ecclesiastical courts. Regarding the first aspect, we may understand 'openness' here in a literal way. If we leave aside specific forms of distinction in different social settings, the micro-space of the

---

[11] Heinrich R. Schmidt, 'Nothurfft vnd Hußbruch' – Haus, Gemeinde und Sittenzucht im Reformiertentum, in: Andreas Holzem / Ines Weber (eds.), Ehe – Familie – Verwandtschaft. Vergesellschaftung in Religion und sozialer Lebenswelt, Paderborn 2008, pp. 301-28; Rainer Beck, Frauen in Krise. Eheleben und Ehescheidung in der ländlichen Gesellschaft Bayerns während des Ancien régime, in: Richard van Dülmen (ed.), Dynamik der Tradition. Studien zur historischen Kulturforschung IV, Frankfurt / Main 1992, p. 137-212, pp. 150-56; David Sabean, Property, Production, and Family in Neckarhausen, 1700-1870, Cambridge 1990, p. 107.

[12] See in more detail Joachim Eibach, Das offene Haus. Kommunikative Praxis im sozialen Nahraum der europäischen Frühen Neuzeit, in: Zeitschrift für historische Forschung 38 (2011), pp. 621-64.

house was visible and accessible to outsiders. We can observe a high degree of transparency of almost all action in the house. Moreover, in the ritual-heavy early modern period, the roles of housefather, housemother, servant, good neighbour etc. were performed in repetitive forms of practice. Thus, dwellings and doing the household were neither a hidden nor a private matter. Both in rural and urban society, much of the domestic work were done outside the house or in liminal spaces, which can be called half-'public', half-'private'. This counts certainly for cooperative agricultural work 'between houses', but also for the artisan's workshop and the merchant's office with their semi-open spaces. In many contexts of work, of ritualised sociability, and also of protection, the house stood open for 'next neighbours' and others: of course servants, but also siblings and other kin, day labourers, guild brothers, adherents of the same faith etc.

The lack of clear-cut differentiation between public and private spheres (from a modern point of view) is mirrored by the fact that 'originally' most rooms of the house had more than one function. For example, before the invention of the corridor and the separate bedroom, the chambers and other sleeping spaces were open and accessible for other house-dwellers. This physical accessibility and frequent co-presence of different actors in the domestic sphere of house and household, resulted in close surveillance of all domestic practices, enhanced by notions of honour and the common good (*Gemeiner Nutzen*). In the economy of '*Selbsthilfe'* (Martin Dinges)[13] or the 'economy of mutual favours' (Bernard Capp)[14] in case of sudden distress, an honourable 'good neighbour' but not the 'evil houser' (*Übelhauser*) could expect support and help. And from the 16th century onwards, in legal complaints (which in the majority of cases came from the wives), ecclesiastical courts examined the moral conduct of all house-dwellers, in particular the responsible housefathers, but also the co-responsible housewives.[15] To sum up, we can distinguish several types and degrees of social openness: intensive interaction with the immediate social environment, a culture of performance and visibility and from the 16th century onwards an increase of system integration through law-based institutions. Of course, things developed very different in different social settings. With particular regard to rural and urban society

---

[13] Martin Dinges, Stadtarmut in Bordeaux 1525-1675. Alltag, Politik, Mentalitäten, Bonn 1988.
[14] Capp, Gossips, p. 56.
[15] See for an overview of quantitative findings Heinrich R. Schmidt, Hausväter vor Gericht. Der Patriarchalismus als zweischneidiges Schwert, in: Martin Dinges (ed.), Hausväter, Priester, Kastraten. Zur Konstruktion von Männlichkeit in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit, Göttingen 1998, pp. 213-36.

the modes and the impact of openness in the practice of 'Doing House and Neighbourhood' have to be distinguished. I will come back to this point in a minute.

Socio-cultural Practice and Space

While we must not forget the impact of norms and discourse on the construction of 'openness', it is fruitful, albeit certainly not easy, to analyse everyday practice. The history of practice is cultural history in its best sense. It is in the concrete socio-cultural practices that we find traces of the actors: the famous 'faces in the crowd'. Social practice is nothing else than 'everyday life' or the also famous '*Lebenswelt*'! And we may think of everyday life as both: structured and surprising.[16] The actors knew their repertoire, but still made decisions and choices. Thus, against the backdrop of the contemporary ideal of an autonomous, self-sufficient, closed house under the harmonious rule of the housefather, in socio-cultural practice we find several forms of interaction and exchange between the interior and the exterior sphere of the house. Domestic practice was always gendered and gender roles were performed under the eyes of neighbours and to some extent controlled by the authorities. The relevance of performance and interaction has been emphasised in the concept of 'doing gender'.[17] With a focus on domestic practice, we soon find out that doing house and household in early modern times was anything but a private matter. In this line, there has recently been a suggestion to concentrate more on the fluidity of gendered borders of households and also of modern families rather than to subscribe to the idea of a general and clear-cut separation of spheres.[18] On the other hand, we can reconstruct social spheres that were less visible and less accessible, thus constituting non-public space, which was not yet private in the modern sense!

Both historians and ethnologists with special interest in the history of the domestic material culture have argued that in the early modern period we can observe an increasing differentiation and reallocation of space within the house. The effect was that the domestic

---

[16] Michel de Certeau, The Practice of Everyday Life, Berkley 1984 ; see also the path-breaking works of Pierre Bourdieu.

[17] Candace West / Don H. Zimmerman, Doing Gender, in: Gender & Society. Official publication of sociologists for women in society 1 (1987), pp. 125–51; Regine Gildemeister, Doing Gender. Soziale Praktiken der Geschlechterunterscheidung, in: Ruth Beckerand / Beate Kortendiek (eds.): Handbuch Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung. Theorie, Methoden, Empirie, Wiesbaden 2004, pp. 132–141.

[18] See Janay Nugent, 'None Must Meddle Between Man and Wife': Assessing Family and the Fluidity of Public and Private in Early Modern Scotland, in: Journal of Family History, 35 (2010), pp. 219-231; Amanda Flather, Gender and Space in Early Modern England, Woodbridge 2007; see also Hunt, Women .

space and 'open hours' for neighbours and the like became more and more specific, and thus more restricted.[19] With regard to the social use of artefacts: is it just by chance that we find many reports from the early modern period that front doors stood open, while the door of the typical bourgeois villa of the 18th and 19th centuries is almost always closed and the villa often hidden behind a high wall? At the same time architects of bourgeois villas and flats constructed special rooms for invitations such as the parlour and, conversely, other rooms for privatised family sociability. So, the obvious closure from the now dangerous world of the street does not necessarily mean that the 19th-century bourgeois forms of dwelling completely abandoned earlier practices of social openness.

However, we may assume that visits of the interior sphere became more and more reserved to certain well-defined occasions, certain times and also certain people. At some stage in modern history neighbours became a source of irritation. Neighbourhood "was perhaps losing something of its significance as a reference group central to self-identity, and as a moral community, to be replaced by more socially selective groupings."[20] Then, a 'good neighbour' was no longer someone who gave support, but rather someone who respected these new boundaries. Keith Wrightson argues that the major transformation took place in the course of the 16th and 17th centuries. However, according to Emily Cockayne, the turning point came no earlier than in the 1950s: "Restraint was welcomed more than reciprocity. Active neighbouring has declined, but latent neighbouring has remained."[21]

Rural Society

Back to the early modern period! Of course, in many ways the concrete practice of house and neighbourhood very much depended on the social setting. While for example the household economy of patricians and new urban professions did not – perhaps not at all – depend on ritualised support of their next neighbours, for the lower populace traditional customs of mutual favours could be a requirement for sheer survival. In general terms, we can observe a divide between rural and urban society.

---

[19] Gisela Mettele, Der private Raum als öffentlicher Ort. Geselligkeit im bürgerlichen Haus, in: Dieter Hein / Andreas Schulz (eds.), Bürgerkultur im 19. Jahrhundert. Bildung, Kunst und Lebenswelt, Munich 1996, pp. 155-69.

[20] Wrightson, Decline, p. 39.

[21] Cockayne, Cheek by jowl, p. 220; see also: Eric Piltz, Das Ende der Nähe? Nachbarschaftlichkeit und die Rede vom Niedergang in Moderne und früher Neuzeit (unpublished manuscript), p. 4.

Neighbourly relations in the village clearly worked different from the ones in the towns. Striking semantic evidence of a close link between the notion of 'the neighbour' on the one hand, the notion of house and household on the other hand can be found already in late medieval customary law (so-called *Weistümer*). In these local village statutes, the status of the neighbour was linked to his 'house and farm' (*Haus und Hof*). More precisely: By definition, a 'neighbour' was a person who had his 'own smoke' (*eygen Rauch*), which was equivalent to the possession of a stove, thus someone who ran his own household.[22] Over the course of the early modern period this quasi-legal definition of 'neighbour' in combination with the possession of a household was more and more abandoned in favour of the above mentioned aspect of proximity, which is still common today. Hence, although the article '*Nachbarrecht*' in Krünitz's encyclopaedia of 1805 still distinguished between the privileged legal status of the 'neighbour' and the other less-privileged inhabitants of the village, this distinction was no longer based on the possession of a stove or a household.

If we acknowledge that one's kin were often one's neighbours, and that one's neighbours were often one's kin, a clear-cut classification of neighbourly relations in the village is almost impossible. Still, many ethnologists of pre-modern rural society point out that for individual households, interaction with next-door neighbours in the village was of the utmost importance in almost every respect. For good or bad, neighbours were always around. According to Karl-Sigismund Kramer, the protagonist of the '*Volkskunde*' research in the post-war Federal Republic, and his disciples who strove to de-mystify the highly problematic concept of '*Volk*' by initiating systematic research in local archives, we must distinguish two types of neighbourhood support in the village: 1. Help in the case of economic distress; 2. Help at every relevant stage in the course of life. In both cases the documentation of support action, based on rich archival evidence, is extensive. A quick overview:[23]

1. ***Neighbourhood support in times of economic distress***: help in the construction of a new house, in particular the transportation of building materials; the duty to help in case of a fire, especially providing accommodation for the family and livestock; help with all kinds of agricultural work, especially in case of illness; financial support if a neighbour is in debt, not of their own fault.

---

[22] Karl-Sigismund Kramer, Die Nachbarschaft als bäuerliche Gemeinschaft. Ein Beitrag zur rechtlichen Volkskunde mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Bayerns, München-Pasing 1954, p. 15 and passim; see also Karl Heinz Burmeister, Art. Nachbarschaft.
[23] Kramer, Nachbarschaft, pp. 68-71.

2. Several forms of practical and / or highly ritualised support at *events in the course of life*: in particular assistance with childbirth and baptism; wedding procedures; death and funeral.

Kramer and other researchers have pointed out that at all of these occasions sociability and festivity among neighbours played an important role. Unlike today, lavish feasts and drinking with neighbours and peers were not optional but rather to part of the compulsive cultural repertoire. They could even take on the character of a quasi-legal action. The relevance of sociability applied not only to festive days, but also to secure the practice of collective work. In everyday rural life, house and neighbourly relations were largely performed as "cooperation between houses" (Jon Mathieu)[24] through the coincidental practice of both work and social activities(*Arbeitsgeselligkeit*). Presumably, this coincidence of work and social activities was even more typical for women than men. Thus, the women of the village did their washing and bleaching together.[25] By contrast, in the towns women of the upper strata had paid female day labourers come to their house to do the washing within their household, and thus not with their neighbours.[26] The example of the washing day is perhaps an early example for the future 'privatisation' of household work inside the house which changed the household economy drastically from the late 18th century onwards.[27] As for the village other forms of collective female work included baking and brewing, often practised in special communal locations. Likewise, spinning was practised in a collective manner. However the location alternated between the houses of the village neighbours. Spinning is an excellent example of the multi-facetted functions of '*Arbeitsgeselligkeit*'. Throughout Europe, during the relatively work-free wintertime the spinning work served as an occasion for the young and unmarried village youths to practise their courting.[28]

---

[24] „zwischenhäusliche Kooperation": Jon Mathieu, ,Ein Cousin an jeder Zaunlücke'. Überlegungen zum Wandel von Verwandtschaft und ländlicher Gemeinde, 1700-1900, in: Margareth Lanzinger / Edith Saurer (eds.), Politiken der Verwandtschaft. Beziehungsnetze, Geschlecht und Recht, Vienna 2007, pp. 55-71, p. 61.

[25] See in more Detail Eibach, Das offene Haus, pp. 629-32.

[26] Heide Wunder, ,Er ist die Sonn', sie ist der Mond'. Frauen in der Frühen Neuzeit, Munich 1992, pp. 131-34.

[27] Barbara Orland, Wäsche waschen. Technik- und Sozialgeschichte der häuslichen Wäschepflege, Reinbek bei Hamburg 1991.

[28] Hans Medick, Spinnstuben auf dem Dorf. Jugendliche Sexualkultur und Feierabendbrauch in der ländlichen Gesellschaft der frühen Neuzeit, in: Gerhard Huck (ed.), Sozialgeschichte der Freizeit. Untersuchungen zum Wandel der Alltagskultur in Deutschland, Wuppertal 1980, pp. 19-50; Kaspar von Greyerz, Passagen und Stationen. Lebensstufen zwischen Mittelalter und Moderne, Göttingen 2010, pp. 111-15.

Not only for collective work, sociability and other social activities, but also in terms of social control and conflict, neighbours in the village were always around. As for the house and its internal sphere, many rituals show a clear sense of spatial borderlines. Since the path-breaking studies of Natalie Davis and E. P. Thompson, as well as works of ethnologists, it is has been well-established that local communities closely observed matchmaking and 'the doing' of marital relations inside the house. Typical occasions for interventions were second, or for other reasons unwanted, marriages, husband-beating, adultery or other forms of 'evil dwelling'.[29]

The charivari-like rituals could take very different forms. We can estimate the severity of the reprimand with regard to the ways in which the building of the house was affected. Interestingly, many rituals respected the 'peace' of the house's interior space in that they were performed outside the house. This applies to most of the classical charivari action. The actors, very often young, unmarried men, unmistakably showed their disapproval of certain deviant behaviour that had taken place in the domestic sphere. However, by yelling loudly, imitating animals' calls or playing improvised instruments in front of the house, they refrained from entering the house itself. Hidden attacks with stones or excrements during the night on spatial borderlines such as fences, doors and windows implied clear warnings for the house-dwellers.[30]

Certainly, 'folk justice' could also take a dramatic turn, when the actors went crossed the threshold into the domestic sphere to smash the stove of the house, so important for the recognition as a 'neighbour'. In sources from England, France and Germany, we find evidence that in case of deviant behaviour of house-dwellers 'neighbours' or even explicitly 'next neighbours' had an obligation to step in.[31] Otherwise, the neighbours themselves could become victims of charivari rituals like being forced to ride on an ass backwards etc. Just one more example of this kind from customary law: In a local statute from a village near Ingolstadt (Bavaria), mentioned by Kramer, if a miller didn't take care of his mill properly

---

[29] Natalie Z. Davis, The Reasons of Misrule: Youth Groups and Charivaris in Sixteenth-Century France, in: Past & Present 50 (1971), pp. 41-75; Edward P. Thompson, ‚Rough Music' oder englische Katzenmusik, in: ibid., Plebeische Kultur und moralische Ökonomie. Aufsätze zur englischen Sozialgeschichte des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts, Frankfurt / Main 1980, pp. 131-68; see also Norbert Schindler, Die Hüter der Unordnung. Rituale der Jugendkultur in der frühen Neuzeit, in: Giovanni Levi / Jean-Claude Schmitt (ed.), Geschichte der Jugend, Bd. 1, Von der Antike bis zum Absolutismus, Frankfurt / Main 1996, pp. 319-382.
[30] See for late medieval Zurich Sutter, Nachbarn, pp. 347-53.
[31] See in more detail Eibach, Das offene Haus, p. 628; see for England Martin Ingram, Charivari and Shame Punishments: Folk Justice and State Justice in Early Modern England, in: Herman Roodenburg / Pieter Spierenburg (eds.), Social Control in Europe, vol. 1: 1500-1800, Columbus 2004, pp. 288-308.

"the neighbours" (*die nachbarn*) were called upon to block the door (*das thor verschlagen*) of the miller's house.[32]

All in all: The house, in the sense of the physical building, had an economic function and symbolised the honour, not only of the house-dwellers themselves, but also of the whole village. Therefore, if the housefather or the housemother acted in an inappropriate or dishonourable way, the village could retaliate by challenging their honour through attacks on the house. Of course, there were also less ritualised sanctions, such as simply beating someone up or the refusal to give support.

Urban Society

In one sentence: Neighbourly relations in pre-modern urban society worked in a different way from rural society, but they still worked! Already before the age of industrialisation and accelerated urbanisation, urban society offered their inhabitants more economic opportunities, a set of different social roles and several kinds of social networks. Different from rural society, in towns the networks of guild corporations and the presence of the authorities with their different offices and courts were the most important social setting.

Social relations in the immediate environment of householders could overlap with membership in guilds or other fraternities. So again, it is hard to clearly determine the shape and functions of neighbourly relations apart from other types of social relations. Neighbourhood could still fulfil specific tasks in the military defence of the town, the organisation of night and day guards, the estimation of taxes of individual households, and the administration of the quarter. However, unlike in the village, for town-dwellers, there were alternatives to neighbourly relations. Hence, court records from late medieval Zurich and 17th century London show that to some extent neighbours were chosen as bondsmen, guarantors and witnesses in court.[33] But the choice of neighbours was far from overwhelming. In 15th century Zurich, a town of some 4.500 inhabitants, only 13 % of the guarantors were next-door neighbours, and two-fifths lived in the same quarter (*Wacht*). Still in late medieval Zurich the house-dwellers spoke of their "*nechste nächburen*", while

---

[32] Kramer, Die Nachbarschaft, p. 54; see more examples oft hat kind ibid.
[33] Sutter, Nachbarn, pp. 272-75; Jeremy Boulton, Neighbourhood. A London Suburb in the Seventeenth Century, Cambridge 1987, p. 244-47.

they lacked an equivalent term for more distant relations in the neighbourhood or town.[34] A biographical analysis of surgeons in 17th and early 18th-century Turin reveals that with regard to marriage, godparenthood and credit relations they drew on three intertwined social networks: kin, profession and neighbourhood.[35]

What was the effect of the different social setting in terms of 'doing house and household'?

1. Although neighbours certainly were present, ***neighbourly relations*** appear to have been ***less inevitable***. For many urban-dwelling females and males, their homes and places of work were located apart from each other. In case of distress, they could rely on different social networks, neighbourhood being only one of them. We have to consider the social strata here more closely. Patricians and town-dwellers with high income did not really depend on support of their next neighbours. In larger towns, the burghers and their families could also ask the town council for poor relief. The situation for the lower populace was much different. They relied on direct interaction with their immediate social environment. This included transportation, sharing space, and borrowing and lending tools and money.

2. Of a far reaching effect was the ***transformation of ritualised support into monetary relations***. As mentioned above, affluent households could afford to pay a female day labourer to do the laundry with new technical instruments in the cellar of their house and thus avoid the '*Arbeitsgeselligkeit*' in the public sphere with the neighbourhood women. Recently, Maria Ågren has shown in an article on 18th-century Swedish towns that wives of poorly paid men contributed to their household by earning extra income.[36] They transported goods, baked bread or did the laundry for other, more prosperous households. The main motivation for their doing this work seems to have been money. Also in medium-size towns, like Frankfurt on Main, women contributed to the household's income or even tried to live on their own with their income from washing, stitching and sewing.[37] These women did not have to come from the

---

[34] Sutter, Nachbarn, p. 53; see for the relevance of ‚nächste Nachbarn' also Kramer, Nachbarschaft, p. 70.
[35] Sandra Cavallo, Artisans of the Body in Early Modern Italy. Identities, Families and Masculinities, Manchester 2007, p. 112-26.
[36] Maria Ågren, Emissaries, allies, accomplices and enemies: married women's work in eighteenth-century urban Sweden, in: Urban History, 2013, pp. 1-21.
[37] Joachim Eibach, Frankfurter Verhöre. Städtische Lebenswelten und Kriminalität im 18. Jahrhundert, Paderborn 2003.

immediate neighbourhood. However, according to Ågren, there is a "sometimes indistinct borderline between mutual help and market transactions".[38]

3. Courts gave new opportunities to handle conflict. The increasing number of judicial records during the early modern period witnesses a process of ***juridification of conflict***. Hence, in 18th-century Frankfurt we only rarely find cases of charivari-like rituals. Interestingly, the majority of neighbourhood conflicts in the criminal court of Frankfurt came from Sachsenhausen, the quarter of the so-called gardeners who lived from small agriculture.[39] Town dwellers seem to have made use of their nearby civil courts eagerly. This counts for all sorts of conflict, but not the least for conflicts between neighbours on emissions and building disputes etc.[40] It also included domestic servants who in towns like Berne towards the end of the 18th century took their masters and mistresses to court to get their full wages.[41] The inclination to use courts does not necessarily imply the end of the old culture of direct and reciprocal dispute over honour. Arlette Farge has shown that in the pre-revolutionary metropolis of Paris the lower strata still depended on each other in terms of mutual help of neighbours. At the same time the impoverished townsfolk engaged in petty conflicts and challenged the honour of their neighbours in very traditional ways.[42] They lived under the permanent condition of 'open house'. Albeit, the fact that Farge could write her book on the basis of police records also proves the enduring effect of system integration.

4. Can we trace an increasing ***differentiation of work and sociability*** in the urban sphere? I am not sure! From a theoretical point of view, overarching processes of transformation like monetarisation and juridification suggest that in the course of the early modern period other developments of functional differentiation took place. In the line of this argument, it was already mentioned that the location of work and household in the urban sphere was not necessarily the same. The decline of certain

14

---

[38] Ågren, Emissaries, p. 12.
[39] Eibach, Verhöre, pp. 266-79.
[40] Inken Schmidt-Voges, Mikropolitiken des Friedens. Praktiken und Semantiken des Hausfriedens im 18. Jahrhundert, Munich 2014 (forthcoming); Christine Schedensack, Nachbarn im Konflikt. Zur Entstehung und Beilegung von Rechtsstreitigkeiten um Haus und Hof im frühneuzeitlichen Münster, Münster 2007.
[41] See the records of the Bernese 'Reformationskammer'.
[42] Arlette Farge, La vie fragile. Violence, pouvoirs et solidarités à Paris au XVIIIe siècle, Paris 1986, pp. 17-30; see also Martin Dinges, Der Maurermeister und der Finanzrichter. Ehre, Geld und soziale Kontrolle im Paris des 18. Jahrhunderts, Göttingen 1994.

rituals points in the same direction. If we turn again to the case of late medieval Zurich and the comprehensive study of Pascale Sutter, we can observe already then the overall importance and differentiated forms of gendered conviviality: neighbouring women, sitting together in front of their house after their evening meal; men assembling in taverns, guild houses or also on the street; journeymen gathering on the town hall bridge. There were baths and brothels. Some alleys of Zurich even saw periodic banquets, organised by the neighbours.[43] Compared to rural society, the link between work and sociability appears to be at least reduced.

The Changing Construction of Social Space

Instead of a summary I want to close with a remark on the spatial aspect of house and neighbourhood. In an article on Augsburg during the age of Reformation, Emily Fisher Gray has shown how the Catholic and the Lutheran parish of the 'Heilig-Kreuz-Viertel' managed to find a modus vivendi. In spite of the religious upheaval and the fundamentalist truth claim of the time, Catholics and Lutherans in that quarter shared the same building and the churchyard for some years. The actors thereby explicitly referred to 'good neighbourliness' (*gute Nachbarschaft*) as a Christian virtue and general norm.[44] The argument of 'good neighbourliness' was convenient to legitimise their doing and to find pragmatic solutions for both parishes. However, the good neighbourly cooperation of the detested enemies ended, when the town council of Augsburg decided to separate the hitherto shared sacral sphere through new separate entrances and separate buildings for both congregations. It was the beginning of the effective separation of the town into two religious communities that was to last for several centuries.

The example tells us something about shared space as a precondition of 'doing neighbourhood'. Full functioning neighbourhoods presupposed the co-presence of the neighbourly actors. The pre-modern village can be seen as one shared space which was worked on and administered by all neighbours. This counts at least for the common land, roads and other resources. Frequent conflicts in rural society over borders and trespassing

---

[43] Sutter, Nachbarn, pp. 110-23.

[44] Emily Fisher Gray, ‚Liebe deinen Nächsten': Konfessionelle Feindseligkeit und Zusammenarbeit während der Reformation in Augsburg, in: Sandra Evans / Schamma Schahadat (eds.), Nachbarschaft, Räume, Emotionen. Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zu einer sozialen Lebensform, Bielefeld 2012, pp. 123-39.

underline the importance and sensitivity of space. To a lesser degree we find social space, shared among neighbours also in the towns. This applies to the yard behind the house, used by all house-dwellers for the collection of water, the drying of the laundry or the storage of materials. Moreover, the spot in front of the house was often used as an extension of the shop or workshop. Both shared social space and the need for good neighbourhood was reduced with the introduction of clear borders. What happens in the course of the early modern period and the 19th century is a reallocation and social differentiation of space, both within the domestic sphere and between interior and exterior spheres of the house. The effect was a fundamental change of the character of household work and also a change of neighbourly relations. While good neighbourly relations used to be indispensable, they are nowadays no more than an option.