

REPRODUCTION AND LONGEVITY AMONG THE BRITISH PEERAGE:  
THE EFFECT OF FRAILITY AND HEALTH SELECTION

Gabriele Doblhammer\* & Jim Oeppen<sup>+\*</sup>

\* Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Konrad-Zuse-Str.1, 18057 Rostock, Germany

+ Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure, Department of  
Geography, University of Cambridge, Downing Place, Cambridge, CB2 3EN, UK

Corresponding author: Gabriele Doblhammer, Konrad-Zuse-Str.1, 18057 Rostock, Germany

Tel: 49 381 2081 124

Fax: 49 381 2081 424

e-mail: [doblhammer@demogr.mpg.de](mailto:doblhammer@demogr.mpg.de)

## Summary

Whether a cost of reproduction exists among humans is still questionable. A major study of aristocratic British families finds a significant positive correlation between parity and late-life mortality, which indicates a trade-off between reproduction and longevity. This result is supported by four other studies, while earlier studies have not found a relationship or came to the opposite conclusion. We show that in natural fertility populations the relationship between fertility and late-life mortality cannot be studied correctly without considering the effects of differences in health and of mortality selection during childbearing ages because these two effects lead to a dampening of the true relationship. If these effects are controlled in Hollingsworth's genealogy of the British peerage a significant trade off between reproduction and longevity exists for females but not for males.

**Key words:** reproduction; longevity; fertility; old-age mortality; frailty;

## 1. INTRODUCTION

A leading biological theory of the evolution of senescence stresses that resources have to be directed either towards somatic maintenance or towards reproduction (Kirkwood 1977, Kirkwood & Rose 1991). Since natural selection places priority on maximizing reproduction rather than on maximizing longevity, organisms may “trade” a long life span for enhanced reproduction. Experiments have indicated that such trade-offs between reproduction and longevity exist in non-human species (Partridge & Barton 1993; Chen, Carey & Ferris 2001, Carey et al. 1998).

If a cost of reproduction exists among humans then it should be strongest in a natural fertility population where fertility and mortality are high. In the past, however, results for historical populations have been ambiguous. Voland and Engel (1986) found a significant but minor negative correlation between mortality and both age at last birth and the number of surviving children in in East Frisia, Germany. A similar result was obtained by Müller et al. (2002) for French-Canadian cohorts. Using the same data Le Bourg et al. (1993) did not find a relationship. In a study of aristocratic British families, Westendorp and Kirkwood (1998) find a significant positive correlation between parity and late-life mortality and a positive correlation between age at first childbirth and late-life mortality. A similar result was obtained by Korpelainen (2000) based on data from the European Nobility and among Finnish peasants and by Smith et al. (forthcoming) for Mormon couples. Lycett et al. (2000) found an increasingly strong positive relationship between reproduction and late-life mortality with increasing poverty in the German Krummhörn region. A recent and problematic study of the Finnish Sami population finds a positive correlation between the number of sons who survive to adulthood and late-life mortality, and a negative correlation for the number of surviving daughters (Helle et al.

2002). Beise and Volland (2002) explored the costs of producing sons rather than daughters in Krummhörn and St. Lawrence valley. For the Krummhörn population, they confirm the result of Helle et al., in the Québec population, they found the opposite relationship. No relationship between female age at death and completed family size was found by Henry (1956) and Gautier and Henry (1958) who studied ever-married women surviving to age 45 in Geneva, Switzerland, and Crulai, France, and by Oeppen (personal communication) who studied both the inhabitants of German villages (Knodel 1988) and English parish data (Wrigley 1997). All studies of contemporary populations with controlled fertility find a significant positive relationship between parity and late-life mortality (Beral 1985; Friedlander 1996; Green et al. 1988, Kitagawa & Hauser 1973; Kvale et al. 1994; Lund 1990; Doblhammer 2000).

Researchers have suggested that unobserved demographic factors like marriage duration and husband's age significantly confound the observed relationship (Gavrilov & Gavrilova 1999). We provide evidence that one main unobserved factor that disturbs the observed relationship between parity and late-life mortality is differences in health (frailty). Two possible pathways exist of how health affects the relationship between reproduction and longevity. One is that both parity and late-life mortality depend on health; the second, that mortality selection during reproductive years depends on parity. Historical demographers define a "natural fertility" population as one where fertility behavior is not parity-specific. The main determinant of fertility is health rather than conscious social factors. Thus, the true relationship between parity and later-life mortality is always confounded by health, which is unobserved. A typical woman, but with poor health, will be "selected" into lower parity, whereas a similar, but robust, woman will probably exhibit higher parity. With the frail concentrated at low parities raising mortality, and the robust at high ones lowering it, we may observe clockwise rotation and a dampening of the

true positive relationship between parity and late-life mortality. At the extreme it is possible that the observed relationship might be even negative.

In historical populations the analysis of the relationship between fertility and mortality late in life is confined to a highly selected group of women: those who survive to old age. Wrigley et al.'s (Wrigley 1997) parish register studies for England from 1580 to 1837 show that only 50-70% of women survived from age 20 to age 50. Thus, it was often the case that death occurred long before the end of a woman's reproductive phase. In these populations the main cost of reproduction may have lain in the risks of pregnancy and childbirth during the pre-menopausal phase of life rather than in accumulated negative effects on old age. Mortality selection due to maternal mortality during childbearing ages may also result in a dampening of the true relationship at later age. Suppose that frail women who had more children than their susceptibility would permit die during childbearing ages. Then after age 50 among the frail women only those who had few children would have survived while the strong women would be concentrated among the high parity women.

None of the existing studies has addressed the problem that health affects both mortality and parity and that mortality selection during childbearing ages depends on parity. We account for the unobservable effects of health on parity and late-life mortality by specifying a simultaneous equation model that treats parity as an endogenous variable. This approach was developed and widely used by Lillard and colleagues (Lillard 1993, Lillard, Brien & Waite 1995, Lillard & Waite 1993, Lillard & Panis 1996).

We demonstrate the effect of health by using what is probably the most accurate and most complete genealogy available today - Hollingsworth's study of the British peerage. We show the completeness of this genealogy by comparing it with the Bloore genealogy of the British peerage,

which was used in an earlier major study (Westendorp & Kirkwood 1998) about cost of reproduction among humans.

## **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

Hollingsworth computerised the genealogies of the British Peerage from 1603 to 1959 (Hollingsworth 1962, 1965). All 30,000 forms have been re-entered by the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure. The details are contained in the original publications, but some features should be emphasised with regard to bias, accuracy, and completeness. The family-trees are descendant from founders, rather than ascendant from survivors, which eliminates the bias towards reproductive success. The rules for inclusion are precisely defined and follow the line of succession, including all known legitimate descendants down to the 15<sup>th</sup> birthday of the grandchildren of Peers, even if they died young, or failed to marry, or have children. All known events were dated, even if the date had to be imputed, but Hollingsworth attached a code that indicated the imprecision. These codes range from zero days to +/- 32 years. However, it is in the nature of genealogies of male succession that some children who died young, and particularly girls, may have been unrecorded. Hollingsworth thought that the data were relatively accurate and complete from 1750 onwards.

The present study is based on all peers (1854 females, 2202 males) with only one marriage and with a maximum uncertainty in birth and death dates of up to one year. The final model excludes childless marriages and marriages with only one child and draws from the records of the 3078 peers who had at least two children. Restricting the analysis to first marriages guarantees that the exposure time of the risk of becoming pregnant or becoming a father is correctly measured. The design of the data does not permit the calculation of the number of years

at risk for all marriages of spouses not born in the peerage. In order to confine the analysis to a largely natural fertility population birth cohorts up to 1850 are included. In this set the first female peer is born in 1641, the first male, in 1636. Violent deaths are excluded when recorded. Supplemental Table 1 gives an overview of the data.

The force of mortality after age 50 is modeled by Equation 1:

$$\ln \mu_j(x, \delta) = \alpha_0 + \alpha' T_j(x) + \beta' Y_j + \delta \quad [1]$$

Let  $\ln \mu_j(x, \delta)$  denote the logarithm of the force of mortality at age  $x$ ,  $\alpha' T_j(x)$  the age dependent baseline hazard, and  $\beta' Y_j$  the observed covariates and their parameters for individual  $j$ . All our calculations are performed in aML (<http://www.applied-ml.com>), thus the baseline hazard is a piecewise-linear spline function where  $T_j(x)$  is a vector of piecewise-linear spline transformations of age  $x$

$$T_j(x) = \begin{pmatrix} (\min [x, \nu_1]), \\ (\max [0, \min [x - \nu_1, \nu_2 - \nu_1]]), \dots, \\ (\max [0, \min [x - \nu_{n-1}, \nu_n - \nu_{n-1}]]), \\ (\max [0, x - \nu_n]) \end{pmatrix} \quad [2]$$

with the nodes  $\nu_n$  of the splines set at ages 60, 70 and 80. The vector  $\alpha'$  of the slopes of the splined linear segments is the average percentage increase in the mortality risk over one year of life. Let  $\delta$  be the heterogeneity component, which accounts for unobserved factors like differences in health.

The observed covariates include as categorical variables 25-year birth cohorts, a birth after age 40, and a birth before age 20. In our final model parity is included as a numerical

variable after having verified that the relationship between fertility and mortality is approximately linear. We also included a tempo variable of fertility, since it is possible that a large number of births may be a proxy for the damaging effect of pace in childbearing rather than of quantity. It is defined as the number of children divided by the number of years between the first and the last child plus one.

Differences in health and mortality selection before age 50 affect both mortality and parity, thus, we treat parity as an endogenous variable. The ordered probit model in Eq. 3 estimates parity as a function of marriage cohort, marriage duration and marriage age. Consider the latent variable  $y_j^*$  where

$$y_j^* = \gamma' Z_j + \varepsilon + u_j \quad [3]$$

and  $y_j = i$  for  $i=2, \dots, 8+$  if  $\tau_i \leq y_j^* \leq \tau_{i+1}$ . Let  $\tau_2 < \tau_3 < \dots < \tau_{8+}$  and  $\tau_2 = -\infty$  and  $\tau_9 = \infty$ .

Let  $y_j^*$  denote the propensity of the number of children (2, ..., 8+),  $\gamma' Z_j$  the observed covariates and their parameters,  $\varepsilon$  the unobservable heterogeneity component and  $u_j$  a random variable which follows a standard normal distribution. Let  $\tau_i$  be the thresholds of the ordered probit model, which need to be estimated.

The unobserved heterogeneity components  $\varepsilon$  and  $\delta$  are assumed to follow a Bivariate Normal distribution with mean zero and variance-covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ , which consists of the standard deviations  $\sigma_\delta$  and  $\sigma_\varepsilon$  and the correlation coefficient  $\rho_{\delta\varepsilon}$  (Eq. 4).

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_\delta^2 & \rho_{\delta\varepsilon} \sigma_\delta \sigma_\varepsilon \\ \rho_{\delta\varepsilon} \sigma_\delta \sigma_\varepsilon & \sigma_\varepsilon^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad [4]$$



A non-zero correlation  $\rho_{\delta\epsilon}$  between the errors for each individual across the two equations indicates one or more unobserved variables, and the sign of the correlation shows us their aggregate effect. In particular, a negative sign indicates that an unobserved variable increases mortality and decreases parity, which is in accordance with the hypothesized effects of health and mortality selection before age 50.

The estimation of the model is based on the maximization of the joint likelihood function for the mortality and the fertility model.

### **3. RESULTS**

#### **3.1 Completeness of the Hollingsworth genealogy of the British peerage**

The number of children who die young tends to be underreported in genealogies in general, and particularly in a system concerned with survival in the male line. It cannot be assumed that underreporting and family size are independent, as large families are less likely to have missing births. If there is a positive relationship between parity and late-life survival, the slope will be biased towards zero by differential underreporting.

We compared 694 families that are included in both the Hollingsworth and the Bloore genealogy used by Westendorp and Kirkwood. Bloore knew that children were under-recorded in his work and we find that for a large proportion of these families Hollingsworth records considerably more children (Figure 1), which explains the unexpectedly low figure of 2.14 (Westendorp & Kirkwood 1998) for the average number of children in the Bloore genealogy as compared to 4.8 in Hollingsworth's data. Despite the doubling of the number of children when compared with Bloore, Hollingsworth himself concluded that a significant number of children who died young were not recorded, especially before 1750 (Hollingsworth 1962,1965).

### **3.2 Unobserved differences in health**

Table 1 shows that the estimated correlation coefficients  $\rho_{\delta e}$  of the variance-covariance matrix of the random factors are significant for both sexes. The negative value of -0.23 ( $p=0.001$ ) for females indicates that health influences both fertility and late-life mortality. For men, unobserved behavioral factors may produce the significant negative correlation of -0.20 ( $p=0.03$ ).

Unpublished research suggests that marriage can be protective as well as selective in lowering male mortality for the British peerage. Thus a smaller family may be associated with absence from the family home and suggest higher exposure to morbidity in military service, from foreign travel, urban life, and sexually transmitted diseases.

### **3.3 The Relationship between Reproduction and Late-Life Mortality:**

Figures 2a and 2b show how the effect of parity on mortality after age 50 depends on the model specification. Neither the simple proportional hazard model nor the hazard model with unobserved heterogeneity, as defined in Eq. 1, yields a relationship between parity and mortality for females but there is a strong and significant negative relationship for males. The full model (Eq. 1 and Eq. 3) finds a significant positive relationship for females and a non-significant positive relationship for males. Among females mortality is 33 per cent lower for parity two ( $p=0.084$ ) and 29 per cent lower for parity four ( $p=0.064$ ) than for women with eight or more children (results based on the specification of parity as indicator variables and not shown). The slope of the decrease in the force of mortality per child is 3.8 per cent and it is significant at a level of  $p=0.04$  (Table 1). Similar to Westendorp and Kirkwood we find a tendency that the 29 per cent of the female peers who gave birth before their 20th birthday experience an increase in

late-life mortality of 22 percent ( $p=0.11$ ). We do not find a mortality advantage for late mothers (at least one birth after age 40). In none of the models were the variables related to fertility significant for males at a conventional significance level of 0.05.

In the parity part of our model (Eq.3) we find for both sexes a significant effect of marriage duration and marriage age on the number of children, with a long marriage duration and a low marriage age resulting in more children as expected for females (for males low marriage age results in significantly less children). When we consider the marriage age of the spouse in the female model (results not shown) marriage age of the woman loses significance while all other parameter values remain unchanged.

#### **4. DISCUSSION**

The Hollingsworth data form a rare example of a descendant genealogy, specifically constructed for demographic research and following a precisely defined set of rules for inclusion and exclusion. Although based on a male succession, it aims to record the full demographic histories of peers and all their legitimate children. Our comparison with the Bloore genealogy demonstrates the completeness of the Hollingsworth genealogy.

It is possible that the effect of reproduction on female late-life mortality may have been even stronger in the general historic population. Peers' nutrition may have been poor by modern standards, but they would not have been subject to calorific stress and may have had other physical advantages related to lifestyle. Although fashions changed, it is likely that a significant proportion of peerage women avoided the full physiological cost of breastfeeding, either through wet-nursing before 1800 or bottle-feeding later. Wet-nursing amongst the upper classes in Britain peaked in the 17<sup>th</sup> and early 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, although it was never as widespread as in parts of

Europe. Although not quantifiable, there was an upper-class movement towards maternal breastfeeding from the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century (Grieco 1991, Fildes 1988).

We do not find a beneficial effect of a late birth. Restricting the group of late mothers to the five per cent who had a child after age 45 does not change the result. This finding is contrary to earlier results from female contemporary populations (Perls et al. 1997) and from three historical populations (Smith, Mineau & Bean forthcoming, Voland & Engel 1986, Mueller et al. 2002). In contemporary populations late mothers are a small, socially selected group. In 1981, only about 7 per cent of Austrian women aged 50 plus had a child after their 40th birthday and in 1971 in England and Wales only 8 per cent (Doblhammer 2000). Among the female peerage late mothers were much more frequent: 32 per cent of the women gave birth in their 40s. The social factors that caused contemporary women to have a child comparatively late may also positively influence their late life mortality. Thus, giving birth after age 40 may not necessarily be an indicator of slower biological aging (Perls et al. 1997).

In historical populations non-biological factors like income or education may have created social and economic reproductive costs. However, many of these factors do not apply to the peerage because they are above some kind of economic threshold. In the peerage the relationship between fertility and late-life mortality may primarily result from the accumulated physiological costs of repeated pregnancies or childbirths or it may stem from a genetic disposition towards reproduction at the cost of longevity (William 1957). Westendorp *et al.* (2001) report genetic evidence that a stronger immune response to infection among women may be associated with a lower probability that pregnancy will proceed. This mechanism for the trade-off between fertility and survival allows a different interpretation of our model and results. Reproductive success may

not only have a direct cost of higher mortality, but could also be a proxy for characteristics of a woman's immune system.

If the trade-off between reproduction and longevity were the reason why humans senesce then we would expect to find this trade-off for both males and females. In our data we find a similar trend for both sexes but it is non-significant for males. For them the evolutionary costs of reproduction in terms of survival may have lain in deleterious courtship behavior (Cordts & Partridge 1996, Partridge & Farquhar 1981) rather than in raising their offspring. By the time of the oldest birth cohorts in the genealogy of the British peerage this behavior may already have been abandoned a long time ago. In addition to the results by Westendorp et al (2001) concerning women's immune systems this sex-specific finding is supported by another study. Christensen et al.(1998) reveal that the number of remaining teeth in old age is negatively correlated with parity among women but not among men.

After statistical correction for the effects of differences in health and of mortality selection before age 50, our data suggest a strong and significant positive correlation between parity and late-life mortality for peerage women. It is possible that the effect may have been even stronger outside this elite group, and if better proxies of the true costs of fertility could be defined.

## REFERENCES

- Beise j. & Volland E. 2002. Effect of producing sons in maternal longevity in premodern populations. *Science* **298**: 5592.
- Beral, V. 1985. Long-term effects of childbearing on health. *J Epidemiol Commun H* **39**, 343-346.
- Carey, J.R., Liedo, P., Müller, H.G., Wang, J.L., Chiou, J.M. 1998. Relationship of age patterns of fecundity to mortality, longevity, and lifetime reproduction in a large cohort of Mediterranean fruit fly females. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* **53**, B245-B251.
- Chen, J., Carey, J.R. & Ferris, H. 2001. Comparative demography of isogenic populations of *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Exp Gerontol* **36**, 431-440.
- Christensen, K., Gaist, D., Jeune, B., Vaupel, J.W. 1998. A tooth per child? *Lancet* **352**, 204.
- Cordts, R. & Partridge, L. 1996. Courtship reduces longevity of male *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Anim. Behav.* **52**, 269-279.
- Doblhammer, G. (2000) Reproductive History and Mortality Later in Life: A Comparative Study of England & Wales and Austria. *Population Studies* **54** (2), 169-176.
- Fildes, V. (1988) *Wet Nursing: a history from Antiquity to the Present*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Friedlander, N. J. 1996. The Relation of Lifetime Reproduction to Survivorship of Women and Men: a Prospective Study. *Am J Hum Biol* **8**, 771-783.
- Gautier, E. & Henry, L. (1958) *La Population de Crulai Paroisse Normande. Étude historique*. Travaux et Documents **33**. Presses Universitaires de France.

Gavrilov, L.A., Gavrilova, N.S. 1999. Is there a reproductive cost for human longevity? *Journal of Anti-Aging Medicine* **2**, 121-123.

Green, A. Beral, V. Moser K. 1988. Mortality in women in relation to their childbearing history. *Brit Med J* **297**, 391-395.

Helle S., Lummaa V., Jokela J. 2002. Sons Reduced Maternal Longevity in Preindustrial Humans. *Science* **296**, 1085.

Henry, L. 1956. Anciennes Familles Genevoises. Étude démographique: XVI<sup>e</sup>-XX<sup>e</sup> siècle. Travaux et Documents **26**. Presses Universitaires de France.

Hollingsworth, T.H. 1962. The Demography of the British Peerage. *Supplement to Population Studies* **18**.

Hollingsworth, T.H. 1965. The Demographic Background of the Peerage, 1603-1938. *The Eugenics Review* **57**, 56-66.

Kirkwood, T. B. L. & Rose, M. R. 1991. Evolution of senescence: late survival sacrificed for reproduction. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B* **332**, 15-24.

Kirkwood, T. B. L. 1977. Evolution of ageing. *Nature* **270**, 301-302.

Kitagawa, E. & Hauser, P. (1973) *Differential Mortality in the United States: A Study in Socioeconomic Epidemiology*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Knodel, J.E. (1988) “*Demographic behavior in the past*”, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Korpelainen, H. 2000. Fitness, reproduction and longevity among European aristocratic and rural Finnish families in the 1700s and 1800s. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* **267**, 1763-1770.

Kvale, G. *et al.* 1994. Parity in relation to mortality and cancer incidence: a prospective Study of Norwegian women. *Int J Epidemiol* **23**, 691-699.

Le Bourg, E. *et al.* 1993. Reproductive Life of French-Canadians in the 17-18<sup>th</sup> centuries: a search for a trade-off between early fecundity and longevity. *Exp Gerontol* **28**, 217-232.

Lillard L.A., Waite L.J. 1993. A joint model of marital childbearing and marital disruption. *Demography* **30**, 653-81.

Lillard, L. 1993. Simultaneous-equations for hazards – marriage duration and fertility timing. *Journal of Econometrics* **56** , 189-217.

Lillard, L. A. & Panis, C. W. 1996. Marital status and mortality: The role of health. *Demography* **33**, 313-327.

Lillard, L. Brien M.J., Waite L.J. 1995. Premarital cohabitation and subsequent marital dissolution - a matter of self-selection. *Demography* **32**, 437-57.

Lund, E. , Arnesen, E., Borgan J-E. 1990. Pattern of childbearing and mortality in married women- a national prospective study from Norway. *J Epidemiol Comm H* **44**, 237-240.

Lycett, J.E., Dunbar, R.I., Voland E. 2000. Longevity and the costs of reproduction in a historical human population. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* **267**, 31-35.

Grieco M., S.F. in Matthews Grieco, S.F. and Corsini, C.A.1991. *Historical Perspectives on Breastfeeding*. UNICEF.

Müller, H.G., Chiou, J.M., Carey, J.R., Wang, J.L. 2002. Fertility and life span: Late children enhance female longevity *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* **57**, B202-B206.



Partridge, L. & Barton, N. H. 1993. Optimality, mutation and the evolution of ageing. *Nature* **362**, 305-311.

Partridge, L. & Farquhar, M. 1981. Sexual-activity reduces lifespan of male fruitflies. *Nature* **294**, 580-582.

Perls, T.T., Alpert, L. & Fretts, R.C. **1997**. Middle-aged Mothers live longer. *Nature* **389**, 133.

Smith, K.R., Mineau G.P., Bean L.L. forthcoming. Fertility and Post-Reproductive Longevity. *Social Biology*.

Voland, E. & Engel, C. 1986. Ist das postmenopausale Sterbealter Variable einer fitness-maximierenden Reproduktionsstrategie? *Anthropologischer Anzeiger* **44**, 19-34.

Westendorp, R. G. j. & Kirkwood T. B. L. 1998. Human longevity at the cost of reproductive success. *Nature* **396**, 743-746.

Westendorp, R.G.J., van Dunne, F.M., Kirkwood, T.B.L., Helmerhorst, F.M., & Huizinga, T.W.J. 2001. Optimizing human fertility and survival. *Nature Medicine* **7** (8), 873.

Williams, G. C. 1957. Pleiotropy, natural selection, and the evolution of senescence. *Evolution* **11**, 398-411.

Wrigley, E.A. *et al.* 1997. *English population history from family reconstitution 1580-1837*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Table 1: Results from the simultaneous estimation of the mortality and fertility model defined in Eq. 1 and Eq. 3.

	Female Peers		Male Peers	
	Parameter estimates	p-value	Parameter-estimates	p-value
<i>Mortality: Proportional Hazard Model (Equation 1)</i>				
Age (Baseline Hazard)				
50-60	0.085	0.00	0.066	0.00
60-70	0.129	0.00	0.110	0.00
70-80	0.132	0.00	0.117	0.00
80+	0.199	0.00	0.171	0.00
Constant	-6.034	0.00	-4.817	0.00
Parity	0.038	0.04	0.027	0.16
Birth Cohort				
<=1650	1.141	0.00	0.636	0.00
1651-1675	0.573	0.09	0.550	0.03
1676-1700	1.002	0.00	0.792	0.00
1701-1725	1.058	0.00	0.722	0.00
1726-1750	0.491	0.03	0.481	0.00
1751-1775	0.618	0.00	0.182	0.16
1776-1800	0.459	0.00	0.199	0.09
1801-1825	0.313	0.01	0.183	0.06
1826-1850 (RG)				
Origin of title				
Irish	0.234	0.03	0.034	0.68
Scottish	-0.029	0.81	-0.062	0.60
British (RG)				
Birth after age 40	0.063	0.52	-0.088	0.28
Birth before age 20	0.215	0.11	-0.034	0.91
Tempo	0.341	0.17	0.093	0.62
<i>Fertility: Ordered Probit Model (Equation 3)</i>				

Thresholds				
T2	-1.695	0.00	1.303	0.15
T3	-0.968	0.08	2.182	0.02
T4	-0.207	0.70	2.875	0.00
T5	0.355	0.51	3.444	0.00
T6	0.865	0.11	3.891	0.00
T7	1.221	0.03	4.335	0.00
Marriage duration	0.067	0.00	0.097	0.00
Marriage cohort				
<=1675	0.225	0.30	0.555	0.00
1676-1700	0.124	0.65	0.940	0.00
1701-1725	0.594	0.02	0.259	0.27
1726-1750	-0.453	0.05	0.030	0.88
1751-1775	0.304	0.15	0.699	0.00
1776-1800	0.471	0.00	0.887	0.00
1801-1825	0.485	0.00	0.828	0.00
1826-1850	0.416	0.00	0.551	0.00
>=1850 (RG)				
Marriage age	-0.060	0.00	0.040	0.03
Variance Covariance Matrix				
$\sigma_{\delta}^2$	1.108	0.00	0.808	0.00
$\sigma_{\varepsilon}^2$	1.187	0.00	1.348	0.00
$\rho_{\delta\varepsilon}$	-0.227	0.00	-0.198	0.03
Log Likelihood	-13930.410		-17108.920	

---




Fig. 1. Comparison of the number of children born to Dukes and Marquesses in the Hollingsworth and Bloore genealogies of the British peerage. The comparison of the number of children of 694 Dukes and Marquesses that are included in both the Hollingsworth and the Bloore genealogy of the British peerage shows the incompleteness of the Bloore genealogy. It is based on the titles and the names of the peers. The circles on the diagonal indicate those peers with the same number of children in both genealogies. All circles above the diagonal refer to peers for whom Hollingsworth recorded more children than Bloore. The diameters of the circles are proportionate to the number of peers.




Fig. 2. Relative mortality risks by parity for the British peerage using different mortality models. (A) Among the female British peerage parity does not influence mortality in a proportional hazard model without correction for unobserved heterogeneity (dark blue line). The model in Eq.1, which corrects for unobserved heterogeneity (green line), yields a similar result. The model that corrects for the unobserved affect of health on parity and mortality (Eq.1 and Eq. 3) finds a positive relationship between parity and longevity. For all parities including childless women and mothers of one child mortality increases by 1.9 per cent ( $p=0.24$ ) for each additional child (light blue line). If the model is restricted to parities two and above (red line) then the increase in mortality per child is 3.8 per cent and statistically significant at  $p=0.04$ . (B) Among the male British peerage, childless peers and fathers of one child experience a significant excess mortality as compared to fathers of eight or more children when applying a proportional hazard model (dark blue line) or the proportional hazard model with unobserved heterogeneity in Eq.1 (green line). This excess mortality becomes insignificant when both Eq.1 and Eq.3 are estimated simultaneously (light blue line). A positive but statistically insignificant relationship between

parity and mortality appears when the model is restricted to parities two and higher (red line).

Mortality increases by 2.7 percent for each additional child ( $p=0.16$ ).




Figure 1




Figure 2 A






Figure 2 B

## LEGENDS

Fig. 1. Comparison of the number of children born to Dukes and Marquesses in the Hollingsworth and Bloore genealogies of the British peerage. The comparison of the number of children of 694 Dukes and Marquesses that are included in both the Hollingsworth and the Bloore genealogy of the British peerage shows the incompleteness of the Bloore genealogy. It is based on the titles and the names of the peers. The circles on the diagonal indicate those peers with the same number of children in both genealogies. All circles above the diagonal refer to peers for whom Hollingsworth recorded more children than Bloore. The diameters of the circles are proportionate to the number of peers.

Fig. 2. Relative mortality risks by parity for the British peerage using different mortality models. (A) Among the female British peerage parity does not influence mortality in a proportional hazard model without correction for unobserved heterogeneity (dark blue line). The model in Eq.1, which corrects for unobserved heterogeneity (green line), yields a similar result. The model that corrects for the unobserved affect of health on parity and mortality (Eq.1 and Eq. 3) finds a positive relationship between parity and longevity. For all parities including childless women and mothers of one child mortality increases by 1.9 per cent ( $p=0.24$ ) for each additional child (light blue line). If the model is restricted to parities two and above (red line) then the increase in mortality per child is 3.8 per cent and statistically significant at  $p=0.04$ . (B) Among the male British peerage, childless peers and fathers of one child experience a significant excess mortality as compared to fathers of eight or more children when applying a proportional hazard model (dark blue line) or the proportional hazard model with unobserved heterogeneity in Eq.1 (green

line). This excess mortality becomes insignificant when both Eq.1 and Eq.3 are estimated simultaneously (light blue line). A positive but statistically insignificant relationship between parity and mortality appears when the model is restricted to parities two and higher (red line). Mortality increases by 2.7 percent for each additional child ( $p=0.16$ ).