ACCOUNTING FOR THE GREAT DIVERGENCE

Stephen Broadberry
London School of Economics and CAGE
S.N.Broadberry@lse.ac.uk

26 January 2013
File: AccountingGreatDivergence1.doc

Abstract: This paper "accounts" for the Great Divergence between Europe and Asia in two ways. In the sense of measurement: (1) the traditional view, in which the Great Divergence had late medieval origins and was already well under way during the early modern period, is confirmed (2) However, revisionists are correct to point to regional variation within both continents (3) There was a Little Divergence within Europe, with a reversal of fortunes

I. INTRODUCTION

The debate over the Great Divergence of productivity and living standards between Europe and Asia has had a remarkable impact on the economic history profession. For more than a century, economic historians had worked within a general framework where the Industrial Revolution was seen as the culmination of a process of gradual improvement, beginning in the late middle ages and continuing through the early modern period. As Europe transformed its institutions and accumulated capital, Asia stagnated and began to fall behind. The Industrial Revolution and nineteenth century colonialism were seen as accelerating this process of divergence, but were not seen as its fundamental causes. Pomeranz (2000) questioned what he saw as the Eurocentric bias of this account, claiming that as late as 1800, the Yangzi Delta region of China was as developed as Britain and Holland, the richest parts of Europe. Other parts of Asia were also seen as equally developed at the end of the eighteenth century. This chimed with the work of Frank (1998) and other economic historians working in California, and became known as the California School. Parthasarathi (1998) has claimed parity of living standards with Britain for South India during the late eighteenth century, while Hanley (1983) has argued for high living standards in nineteenth century Japan.

However, one feature of this work was that it was not generally based on systematic analysis of data, despite the fundamentally quantitative nature of the revisionist claims being made. The last decade has seen tremendous progress in the extension of quantitative economic history both back in time and across space to cover Asia as well as Europe, and this paper draws on this work to provide an account of the Great Divergence. The word "accounting" is used in two ways in this paper, embracing both measurement and explanation. The firmest conclusions will be in the area of measurement, because that is

where most progress has been made recently, but there have also been advances in understanding the explanatory factors leading to the Great Divergence.

This paper argues that the revisionist authors of the California School have massively exaggerated the development level of the most advanced Asian economies in 1800, so that their most striking claim turns out to be false. Nevertheless, the California School has had an enduring effect on economic history. It would now be impossible to make a serious comparison between Europe and Asia without emphasising regional variations within both continents. Much of this paper hinges on regional differences within both continents, and these differences were barely visible in the literature as recently as a decade ago. Although the Great Divergence between Europe and Asia was already had its origins in the late medieval period and was already well under way in the early modern period, as in the traditional economic history literature, there was a great deal of regional diversity, as suggested by the California School. Within Europe, there was a massive reversal of fortunes between the North Sea Area and Mediterranean Europe. This is sometimes known as the Little Divergence, and involved Britain and Holland overtaking Italy and Spain. Within Asia, there also seems to have been a reversal of fortunes with Japan overtaking China and India in another Little Divergence. Although this account therefore suggests some similarities between Japan and the North Sea Area, which seems consistent with the views of the California School, it is important to bear in mind that Japan started from a lower level and grew at a slower rate than the North Sea Area, and thus continued to fall behind until after the Meiji Restoration of 1868.

As well as quantifying the timing of the Great Divergence in terms of GDP per capita comparisons, this paper also offers an account of the Great Divergence, in the sense of

explanation. First, the Black Death led to a permanent upward shift of per capita incomes in the North Sea Area, which did not occur in the rest of Europe or Asia (Epstein, 2000; Allen, 2001). Second, long distance trade accelerated the divergence through its effects on the position of the merchant class in different countries (Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson, 2005). Third, mixed agriculture with a large pastoral component helped to put the North Sea Area on a path to high-value-added, capital-intensive, non-human-energy-intensive production (Broadberry, Campbell, Klein, Overton and van Leeuwen, 2011). Fourth, high female age of first marriage in the North Sea Area led to lower fertility and more investment in human capital (de Moor and van Zanden, 2011). Fifth, although it is possible to point to an "industrious revolution" in the North Sea Area, which helps to explain the Little Divergence within Europe, the term was first coined in the context of Japan during the Tokugawa Shogunate, and thus has less role in explaining the Great Divergence between Europe and asia (de Vries, 2008; Hayami, 1967).

2. MEASURING ECONOMIC GROWTH BEFORE 1870

Until recently, most accounts of economic growth before 1870 were largely qualitative. That changed with Maddison's (2001), *The World Economy: A Millennial Perspective*, published shortly after Pomeranz's (2000) *The Great Divergence*. However, there is a large amount of "guesstimation" in the Maddison (2010) data set, with a number of observations set at or close to $400 in 1990 international prices. This is equivalent to most people living at "bare bones subsistence", or the World Bank poverty level of $1 per day, with a small rich elite on top. Table 1 sets out Maddison's estimates for the four European countries and the three Asian countries which will be the focus of attention in this paper. The four European countries have been chosen to include the richest parts of Europe in the late middle ages (Italy and Spain) and in the early modern and modern periods (Holland and Britain).

Similarly, the Asian economies have been chosen to include the richest parts of Asia in the early part of the second millennium (China) and in the modern period (Japan). Recently, however, economic historians have begun to produce estimates of per capita income in a national accounting framework, based on hard data, and a firmer picture has begun to emerge of the contours of long run growth and development in both Europe and Asia.

2.1 Europe

For some European countries, abundant quantitative information has survived, so that historical national accounts can be constructed on a sectoral basis in great detail. Britain and Holland have the best data, with historical national accountants able to build on decades of detailed data processing by generations of scholars as well as well-stocked archives (Broadberry, Campbell, Klein, Overton and van Leeuwen, 2011; van Zanden and van Leeuwen, 2012). For other countries, where information is more limited, or where there has been less processing of existing data, Malanima (2011), Álvarez-Nogal and Prados de la Escosura (2012) and others have developed a short-cut method for reconstructing GDP. In the short-cut method, the economy is first divided between agriculture and non-agriculture. In the agricultural sector, output is estimated via a demand function, making use of data on population, real wages and the relative price of food, together with elasticities derived from later periods and the experience of other less developed economies. An allowance can also be made for international trade in food. For the non-agricultural sector, output is assumed to have moved in line with the urban population, but with some allowance made for rural industry and the phenomenon of agro-towns. This output-based GDP is helpful in bridging the gap between the macro approach of growth economists and the sectoral approach of much economic history.

The new estimates based on historical national accounting, presented here in Table 2, revise upwards the level of per capita GDP in the medieval period. Medieval western Europe was substantially richer than Maddison thought, and subsequent growth therefore more gradual. The British data from Broadberry, Campbell, Klein, Overton and van Leeuwen (2011) cover the territory of England before 1700 and Great Britain after 1700, while the Dutch data from van Zanden and van Leeuwen (2012) cover the territory of Holland before 1807 and the Netherlands after 1807. The Italian data from Malanima (2011) cover central and northern Italy, excluding the south, while the data of Álvarez-Nogal and Prados de la Escosura (2012) cover the territory of modern Spain.

Note that before the Black Death in 1348, per capita incomes were substantially higher in Italy and Spain than in England and Holland. There then followed a reversal of fortunes between the North Sea Area and Mediterranean Europe, so that by 1800 per capita incomes were substantially higher in Great Britain and the Netherlands than in Italy and Spain. Note that Italy, England and Holland all experienced a substantial increase in per capita incomes across the Black Death, as population fell sharply. However, Spain did not share in this Malthusian response to the Black Death, and although Italian incomes increased in the short run, they fell back to pre-Black Death levels as population growth returned after 1450. The Little Divergence then occurred with a surge of per capita incomes in the North Sea Area, led initially by Holland during its Golden Age of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, then by Britain during its Industrial Revolution of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

2.2 Asia

Data are available in abundance for some Asian economies for some time periods, but there has been relatively little work so far processing this material. Much Chinese data still needs to be processed, but it is now possible to produce annual estimates of GDP from the output side, apart from during dynastic changes (Broadberry, Guan and Li, 2012). Japan also has a wealth of data, but at this stage the estimates are closer in spirit to the short-cut methods used for Italy and Spain than to the full output-based estimates for Britain and Holland (Bassino, Broadberry, Fukao, Gupta and Takashima, 2012). Indian data are less abundant, and it has so far only been possible to produce estimates back to 1600 (Broadberry and Gupta, 2012). Apart from Abū 'l-Fazl's [1595] remarkable document, *The Ā'īn–i-Akbarī*, from the highpoint of the Mughal Empire, most of the information about India comes from the records of the European East India Companies and the British Raj.

The results for Asia in Table 3, like those for Europe in Table 2, suggest an upward revision of early GDP per capita compared with Maddison's estimates, but not generally on quite the same scale as in Europe. In particular, Japan had very low levels of per capita GDP at the start of the second millennium, then experienced modest but steady growth at 0.06% per annum through to the mid-nineteenth century. Japan's more dynamic growth after the Meiji Restoration of 1868 thus built on this earlier progress. China's per capita GDP, by contrast, was on a downward trajectory from its high-point during the Northern Song Dynasty. On these estimates, Japan overtook China during the seventeenth century. India shared in the Chinese pattern of declining per capita GDP from 1600, at the height of the Mughal Empire under Akbar. However, Japan was already slightly ahead of India by the time the Indian series starts in 1600.

The Asian Little Divergence thus parallels the European Little Divergence quite closely. Indeed, if the North Sea Area economies of Britain, Holland and Belgium (Flanders) are aggregated together, they show a continuous upward trajectory from the mid-fourteenth to the mid-nineteenth century, much as in Japan, led initially by a growth surge in Flanders, followed by surges in Holland and then in Britain. And just as stagnation and decline characterised Europe outside the North Sea Area at this time, so too there was stagnation and decline in Asia outside Japan. Of course, China is a large economy, and it would be desirable to disaggregate further, in the spirit of the California School, to see whether the Yangzi Delta was on a par with Japan until the nineteenth century, for example.

Li and van Zanden (2012) have produced a comparison of GDP per capita in the Yangzi Delta and the Netherlands in the early nineteenth century, finding per capita incomes in the Yangzi Delta to be 53.8 per cent of the level in the Netherlands during the 1820s. This suggests a per capita GDP figure of around $1,050 for the Lower Yangzi, in 1990 international dollars, slightly above the Japanese level at this time. Note also that a recent paper by Roy (2010) produces an estimate of GDP per capita for Bengal, the first part of India to fall under British control. Roy finds that per capita incomes in Bengal were around 20 per cent of the British level in the 1760s. This is a bit lower than the average suggested by Broadberry and Gupta (2012) for India as a whole, falling from 34 per cent in 1750 to 27 per cent by 1801. However, this would be expected for a relatively poor region such as Bengal.

Table 4 puts together the new GDP per capita estimates for Europe and Asia from Tables 2 and 3, to provide a focus on the Great Divergence. Japan was following a similar trajectory to the North Sea Area, but at a much lower level, and with a slower rate of growth, so that Japan continued to fall behind the West until after the Meiji Restoration in 1868.

Although China was richer than England in 1086, it must be remembered that England was a relatively poor part of Europe in the eleventh century. Comparing China with the richest part of medieval Europe, it seems likely that Italy was already ahead by 1300. However, care needs to be taken here, since a smaller region of China such as the Yangzi Delta may still have been on a par with Italy in 1500, which would be consistent with the accounts given in the earlier, qualitative literature. This would only require per capita incomes in the Yangzi Delta to have been around 54 per cent higher than in China as a whole, which is broadly consistent with the scale of regional differences within China during the nineteenth century. However, with the rise of Holland during its Golden Age, there can be little doubt that the Great Divergence was already well underway during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. By this stage, the discrepancy between the aggregates for China and Holland are too large to be bridged by regional variation. It is worth noting that Pomeranz (2011) now accepts that his earlier claim of China on a par with Europe as late as 1800 was exaggerated, although his continued insistence on parity as late as 1700 looks difficult to reconcile with the scale of the per capita GDP differences in Table 4, even allowing for regional variation within China.

3. EXPLAINING ECONOMIC GROWTH

The second way of accounting for the Great Divergence is to provide an explanatory framework. Armed with the estimates of economic growth before 1870 from Table 4, this section now turns to explanation. A common framework will be adopted for analysing the Little Divergence within Europe, the Little Divergence within Asia and the Great Divergence between Asia and Europe.

3.1

Most European countries experienced an increase in per capita incomes across the Black Death of the mid-fourteenth century, but Spain did not share in this Malthusian response to the mortality crisis. Álvarez-Nogal and Prados de la Escosura (2012) explain this by Spain's high land-to-labour ratio in a frontier economy during the Reconquest. Instead of reducing pressure on scarce land resources, Spanish population decline destroyed commercial networks and further isolated an already scarce population, reducing specialisation and the division of labour. Thus Spain did not share in the general west European increase in per capita incomes after the Black Death. In the case of Italy, although Italian per capita incomes did increase after the Black Death, the gains disappeared again after the return to population growth from 1450, in contrast to the consolidation of the gains in the North Sea Area.

The reversal of fortunes within Europe pivots around 1500, when per capita incomes were approximately $1,500 in both Italy and Holland. The North Sea Area forged ahead after 1500, led initially by Holland during its Golden Age during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and then by Britain during the Industrial Revolution. Economic historians have often pointed to long distance trade as playing an important role in this post-1500 Little Divergence, following the opening up of new trade routes to Asia around the south of Africa, and to the New World following Europe's encounter with the Americas. However, it might be expected that Spain and Portugal would have been the gainers from these changes, since they were the pioneers and both had Atlantic as well as Mediterranean coasts. However, Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson (2005) explain the success of Britain and Holland (and the failure of Spain and Portugal) through an interaction between Atlantic access and institutional constraints on executive power. In Britain and Holland, constraints on rulers were sufficient to ensure that they were unable to appropriate the bulk of the gains from trade. In Spain and Portugal, by contrast, rulers were sufficiently strong to exploit the opportunities themselves

and prevent a strong merchant class from constraining their powers to appropriate. This view is not universally accepted, however. For example, Epstein (2000) argues that state power was fragmented in the medieval period, with market integration hindered by the "freedoms" granted to interests such as towns and guilds, so that what was needed for growth was centralisation of state power and expansion of state capacity rather than constraints on the executive. The two views can be reconciled once it is recognised that a balance is needed between having a state that is strong enough to enforce property rights but not so strong that can it can appropriate all the gains from trade. Early modern Britain and Holland dominated Spain and Portugal in terms of both their ability to raise taxes that allowed for an expansion of state capacity and in the control exercised by mercantile interests over the state through parliament (O'Brien, 2011, Karaman and Pamuk, 2010; van Zanden, Buringh and Bosker, 2012).

The success of the North Sea Area may also be linked to agriculture and structural change. Agriculture in the North Sea Area was more animal oriented than in the rest of the continent, with a large pastoral farming component. The data for England are shown in Table 5. In current prices the share of the pastoral sector was already above 50 per cent after the Black Death, and was more than 60 per cent by the mid-fifteenth century. Although the share declined between the 1450s and the 1650s, much of this was due to an increase in the relative price of grain following the return of population growth. In constant 1700 prices, there was an upward trend in the share of the pastoral sector, with just a gentle setback between the mid-fifteenth and mid-seventeenth centuries. To put things in perspective, the pastoral share of agricultural value added in India in the early twentieth century was around 20 per cent (Sivasubramonian, 2000).

The importance of pastoral agriculture in the North Sea Area had a number of important implications for future growth. Although this did not create more kilocalories per person, it meant that food was more processed than in other societies (Allen, 2009; Broadberry, Campbell, Klein, Overton and van Leeuwen, 2011). North Sea Area agriculture thus had a number of characteristics that were important for future growth (Broadberry, Campbell, Klein, Overton and van Leeuwen, 2011). First, this was a high-value-added agriculture; even if it did not produce many more kilocalories per head than arable agriculture, the food was more highly processed. Second, this was a highly capital-intensive agriculture, with animals making up a large share of the capital stock. Third, this was an agriculture which was highly intensive in the use of non-human energy. The North Sea Area pulled ahead of Mediterranean Europe as high-value-added, capital-intensive, non-human-energy-intensive techniques spread from agriculture to industry and services and as industry and services became more important with structural change.

Hajnal (1965) argued that northwest Europe had a different demographic regime from the rest of the European continent, characterised by later marriage and hence limited fertility. Although he originally called this the European Marriage Pattern, later work established that it applied only to the northwest of the continent. This can be linked to labour market opportunities for females, which de Moor and van Zanden (2010) link in turn to pastoral agriculture. Fewer children are associated with more investment in human capital, both for the females engaged in market activity before marriage, and for the children because of the "quantity-quality" trade-off (Voigtländer and Voth, 2010). Development in the North Sea Area was characterised by human- as well as physical-capital intensity (Baten and van Zanden, 2008).

One other difference between northwest Europe and southern Europe which has received attention in the literature is attitudes to work. This idea can be traced back originally to Max Weber (1930) and the protestant ethic. However, its most recent variant is the "Industrious Revolution", a term widely associated with de Vries's (1994) work on Europe, but actually coined by Hayami (1967) working on Japan. The basic idea is that people worked harder to obtain new goods made available by long distance trade and industrial innovation. Following the Reformation, the number of holidays in Europe was reduced by around 50 per year, and during the Industrial Revolution, St Monday, the practice of tolerating people not turning up for work on the first day of the week, disappeared, removing another 50 holidays per year. Table 6 sets out the empirical evidence on annual days worked per person in England, which approximately doubled from around 165 in the fifteenth century to around 330 in the nineteenth century. This can be seen as increasing labour intensity in the short run, but as incomes increased, savings also rose, providing funds for investment and thus allowing an increase in capital intensity in the long run.

3.2

Although the idea of Chinese decline since the Song Dynasty is not new, and Japanese post-Meiji growth is widely seen as building upon foundations laid in the Tokugawa Shogunate, there is no literature on an Asian Little Divergence (Needham, 1954; O'Brien, 2009; Hayami, Saito and Toby, 2004). Here, the parallels with the European Little Divergence are drawn out. First, there are no signs of a positive effect from the Black Death on per capita incomes in Asia, in contrast to Europe. This is not surprising in the case of Japan, which is known to have remained isolated from the Black Death. However, there was a large decline in China's population during the fourteenth century, which did not have a positive effect on per capita GDP. The reason for this seems to be that this period coincided with the Mongol interlude,

which destroyed the institutional framework that had underpinned the high per capita incomes of the Northern Song Dynasty. This reduced specialisation and the division of labour, so that China's experience was closer to that of Spain than to that of England or Holland.

Turning to consider long distance trade, both Japan and China adopted a restrictive closed door policy, which suggests that this factor might be more important in explaining the Great Divergence between Europe and Asia, than the Little Divergence within Asia. China turned inwards after the "voyages to the western oceans" that had occurred between 1405 and 1433, which had shown China to be technologically ahead in shipbuilding (Fairbank, 1992: 137-140). Tokugawa Japan adopted a policy of *sakoku* or "seclusion" from the 1630s, following an initial period of openness to relations with European traders. Although recent work has tended to question the extent to which trade really was closed off by these policies, the contrast with the outward orientation of the European states which sponsored the voyages of discovery from the fifteenth century remains striking (Tashiro, 1982; van der Wee, 1990). With early modern China and India turned inwards, India was the most open to trade, with its major export business in cotton textiles (Chaudhuri, 1978). This did not lead to Indian prosperity, but not because of the failure of Indian merchants to impose constraints on the executive, as would be suggested by the framework of Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson (2005). Far from being dominated by strong states, merchants in the Indian Ocean trade operated in an environment of weak states, where piracy was a major problem (Prange, 2011). The interaction between long distance trade and institutions in Asia thus seems to point more in the direction of Epstein's (2000) concerns about the need for building state capacity.

Agriculture was much less animal oriented in both China and Japan than in Europe, so this factor would again seem better suited to explaining the Great Divergence between Asia and Europe rather than to accounting for the differing performances of China, Japan and India during the Asian Little Divergence.

Marriage patterns do have an important role to play in explaining the Asian Little Divergence as well as the Great Divergence. Hajnal (1965) pointed to the different marriage pattern in northwest Europe compared with the rest of Europe, and although the female age of first marriage in China and India was much lower, Japan was an intermediate case, closer to the experience of northwest Europe, as can be seen in Table 7. The average age was 22.1 in Tokugawa Japan, compared with 25.4 in early modern England, but 18.6 in late Ming and Qing China and just 13.0 in modern India.

This later marriage in Japan can also be linked to the labour force participation of women, which underpinned an industrious revolution. This may at first sight seem surprising, given the small scale of pastoral agriculture in Japan compared with the North Sea Area. However, in the case of Japan, the labour market opportunities for women were provided by the silk industry, and later by cotton textiles. Although de Vries (1994) was influenced by Hayami's (1967) work on Tokugawa Japan when arguing for an industrious revolution in Europe, on closer inspection, Hayami's interpretation is a bit different for Japan. Indeed, Hayami and Tsubouchi(1989) generalised the idea to an East Asian industrious revolution, based on rice cultivation, which was seen as the basis of an alternative to western capital-intensive industrialisation. This idea was picked up by Pomeranz (2000: 91-106), who argued for a Chinese industrious revolution. However, Huang (2002) argues that this is a misinterpretation of what he calls "involution". For Huang, Chinese over-population led to

smaller landholdings, driving women to work in proto-industry just to remain at subsistence. This leaves out the crucial demand side of de Vries's notion of an industrious revolution, with people working harder to be able to consume luxury goods. In Western Europe and Japan, harder work brought rising household incomes and consumption per head.

3.3 The Great Divergence

Putting together the above analysis of the European and Asian Little Divergences produces an explanatory framework for the Great Divergence that is sensitive to the regional variations within both continents that is the hallmark of the California School. The main conclusions can be listed as follows.

First, the Black Death led to a permanent upward shift of GDP per capita in the North Sea Area, which did not occur in the rest of Europe or Asia. Second, long distance trade accelerated the divergence, but in a subtle way, through interactions with institutions. This encompasses not just constraints on the executive, as suggested by Acemoglu, Robinson and Johnson (2005), but also the capacity of the state to create an integrated market. In Europe, Britain and Holland dominated Spain and Portugal on both counts. In Asia, Japan and China turned inwards and although India remained open, state capacity remained weak.

Third, different agricultural systems mattered. The large share of pastoral farming in agriculture put northwest Europe on a path to high-value-added, capital-intensive, non-human-energy-intensive production. These production characteristics then spread from agriculture to industry and services, which accounted for a growing share of output. Fourth, marriage patterns also mattered. The high female age of first marriage in northwest Europe led to lower fertility and more investment in human capital. Although female marriage was

early in India and China, Japan was an intermediate case. Fifth, an industrious revolution was more important in explaining the Little Divergences within Europe and Asia than the Great Divergence, since there were similarities between the North Sea Area and Japan.

4. CONCLUSIONS

This paper sets out to "account" for the Great Divergence between Europe and Asia, covering issues of both measurement and explanation. Dealing with measurement issues, there are a number of firm conclusions: (1) The traditional view, in which the Great Divergence had late medieval origins and was already well under way during the early modern period, is confirmed (2) However, revisionists are correct to point to regional variation within both continents (3) There was a Little Divergence within Europe, with a reversal of fortunes between the North Sea Area and Mediterranean Europe. (4) There was a Little Divergence within Asia, with Japan overtaking China and India. However, Japan started at a lower level of per capita income than the North Sea Area and grew at a slower rate, so continued to fall behind until after the Meiji Restoration of 1868.

Turning to explanation of the Great Divergence, a number of firm conclusions can also be drawn: (1) The Black Death led to a permanent per capita income gain in the North Sea Area, but not in the rest of Eurasia. (2) Long distance trade accelerated the divergence through its interaction with institutions (3) The large share of pastoral farming in agriculture helped to put the North Sea Area on the path to high-value-added, capital-intensive, non-human-energy intensive production. (4) Late marriage in the North Sea Area lowered fertility and encouraged human capital formation (5) The industrious revolution was more important in explaining the Little Divergences within Europe and Asia than the Great Divergence.

More research is still needed, however. Although historical national accounting has now made a substantial contribution to understanding the Great Divergence, there is more to be done: (1) Historical national accounts are needed for more countries, reaching further back in time (2) More regional disaggregation is needed within large countries. (3) Much more work is needed to assemble comparative data on the explanatory variables (4) More attention needs to be paid to the case of Japan, the first Asian country to achieve modern economic growth, but which has been overshadowed in the Great Divergence debate by the focus on China.

TABLE 1: -
1870 (1990 international dollars)

	UK	NL	Italy	Spain	Japan	China	India
1000	400	425	450	450	425	466	450
1500	714	761	1,100	661	500	600	550
1600	974	1,381	1,100	853	520	600	550
1700	1,250	2,130	1,100	853	570		

TABLE 3: GDP per capita levels in Asia (1990 international dollars)

	Japan	China	India
730	483		
900	534		
980		1,328	
1086		1,244	
1120		962	
1150	603		
1280	560		
1300			
1400		948	
1450	554	946	
1500		909	
1570		898	
1600	791	852	682
1650	838		638
1700	879	843	622
1750	818	737	573
1800	876	639	569
1850	933	600	556

Sources and notes: Japan: Basssino, Broadberry, Fukao, Gupta and Takashima (2012); China: Guan and Li (2012); India: Broadberry and Gupta (2012); Chinese data are for 10-year averages starting in the stated year (i.e. 980-89, 1086-95,…), but data for Japan and India are only available for benchmark years.

TABLE 4: GDP per capita levels in Europe and Asia (1990 international dollars)

	England/ GB	Holland/ NL	Italy	Japan	China	India
730				483		
900				534		
980					1,328	
1086	754				1,244	
1120					962	
1150				603		
1280	679			560		
1300	755		1,482			
1400	1,090	1,245	1,601		948	
1450	1,055	1,432	1,668	554	946	
1500	1,114	1,483	1,403		909	
1570	1,143	1,783	1,337		898	
1600	1,123	2,372	1,244	791	852	682
1650	1,110	2,171	1,271	838		638
1700	1,563	1,403	1,350	879	843	622
1750	1,710	2,440	1,403	818	737	573
1800	2,080	1,752	1,244	876	639	569
1850	2,997	2,397	1,350	933	600	556

Sources: Tables 2 and 3.

TABLE 5: Share of pastoral sector in English agricultural value added, 10-year averages (%)

	At current prices	At constant 1700 prices
1270s	39.9	30.8
1300s	48.8	33.6
1350s	51.2	46.7
1400s	53.7	42.5
1450s	61.6	46.9
1550s	41.9	39.5
1600s	41.9	41.2
1650s	35.5	36.0
1700s	40.3	38.5
1750s	42.2	45.4
1800s	51.5	54.7
1850s	55.2	55.8
1860s	60.0	55.7

Sources: (Broadberry, Campbell, Klein, Overton and van Leeuwen, 2011).

TABLE 6: Annual days worked per person in England

Period	Blanchard/Allen and Weisdorf	Clark and van der Werf	Voth
1433	165		
1536	180		
1560-1599		257	
1578	260		
1584	210		
1598	259		
1600-1649		266	
1650-1699		276	
1685		312	
1700-1732		286	
1733-1736		295	
1760			258
1771		280	
1800			333
1830			336
1867-1869		293-311	
1870		318	

Sources and notes: 1433-1598: derived by Allen and Weisdorf (2011: 721) from Blanchard (1978: 24) as the number of days worked in agriculture (135) plus the share of the remaining130 workdays spent in mining; 1560-1599 to 1870: Clark and van der Werf (1998: 838); 1760-1830: Voth (2001: 1078).

TABLE 7: Female age of first marriage

	Period	Range	Unweighted average
England	1600-1849	23.4 to 26.5	25.4
Japan	1680-1860	18.8 to 24.6	22.1
China	1550-1931	17.2 to 20.7	18.6
India	1911-1931	12.9 to 13.3	13.0

Sources: Wrigley and Schofield (1987: 255); Mosk (1980: 476); Lee and Wang (1999: 67); Bhat and Halli (1999: 137).

REFERENCES

Abū 'l-Fazl [1595] (1927), *The Ā' īn–i-Akbarī*. Translated into English by H.Blochman, Delhi: Low Price Publications.

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S. and Robinson, J. (2005), "The Rise of Europe: Atlantic Trade, Institutional Change, and Economic Growth", *American Economic Review*, 95, 546-579.

Allen, R.C. (2001), "The Great Divergence in European Wages and Prices from the Middle Ages to the First World War", *Explorations in Economic History*, 38, 411-447.

Allen, R.C. (2009), *The British Industrial Revolution in Global Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Allen, R.C. and Weisdorf, J. (2011), "Was There an 'Industrious Revolution' Before the Industrial Revolution? An Empirical Exercise for England, c. 1300-1830", *Economic History Review*, 64, 715-729.

Álvarez-Nogal, C. and Prados de la Escosura, L. (2012), "The Rise and Fall of Spain, 1270-1850", *Economic History Review*, (forthcoming).

Bassino, J.-P., Broadberry, S., Fukao, K., Gupta, B. and Takashima, M. (2012), "Japan and the Great Divergence, 730-1870", http://www2.lse.ac.uk/economicHistory/whosWho/profiles/sbroadberry.aspx.

Baten, J. and van Zanden, J.L. (2008), "Book Production and the Onset of Modern Economic Growth", *Journal of Economic Growth*, 13, 217-235.

Bhat, P.N.M. and Halli, S.S. (1999), "Demography of Bride Prices and Dowry: Causes and Consequences of the Indian Marriage Squeeze", *Population Studies*, 53, 129-148.

Blanchard, I. (1978), "Labour Productivity and Work Psychology in the English Mining Industry, 1400-1600", *Economic History Review*, 31, 1-24.

Broadberry, S.N., Campbell, B., Klein, A., Overton, M. and van Leeuwen, B. (2011), "British Economic Growth, 1270-1870: An Output-Based Approach", London School of Economics, http://www2.lse.ac.uk/economicHistory/whosWho/profiles/sbroadberry.aspx.

Broadberry, S. Guan, H. and Li, D. (2012), "China, Europe and the Great Divergence: A Study in Historical National Accounting", London School of Economics.

Broadberry, S. and Gupta, B. (2012), "India and the Great Divergence: An Anglo-Indian Comparison of GDP per capita, 1600-1871", London School of Economics, http://www2.lse.ac.uk/economicHistory/whosWho/profiles/sbroadberry.aspx.

Chaudhuri, K.N. (1978), *The Trading World of Asia and the East India Company, 1660-1760*, Cambridge: Cambridge university Press.

Clark, G. and van der Werf, Y. (1998), "Work in Progress? The Industrious Revolution", *Journal of Economic History*, 58, 830-843.

Epstein, S.R. (2000), *Freedom and Growth: The Rise of States and Markets in Europe, 1300-1750*, London: Routledge.

Fairbank, J.K. (1990), *China: A New History*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Frank, A.G. (1998), *ReOrient: The Silver Age in Asia and the World Economy*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hajnal, J. (1965), "European Marriage Patterns in Perspective", in Glass, D.V. and Eversley, D.E.C. (eds.), *Population in History: Essays in Historical Demography*, London: Edward Arnold, 101-143.

Hanley, S.B. (1983), "A High Standard of Living in Nineteenth-Century Japan: Fact or Fantasy?", *Journal of Economic History*, 43, 183-192.

Hayami, A. (1967), "Keizai Shakai no Seiretsu to sono Tokushitsu (The Emergence of the Economic Society and its Characteristics)", in Gakkai, S.K. (ed.), *Atarashii Edo Jidaizo o Motomete*, Tokyo: Toyo Keizai Shinposha.

Hayami, A., Saito, O and Toby, R.P. (eds.), *The Economic History of Japan, 1600-1990, Vol. 1: Emergence of Economic Society in Japan, 1600-1859*, Oxford; Oxford University Press.

Hayami, A. and Tsubouchi, Y. (eds.) (1989), *Economic and demographic Development in Rice Producing Societies: Some Aspects of East Asian Economic History, 1500-1900*, Tokyo.

Huang, P.C.C. (2002), "Development or Involution in Eighteenth-Century Britain and China?: A Review of Kenneth Pomeranz's The Great Divergence: China, Europe and the Making of the Modern World Economy", *Journal of Asian Studies*, 61, 501-538.

Karaman, K.K. and Pamuk, S. (2010), "Ottoman State Finances in European Perspective, 1500-11914", Journal of Economic History, 70, 593-629.

Lee, J.Z. and Wang, F. (2001), *One Quarter of Humanity: Malthusian Mythology and Chinese Realities*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Li, B. and van Zanden, J.L. (2012), "Before the Great Divergence? Comparing the Yangzi Delta and the Netherlands at the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century", *Journal of Economic History*, (forthcoming).

Maddison, A. (2001), *The World Economy: A Millennial Perspective*, Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Maddison, A. (2010), "Statistics on World Population, GDP and Per Capita GDP, 1-2008 AD", Groningen Growth and Development Centre, http://www.ggdc.net/MADDISON/oriindex.htm.

Malanima, P. (2011), "The Long Decline of a Leading Economy: GDP in Central and Northern Italy, 1300-1913", *European Review of Economic History*, 15, 169-219.

de Moor, T. and van Zanden, J.L. (2010), "Girl Power: The European Marriage Pattern and Labour Markets in the North Sea Region in the Late Medieval and Early Modern Period", *Economic History Review*, 63, 1-33.

Mosk, C. (1980), "Nuptiality in Meiji Japan", *Journal of Social History*, 13, 474-489.

Needham. J. (1954), *Science and Civilization in China, Volume 1*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Brien, P.K. (2009), "The Needham Question Updated: An Historiographical Survey and Elaboration", *History of Technology*, 29, 7-28.

O'Brien, P.K. (2011), "The Nature and Historical Evolution of an Exceptional Fiscal State and its Possible Significance for the Precocious Commercialization and Industrialization of the British Economy from Cromwell to Nelson", *Economic History Review*, 64, 408-446.

Parthasarathi, P. (1998), "Rethinking Wages and Competitiveness in the Eighteenth Century: Britain and South India", *Past and Present*, 158, 79-109.

Pomeranz, K. (2000), *The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the Making of the Modern World Economy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pomeranz, K. (2011), "Ten Years After: Responses and Reconsiderations", Historically Speaking, 12(4), 20-25. Project Muse, https://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/historically_speaking/v012/12.4.coclanis.html.

Prange, S. (2011), "A Trade of No Dishonor: Piracy, Commerce, and community in the western Indian Ocean, Twelfth to Sixteenth century", *American Historical Review*, 116, 1269-1293.

Roy, T. (2010), "Economic Conditions in Early Modern Bengal: A Contribution to the Divergence Debate", *Journal of Economic History*, 70, 179-194.

Sivasubramonian, S. (2000), *The National Income of India in the Twentieth Century*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Tashiro, K. (1982), "Foreign Relations During the Edo Period: *Sakoku* Reexamined", *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 8, 283-306.

Voigtländer, N. and Voth, H.-J. (2010), "How the West 'Invented' Fertility Restriction", UPF Barcelona.

Voth, H.-J. (2001), "The Longest Years: New Estimates of Labor Input in England, 1760-1830", *Journal of Economic History*, 61, 1065-1082.

de Vries, J. (1994), "The Industrial Revolution and the Industrious Revolution", *Journal of Economic History*, 54, 249-270.

de Vries, J. (2008), *The Industrious Revolution: Consumer Behavior and the Household Economy, 1650 to the Present*, Cambridge: Cambridge university Press.

Weber, M. (1930), *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, London: Allen and Unwin.

van der Wee, H. (1990), "Structural Changes in European Long-distance Trade, and Particularly in the Re-export Trade from South to North", in Tracy, J.D. (ed.), *The Rise of Merchant Empires: Long-distance Trade in the Early Modern World, 1350-1750*, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 14-33.

Wrigley, E.A. and Schofield, R.S. (1989), *The Population History of England, 1541-1871: A Reconstruction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van Zanden, J.L., Buringh, E. and Bosker, M. (2012), "The Rise and Decline of European Parliaments, 1188-1789", *Economic History Review*, 65, 835-861.

van Zanden, J.L. and van Leeuwen, B. (2012), "Persistent but not Consistent: The Growth of National Income in Holland, 1347-1807", *Explorations ion Economic History*, 49, 119-130.