

Gender and Well-Being

Interactions between Work, Family and Public
Policies

COST ACTION A 34

Third Symposium:

**Production and Distribution of Well-Being into the
Family: Strategies of Remunerated and Non-
remunerated Labour and Consumption Patterns**

25th -27th June 2007

**University of Barcelona
Barcelona-Spain**

Please, do not quote without author's permission

“Gender, well-being and survival as paid or unpaid labor in Pyrenean families”

Marie-Pierre Arrizabalaga¹
Université de Cergy-Pontoise
marie-pierre.arrizabalaga@u-cergy.fr

Traditionally, women’s well-being in the Pyrenees was best secured through marriage, whether they originated from propertied or non-propertied families. Women could then benefit from and live according to their husbands’ status and salaries. It seems however that marriage was more vital for women of a lower background (landless families) rather than for those of a higher background (propertied families). The reason for this was probably because the Ancient Regime local customs forced Pyrenean propertied families to secure well-being to all the children whether through marriage or through celibacy. Indeed, the customs which perpetuated the Pyrenean house system or single inheritance traditions compelled propertied families to marry all the children comfortably (Arrizabalaga, 2004). Otherwise, they had to offer them (the younger ones in particular) the possibility to care for them at home as single unpaid members of the family. In this way, men and women from propertied families, whether married or unmarried, were secured well-being, a decent life, and a decent status as well.

The customs thus protected the rights of propertied families’ unmarried sons and daughters by making sure that they were all provided for in the family farm through life. Men helped in the outdoor chores and women in indoor chores. Each contributed to the household’s revenues as unpaid labor and enjoyed their parents’ status through life in exchange for room, board, life-long care, and retirement.² They were full members and participants to the family well-being though they received no salary. In the Ancient Regime, family size being lower than in the nineteenth century (three children per family on average in the Western Pyrenees instead of three to four in the nineteenth century), male or female celibates from propertied families were quite numerous. All families seemed to have one living in the family house through life

¹ Maître de conférence at the University of Cergy-Pontoise, a member of the university research group CICC-EA 2529 & IKER-UMR 5478.

² This system was responsible for the formation of specific family structures, the stem-family in the Pyrenees (two family groups living together under the same roof). This system in the Pyrenees has been the object of many studies in the Ancient Regime and after the French Revolution (Le Roy Ladurie, 1972; Fine-Souriac, 1977; Fauve-Chamoux, 1993a, 1993b, 1995, 2002; Arrizabalaga, 1997a, 1997b; Fauve-Chamoux et al., 1998).

(Lafourcade, 1989). As for landless families' celibates in the Ancient Regime, little is known. Yet it seems that for them, paid service labor outside the family house was probably inevitable, vital, and difficult considering the limited economic possibilities of the time in the Pyrenees. They therefore often opted for marriage to avoid a life of hardship, instability, and poverty.

In the nineteenth century, the situation evolved differently. Though the population increased, economic opportunities expanded, transportation improved, and migration was facilitated, the number of celibates remained quite high. This was due to single inheritance which prevailed despite the egalitarian laws of the Civil Code of 1804 (Arrizabalaga, 2005a, 2005b). Yet, fewer men and women accepted to remain single in the family house as unpaid labor as a result of new, better paid professional opportunities elsewhere. The purpose of this paper is precisely to focus on unmarried men and women as paid or unpaid labor whose well-being and survival depended on their capacity to take advantage of family conditions and new opportunities to secure themselves well-being. While some perpetuated ancient practices as unpaid labor in the family house under the authority of their parents first and later under the authority of the family single heir or heiress of the house, most opted for other destinies. They found jobs outside the family house, especially landless farmers' sons and daughters who could not reside with their parents as adults and were forced to find employment to secure their own survival and well-being. They found solutions in service labor in rural areas or small towns which only secured them life-long toil and meager revenues. It appears that unpaid unmarried men and women were rare among landless families whose children generally married to be able to sign land leases (generally granted to married couples) and provide a decent well-being for themselves.

The question which we will address are the following ones. Where there many unmarried men and women in the Pyrenees after the Revolution when economic opportunities expanded? How did their number evolve over time? What was their destiny as paid or unpaid labor? With industrialization, urbanization and emigration in the nineteenth century, their situation evolved greatly so that they soon had greater access to new, better paid, more diverse employment opportunities as paid labor. Considering expanding and improving economic conditions especially in cities, propertied families' sons and daughters were proportionally fewer to live and work at home as unpaid labor. Many indeed lived as paid labor in rural, urban, or overseas environments? Why was marriage not an option for them? The destiny of these unmarried men and women as unpaid or paid labor, all originating from propertied or non-propertied families, was inevitably different, yet single women, no matter

their social background, had greater chances to experience downward social mobility than men. Why did women then opt for a life of celibacy?

Sources and methodology

I will use the Basque case in order to analyze the reasons why so many unmarried men and women accepted the hard living conditions as unpaid or paid labor and the types of destinies and social mobility they experienced in the Pyrenees in the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century. Basque conditions on these matters will provide an illustration of what happened in other mountain provinces of Southern France. All had written customs before the French Revolution which gave rights to all individuals, including unmarried ones. The local Basque family practices were not all together different from the others because single inheritance was the rule as it was in all the other provinces of the Pyrenees. It was single inheritance that generated high celibacy, families being able to secure status and well-being to no more than two children generally. Yet when families were larger and when they could not collect dowries for all the children, celibacy or emigration was inevitable (Arrizabalaga, 2005c, 2005d, 2006c). Thus, in the Pyrenees, as in the Basque Country, the local customs of the Ancient Regime imposed single inheritance. The selection of one heir or heiress inevitably generated the exclusion of the other children from inheritance, and therefore celibacy when all the children were not all provided for a decent marriage. The situation did not change all that much with the French Revolution. Though the Civil Code of 1804 imposed equality, single inheritance practices, though transformed, prevailed and generated new inequalities between siblings depending on their birth rank and on their sex (Arrizabalaga, 2002a, 2002b). Celibacy however remained high, especially among younger sons and daughters (younger daughters in particular). It was not so high among landless families' sons and daughters, as the data will show. Why did celibacy, especially as unpaid labor, prevail among women of all status despite industrialization, urbanization, and expanding economic conditions. Why was marriage not an option?

For our demonstration, we will use family reconstitutions, 120 genealogies from 1800 until today or the life experiences of about 3000 individuals originating from six different villages in the Basque Country in the three Basque provinces: Sare (a mountain) in the province of Labourd; Les Aldudes and Mendive (two highland villages), Isturits and Amendeuix (two lowland villages) in the province of Basse Navarre; and finally, Alçay (a highland village) in the small province of Soule, all villages located in rural areas distant from the regional city of Bayonne. In order to complete these 120 genealogies, many different sources were consulted: the civil registers of births, marriages, and deaths of the six villages, of all villages around

them (15 to 20 of them around each village), the district towns (all the cantonal seats of the Basque Country and surrounding Bearn towns), Bayonne, and Pau (Arrizabalaga, 1998). The information thus collected was then cross-analyzed with the land registers (*Cadastré*)³ of the six villages and the villages around them, the succession registers (*Enregistrements*)⁴ of the seven districts (or *cantons*), and finally the notary records.⁵

The succession and notary records were useful sources in this research on celibacy because unmarried men and women are difficult to trace. Rarely do they appear in archives, especially those landless originating from landless families.⁶ That explains why studies on them are so few (Fauve-Chamoux, 2005). Indeed, their marital status or rather the “absence of marital” status makes unmarried people invisible except in birth and death records. In between, they rarely leave any trace behind them. Only when they and/or their parents owned personal transmissible assets of some kind did they appear in succession records and notary records.⁷ These documents are the only ones giving indication on their inheritance and succession intentions and on their well-being through life. These indicators are not available for landless families’ unmarried sons and daughters who, when landless themselves, left no trace behind them besides their birth and death certificates and died as “indigents” (with no personal assets). In these circumstances, landless single people’s life experiences are therefore very difficult to study and their well-being difficult to evaluate. This study however will attempt to make amend to this situation and bring some tentative answers.

Male and female celibacy in the nineteenth century: data

The statistical analysis of the family reconstitution data indicate that about 20% of the children and grand children of the 120 couples remained single through life, more precisely 19.74% of the 456 surviving adult children of the second-generation cohort and 19.04% of the 809 surviving adult children of the third-generation cohort (see Table 1). About half of the them were men (46.7% among the second-generation single people and 50.6% of the third-

³ The land registers or *Cadastrés* that we consulted are *Cadastré. Matrice des propriétés foncières*, serie 3P3, Archives Départementales des Pyrénées-Atlantiques (ADPA). *Cadastré. Matrice des propriétés bâties*, serie 3P2, ADPA.

⁴ The succession registers or *Enregistrements* that we consulted are *Enregistrement. Mutation après décès*. Records from seven cantonal seats: Labastide-Clairance, Hasparren, Saint-Jean-de-Luz, Ustaritz, Saint-Etienne-de-Baïgorry, Saint-Jean-Pied-de-Port, Saint-Palais, Mauléon-Licharre. Serie Q, ADPA, 269 volumes.

⁵ The notary records were very incomplete yet most of the acts and their content were summarized in the declarations families made in the succession registers or *Enregistrements* above mentioned. The volumes consulted are: Espelette, Saint-Etienne-de-Baïgorry, Saint-Jean-Pied-de-Port and Tardetz, serie III E, ADPA.

⁶ One of the most famous author who wrote on celibacy in the Pyrenees was Pierre Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 1962, 1972, 2002).

⁷ These unmarried persons’ parents named them in their succession declaration stating what they were entitled to. When they themselves owned assets of their own, they signed testaments and therefore appeared in succession records within six months after their death.

generation single people) and the other half were women (53.3% of the second-generation single people and 49.4% of the third-generation single people) (see table 2). Finally, there were slightly more women than men if we compare them with the total number of individuals in the cohort, (see Tables 3). As a result, one women out of five remained single in the nineteenth century, fewer perhaps than in the Ancient Regime, it seems, when about one third (from 30 to 33%) remained single (Lafourcade, 1989). Male and female celibacy in the nineteenth century however was probably higher than the above data indicate as a result of the “unknown” cases, many of whom probably remained single as well (See table 1). We could estimate that celibacy actually reached one quarter to one third of the cohorts, fewer and fewer living in the family house than before, as we will see. Indeed, men and women in the nineteenth century had other options than celibacy and they therefore were fewer to accept the living conditions of single persons living at home and depending on the heir or heiress. They were even fewer to live in the rural environment they were familiar to, envisioning emigration instead, as the data will later show.

Table 1. Marital status of the children (second-generation cohort) and the grand children (third-generation cohort) of the 120 couples

Marital status	Second-generation	Third-generation
Single	19.74%	19.04%
Married	58.77%	40.17%
Unknown	21.49%	40.79%
Total	100% (N=456)	100% (N=809)

Table 2. Permanent men and women celibacy among the children (second-generation cohort) and the grand children (third-generation cohort) of the 120 couples

Sex	Second-generation	Third-generation
Men	46.7%	50.6%
Women	53.3%	49.4%
Total	100% (N=90)	100% (N=154)

Table 3. Unmarried sons and daughters (second-generation cohort) and unmarried grand sons and daughters (third-generation cohort) of the 120 couples compared to the total cohort

Celibacy / Gender	Second- Generation cohort	Third- Generation cohort
Men	19.5%	18.7%
Women	19.9%	19.45%
Total	19.74% (N=90)	19.04% (N=154)

Female celibacy and well-being before and after the French Revolution

The data clearly highlight pervasive ancient practices derived from the Pyrenean customs. These customs were written in the early modern era in order to inform the monarch on how local practices regulated communities', families', and individuals' well-being as well as their rights, powers, and obligations.⁸ They affected both propertied families and non-propertied families and in the same process they regulated the rights and powers of unmarried men and women. Most of the prerogatives of the customs remained effective through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Indeed, Pyrenean propertied families' practices were strictly regulated by the customs which imposed single inheritance and unequal succession rules rigidly, rules which prevailed until recently despite the Civil code.⁹ Families transmitted all their inherited assets to one child, to the first-born son or daughters (*ânesse intégrale*) in the Basque Country, Bareges and Lavedan¹⁰, to the first-born son (male primogeniture) in Bearn and the Baronies in particular¹¹, and to the first-born or cadet son in French Catalonia.¹² As a result of these single inheritance rules, there prevailed in the Pyrenees a system known as the "house system", which gave primacy to the survival and well-being of the family house and land over the children's (Fauve-Chamoux & Ochiai, 1998). The single heir or heiress (depending on the practices) was empowered of all assets as long as his or her decisions served the purpose of the house and its longevity. He or she had to transmit all inherited assets intact and undivided from one generation to the next while securing the well-being of the siblings. Practices evolved in the nineteenth century as female inheritance became more common, yet single inheritance as a system survived with the obligation to secure siblings' well-being.¹³

These practices inevitably generated exclusion, most notably among the younger children, and especially daughters in areas where only men inherited (all but the Basque Country,

⁸ In 1454, King Charles VII of France ordered that the local oral customs and traditions of all provinces be approved by local *parlements* and written in French in an attempt to codify all family practices in France and make them accessible to everyone. The customs became written, legal laws implemented until the French Revolution.

⁹ The studies on how unequal practices of the Ancient Regimes worked and were perpetuated in the nineteenth century despite the egalitarian laws of the Civil code are numerous (See Beaur et als., 2004; Bonnain et als., 1992; Bouchard et als., 1998; Dussereault et als., 2003; Green & Owens, 2004; Augustins, 1989).

¹⁰ On the practices of male or female primogeniture or *ânesse intégrale* in the Basque Country, Bareges and Lavedan, see Cordier, 1859; Etcheverry, 1899; Fougères, 1938; Barcelo, 2988; Lafourcade, 1989; Etchelecou, 1991; Bonnain, 1998; Zink, 1993. See also Duroux, 2004.

¹¹ On the practices of first-born male primogeniture in Bearn and the Baronies in particular, see Cordier, 1859; Fougères, 1938; Poumarede, 1972; Chiva & Goy, 1981, 1986; Fauve-Chamoux, 1984, 1987; Desplat, 1984; Etchelecou, 1991; Zink, 1993; Comas d'Argemir & Soulet, 1993; Soulet, 1993; Lacanette-Pommel, 2003.

¹² On the practices of first-born or cadet son in French Catalonia, see Assier-Andrieu, 1981 & 1990.

¹³ As the law required, siblings were to be compensated and secured equal well-being. Families attempted to comply despite pervasive single inheritance practices (See Arrizabalaga, 2006a & 2006b; Fauve-Chamoux, 1998 & 2003; Bonnain, 1996; Yver, 1966).

Lavedan and Bareges).¹⁴ As one inherited all land assets, the others were entitled to a compensation, that is their share over the other assets (the *légitime*: assets acquired during parents' marriage), of smaller value than the heirs' assets, in the form of a dowry, yet generally enough to marry into a local propertied family. Not all children were however secured a dowry, men and women. And those who could not hope for a decent dowry were encouraged to permanent celibacy at home as unpaid labor. Women were not always the ones who were sacrificed and forced to accept this condition. As families, with three children on average, could generally secure inheritance to the heir or heiress and a dowry to the second-born child, the other younger children, men or women, were forced to remain unmarried in the family house under the authority of the heir or heiress, never to be entitled to property right, salary, or compensation but room, board, care and retirement through life in the family house (Lafourcade, 1989). Thus, the Basque customs (as did the Lavedan and Bareges customs as well) allowed the prevalence of the house system and single inheritance until the French Revolution, an unequal system which, though transformed, was perpetuated in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries despite the Civil code. In this way, the system continued to exclude siblings and force some of them to permanent celibacy.

Celibacy at home as unpaid labor continued to be an option open to younger men and women who wanted to maintain their status as propertied sons or daughters and avoid precarious living and social conditions in the community and downward social mobility. Nonetheless, they had no life of their own, always under the authority of their parents first and later under the authority of the heir or heiress. In this way, inheritance practices before and after the Revolution guaranteed an unequal treatment depending upon birth rank (between first-born and younger children) rather than sex (between men and women) with the goal of securing socio-economic stability, well-being and continuity to houses, families, and communities. These practices were imposed as a result of the scarcity of money (for dowries and compensations), of land (individual properties being too small to survive partition and existing only as a result of single inheritance), and of employment (little craft or industrial employment available in the Pyrenees at the time). Therefore, the prevalence of single inheritance in the Pyrenees and that of permanent celibacy in particular were vital strategies to the continuity, well-being, social peace, and economic stability of families and communities.

¹⁴ Gender inequalities prevailed more strongly in the provinces of Bearn, Baronies, and French Catalonia because these provinces had adopted Roman laws and practices by advantaging more male than female descendants. In the provinces of Pays Basque, Lavedan and Bareges male or female primogeniture prevailed, hence greater gender equalities there.

The conditions of propertied families' celibates, male or female, were unfavorable but not so unfavorable as those of sharecroppers' unmarried sons and daughters. The latter could barely survive as paid servants. They lived a life of dependency and toil working for an employer and living in his house as low-paid labor twenty four hours a day. Their living conditions were precarious and their working conditions hard, probably more so than for unmarried men and women living and working as unpaid labor at their parents'. While the latter were secured livelihood, care and retirement through life, the former could be fired and be left homeless with nothing at any time. Thus, propertied families' unmarried sons and daughters had rights which others did not have. The heir or heiress did not compensate them but was compelled to take good care of them at home (one generally and occasionally two). This right was known as "*droit de chaise*" in the customs entitling uncompensated unmarried siblings to the family status, stable residence in the family house through life, participation in decision-making, and decision-power over the sale of the inherited land. Thus the heir or heiress could not sell inherited assets without the approval of the surviving parents and unmarried sibling(s) living in the house. Thus, unmarried men and women at home enjoyed a certain status, which was probably better than sharecroppers'. The Civil code perpetuated these practices but from then on uncompensated unmarried siblings had property rights on the inherited assets which they could demand. Rather than forcing partition, they accepted celibacy. As the succession records indicate, their self-abnegation for traditions (the survival of the house and the family) was such that upon death, they donated their share of the assets to the heir or heiress and contributed to the transmission of the family house and land intact and undivided to the next generation, despite the egalitarian law.

Propertied families' unmarried sons and daughters however did not enjoy equal rights, equal opportunities, and equal treatment. It appears that men had greater rights than women. Unmarried men worked on the farm and lived in the family house, as did their unmarried sisters, but made more benefits from their work in the house than their unmarried sisters. With the family's domestic animals, they raised their own (sheep and cows) and grazed them on common land. They made money with which they sometimes bought pieces of land for themselves to benefit from. As their succession declaration (testaments) indicate, they used their savings to acquire small property during their life time. When they saved enough, some could perhaps settle as propertied farmers or propertied artisans in the community and therefore live a life of their own. Yet this was unusual and rare as a result of the scarcity of land in the Pyrenees (Beaur et als., 2004). Others finally left the village and found other ways to settle down: in the army, the church, or abroad. Thus succession registers are truly

important indicators to evaluate these celibates' well-being. They indicate that propertied families' unmarried sons were probably grateful of their conditions at home because upon death, they did not hesitate to transmit their personal assets and their share of the inheritance to which they were entitled by law (which they never demanded however) to the heir or heiress of the house in return for good care and retirement.

Unmarried sisters under the authority of the heir or heiress did not enjoy the same opportunities. They lived and worked in the family house but were responsible of domestic, indoor chores. They took care of the house, of the children, and of the family poultry, yet could not save enough money to build a small fortune. Their celibacy was therefore permanent and provided them with no personal wealth besides the legal share to which they were entitled by law and to which they renounced in exchange for room, board, care, and retirement. Similar to their unmarried brothers, they never demanded their share and upon death, were also so grateful that they donated it to the heir or heiress of the family house. Inequalities between unmarried men and women did not so much derive from family inheritance practices or birth rank, but from sex and economic conditions, the labor market being then and later less favorable to women. Unmarried women did not have access to jobs which allowed them to envision another life besides celibacy at home. At best, they could hope to inherit (as first-born daughters) or to be endowed enough by their parents so that they could marry an heir. If such options were not available, permanent celibacy at home was the ultimate option.

Unmarried men and women, especially women, could further contribute to the survival of the house system by accepting marriage offers from propertied widows or widowers with young children. Propertied widows occasionally married unmarried men to work on the family farm and propertied widowers married unmarried women to take care of the house and the under age children. This was because unmarried men and women often had a longer life expectancy than married men and women, especially longer than married women who ran great risks due to their successive pregnancies. It however appears that later in life, unmarried women had greater chances to marry a local propertied man than their male counterpart because widows remarried more rarely than widowers. While the former could find paid agricultural laborers to take care of the outdoor chores, widowers desperately needed a wife at home permanently to take care of the house and children. The status which derived these conditions was not so great as the one which the heir or heiress or their spouse enjoyed, yet it was probably better than that of a unmarried person or that of a sharecropper.

Men or women originating from sharecropping families rarely envisioned celibacy because this status secured them a very low status, lower than that of sharecroppers. Marriage was therefore a vital stage in their life cycle. Sharecroppers' daughters in particular did not enjoy a decent status and their living and working conditions were particularly unfavorable when they remained single as they could only survive as domestic servants through life (Fauve-Chamoux, 2005). They never received a dowry. They needed to work before marriage to collect a small dowry and they barely did. Men for their part had greater possibilities. They could accumulate more than women and if they were hard workers, they could collect a large enough dowry to marry a small heiress. Generally, they saved enough to marry and settle as sharecroppers in the village or nearby (in the area where they had been employed). As a result of these conditions, sharecroppers' sons and especially daughters were fewer than propertied families' sons and daughters to remain single, marriage being a necessary stage in the life course and at a younger age than for propertied families' sons and daughters for survival. To improve their conditions, we will see that many emigrated.

Female celibacy and migration patterns

When looking at unmarried men's and women's migration patterns in family reconstitution in the first half of the nineteenth century (second-generation cohort), it appears that the large majority of the unmarried people resided in their village of birth, slightly more women (66.6% or one third) than men (61.9%), yet more men than women never moved away from their parents' house (45.2% for men against 25% for women). Thus, contrary to single men, more single women lived in their familiar rural environment (66.6%) but not under the authority the heir or heiress of the house. Unmarried women from propertied families therefore were more mobile than their male counterpart, fewer of them being willing to accept the status of unmarried women at home than men. This condition was probably less honorable and valuable for women than it was for men, women being considered as house servants while men enjoyed the status of farm employees with the possibility to make their own money raising their own cattle (sheep generally) on common land and sometimes owning small plots of land, something not available to women.

Thus, the status as unmarried siblings at home was more favorable to men than it was to women, 75% of the unmarried women looking for opportunities elsewhere, in their familiar rural environment in the village or nearby for 41.6% of them, and in towns or cities for 27.1% of them. While two-thirds of the unmarried men and women lived in the familiar rural environment in order to enjoy family and community solidarity, the other third emigrated. They either settled in cities or departed to America. Men preferred America where many

became successful propertied farmers, cattle raisers or artisans rather than cities where they established as civil servants generally or else priests (Arrizabalaga, 1996 & 2003). Women by contrast were attracted to cities where they lived a life as servants or unskilled, low-paid employees (hoping probably to marry a civil servant), and a few others entering the Catholic church orders (as nuns) (Arrizabalaga, 2005d, 2006a, 2006b).

Table 4. Migration patterns among unmarried men and women: the children (second-generation cohort) and grand children (third-generation cohort) of the 120 couples

Generation Residence/gender	Second generation		Third generation	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Home	45.2%	25%	29.5%	26.3%
Rural	16.7%	41.6%	24.3%	27.6%
Urban	16.7%	27.1%	24.4%	42.1%
Abroad	21.4%	4.2%	16.7%	4%
No information		2.1%	5.1%	
Total	100% (N=42)	100% (N=48)	100% (N=78)	100 (N=76)

In the second half of the century, the situation evolved so as to accentuate the earlier-discussed diverse migration trends. Fewer unmarried men and women remained in their familiar rural environment: 53.8% of the unmarried men and 53.9% of the unmarried women, about half of them living in their parents' house, under the authority the heir or heiress and the other half being employed in the village or nearby as artisans for men (some being propertied artisans) and servants, shop attendants, seamstresses or unskilled laborers for women (see Table 4). It appears that fewer unmarried men and women remained in the family house as farm helpers (for men) or house helpers (for women) and many preferred to settle alone in the village or elsewhere. Though the majority of the unmarried men and women resided in the familiar rural environment still in the second half of the nineteenth century where they probably could enjoy a decent life and where they were secured family and community solidarity and help, more and more tried a new life elsewhere. As employment opportunities expanded as a result of industrialism, urbanization, and emigration in the second half of the nineteenth century, men and women departed from the village in greater number. As earlier, men seemed to be more attracted to America than women. Obviously it was difficult for single women to survive in America, employment being scarce for them in the new world outside family business (Arrizabalaga, 2006a & 2006b). Their survival and well-being depended on marriage. Besides, the marriage market in America was very favorable to them, many unmarried men looking for women to marry and settle permanently.

Actually, rarely did the unmarried women who emigrated to America appear in our data because they got married soon after emigration, sometimes within three months. Single men

in America were however numerous. They were men who could not find a wife of their cultural background to marry before or after emigration. In America, the marriage market was particularly unfavorable to them as a result of the scarcity of women especially in remote areas. Besides, men seemed to want to marry a woman of their origins. If not, they remained single rather than accept exogamous marriages (marriage outside the geographic, cultural background). Their goal was then to return home after a few years in America (which few did).

The unmarried women who remained unmarried after migration were women who settled in cities, in local towns but more importantly in the coastal towns of Saint-Jean-de-Luz and Biarritz, the regional city of Bayonne and other cities such as Bordeaux and Paris. They lived off low revenues as unskilled employees or servants in wealthy families. Others were seamstresses, shop employees, house servants (Arrizabalaga, 2005d). Contrary to America, the job market in cities was favorable to them, more so than the marriage market, the female population in cities outnumbering the male population. Many women could find decent jobs but were unable to find someone adequate to marry. Besides, propertied women's daughters who settled in cities were not up to accept any marriage. They seemed to consider a marriage of equal status or better only. Some considered celibacy as part of their professional design. The hard-working ones, originating from propertied families and enjoying a good moral reputation, could be domestic servants for wealthy families. It appears that women remained single in cities not so much because they could not find a spouse (their marriage market being rather more favorable to them in cities than it was for men in America) but because they could not find the person of their choice: one who qualified their social and professional criteria and priorities. These women seemed to only consider marriage with an established propertied artisan or a civil servant, men who could secure a good standard of living and a high social status. Rarely did they marry a landless artisan and even more rarely an unskilled laborer who could only secure them a life of toil, hardship, and insecurity. Rather than marry down, they remained single. Working for a wealthy family in cities was an honorable option which gave them the opportunity to freely return to their village of birth. Yet not all unmarried women had the same behavior, those of different status though had different migration and employment opportunities.

Female celibacy, status, and migration

The family reconstitution data show that depending on their status, women did not favor celibacy in the same way. Indeed, when looking at women's social status, whether they were propertied or landless families' daughters, they had different priorities and therefore different

migration destinies. When analyzing women’s destinies among the propertied families (about half of the cohort) and among the landless families (about the other half of the cohort), we notice that over time propertied families’ daughters considered celibacy as paid or unpaid labor, more favorably than landless families’ daughters. Indeed, there were 25 single women from propertied families in the first half of the nineteenth century against 23 from landless families. In the second half of the century, there were 51 single women from propertied families against 25 from landless families (see tables 5 & 6). As a comparison, propertied families’ sons were even greater to consider permanent celibacy in the nineteenth century than landless families’ sons: from 29 to 57 among propertied families’ sons against 13 to 20 among landless families’ son (see Tables 5 & 6). Therefore, landless families’ children, men and women, were fewer to envision permanent celibacy, their social and economic conditions forcing them to low-paid unskilled employment leading to greater insecurity. They were therefore more inclined to marriage for survival. This allows us to infer that celibacy was not the condition reserved just to the most destitute and the least taken-care of. Celibacy was also a decision made by people who were able to support themselves (though at minimum wages for women generally) and did not consider marriage at any circumstance.

While celibacy was unfavorable for men and women of lower background, in propertied families, it was not. Female celibacy in propertied families was probably a choice rather than an inevitable circumstance. They envisioned celibacy instead of down marriages, preferring professional and residential liberty in cities with the possibility to later return to their village before death (in order to be buried in the family’s burial grounds). Male celibacy in propertied families was more the choice of circumstances than a deliberate decision, depending on their professional activities. In America, they did not have a choice, women being scarce in remote areas. Besides, military employees in French cities were often forced to celibacy as a result of their residential mobility and priests as part of their religious obligations. It appears that celibacy in propertied families was less of a choice for men than it was for women.

Table 5. Migration patterns among propertied families’ unmarried men and women: the children (second-generation cohort) and grand children (third-generation cohort) of the 120 couples

Generation Residence/gender	Second generation		Third generation	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Home	55.2%	28%	38.6%	39.2%
Rural	10.3%	24%	17.6%	13.7%
Urban	3.5%	44%	14%	43.2%
Abroad	31%	4%	22.8%	3.9%
No information			7%	
Total	100% (N=29)	100% (N=25)	100% (N=57)	100 (N=51)

Table 6. Migration patterns among landless families' unmarried men and women: the children (second-generation cohort) and grand children (third-generation cohort) of the 120 couples

Generation Residence/gender	Second generation		Third generation	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Home	23.1%	21.7%	5%	
Rural	30.8%	60.9%	45%	56%
Urban	46.1%	8.7%	50%	40%
Abroad		4.35%		4%
No information		4.35%		
Total	100% (N=13)	100% (N=23)	100% (N=20)	100 (N=25)

Not only did celibates from propertied families have different approach to celibacy from those from landless families, but unmarried men and women had different migration patterns depending on their social origins. Propertied families' unmarried sons favored their rural environment or America and their sisters their rural environment or cities (see Table 5). By contrast, landless families' unmarried sons and daughters either resided in their familiar rural environment or in the local town, the cantonal seat closest to their village, a place they were familiar with, where they could maintain close ties with their family and village (see Table 6). Thus, propertied families' sons and daughters were more mobile than landless families' sons and daughters. While the richer ones envisioned emigration to America (for single men) or to cities (for single women) and were attracted by more distant destinations in order to maintain or perhaps improve their social status, the poorer ones envisioned a close-by migration destination for survival. They rarely envisioned migration to large distant cities or America probably because they could not afford it, at least until emigration agents offered their financial help after 1860. Thus celibacy for landless families' children was generally a situation which they strove to avoid while for propertied families' children, it was a strategy towards social mobility (for men) and individual liberty (for women). The latter, better trained (as potential heirs), more determined and hard-working, saw celibacy at home as the easy solution which did not satisfy the ambitions of more and more of them. Migration however did (Bouchard et als., 1998; Lorenzetti et als., 2005; Segalen et al., 1994 ; Van Poppel et als., 2004).

Female celibacy and social mobility

The labor market and the economic conditions of the time were responsible for the different social mobility patterns among unmarried men and women, unmarried women being unable to secure themselves a stable social status compared to men. Indeed, looking at parents' social status and their sons' and daughters' social status in the statistical tables on family

reconstitution, it appears that unmarried men had a greater chance to maintain or improve their social status than unmarried women, whether they originated from propertied or landless families (see tables 7 & 8). Most unmarried men, from propertied or landless families, improved their social conditions finding positions as civil servants or priests in the church. Single women by contrast rarely improved their status through celibacy (less than 5% no matter their social background). In comparison, the majority of the unmarried women, whether from propertied or landless families, experienced downward social mobility through celibacy as they were secured unskilled, low paid jobs in towns and cities, barely enough to survive. These unmarried women were hardworking women, willing to sacrifice their marital status to work as independent employees, accumulating decent savings through life sometimes, even as domestic servants working for wealthy families in Paris, so much so that, by the end of their life, some of them declared themselves self-supporting (*rentières*).¹⁵ Therefore, most of the unmarried men, no matter their social background, experienced stable or upward social mobility while unmarried women, no matter their social background, experienced stable or downward social mobility. This was due to gender discrimination. Women suffered from inequalities in the job market and in the marriage market, both more unfavorable to them than to men. Industrialism, urbanization, and emigration offered greater employment opportunities to men than to women. Women maintained or improved their social status through marriage while men did often as a result of better economic conditions in the labor market in cities and overseas. Thus, it was not such an honorable condition for women to remain single as it was for men, yet many accepted it rather than marriages.

Table 7. Social mobility among propertied families' unmarried men and women: the children (second-generation cohort) and grand children (third-generation cohort) of the 120 couples

Generation Social mobility/gender	Second generation		Third generation	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Upward	16%	3.8%	17%	0%
Stable	68%	34.6%	55.3%	42%
Downward	16%	61.5%	27.7%	58%
Total	100% (N=25)	100% (N=26)	100% (N=47)	100 (N=50)

¹⁵ Many of the unmarried women who resided in towns or cities were women who originated from propertied families and who had lived a hard life as servants. Some of them worked so hard that they had saved money for their retirement and others had accumulated great wealth so that they declared as “rentières” living off their large wealth.

Table 8. Social mobility among landless families' unmarried men and women: the children (second-generation cohort) and grand children (third-generation cohort) of the 120 couples

Generation	Second generation		Third generation	
Social mobility/gender	Men	Women	Men	Women
Upward	58.3%	5%	20%	4.2%
Stable	16.7%	50%	55%	12.5%
Downward	25%	45%	25%	83.3%
Total	100% (N=12)	100% (N=20)	100% (N=20)	100 (N=24)

While propertied families' unmarried sons thus remained in the house, a few in cities and many in America where they often fared as well or better, propertied families' unmarried daughters remained in their familiar rural environment (in the house, in the village or nearby) or migrated to cities where their destinies were perhaps more favorable than in the village as a result of a better job market and the labor demand in the industries and in the services. But their conditions were not so favorable as men because they experienced stable or downward social mobility more often. By contrast, landless families' unmarried sons and daughters settled in their familiar rural environment or in the nearby town and rarely in large cities or America. Yet similar to the earlier group, unmarried men fared better than unmarried women, men experiencing stable or upward social mobility as artisans or civil servants (some of whom became property owners) while unmarried women barely maintained their status or experienced downward social mobility as servants, hence these women's obligation to consider marriage as a strategy for survival or stable social mobility instead.

Conclusion

In the Old Regime, celibacy was common as a result of the single inheritance practices, male or female primogeniture in the Basque Country, Bareges, Lavedan, male primogeniture in Bearn and Baronies, and male single inheritance (first-born or cadet male primogeniture) in French Catalonia which forced families to select one child to inherit all the family assets: the house and the land, a system which naturally excluded all the other siblings from inheritance. This prevailing exclusion despite the Civil code in the nineteenth century was the necessary condition which justified massive emigration. Families could compensate some of their children but not all. As result of family size (3 children on average at the time), a limited land market, and cash scarcity, families could provide for two yet they could not settle all their children, the third one being encouraged to accept celibacy in the family house. Hence, celibacy was an intricate part of the Pyrenean house system, inheritance strategies and family

practices in the pre-revolutionary period, about one third of the children, male or female, being forced into permanent celibacy. This was not the fate of the girls only as women could inherit and others married heirs. There was therefore no discrimination against women when it came to consider celibacy as a necessity for individual and family survival. Besides, celibacy was the consequence of limited economic conditions and opportunities in the mountain regions as well as in cities which did not yet offer many jobs and therefore did not attract many people.

Celibacy however was no longer an economic necessity in the nineteenth century. And yet, the number of unmarried men and women remained rather high. Among them, fewer accepted celibacy at home. This was due to improving economic conditions in cities and overseas which attracted men and women and which offered better employment opportunities and an expanded job market. As economic conditions improved, for men and women, more men and women emigrated, many of whom accepting permanent celibacy. Among them, there were about as many unmarried men as unmarried women. Conditions therefore did not force more women to permanent celibacy than men. There was no gender discrimination when it came to consider permanent celibacy. Finally, as in the Old Regime, celibacy was not considered as being dishonorable, a lower status to avoid at all cost as it only secured disrepute and downward social mobility. On the contrary, as in the Old Regime, propertied families' unmarried men and women continued to enjoy a rather high status through life, as propertied families' unmarried sons or daughters. Yet their high number derived from limited economic conditions and opportunities and families' limited economic resources to compensate all the children equally and well enough. In the nineteenth century, men and women continued to consider celibacy but no longer as a solution to limited economic opportunities and poverty but as a solution to enjoy greater migration and social mobility (for men) and avoid down marriages (for women). Those who migrated to cities (women generally) or America (men generally) were probably the most entrepreneurial, determined, and perhaps independent as they were able to take care of themselves alone as paid labor through life. Correspondingly, they were proportionally fewer to consider celibacy at home as they had other options, women being more mobile than men, more of them living outside the family house than men.

Unmarried men's destinies however differed from unmarried women's. Indeed, their migration destinations differed depending on their sex and their social background. Among propertied families, when celibates did not settle in their rural environment, they either emigrated to America for men or to regional towns or cities for women. These different

migration destinations were due to the labor markets. The job market was favorable to men everywhere, America in particular, but not to women, who were primarily attracted to cities where opportunities were better. While men remained single because of the type of employment they accepted and their destinations (civil servants in cities and propertied farmers or cattle raisers in America), women remained single as a result of an unfavorable marriage market in towns and cities. Men remained single as they could not marry women of their culture and the marriage market was unfavorable to them in America (many indeed strove to return home), women remained single because the unfavorable marriage market did not allow them to make a decent marriage, one which secured them stable or upward social mobility. Rather than accept down marriages and downward social mobility as propertied families' daughters and potential heiresses, they lived self-supporting independent lives as permanent single women. And some were quite successful.

By contrast, among landless families, celibates, male or female, were not so mobile. They settled within their rural, social environment in their village, nearby or in the nearby town. Their concern was to secure well-being, security, and stability to themselves and their close relatives. As they needed their family's assistance to survive, migration was limited to a close-by environment. There, their marriage and labor markets was favorable and were intended to survival. Celibates were therefore fewer.

Despite these different behavior and women's quest for social mobility, unmarried women's destinies were not so favorable as men's no matter their social background. They experienced downward social mobility more often than men did. Actually, when women remained single, their conditions either declined or at best remained stable. Unmarried men by contrast either maintained or improved their conditions. There was therefore great inequalities between men and women with regards to celibacy, as women did not benefit from their status as much as men did. Yet celibacy was not the condition reserved to the poor or the impoverished, those who had no other choice but celibacy. Instead, it was the consequence of decisions which corresponded to priorities and circumstances, at times a choice to secure status (social mobility for men) and the freedom of movement (geographic mobility for women). Celibacy among landless families however seemed to be more associated to poverty and failure to be avoided at all cost.

Bibliography

- ARRIZABALAGA, Marie-Pierre, 2006a, « Les femmes pyrénéennes et l'émigration transatlantique aux XIXe et XXe siècles : une réalité mal connue », in Philippe RYGIEL & Natacha LILLO (eds.), *Rapports sociaux de sexe et migrations. Mondes atlantiques, XIXe – XXe siècles*, Paris, Publibook, 59-70.
- _____, 2006b, « Destins de femmes dans les Pyrénées au XIXe siècle : le cas basque », *Annales de Démographie Historique. Itinéraires féminins*, à paraître

- _____, 2006c, « Droits, pouvoirs et devoirs dans la maison : la place des hommes et des femmes au sein des familles basques depuis le XIXe siècle », *Vasconia*, 35, 159-187.
- _____, 2005a, « Pyrenean marriage strategies in the nineteenth century: the Basque case », *IRSH*, 50, 93-122.
- _____, 2005b, « Succession strategies in the Pyrenees in the 19th century. The Basque case », *The History of the Family: an International Quarterly* (USA), 10, n° 3, 271-292.
- _____, 2005c, « Migrations féminines – migrations masculines : des comportements différenciés au sein des familles basques au XIXe siècle », in Luigi LORENZETTI, Anne-Lise HEAD-KONIG, Joseph GOY (eds.), *Marchés, migrations et logiques familiales dans les espaces français, canadien et suisse, 18^e-20^e siècles*, Bern, Peter Lang, 183-195.
- _____, 2005d, « Basque women and migration in the nineteenth century », *The History of the Family. An International Quarterly*, 10, 2, 99-117.
- _____, 2004, « Stratégies de l'indivision et rapport à la terre après le Code civil: le cas basque au XIXe siècle », in Gérard BEAUR, Christian DESSUREAULT, Joseph GOY (eds.), *Familles, terre, marchés. Logiques économiques et stratégies dans les milieux ruraux (XVIIe-XXe siècles)*, Rennes, Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 171-183.
- _____, 2003, « Comment le marché de l'emploi national et international a-t-il influencé les destins individuels au sein de familles basques et les modalités de transmission du patrimoine au XIX siècle? », in Christian DESSUREAULT, John DICKINSON, Joseph GOY (eds.), *Famille et marché (XVIe – XXe siècles)*, Sillery (Québec), Septentrion, 183-198
- _____, 2002a, « Female primogeniture in the French Basque Country », in Emiko OCHIAI (ed.), *The Logic of Female Succession: Rethinking Patriarchy and Patrilineality in Global and Historical Perspective*, Kyoto, International Research Center of Japanese Studies, 31-52.
- _____, 2002b, « Les héritières de la maison au Pays Basque au XIXe siècle », *Lapurdum*, VII, 35-55.
- _____, 2000, « Les Basques dans l'Ouest américain, 1900-1910 », *Lapurdum*, V, 335-350.
- _____, 1998, *Famille, succession, émigration au Pays Basque au XIXe siècle. Etude des pratiques successorales et des comportements migratoires au sein de familles basques*, Doctoral thesis, Paris, Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales.
- _____, 1997a, « The stem family in the French Basque Country: Sare in the nineteenth century », *Journal of Family History*, 1, 50-69.
- _____, 1997b, « Structures familiales et destins migratoires à Sare au XIXe siècle », *Lapurdum*, II, 237-255.
- _____, 1996, « Réseaux et choix migratoires au Pays Basque. L'exemple de Sare au XIXe siècle », *Annales de démographie historique*, 423-446.
- ASSIER-ANDRIEU, Louis, 1981, *Coutume et rapports sociaux. Etude anthropologique des communautés paysannes du Capcir*, Paris, Editions du CRNS.
- ASSIER-ANDRIEU, Louis (ed.), 1990. *Une France coutumière. Enquête sur les "usages locaux" et leur codification (XIXe-XXe siècles)*, Paris, Éditions du CNRS.
- AUGUSTINS, Georges, 1989, *Comment se perpétuer? Devenir des lignées et destins des patrimoines dans les paysanneries européennes*, Nanterre, Société d'ethnologie française.
- BARCELO, R., 1988, "Transmission héréditaire et systèmes de production: le cas de la Soule (Pyrénées-Atlantiques)", *Sociologie du travail*, 3, pp. 443-460.
- BEAUR, Gérard, DESSUREAULT, Christian, GOY, Joseph (eds.), 2004, *Familles, terre, marchés. Logiques économiques et stratégies dans les milieux ruraux (XVIIe-XXe siècles)*, Rennes, Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- BONNAIN, R., 1998, "Migration, exclusion et solidarité", in BOUCHARD, G. & DICKINSON, J. & GOY, J. (eds.), *Les Exclus de la terre en France et au Québec (XVIIe - XXe siècles)*, Sillery (Quebec), Septentrion, pp. 271-290.
- BONNAIN, Rolande, 1996, "Houses, heirs and non-heirs in the Adour Valley. Social and geographic mobility in the nineteenth century", *The History of the Family: an International Quarterly*, 1 (3), 273-296.
- BONNAIN, Rolande, BOUCHARD, Gérard, GOY, Joseph (eds.), 1992, *Transmettre, hériter, succéder. La reproduction familiale en milieu rural: France – Québec, XVIIIe – XXe siècles*, Lyon, Presses Universitaires de Lyon.
- BOUCHARD, Gérard, GOY, Joseph, HEAD-KONIG, Anne-Lise (eds.), 1998, *Problèmes de la transmission des exploitations agricoles (XVIIIe – XXe siècles)*, Rome, Editions de l'Ecole Française de Rome.
- BOUCHARD, Gérard, DICKINSON, John, GOY, Joseph (eds.), 1998, *Les Exclus de la terre en France et au Québec (XVIIe – XXe siècles). La reproduction familiale dans la différence*, Sillery (Quebec), Septentrion.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre, 2002, *Le Bal des célibataires. Crise de la société paysanne en Béarn*, Paris, Seuil.
- _____, 1972, "Les stratégies matrimoniales dans les systèmes de reproduction", *Annales ESC*, 4-5, 1105-1127.
- _____, 1962, "Célibat et condition paysanne", *Études rurales*, 5-6, 32-135.

- CHIVA, Isaac & GOY, Joseph (Eds.), 1981, *Les Baronnies des Pyrénées. Maisons, mode de vie, société*, Tome I, Paris, Editions de l'EHESS.
- _____, 1986, *Les Baronnies des Pyrénées. Maisons, espace, famille*, Tome II, Paris, Editions de l'EHESS.
- COMAS D'ARGEMIR, Dolors & SOULET, Jean-François (Eds.), 1993, *La familia als Pirineus*, Andorre, Impremta Solber.
- CORDIER, Eugène, 1859, *Droit aux Pyrénées. Barèges, Lavedan, Béarn et Pays Basque*, Paris, A. Durand.
- DEROUET, B., 1994, "Transmettre la terre. Origines et inflexions récentes d'une problématique de différence", *Histoire et sociétés rurales*, 2, pp. 33-67.
- DEROUET, B., 1989, "Pratiques successorales et rapport à la terre: les sociétés paysannes d'Ancien Régime", *Annales ESC*, 1, pp. 173-206.
- DESPLAT, C., 1984, *Le for réformé de Béarn*, Pau, Marrimpouey.
- DESSUREAULT, C. & DICKINSON, J. & GOY, J. (eds.), 2003, *Famille et marché (XVIe-XXe siècles)*, Sillery (Québec), Septentrion.
- DUROUX, Rose, 2004, "Emigration, gender, and inheritance: a case study of the High Auvergne, 1700-1900", in David R. GREEN and Alastair OWENS (eds.), *Family Welfare. Gender, Property, and inheritance since the Seventeenth century*, London, Praeger, 47-71.
- ETCHELECOU, A., 1991, *Transition démographique et système coutumier dans les Pyrénées occidentales*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
- ETCHEVERRY, L., 1899, "Les coutumes successorales du Pays Basque au XIXe siècle", *La Tradition au Pays Basque*, Paris, Bureaux de la tradition nationale, pp. 179-190.
- FAUVE-CHAMOIX, Antoinette, 2003, « Le rôle des femmes dans la transmission des biens en France », in Christian DESSUREAULT, John DICKINSON, Joseph GOY (eds.), *Famille et marché (XVIe – XXe siècles)*, Sillery (Québec), Septentrion, 245-260.
- _____, 2002, « Strategies of household continuity in a Stem-Family Society: from heirship to headship », in Renzo DEROSAS, Michel ORIS (eds.), *When Dad Died. Individuals and Families Coping with Distress in Past Societies*, Bern, Peter Lang, 121-139.
- _____, 1998, « La reproduction familiale en milieu paysan : le destin des exclus », in Gérard BOUCHARD, John DICKINSON, Joseph GOY (eds.), *Les Exclus de la terre en France et au Québec (XVIIe – XXe siècles). La reproduction familiale dans la différence*, Sillery (Québec), Septentrion, 73-91.
- _____, 1995, « The stem family, demography and inheritance », in D. Siddle (ed.), *The European Peasant Family and Economy*, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press, 86-113.
- _____, 1993a, « Les frontières de l'autorégulation paysanne: croissance et famille-souche », *Revue de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 50, 38-47.
- _____, 1993b, « Household forms and living standards in preindustrial France: from models to realities », *Journal of Family History*, 18, 2, 135-156.
- _____, 1987, « Le fonctionnement de la famille-souche dans les Baronnies des Pyrénées avant 1914 », *Annales de démographie historique*, 241-262.
- _____, 1984, « Les structures familiales au Royaume des familles-souches : Esparrros », *Annales ESC*, 3, 514-528.
- FAUVE-CHAMOIX, Antoinette (éd.) (2005), *Domestic Service and the Formation of European Identity. Understanding the Globalization of Domestic Work, 16th – 21st Centuries*, Bern, Peter Lang.
- FAUVE-CHAMOIX, Antoinette & OCHIAI, Emiko (eds.), 1998, *Maison et famille souche : perspectives eurasiennes*, Kyoto (Japan), International Research Center for Japanese Studies.
- FINE-SOURIAC, Agnès, "La famille-souche pyrénéenne au XIXe siècle. Quelques réflexions de méthode", *Annales ESC*, 1977, 3, 478-487.
- FOUGERES, Alain, 1938, *Les Droits de famille et les successions au Pays Basque et en Béarn d'après les anciens textes*, Bergerac, H. Trillaud.
- GREEN, David R. & OWENS, Alastair (Eds.), 2004, *Family Welfare. Gender, Property, and inheritance since the Seventeenth century*, London, Praeger.
- LACANETTE-POMMEL, Christine, 2003, *La famille dans les Pyrénées. De la coutume au code Napoléon*, Estadens, PyrÉGraph.
- LAFOURCADE, Maïte, 1989, *Mariages en Labourd sous l'Ancien Régime. Les contrats de mariage du pays de Labourd sous le règne de Louis XVI*, Bilbao, Universidad del País Vasco.
- LE ROY LADURIE, Emmanuel, 1972, "Système de la coutume. Structures familiales et coutumes d'héritage en France au XVIe siècle", *Annales ESC*, 4-5, 825-846.
- LORENZETTI, Luigi, HEAD-KONIG, Anne-Lise, GOY, Joseph (Eds.), 2005, *Marchés, migrations et logiques familiales dans les espaces français, canadien et Suisse, 18^e – 20^e siècles*, Genève, Peter Lang.
- POUMAREDE, Jacques, 1972, *Les Successions dans le Sud-Ouest de la France au Moyen Age*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.

- SEGALEN, Martine, RAVIS-GIORDANI, Georges, 1994, *Les Cadets*, Paris, CNRS Editions.
- SOULET, J.-F., 1993, "L'évolution de la famille au XIXe siècle sur le versant nord des Pyrénées", in COMAS d'ARGEMIR, D. & SOULET, J.-F. (eds.), *La familia als Pirineus*, Andorre, Impremta Solber, pp. 222-229.
- VAN POPPEL, F. & ORIS, M. & LEE, J. (eds.), 2004, *The Road to Independence. Leaving home in Western and Eastern Societies, 16th – 20th centuries*, Bern, Peter Lang.
- YVER, Jean, 1966, *Égalité entre héritiers et exclusion des enfants dotés: essai de géographie coutumière*, Paris, Éditions Sirey.
- ZINK, Anne, 1993, *L'Héritier de la maison. Géographie coutumière du Sud-Ouest de la France sous l'Ancien Régime*, Paris, EHESS, 1993.