

# 婚姻家庭与人口行为

李中清 郭松义 定宜庄 编

北京大学出版社  
北 京

## 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

婚姻家庭与人口行为/李中清等主编. —北京:北京大学出版社,  
1999.12

ISBN 7-301-04416-X

I. 婚… II. 李… III. ①婚姻社会学-中国-文集 ②家庭社会学-中  
国-文集 ③人口社会学-中国-文集 IV. C913.1-53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(1999)第 74267 号

### 书 名: 婚姻家庭与人口行为

著作责任者: 李中清 郭松义 定宜庄 编

责任编辑: 周月梅

标准书号: ISBN 7-301-04416-X/K·278

出版者: 北京大学出版社

地 址: 北京市海淀区中关村北京大学校内 100871

网 址: <http://cbs.pku.edu.cn/cbs.htm>

电 话: 出版部 62752015 发行部 62754140 编辑部 62752032

电子信箱: [zpup@pup.pku.edu.cn](mailto:zpup@pup.pku.edu.cn)

印刷者: 北京大学印刷厂印刷

发 行 者: 北京大学出版社

经 销 者: 新华书店

787×1092 16 开本 20.75 印张 360 千字

2000 年 1 月第 1 版 2000 年 1 月第 1 次印刷

印 数: 0001—1500 册

定 价: 40.00 元

# 目 录

前 言	( 1 )	
中国东北地区分家的原因和结果(1789~1909)	.....	
..... 康文林 李中清	( 1 )	
清代的童养媳婚姻	..... 郭松义	( 33 )
近百年闽东沿海的婚姻、家庭与生育率		
——连江县浦口镇官岭村调查报告	..... 郑振满	( 61 )
乡村婚姻与社会文化变迁		
——近 50 年江西“同宗相婚”现象考察	..... 梁洪生	( 82 )
族际家庭与族际婚姻:呼和浩特蒙汉通婚	..... 纳日碧力戈 王俊敏	(109)
18 世纪中国家庭结构分析		
——立足于 1782~1791 年的考察	..... 王跃生	(126)
瑞典南部的人口生育与经济压力,		
1829~1867	..... Paul Nystedt Martin Dribe	(145)
堕胎、避孕与绝育:宋元明清时期江浙地区的节育方法		
及其运用与传播	..... 李伯重	(172)
清代溺婴问题新探	..... 常建华	(197)
中国人口的传统死亡模式		
——以明清江南地区两个家族为个案的历史人口学研究	..... 侯杨方	(220)
斯堪尼亚地区 19 世纪的人口迁移与经济压力	..... Martin Dribe	(234)
一个统计学分析:对林堡地区所作的个案		
研究,1847~1866	..... 卡特琳·卡普隆	(270)
寻找真正的活历史:人口统计、田野调查与		
历史文献三结合的新尝试	..... 定宜庄 郭松义	(303)
附录:论文作者单位、地址	.....	(323)

# CONTENTS

Introduction .....	( 1 )
Causes and Consequences of Household Division in Northeast China, 1789~1909 .....	Cameron Campbell James Lee ( 1 )
Little Daughter-in-law Marriage During the Qing .....	..... Guo Songyi ( 33 )
Fertility, Marriage, and Family on the Fujian Coast during the Last Century; A Research Report on Lianjiang County, Pukouzhen, Guanlingcun .....	Zheng Zhenman ( 61 )
Rural Marriage and Social-cultural Change; Consanguinity in Jiangxi, 1950~2000 .....	Liang Hongsheng ( 82 )
Inter-ethnic Mongol-han Marriage in Huhehaote .....	Naranbilike Wang Junmin(109)
Family Structure in Eighteenth Century China, 1782~1791 .....	Wang Yaosheng(126)
Fertility and Economic Stress in Southern Sweden, 1829~1867 .....	Paul Nystedt Martin Dribe(145)
Abortion, Contraception, and Termination of Pregnancy: Fertility Control and its Dissemination in Jiangsu and Zhejiang Provinces during the Song, Yuan, Ming, and Qing Dynasties .....	Li Bozhong(172)
New Research on Infanticide during the Qing ...	Chang Jianhua(197)
A Model of Traditional Mortality in the Chinese Population System .....	Hou Yangfang(220)
Migration and Economic Stress in Nineteenth Century Scania, Sweden .....	Martin Dribe(234)
A Statistical Analysis of Migrations from a Population Register. A Case Study, Limbourg, 1847~1866 ...	Catherine Capron(270)
In Search of Living History: Demography, Field Work and Historical Documentation, an Attempt at a New Synthesis .....	Ding Yizhuang Guo Songyi(303)
Appendix: Address of Authors .....	(323)

## 前 言

1998年11月,我们来自多个国家的30余名学者聚首北京,参加了在内容和时间上相互衔接的两个学术会议。前一个叫做“欧亚人口与家庭历史研讨会”,参加的有美国、意大利、比利时、瑞典、日本和中国的20位学者;后一个议题是“中国婚姻、家庭和人口行为”,主要由中国和美国学者参加。虽然与会的人数不多,但由于他们来自东西方不同国度,并汇集了诸如历史学、人口学、社会学、人类学和民族学等各学科,分别就各自国家和所从事的不同学科领域的专长,围绕婚姻、家庭和人口行为这一题目进行比较、分析,从而既扩展了研究视野,也加强了研究深度,使参加者均感获益良多。我们这个论文集,便是从这两个会议的近30篇文章中选录出来的。

这个论文集按照内容大体分为三个专题:

第一个专题是有关中国的婚姻、家庭和人口行为的,共收论文6篇。其中康文林(Cameron Campbell)和李中清(James Lee)的 *Causes and Consequences of Household Division in Northeast China, 1789~1909* (中国东北地区分家的原因和结果(1789~1909年)),主要是根据清代盛京内务府户口册资料,对18世纪晚期以来120年间中国东北民间的分家原因和结果进行了分析。作者认为,在中国传统社会里,家长具有绝对的权威,在诸子中,嫡长子又是父亲权力的继承者,可体现在财产分配上,诸子享有平等的权利,所以分家便成了诸子在经济方面获取均平权益的机会。郭松义的“清代的童养媳婚姻”,讨论了虽非社会主流,当时却十分普遍的一种童养媳婚姻形式,并就童养媳的领养原因和童养形式,养媳在童养期间的身份地位,以及此类婚姻中发生的婆媳矛盾和夫妻冲突,一一作了分析。郑振满的“近百年闽东沿海的婚姻、家庭与生育率——连江县浦口镇官岭村调查报告”,是通过问卷调查的形式,收集官岭村100位男女个人生活史资料,又结合有关文献,作出有关该村近百年来婚姻、家庭、生育、收养等方面的报告。梁洪生的“乡村婚姻与社会文化变迁——近50年江西‘同宗相婚’现象考察”,也在乡村调查基础上,选择5个村庄为典型,对中国农村普遍存在、却与传统礼教有悖的家族内部同宗婚配情况的发展演变,作了很好的剖述。如果说郑、梁二位的成果是以社会调查为基础,又参考有关文献资料写出的历史文章,那么纳日碧力戈和王俊敏合作的

“族际家庭与族际婚姻：呼和浩特蒙汉通婚”一文，就是遵循人类学研究方法作出的颇具现实感的论文。作者运用巴特、郝瑞等学者的“边界”理论，讨论了当今内蒙古呼和浩特市区的蒙汉通婚情况，得出那里的蒙古族正在告别曾经拥有的“物质边界”，向着属于“心理边界”的“符号边界”过渡的结论。

有关家庭方面的文章只收了王跃生的“18世纪中国家庭结构分析——立足于1782~1791年的考察”一文。此文采用1303件个案资料为分析样本，了解到在中下层各类家庭中，核心小家庭乃是家庭形态的主流。而直系家庭占有较大的比重，说明父母至少同一个已婚子女生活在一起，并由子女承担养老责任，仍属社会的普遍现象。

第二个专题是属于人口行为的，也有6篇文章，其中3篇是谈中国的，另3篇由外国学者谈西欧的情况。Martin Dribe的 *Migration and Economic Stress in Nineteenth Century Scania, Sweden* (瑞典斯堪尼亚地区19世纪的人口迁移与经济压力)一文，利用教区资料，对1829年到1868年瑞典农村的人口流动作了分析研究。当时那里正处于农业变革的时期，经济上的变动使原本相对平稳的家庭也发生了不同的变化：一些无地少地的家庭，每当年景歉收，便把年龄稍大的孩子送往外地以减轻家庭负担；小康之家因能承受一定的外来压力，即使在遇到经济困难时，也很少有离家迁出的；至于还有一些因习俗缘故（这种习俗多流行于北欧的瑞典、挪威、丹麦、英国，以及德国北部和法国的部分地区），男子到一定年龄便需出外锻炼谋生本领者，本来就是一支流动性很大的队伍，越是经济繁荣他们便越显活跃，因为那时可供选择的工作机会多，更能待价而沽。Paul Nystedt和Martin Dribe的 *Fertility and Economic Stress in Southern Sweden, 1829~1867* (瑞典南部的人口生育与经济压力，1829~1867)，所用资料与Martin Dribe基本相同，但考察的角度有所差别。著者采用微观纵向数据，将瑞典斯堪尼亚地区四个农民教区的资料，按照时间和历史事件相结合的方法，分别建立几个模型，分析了工资收入短期变动对生育率的影响，以及这种影响在不同阶层中的反映。Catherine Capron的 *A Statistical Analysis of Migrations from a Population Register, A Case Study, Limbourg, 1847~1866* (一个统计学分析：对林堡地区所作的个案研究，1847~1866)是对比利时东部一个纺织小城林堡所作的个案分析。此城因社会经济结构变迁，引发人口行为的变化，这里既有婚姻的原因，也与家庭制度有关。

在涉及中国人口行为的论文中，李伯重的“堕胎、避孕与绝育：宋元明清时期江浙地区的节育方法及其运用与传播”，重点为了说明，至少在江

浙地区,早在宋元明清时期,人们已熟知通过生育控制以降低生育率的方法,而且在运用水平上超过同时期的西欧,从而批驳了那种认为只有到了近代以后中国才有生育控制的说法。侯杨方的“中国人口的传统死亡模式——以明清江南地区两个家族为个案的历史人口学研究”,利用曹、范两家的家谱资料,重点对家族人口的死亡模式与时代背景间的相互关系进行分析。又鉴于中国普通家谱对未成年人口死亡记录遗漏严重,特通过编制布拉斯相关模型生命表加以探求。常建华的“清代溺婴问题新探”,除了考察溺婴习俗、地区分布和所产生的后果等等以外,还讨论了用冥诛说警戒溺婴者的社会新动向,认为这是把劝善和戒溺婴结合起来,教育民众勿滥溺婴。

第三个专题是讨论研究方法的。由于与会学者来自各个学科,在我们所选的论文中,既有纯粹用历史学方法写的,也有采用人口学和人类学方法的,还有社会学和历史学、民族学结合起来做的,所以在会议中,研究方法的问题自然成了交流的热点。定宜庄在会上具体地介绍了她与郭松义如何通过将文献和田野调查相结合的做法,查明了藏于辽宁省档案馆的清代盛京内务府三佐领属下人丁户口册所载的大批另户人口身份的过程,从而为研究清代人口史提供了一个新的线索。论文集中最后一篇“寻找真正的活历史:人口统计、田野调查与历史文献三结合的新尝试”一文,就是在这个发言的基础上整理而成的。

记得在1993年,我们曾召开过一个以“清代皇族人口行为和社会环境”为题目的小型学术讨论会,后来编辑出版了一本论文集。当时我们曾设想,几年后待时机成熟,将再搞一次类似的活动。这次会议、这个论文集,实际上就是对头一次会议和编头一个论文集时所作承诺的交待。当然,此次的主题有所变动,重点也有所转移,但基本上仍是围绕人口行为展开的。因为不管是婚姻家庭,抑或人口环境,差不多都与人口行为有关,或者会影响到人口行为。基于这个论文集的读者对象主要是中国同行,所以选录的文章亦以讨论中国问题为主,还有许多精品,因格于主题和篇幅,只好割爱了。至于3篇涉及西欧的文章,是为了让中国读者有机会认识那个时期那里的情况,比较一下在社会转型期间东西方在人口行为变化方面的异同;另一方面也是想介绍一些西方人口学的研究方法,因为他们都是属于典型的采用人口学方法来作历史研究的。在编者看来,这些被选录的文章,总的质量仍可称满意。作者们无论是资料的搜集,或是题目的选择,乃至采用不同的研究方法,都各有特色,并有新意可寻。至于究竟如何,当然要由读者自己作出判断了。

这个论文集能得以顺利出版,首先应感谢北京大学出版社的副总编

周月梅编审。她不辞劳苦,打破常规,做了不少本该由我们来做的工作。没有她的劳绩,这本书不会这么快、这么好地呈现在读者面前。中国社会科学院民族研究所的纳日碧力戈先生帮助翻译了几位外国学者的论文提要,北京大学的黄道林、郑铁兵、中国社会科学院历史所的孟艳红、陈爽等先生,也都为我们的工作帮了忙、出了力,亦借此一并表示谢意。

编者谨识  
1999年10月

# CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF HOUSEHOLD DIVISION IN NORTHEAST CHINA, 1789~1909<sup>①</sup>

Cameron Campbell and James Lee

**Abstract** In Liaoning during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, multiple-family households were common. These households were hierarchical. Their heads assigned responsibilities and allocated resources. Privilege, including access to marriage and reproduction, depended on relationship to him. Since the head's eldest son normally inherited his status upon his death, only through household division could distant kin acquire control over a share of family resources. In this paper we identify the circumstances that precipitated household division by application of discrete-time event-history methods to longitudinal, nominative household register data from state farms in Liaoning during the Qing. We find that the timing of division was contingent on exogenous events such as the deaths of key household members, thus the opportunities for involvement in one were limited. By comparing marriage and reproduction according to relationship at birth and past history of involvement in household division, we examine whether or not division was a liberating experience for distant kin of the head.

**Key words** History Northeast China Household division

In late imperial China, as many as 10 percent of all peasants were unfree. The most common form of unfree labor were state populations organized under the Eight Banners, an elite military organization. This paper examines the causes and consequences of household division in seven such Banner populations organized under the imperial household agency (*neiwufu*).<sup>②</sup>

The banner household, called *hu* in Han Chinese or *boigon* in Manchu Chinese, was defined by common residence and common consumption.<sup>③</sup> Household members lived together, ate together, and farmed together. They did so, however, on state land as hereditary state peasants, albeit elite peasants.<sup>④</sup> Provided with ample land,<sup>⑤</sup> their

principal functions were to provide the state with agricultural goods, as well as labor and military service.<sup>⑥</sup>

The Qing state organized the banner household according to two contradictory principles. On the one hand, by encouraging late household division, many banner households developed into large joint households.<sup>⑦</sup> In one northeast Chinese banner population, Daoyi, it was common for even married cousins and similarly distant kin to live together (Lee and Campbell 1997). On the other hand, by enforcing a system of primogenitary household headship, and by granting household heads considerable power over the persons and property of all household members, banner households also resembled stem households.<sup>⑧</sup> In such circumstances, only by being involved in a household division could distant kin hope to acquire control over their share of the patrimony.

The combination of exclusionary headship and inclusionary membership was a source of tension and potential conflict within banner households.<sup>⑨</sup> Heads often used their power to favor close kin in the allocation of household resources and discriminate against distant kin. Our previous analysis of social organization in Daoyi revealed differentials in marriage chances and fertility behavior in multiple-family households indicative of sharp stratification by relationship to the household head (Lee and Campbell 1997, 105~156). Individuals who were distant kin of the head married later and had fewer children.

In this paper, we identify the conditions that could precipitate household division and assess the degree to which such an event liberated or limited demographic opportunities for those involved. In examining the causes of household division, we focus on the role of such exogenous events as the death of senior household members. Our hypothesis is that if divisions were contingent on such deaths, then household members had limited control over the timing and therefore over the circumstances of household division.

We also seek to understand to what degree the Liaoning joint banner households were egalitarian or inegalitarian. We consequently investigate the consequences of household division for nuptiality and fertility. Marriage and children were expensive in late imperial China.

To the extent that the multiple-family households exploited distant kin to favor close kin, we would expect household division to impair the demographic opportunities of close kin and to improve the demographic opportunities of distant kin to marry, to bear children, even to survive. To the extent that multiple-family households were egalitarian, we would expect household division to have little effect on population behavior.

To measure such effects, we compare the marriage and fertility behavior of individuals according to whether or not they have been involved in a household division. We distinguish individuals according to their relationship to household head at time of first appearance, since that predicts their relationship at later ages. For example, in the absence of division, non-eldest sons of the head eventually become brothers of the head, while descendants of brothers and cousins eventually become cousins and uncles. To the extent division was a liberating experience for distant kin of the head, descendants of brothers and cousins involved in a division should have higher marriage and fertility rates than those never involved in a division.

Our paper is divided into five parts. In part one, we describe the seven populations and the household registration system that documents their behavior. In part two, we replicate previous findings from an earlier analysis of a smaller sample of populations (Campbell and Lee 1998, Lee and Campbell 1998) and show that a large proportion of the individuals in our populations lived in multiple-family households, and that many of them were distant kin of the head of their household. In part three, we confirm that in the absence of household division, only the eldest son of the head was able to inherit household headship. For other kin, becoming a head typically required household division. In part four, we identify the circumstances that tended to precipitate a household division. Moving beyond the tabular comparisons of probabilities in Lee and Campbell (1997), We apply logistic regression to relate the chances of division to characteristics of the household and the recent occurrence of deaths of certain household members. In part five, we examine the consequences of division. We again make use of logistic regression, this time to compare the marriage chances of

different kin according to whether or not they have been involved in a division.

## I. Populations and Data

All together, we have 256 403 individual observations and 43 814 household observations from seven populations during the 120 year period from 1789 to 1909 including 1 026 cases of household division.<sup>⑩</sup> We summarize the number of observations of individuals, households, and household divisions by population in table 1. All seven populations are from what is now Liaoning Province in northeast China: 26 847 from Chengnei, that is the provincial capital, Shenyang, 96 154 from the surrounding villages of Daoyi directly to the north, 36 444 from Feicheng and 21 583 from Dami in the northern counties of Tieling, Faku, and Kaiyuan, and 17 511 from Niuzhuang and 57 864 from Gaiping Counties at the southwestern junction of the Liaodong peninsula, including 36 578 from the Gaizhou grain estates and 21 286 from the Gaizhou cotton estates.<sup>⑪</sup>

**Table 1 Individual and Household Observations,  
and Numbers of Household Divisions, 1789~1909\***

Population	Individual	Households	Household Divisions
Daoyi	96154	15204	370
Gaizhou	36578	5420	130
Dami	21583	4759	78
Chengnei	26847	4996	127
Gaizhou Mianding	21286	3485	78
Yuding	17511	2541	69
Feicheng	36444	7409	174
Total	256403	43814	1026

\* Registers before 1789 are not included in this analysis because they do not provide detail on household structure or relationship.

These data are derived from 'Household and Population Registers of the Eight Banner Han Chinese Army' (*Hanjun baqi rending hukou ce*) that were compiled on a triennial basis between 1789 and 1909.<sup>⑫</sup> The Qing relied heavily on these registers for civilian and military administration. They accordingly devised a remarkable system of

internal cross-checks to ensure consistency and accuracy. First, they assigned every person in the banner population to a residential household (*linghu*) and registered them on a household certificate (*menpai*). Then they organized households into clans (*zu*), and compiled annually updated clan genealogies (*zupu*).

Finally, every three years they compared these genealogies and household certificates with the previous register to compile a new register. They deleted and added people who had exited or entered in the last three years and updated the ages, relationships, and occupations of those people who remained. Each register, in other words, completely superseded its predecessor.

The registers record at three year intervals for each person in the entire population the following information in order of appearance: relationship to their household head; name(s); adult banner status; age; animal birth year;<sup>⑬</sup> lunar birth month, birth day, and birth hour; marriage, death, or emigration, if any during the intercensal period; physical disabilities, if any and if the person is an adult male; name of their kin-group head; banner affiliation; and village of residence. Individuals were listed one to a column in order of their relationship to the head, with his children and grandchildren listed first, his coresident siblings and their descendants listed next, and then uncles, aunts, and cousins.<sup>⑭</sup> In addition, household heads are identified by their father and grandfather's names and occupations, while widows are identified by their husband's name and occupation.

The banner registers provide far more comprehensive and accurate demographical and sociological data than the *baojia* household registers common elsewhere in China (Harrell 1987, Skinner 1987, Telford 1990).<sup>⑮</sup> This is true for the entire Northeast which was the Qing homeland and was under special state jurisdiction, distinct from the provincial administration elsewhere. Regimentation of the population actually began as early as 1625, when the Manchus made Shenyang their capital and incorporated the surrounding communities into the banner system.<sup>⑯</sup> By the late eighteenth century, not only was the population registered in remarkable precision and detail, migration was strictly controlled, not only between Northeast China and China

Proper, but between communities within Northeast China as well.<sup>⑥</sup> Government control over the population was tighter than in almost any other part of China. As a result, the Eight Banner household registers are the most extensive and detailed records of a Chinese peasant population in the late imperial period.<sup>⑦</sup>

We are consequently able to recreate the household structure and domestic processes in our populations from the banner registers in greater detail than elsewhere. The household was the basic unit of banner social structure (Fu 1983). Banner registers accordingly organized individual records by household beginning with the head, followed by other household members according to their relationship to the head. The ordering principle depended in descending order on degree of kinship, generation, and gender. Children follow immediately after parents. Thus sons, daughters, grandsons, and granddaughters come before brothers, sisters, nephews and nieces, and they in turn come before uncles and cousins. These same principles of hereditary priority underlay the processes of household formation, creating three distinct interest groups within the multiple-family banner household.

## I . Household structure and relationship

To classify household structure, we follow Lee and Campbell (1997) and apply a modified version of the classic Hammel-Laslett scheme (1974). Single-family households are divided into fragmentary, simple, and extended households. Fragmentary households include those in which an individual is living alone, as well as those in which individuals who do not form a conjugal unit are living together. Simple households are nuclear families, including childless married couples, married couples with children, and widows or widowers living with children. Extended households are ones in which a conjugal unit coresides with additional kin who do not form an additional conjugal unit. A married couple living together with the husband's unmarried younger brother is a typical example. A married couple living with the husband's widowed father is another.

We categorize multiple-family households, that is households with

more than one conjugal unit, according to the nature of the head's authority over other household members. While all household heads had considerable legal discretion over both the property and the person of other household members, this was reinforced by community and Confucian norms. <sup>⑨</sup> *Vertical* households were ones in which everyone in the household was either descended from the head, or married to one of his descendants. In such households, the authority that the head derived from his title was reinforced by traditional filial piety, that is, the obligation of sons to obey their fathers under all circumstances. *Horizontal* households were ones in which the head and his descendants lived together with his younger brothers and their descendants. The head's titular authority was enhanced by his position as elder brother in the household's senior generation, but not as much as would be the case if he were everyone's father. In *diagonal* households, heads coresided with their uncles, cousins, or both. The head's authority over such distantly related kin derived almost entirely from his title, since they were beholden to him neither as his sons nor his younger brothers. In some cases, where a head lived with an uncle, the head was faced with the challenge of exerting authority over someone who was older and a member of a senior generation. <sup>⑩</sup>

The various categories are related to each other by the fact that each represents a stage in an ideal model of household progression. A fragmentary household could become a simple or extended household through the marriage of one of its members. A simple or extended household usually became a vertical as soon as at least one son married. If there was only one son, and he had no married children, the household reverted to an extended or simple form on the death of the head or his spouse. If there was more than one son, however, and they were all married, the vertical became a horizontal once the head died and his or her eldest son succeeded him. A horizontal turned into a diagonal when its head died and his or her son succeeded, and the former head's brothers became the new head's uncles, and the former head's nephews became the new head's cousins.

The tabulation of households by type in table 2 reveals that while just under one-half of households comprised more than one family, well

over half of individuals lived in multiple-family households.<sup>20</sup> Slightly less than one-quarter of households, 23.7 percent, were nuclear family households, and since they were smaller than multiple-family households, they only accounted for 11.2 percent of the population. Nearly half of all households, 47.9 percent, were multiple-family households. The most common of these were horizontal households. Since multiple-family households were larger than single-family households, they accounted for just over three-quarters, 75.9 percent, of the individuals in the population.<sup>21</sup>

**Table 2 Individuals and Households by Household Type, 1789~1909\***

Household Type	Individuals(%)	Households(%)
Fragmentary	2.8	13.4
Simple	11.2	23.7
Extended	10.1	15.0
Vertical	17.4	15.3
Horizontal	36.0	22.1
Diagonal	22.5	10.5
Total	100.0(N=232454)	100.0(N=39320)

\* This calculation was restricted to households where the head was alive.

Because multiple-family households were common, nearly half of individuals were not members of their household head's nuclear family. These were the individuals against whom the head might discriminate when it came time to allocate resources and responsibilities, and who could gain direct control over their share of the patrimony only at the time of household division. According to table 3, which summarizes the distribution of individuals by their relationship to the household head, 13.9 percent of individuals were actually quite distant kin, including uncles, aunts, cousins, and descendants of cousins. According to Lee and Campbell (1997), these were the kin who were most vulnerable. 28.7 percent were brothers, sisters, sisters-in-law, and their descendants. 10.6 percent were grandchildren or great-grandchildren of the head, or his father or mother. Only 52 percent were heads, their wives, and their children. Were this calculation to be restricted to multiple-family households, of course, the proportions who were not members of the head's nuclear family would be even higher.

**Table 3 Individuals by Relationship to Household Head, 1789~1909\***

Relationship	Percent (%)
Head	16.9
Father, Mother	3.5
Wife	10.7
Son, Daughter, Daughter-in-law	24.4
Grandson, Granddaughter, Granddaughter-in-law	7.1
Brother, Sister, Sister-in-law	12.2
Brother's Son, Brother's Daughter, Brother's Daughter-in-law	9.4
Brother's Grandson, Granddaughter, Granddaughter-in-law	1.9
Uncle, Aunt	4.5
Cousin, Cousin-in-law	6.2
Cousin's Son, Cousin's Daughter, Cousin's Daughter-in-law	2.8
Cousin's Grandson, Granddaughter, Granddaughter-in-law	0.4
Total(N)	100.0(N=232454)

\* This calculation restricted to households where the head is alive.

### III. Headship succession and household division

Having described the households in which individuals lived, we turn to an exploration of headship succession. We begin with a comparison of the rules of succession in our seven populations. We identify the individuals most likely to become heads and map out the two routes, inheritance and household division, by which they could hope to attain the position. We then examine the implications of being a head, or the close relative of one, for individual well-being reflected by the probability of marriage. To learn what influenced the chances that the distant relatives of a head would ever enjoy the fruits of headship, we close with an analysis of the determinants of household division.

Only a few select kin of a current head could expect to ever acquire headship by inheriting it from the current head (Lee and Campbell 1998, Campbell and Lee 1998). Though property inheritance in China was ostensibly partible, headship and the control over the household's labor and resources that came with it was passed from one generation to the next according to simple primogeniture stem rules.<sup>65</sup> Table 4 summarizes the current relationships of individuals who inherit headship in the next register, that is, become household heads without departing