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Masha Antokolskaia
The idea of this study first crossed my mind when I was asked to contribute to a report on the perspectives of the harmonisation of family law in Europe for the Netherlands Comparative Law Association. I was challenged by the idea of exploring the main objection to family law harmonisation, the so-called 'cultural constraints argument'. This argument suggests that it is principally impossible to harmonise family law because the family laws of the different European countries are deeply embedded in their unique national cultures and history. The cultural constraints argument gives rise to two main questions. The first question, whether family law has converged in the past and currently converges in the present, is in principle a historical-empirical one. The other question, whether convergence and the deliberate harmonisation of family law are possible at all, also seems empirical at first sight, but an analysis of the debate on this issue will reveal that the essence of the discord is on the theoretical, rather than the empirical level.

The main purpose of this book is to suggest answers to these two questions through the analysis of convergence and divergence tendencies and the historical instances of deliberate harmonisation in the field of marriage, unmarried cohabitation, divorce, the position of extramarital children, and matrimonial property, in the majority of Europe throughout the last two millennia. In spite of the long span of time and the large geographical and institutional areas covered, this book has a rather limited scope. It does not deal with most of the issues involved in the contemporary debate surrounding the deliberate harmonisation of family law in Europe; such as whether such harmonisation is necessary or desirable, what methods should be employed to achieve it, which fields should be chosen, whether the EU has competence to harmonise family law, and so on. Save a single exception, neither does this book deal with the activities of the Commission on European Family Law (CEFL). The research for this book had already started before the CEFL was established in 2001. My inspiration for this research became all the stronger when, in 2001, I became a member of the CEFL Expert Group. This made me a 'participating observer' and allowed me to look into the 'harmonisation kitchen'. However, this study neither follows the patterns of the CEFL’s work, nor comments on it. While the CEFL is primarily focussed on drafting activities – elaborating Principles of European Family
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Law – the research presented in this book is entirely devoted to historical and theoretical issues.
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