

Book Reviews

C. W. CHALKLIN, *Seventeenth Century Kent: a Social and Economic History*. Longmans, 1965. xv+294 pp. 35s.

This volume is a very competent addition to the gradually growing library of local studies on agrarian and economic topics. Mr Chalklin, who is now a lecturer at Reading University, has had the advantage of working for several years on the staff of the Kent Archives Office. Few local repositories are richer in sources or better organized, and the author has exploited these facilities with admirable thoroughness. The volume is based partly on his own researches, and partly on several unpublished theses, whose conclusions he has sometimes been able to substantiate with a wealth of further detail. As is fitting in a county still predominantly agricultural outside its commuter belt and its seaside resorts, the greater part of the book is devoted to Kentish farming and rural society. Its four parts describe 'The setting and its Inhabitants', 'Farming', 'Industry and Trade', and 'Society'. Numerous other topics—for example the history of disease (pp. 38-41)—are suggestively touched on, and show how many major fields of local history, even in so well-trodden a county, remain virtually unexplored. Manufactures, such as the Wealden iron industry, are not neglected, but are given a secondary place. Though in several parishes they employed a large part of the population and enriched a few minor gentry like the Streatfeilds and Horsmondens, they were not of comparable importance to the iron industry in Sussex, on which the fortunes of knightly and even noble families, such as the Ashburnhams, were sometimes based. Mr Chalklin's account of Kentish agriculture does not produce any novel or startling conclusions, but it patiently and convincingly traces the modern agricultural pattern of the county back to its Tudor and Stuart origins. My only small amendment would be that hops seem to have been grown extensively around Canterbury rather earlier than he suggests: by

Charles I's reign, at least, according to a contemporary dispute in Chancery.

The author's description of Kentish society is perhaps the most interesting section of the book. The effects of partible inheritance in Kent, and of patriarchal forms of life, are strikingly illustrated in some of his examples of family history. The account of the rise of the Childrens of Hildenborough, from obscure medieval beginnings, until they unobtrusively graduated into gentility under Charles II, is the perfect success-story of a yeoman line unencumbered in any generation by a superfluity of sons and daughters (pp. 234-6). Their head, George Children, became sheriff of Kent in 1698. The old family-home, however, though added to bit by bit till it had become a small mansion, apparently still remained, like those of hundreds of other Kentish gentry, essentially a farmhouse, where farm labourers and servants lived under the same roof-tree as the local squire. The other side of the yeoman's story is told in the record of the Rucke family of Boughton-under-Blean (pp. 232-3). Their roots in the local countryside were similar to the Childrens', but owing to successive partitions of their small patrimony among a numerous progeny, no member of the family owned enough land, by 1670, to support his dependants. Each retained a few acres; but one of them had perforce become a maltster at Boughton; another was a cordwainer at Molash, over the Downs; and a third rented a 100-acre farm in Lynsted, while he and his brother leased their own joint holding of 13 acres to a local tailor. Although by this date the landed estates of the Kentish gentry were rarely subject to the vagaries of partible inheritance, their former history ran to much the same pattern of rise or decline. As yet there was no very sharp distinction between their lower ranks and the yeomanry; their origins in small medieval freeholders were often identical; they still mixed with each other, and they usually attended the same

local schools (p. 209). Until Hasted's time, and after, it was still true that the intermingling of the estates of yeomen and gentlemen "brought them together to solve the common problems of neighbouring landlords, and taught the gentry to treat the farmer with respect and civility" (p. 231).

Mr Chalklin's account of town life in Kent also contains much of interest, and makes one look forward to the publication of his further researches in this field in other counties. With regard to his remark that the urban proportion of the Kentish population was nearly double that of the average county, one wonders whether a possible *caveat* should not be entered (p. 32). I may be misunderstanding him, but apparently this calculation includes the suburbs along the Thames, which, though geographically in Kent, were obviously oriented towards London, not towards county affairs. This raises the question of how far the county is a justifiable unit in dealing with economic history: a point which will be referred to later in this review. More important, it is not clear whether the total always excludes the non-urban population of those town parishes where many families lived in rural hamlets apart from the urban settlement itself. At Sevenoaks, the rural population is properly excluded. From Gregory King's special survey of the parish, cited by Mr Chalklin, it is clear that at most only 57 per cent of the 1,572 persons in the parish actually lived in the town; the rest were country folk pure and simple, living two or three miles away at least, in the hamlets of Riverhead and Sevenoaks Weald. In a county of dispersed settlement, this population pattern must have been frequent: even more so, probably, than these figures suggest, since there were in reality more than three separate settlements in the parish of Sevenoaks, though all were grouped in one of the three 'boroughs' of Sevenoaks—Town or Upland, Riverhead, and Sevenoaks Weald—which were administrative divisions. In small market centres, moreover, like West Malling and Westerham, and in some of the larger ones no doubt, probably many of the 'townsmen' were themselves

farmers rather than tradesmen. Apart from the obvious cases of Canterbury, Rochester, Maidstone, Sandwich, and Dover, one wonders indeed how many of the numerous market centres of the county were strictly urban settlements. The problem of definition in such comparisons is more than an academic one.

In a book of this kind, the problem always arises of reconciling the claims of analysis and description, of facts and the problems underlying them, of the procrustean basis of provincial life and the form and shape of society moulded by it. Some readers may feel that Mr Chalklin has decided a little too much in favour of factual relation. There is much to be said for what has been called the "excellent low voice" of local study; but what does all the evidence, so interesting in its detail to the native, really mean? Mr Chalklin would have been justified, from the plentiful evidence he has marshalled, in sometimes drawing his conclusions more boldly. For example, he shows unmistakably the extent of woodland in Kent (p. 76), alludes to the last stages in its colonization (pp. 11–12), mentions the importance of heath, wood, and wasteland to the poor (p. 22), and the dependence of the iron industry on Wealden fuel. But the predominant place of woodland in the Kentish economy as a whole, which these fragmented facts suggest, does not emerge as clearly as the sources warrant. In the hand-made world of the Stuart era, wood was by far the most important raw material, not only for fuel but for building ships, houses, coaches, and wagons, and for manufacturing almost every kind of implement and utensil used by the farmer and the housewife. In densely peopled and well-wooded areas like the Weald, the whole way of life of many hundreds of craftsmen and husbandmen depended upon it, directly or indirectly, for daily work and seasonal by-employments.

Another problem arises in connection with Mr Chalklin's remark that the number of nonconformists in the diocese of Canterbury in 1676 was higher than in any other diocese in the province (p. 227). If this is correct,

without qualification, it poses a number of far-reaching questions. To some extent the figures are distorted by the quite exceptional foreign congregations of Canterbury (numbering 900 members in the 1630's), and of Maidstone, Sandwich, and Dover. But there is surely an important problem underlying the author's statement, especially when it is realized that in the Civil War puritans were relatively quiescent and few in numbers in Kent, in comparison with such counties as Suffolk and Northamptonshire. Where did they all come from? Or is the Compton Census wholly unreliable? The answer is in part connected with the distribution of nonconformity in the county, primarily in Canterbury itself, in the London suburbs, and in the clothing villages of the Weald (though not all of these were in the diocese of Canterbury). The Wealden area, in fact, had every predisposition in favour of nonconformity. Some of the parishes were enormous by southern standards; many inhabitants lived miles from their parish church; in winter they were sometimes isolated for months by impassable roads; and there were very few dependant chapels in outlying hamlets in the Weald, as there were in parts of the Pennines. In such circumstances there was every temptation to ignore the local vicar and listen to the itinerant ministers who preached in neighbouring barns and cottages, particularly after the Great Ejection of 1662. Like forest parishes elsewhere, moreover, those in the Weald were extremely populous, no doubt often with many new or migrant families in them, usually without any single dominant squire to control them, and often-times distinctly unruly. Based on the scattered and isolated hall-houses of farmers and clothiers, the social structure of the area bred a vigorous but insular and independent family life, closely integrated in structure, with sons, daughters, and servants lodged under the same roof as the family head and master. Finally, as Mr Chalklin interestingly suggests, the frequent journeys of the clothiers to the London cloth market, where they heard the city ministers, and in their inns met puritan traders from other counties, no doubt facili-

tated the dissemination of nonconformist ideas: just as the growing tribe of wayfaring merchants in general in this period encouraged the spread of puritanism in Northamptonshire and other forest areas. In short, it seems an over-simplification to think of nonconformity as a prominent native feature of the county as a whole. The truth is more complex, and more interesting.

Everyone who reads this book will hope that comparable studies of other regions may be undertaken. Many aspects of the social and agrarian pattern elsewhere have been analysed by Professor Hoskins, Dr Thirsk, Dr Kerridge, and others, and further surveys and monographs will help to highlight some of the comments in this book, and put others into perspective. One of the most pressing economic problems of English history is the force, extent, and effect of metropolitan influence in the provinces. In describing the attractive power of the London market, Mr Chalklin has of course relied heavily on Professor Fisher's work. The subject forms one of his two main themes and is obviously of great importance (p. 4). What we really need to know, however, is not simply the absolute figures of London's imports from Kent, which Professor Fisher and others have given us, but the *proportion* of London's supplies that came from Kent, and the *proportion* of the county's output sent to London. The latter figure can never be known exactly, but it was clearly sizeable in the rich cornlands of north-east Kent, though always subject to violent annual fluctuations and the vagaries of the local climate. Elsewhere, however, in the Weald, the chartland, and the downland, metropolitan demand can only have been marginal, save in certain isolated tracts of countryside, such as the hopfields around Maidstone. Poor or difficult soils, inadequate transport, and the small family-farm characteristic of much of the area did not encourage commercial exploitation. As for the proportion of London's imports that came from Kent, it is necessary to remember also the great seaborne corn-trade from King's Lynn and the Essex ports, the important overland

corn-trade, primarily from Hertfordshire, and, above all, the river traffic down the Thames from Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire, and Berkshire. Mr McGrath has suggested that the corn-trade by road and river was probably six times that of the whole coasting trade.¹ In 1573-4, admittedly an exceptional year, Henley-on-Thames alone sent three times as much corn to London as the whole county of Kent. By 1700, other inland shires had also become strong competitors: Northamptonshire, for example, was now regarded by some observers as the premier grain county in England, apparently shipping its corn crop principally down the River Nene from Peterborough.

These facts should make historians wary of attributing economic change in the southern counties exclusively to London. Even the demands of a town of half a million people were not inexhaustible. Though incomparably larger than other towns, London was, after all, no more populous than modern Sheffield or Dublin. For every person within it, there were ten or a dozen in the provinces to be clothed and fed. Though Mr Chalklin mentions that much Kentish produce was consumed locally, occasionally he seems to me to exaggerate the city's impact upon the county. For example, if the chief reason for the decline of the Wealden cloth trade was the high cost of labour, and if this was really due to competition from London (pp. 115, 122), why did the industry continue to flourish, and indeed expand, in areas equally subject to such influences, such as the borders of Essex? Why, moreover, were labour costs high in this area of the county where, from the remarkable density of the population, one would rather expect a surplus labour pool to develop? And why, if wages were so high in Kent due to metropolitan competition in the seventeenth century, were they so inadequate in the early nineteenth century as to cause some of the worst agrarian disturbances in England? The simple fact is that metropolitan influence varied greatly from place to place, within

quite narrow areas of countryside. This was inevitable in a country so intensely local in form as Stuart England. It was conditioned not simply by proximity to the city but by purely local factors of soil, climate, transport, social structure, rural economy, and village custom. In certain districts the force of metropolitan demand was all-pervasive. These areas were usually surrounded, however, by whole tracts of land where it was relatively weak and sometimes negligible. It was not felt equally all over the county of Kent because it operated within a society largely shaped by conditions of terrain, transport, and tradition unconnected with the capital: a society so shaped, so integrated, and so intractable as to respond only parochially and partially to the stimulus of metropolitan demand.

It would be quite wrong to suggest that Mr Chalklin ignores these problems. The regional variety within the county is evident in virtually every chapter of his book. But one puts the book down with the reluctant feeling that in economic matters the county by itself is not an altogether satisfactory unit of study. It is apt to be too diverse, too amorphous to hang together. Except among the administrative and political orders of society, it rarely developed an overriding sense of community except in time of crisis. This was less true of Kent than of some counties, for example in the Midlands. Amongst the upper levels of society, the shire had unquestionably come to form, by this period, a distinct community in its own right. Nor was the sense of county allegiance absent from the ranks of the poor: at times, in the Civil War for instance, it was intense. But the conclusion is inescapable that it was the village, hamlet, or town that formed the dominant social and economic entity in the minds of most ordinary folk, apart from the gentry. The inhabitants of Greenwich partook much more of London's way of thinking than of the outlook of Canterbury or the county of Kent generally. The basic fact that local historians have to work

¹ P. V. McGrath, *The Marketing of Food, Fodder, and Livestock in the London Market area in the Seventeenth Century . . .*, London M.A. thesis, 1948, p. 119.

on in this period is that English provincial society consisted of four distinct types of community: the village, the town, the county, and the society of wayfarers. Their task is to trace the origin, evolution, and interaction of these kinds of community upon each other. In Kent it is particularly necessary to recognize the variety of parish life within the pattern of the county community: just as it is imperative to realize the variety of what Namier once called these 'county commonwealths' within the community of the realm. For at the end of the eighteenth century, before the transport revolution had broken down the seclusion of local life, Hasted remarked, with characteristic native observation, that the soil of Kent "is so different in almost every parish that it is not possible to give any regular description of it": the variety of ground "is so great that it may almost be called from thence an epitome of the whole kingdom."¹

ALAN EVERITT

Ceres en Clio. Zeven Variaties op het Thema Landbouwgeschiedenis. [Ceres and Clio. Seven essays on Agricultural History. Written to mark the twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Studiekring voor de Geschiedenis van de Landbouw. (Study Circle for Agricultural History)]. Agronomisch-Historische Bijdragen, Vol. VI. H. Veenan & Zonen N.V., Wageningen, 1964. 235 pp.

It is extraordinarily difficult to write a review of a collection of essays such as is here presented without going to inordinate lengths. These seven essays deal with subjects widely separated in time, and their chronological diffusion is complicated by the fact that they also deal with different geographical areas of the Netherlands. Each is provided with a brief summary in English. The first essay by N. G. Addens deals with the shortlived 'General Royal Agricultural Society, 1856-63.' It was founded by royal mandate, and its purpose was to try to co-ordinate the work of the numerous local societies which had been formed with the object of persuading the

farmers to adopt better methods. At first the local societies joined the General Society, but after a while their enthusiasm waned, and they dropped out. This was quite a different idea from that which inspired the Royal Agricultural Society of England, a society founded by landowners and farmers and given the royal cachet later. The Dutch Royal Society only made a small direct contribution to farming progress by arranging trials, etc., in much the same way as other similar institutions. It does not seem very clear why it finally expired of inanition, but perhaps the attempt to synthesize the work of a large number of local societies of one kind and another was doomed to failure from the start. It is almost impossible to unify such disparate elements.

S. J. Fockema Andreae follows with an essay having a title which I would translate as 'Landowners and Land Use in a Dutch village', but of which the summary is headed 'Soil property, and exploitation in a Dutch village'. Possibly my choice of wording is the result of an incomplete appreciation of the nuances of the language, but the essay is an examination of the terriers relating to part of the village of Wassenaar between Leyden and the Hague. These are very voluminous, beginning in the sixteenth century and continuing to the nineteenth. The essay is illuminated by two short extracts, and indicates some of the changes in ownership and land-use described in the documents.

'Farm Bookkeeping in the Netherlands before 1900' is discussed in some detail by J. A. Kuperus. The technicalities of the different forms of farm account-keeping escape me, so I can say nothing about the merits of one system as compared with another. Here the practice as it fluctuated, the adoption of the system recommended by Albrecht Thaer in 1806, and its practice by van der Bosch in 1813, as well as the teaching of farm book-keeping from 1860 onwards are described, and a short list of various categories of accounts that have survived is added.

J. F. Niermeyer examines three charters of

¹ Edward Hasted, *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent*, 2nd edn, I, 1797, p. 266.

the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which are in the archives of the Praemonstratensian abbey of Berne in the Meierij, North Brabant, under the title 'Agricultural activities of the . . . abbey . . .' at the head of the summary. The charters seem to be in some disagreement about the legal status of the land, which appears to have been translated from a private estate to a monastic grange. This essay is completed by three transcripts.

J. M. G. van der Poel contributes an essay on 'The Cultivation of Madder', an important dye plant cultivated by the Zealand peasants. The article discusses the methods of cultivation, fertilizing, and harvesting of the crop. The tools and implements used are described, and some illustrations are provided. The crop, which had been a mainstay of the peasants from the Middle Ages, only fell into disuse with the coming of synthetic dyes in the mid-nineteenth century.

The accepted pattern of the medieval manor must be well known to all readers of this Review. Many scholars have devoted their time to the study of this subject during a long period of years, but there are still some open questions. Among these are the spread of the system, its adoption, and its variations in different areas. These are the questions that Slicher van Bath has tried to answer in relation to one small area of the Netherlands, the title of his paper being 'Manors in the Veluwe.' From the first recorded manor in A.D. 838 the system slowly developed its full dress order, but some of the estates described in the documents never functioned as manors of that kind. The essay is illustrated with sketch maps showing those which became fully-developed manors working on the well-known lines, and those which did not reach this standard, or rather developed in other ways.

The series of essays is completed by A. Verhulst on 'Sources and Problems of Flemish Agrarian History in the later Middle Ages.' This is of considerable value to scholars concerned with the general development of agriculture in West European countries, because it was in Flanders and in Northern

Italy that the cultivation of the fodder crops known to the Greeks, Romans, and Arabs, was introduced, and so laid the foundation for increased production. Other well known and widely-discussed problems are involved, and these are treated with careful reference to the rather massive modern literature bearing on them.

I fear that this is quite inadequate as a review of the publication, but too much space would have been occupied had I attempted a critical evaluation of each of these seven essays. *In fine* the *Studiekring* has produced, with the help of seven distinguished Dutch historians, a worthy memorial of its first twenty-five years of life.

G. E. FUSSELL

CARLO PONI, *Gli Aratri e l'Economia Agraria nel Bolognese dal XVII al XIX Secolo*. Zanichelli, Bologna, 1963. viii + 274 pp. L 4,000;

CARLO PONI. 'Ricerche sugli inventori Bolognesi della macchina seminatrice alla fine del secolo XVI', *Revista Storica Italiana*, Anno LXXVI, pt. ii. 1964.

Bologna has a distinguished heritage of didactic treatises on farming beginning in the thirteenth century when Petrus Crescentius produced his *Liber Ruralium Commodorum*, an attempt to put before the agriculturists of his time the precepts of the classical writers, together with additions made by Arab scholars who had preserved their writings. This he did with rather more elaboration than Walter of Henley, his contemporary. Carlo Poni is not, of course, writing a textbook of farming: but it must be emphasized that he has a complete understanding of the technical processes he discusses, and their relation to the social organization that perhaps derived from them or perhaps dictated them. His knowledge of the contemporary sources, textbooks, and periodicals as well as of documents, seems impeccable. With such a background he makes an attempt to connect the social and technical developments in a combination which the Americans call technology and culture. It is something I have often been pressed to

attempt, but have found impossible because of the vastness of the task and the shortness of life. Signor Poni is not deterred by such considerations. In the very first sentence of his preface, he states categorically a fact that needs little emphasis for Italy, or indeed for other countries. The history of the technology of production has few students in Italy, he says, and indeed it is only in very recent times that this aspect of living has been studied by other peoples. Historians are apt to concentrate on the history of inventions, and to omit the economic and social results, except perhaps in connection with the industrial revolution. This was an obstacle to Poni's own work.

Something that emerges very clearly from this work is that Italian farming in Bologna was very different from the English practice, and, indeed, from that of Germany and the northern half of France. Two patterns of plough were used in the Bolognese plain in the seventeenth century. Both were very ancient. The *pio* had only one mouldboard, and oddly enough, according to the illustrations, this was often fixed on the left side so that it turned the furrow to the left, and not to the right as in this country. It was used for making the seedbed. The *ara*—"aratro a due orecchi per seminare"—was a double mouldboard plough used for covering the seed. It was the veritable plough of classical times with *duas aures*. Apart from the difference in the size of ears, it was what is known as a ridging plough. Both types were fitted with wheels and were hauled by two or more oxen. A great deal of cultivation was also spade work. But the *ara* was sometimes used for preparing the seedbed, and a controversy raged about the relative merits of the two types until well into the nineteenth century.

The system of tenure was share-cropping, and the *mezzadri* and *padroni* were often at odds about the methods of seedbed-preparation and cultivation generally. The peasants wanted to reduce the hard manual labour, and the landlords wanted the biggest return, which they insisted was obtained by spade

culture, especially for the main cash crop, hemp. The advantages and disadvantages were discussed at length in the contemporary literature from the seventeenth century on. Signor Poni examines the sources closely, and describes in detail the different systems of working with the two sorts of plough, and the modifications introduced as time passed. He does not indicate what crop rotations were followed, placing far more weight upon the effect of introducing better implements, which was a very slow process. Steam cultivation does not appear to have been widely used after its introduction, mainly, I suppose, because of the small size of the holdings. An odd use of balance ploughs hauled by oxen through a system of cables and anchors—similar to the so-called roundabout method of steam cultivation—was adopted by some peasants. This was certainly an ingenious adaptation, which probably added to the haulage power of the oxen. Comparative trials of various kinds of ploughs were made in the nineteenth century, and eventually led to the introduction, at least on some farms, of modern patterns. Steam cultivation was tested on the vast Torloni estates.

A special adaptation was made to some ploughs which made it possible to carry out a sort of trench-ploughing, and so did away with the necessity for spade work. It is estimated to have reduced the hard work by one-third. The area under hemp was very largely increased. Some modification in the relation between landowner and peasant must have resulted. The technical advances were accepted because their use, as in other places and for other crops, made for better yields and higher money returns.

In his researches into the invention of a seed drill by Bolognese inventors of the sixteenth century, Signor Poni has cleared up a problem that has existed for a long time. Tarello had apparently been granted a patent by the Venetian Senate in 1566, though some doubt may be felt about whether his proposed machine was actually produced. Cavallini's invention was described by Canon Segni in 1602. By a close study of Venetian archives

and those of Modena, as well as of the secondary sources, Signor Poni has been able to describe Cavallini's struggles for recognition and the claims of Fieno to have produced a similar machine. But, alas, all that is known of the second inventor's production is that it was proposed to use oxen to haul it. There were insuperable social and economic obstacles to the adoption of the machine. The main difficulty was the share-cropping system (*mezzadria*) on which so much Italian farming was based. The peasants were too ignorant to follow the progress of technical development, and, I suspect, too poor to buy the things if they were not. There were also some faults in the designs as there are so often in the initial pattern of any machine. It can, however, readily be allowed, as Signor Poni argues, that the seed drills of Cavallini and perhaps that of Fieno, must have had some influence on the researches and experiments made in the following century by Locatelli, Worlidge, and Tull.

In Italy some efforts were made in the second half of the eighteenth century to design a seed drill after the Tull pattern, known through the works of Duhamel. Some gentlemen experimented with this method of sowing seed, but though they tried hard, and had introduced some interesting modifications of the Tull-Duhamel design, they did not achieve the desired result, for which they once again blamed the stupor of the peasants. Signor Poni argues that the invention of Cavallini's machine was an indication of the tendency in sixteenth century Italy to develop mechanical aids in order to reduce the demand for severe manual labour. However this may be, his claim for Italian priority in the invention of the seed drill can hardly be disputed.

G. E. FUSSELL

MICHAEL CONFINO, *Domaines et Seigneurs en Russie vers la Fin du XVIII^e Siècle*. Collection Historique de l'Institut d'Etudes Slaves, XVIII, Paris, 1963. 311 pp., illus. In 1765 the Free Economic Society of St Petersburg was founded. Professor Confino has used the seventy-two volumes of the

Works issued by the Society between its foundation and 1820 as the basis for this impressive study in which he concerns himself, according to his subtitle, with agrarian structure and economic views. He starts by touching on the history of the Society, and describing the contents of, and contributors to, the *Works* which aimed to encourage farming and economy in Russia. The circulation of the periodical was never impressive. Confino estimates the number of copies distributed, including many free copies, at about 1,100 per issue. It would seem worthwhile to relate this figure to that of the number of gentry and other estate-holders in Russia in the late eighteenth century, probably at least a quarter of a million. Moreover, of the 246 contributors of material to the *Works* in the half-century under review, 42 wrote more than half the articles. Is such a group of gentry and bailiffs not likely to be a non-random sample, and how can one make allowance for this bias?

Nevertheless, ignoring such difficulties, we have here a very good description of the almost military organization, at least on paper, of the various ranks of estate administration, down to the level of the nominally elected peasant overseers. This hierarchical bureaucracy ensured close control of the enserfed peasantry on the estates, and was a means for continually mulcting the peasants, quite apart from the usual obligations of quit rent or labour rent. But, while stressing that eighteenth-century Russian landlords should not be accused of mental if not physical absenteeism, because the bailiffs took over when the landlord was absent, Confino does not seem adequately to deal with the 76 per cent of estates with less than 60 serfs in 1777. At this date 32 per cent of estates had less than 10 serfs; did the same sort of bureaucratic structure apply to these estates, or are they perhaps inadequately represented in the *Works*? Again, in giving reasons for the survival of peasant characteristics and values Confino mentions as the first factor, though he does not say it is the most important one, the size of the estate bureaucracy. As size in-

creased, more peasants had to be brought into the administration and, applying customary law, they mitigated the severity of the landlords' written administrative directives. This could scarcely apply to the third of estates with less than ten serfs.

Confino rightly stresses that large acreages, or large numbers of 'souls', did not necessarily mean large-scale production. The small-scale peasant unit was the basis of even large estates which remained in large part natural economies, not closely geared to the market. When landlords became aware of the possibility of increased income from marketing, in part due to a change in the general economic situation in the late eighteenth century, one result was a revival of labour rents. This curious phenomenon is excellently dealt with. The economic calculation of the contributors to the *Works* compared the virtually net income from quit-rents with the gross product obtained by labour rents even as late as 1810. Serf labour was treated as if it had no price; no overheads or capital expenditures were taken into account. But can one then go on to label this as "peasant accounting writ large" (p. 265)? It is no doubt true that the peasant also used no such economic categories, but even in a largely natural economy the aims of estate management can hardly have been the same as those on a peasant family farm. We would need to know a lot more about peasant economic concepts to be sure that they were in fact like this.

The great discussion of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries about the relative value to the landlord (and, hence, to the state) of quit rents or labour service was thus vitiated by this comparison of incomparables. It was also, as Confino points out, artificial; while landlords in their theoretical arguments always favoured labour services, in practice they instituted quit rents when the situation demanded it, and estates with both labour services and quit rents were common.

Professor Confino has raised many interesting problems in this carefully documented and detailed study and we must be particular-

ly grateful to have such a work available in a West European language. Oreshkin's little book, *The Free Economic Society in Russia, 1767-1917*, also published in 1963, is broader in scope, but it is in Russian only. At times, however, Professor Confino forgets that his readers may not know Russian and, quite apart from spattering his text with Russian terms, he sometimes transliterates, but fails to translate (e.g. pp. 74, 97, 98, 116, 175, etc.). This, of course, makes the book less easily understood by the non-specialist than it might have been. At the same time the sector of society dealt with may be somewhat narrower than the book's title and sub-title might be taken to imply. Nevertheless, this is an illuminating account of how certain estate-owners and administrators in eighteenth-century Russia viewed their world. It also provides insights into some aspects of the mental outlooks displayed in the early nineteenth-century discussion in Russia on whether serf or free labour was to be preferred.

R. E. F. SMITH

F. W. MAITLAND, *Township and Borough*. Cambridge University Press, 1964. x+220 pp., illus. 35s.

Students of agrarian as well as urban history have reason to be grateful to the Cambridge Press for this reprint. *Township and Borough* has a good claim to be regarded as Maitland's most brilliant work. It is based on the Ford lectures which he delivered at Oxford in 1897, fourteen years after the publication of Seebohm's *English Village Community*, a book which Maitland justly described as epoch-making. Seebohm had riveted the attention of historians on the old common fields and their social implications, and Maitland perceived the relevance of these to an inquiry into borough origins. He stated roundly that those who would study the early history of our towns have fields and pastures on their hands. Acting on this principle himself, he dealt at some length with the unenclosed town fields which formerly adjoined so many boroughs, adducing much interesting infor-

mation about those of Cambridge in particular. He believed that the transition from rural to urban habits, and the evolution of corporate personality among the townsmen, should be studied as two phases of one process; and in this book he showed future historians how to do it.

The publisher's note on the jacket refers to the author as "Sir William Maitland." It would have been pleasant to hear Maitland's own comment on this imaginary knighthood.

H. P. R. FINBERG

C. R. ELINGTON (ed.), *A History of the County of Gloucester*, Vol. VI. O.U.P., 1965. xxii+274 pp. £7 7s.

This is the first volume of *V.C.H. Gloucestershire* to appear since 1907. It covers the history of thirty parishes in the north Cotswolds, only two of which are not predominantly rural. Stow-on-the-Wold, which acquired a market in 1107, became in practice self-governing, and in 1604 secured a charter of incorporation. Moreton-in-Marsh, a later starter, had burgage-holders, a market, a port-moot, and a functionary styled a catchpole, but there its burgality ceased. Outside these two small market-towns, arable and pastoral husbandry have always been the principal source of livelihood. One parish, Westcote, still retains a partial survival of its old open-field system, in dramatic proximity to the airfield at Little Rissington.

The volume conforms to the familiar pattern of the Victoria County Histories. The feature of that pattern which finds least favour with historians nowadays is the division of the subject-matter into separate compartments: Topography, Manors, Markets and Fairs, Economic History, Local Government, Church, Nonconformity, Schools, and Charities. This makes it far from easy to extract a coherent picture; in reading of such a place as Stow-on-the-Wold one has constantly to refer from one section to another to make sense of the abundant information provided. It is of course much easier to assemble factual data than to construct an ordered narrative, and if the editorial plan were revised with

such a narrative in view we might have to wait much longer for each volume to appear. As it is, *V.C.H.* falls rather uneasily between two categories: it is much more than a work of reference, but something less than a finished history.

It is a pity that this volume went to press before the English Place-Name Society published its four volumes on the place-names of the county. They would have precluded such unlucky suggestions as that 'Æeoport' could have been Eyford (p. 74), and that the 'Hereforda' of a ninth-century charter was Harford in Naunton (p. 80). Here the author has relied on Dugdale, misquoting the place-name and supplying an erroneous date; the true date is 814, and the place is really Harvington in Worcestershire. He quite rightly takes the St Edward to whom Stow church is dedicated to be Edward the Martyr, not Edward the Confessor, but omits to quote the passage in Domesday Book which proves the point by its mention of a gift made by the Martyr's brother Ethelred II to this same church.

An interesting word which this reviewer has not met elsewhere is 'berridale', meaning a strip or strips in the common arable field, once part of the lord's demesne but now in the hands of a villager. This compound reflects a late use of *burh* in the sense of 'manor', which is well attested elsewhere, though not much noticed by lexicographers.

H. P. R. FINBERG

A. JEWELL (compiler), *Crafts, Trades, and Industries, A Book List for Local Historians*. Standing Conference for Local History (National Council of Social Service), 1963. 24 pp. 2s. 6d.

It is an encouraging sign that a book list of crafts, trades, and industries should now be published "for local historians" by the enterprise of the Standing Conference for Local History. It is noteworthy, too, that the compiler is the Keeper of the Museum of English Rural Life, an indication of the increasing part museums are beginning to play in the recording, interpretation, and even teaching of local history. The fashion for family and

institutional history that for long dominated local history studies has inhibited research into basic parochial economics and the workings of everyday existence. A bibliography like this means that the local historian now has conveniently at hand a carefully chosen, discriminating list of books capable of giving a broader understanding of the occupations on which the economy and social structure of his area is based. Its use in conjunction with a detailed scrutiny of purely local information such as documentary sources and collections in museums should materially assist authors in producing better-balanced local histories, in which every walk and condition of life is given its due emphasis.

The list is arranged under 17 main headings, for example basketry, charcoal-burning, glass-working, rope-making, textile crafts. Some sections are rather thin, usually because books do not exist, but others could be strengthened. Thus, to the section on enamelling, with one entry, might be added H. Maryon, *Metalwork and Enamelling* (London, 1954). Coverage is good for England and Wales, poor for Scotland (omissions are, e.g. J. A. Fleming, *Scottish Pottery* (Glasgow, 1923); J. Smith, *Old Scottish Clockmakers* (Edinburgh, 1921)), and non-existent for Ireland. In addition to the main headings there is a good index of over 120 occupations touched on by the books in the bibliography, including flint-knapping, coracle-making, intarsia, and par-getting.

Although Mr Jewell has been primarily concerned with books of general application, it would have been helpful if reference had been made, possibly in the foreword, to some of the periodical literature. The Irish lacuna could have been partly filled, for instance, by mentioning a journal like *Ulster Folk Life*, with its articles on straw-plaiting, rope-making, thatching, and smithing. Localized studies such as these also have a general value. The foreword rightly puts emphasis on a knowledge of craft terms and the dictionaries it mentions will normally lead the researcher to such glossaries and lists of technical terms as exist for his own district.

Crafts, trades, and industries do not by any means exhaust the subjects that ought to be included in local history studies, and one might express the hope that the Standing Conference for Local History will think of following up this excellent list by others of similar merit on, for example, fishing, farming, and vernacular architecture.

A. FENTON

R. J. FORBES, *Notes on the History of Ancient Roads and their Construction*. Adolf M. Hakkert, Amsterdam, second unrevised edition, 1964. xii + 182 pp.

This book is a reprint of a work which first appeared in 1934, but which the author has not found it necessary to revise, for, he says, "no essential new research on the techniques of ancient road-building was published after the original edition." Its interest to the readers of this review lies in directing attention once again to the neglected question of the origin and use of roads which linked farm with farm and farm with market. The feet of millions of men and beasts have worn some of them into deep lanes, yet one can comb a hundred documents without finding a scrap of information on the making of roads or the size or kind of burdens they carried.

Mr Forbes's book explores the technical aspects of his subject, and sets out all that is known so far about the materials and methods of road construction in prehistoric Europe, Malta, and Crete, in ancient Egypt, Palestine, and Mesopotamia, India, Greece, and the Roman Empire. Separate sections deal in turn with major traffic routes, processional ways, and city streets, and a bibliography accompanies each chapter. The author broaches some of the historical problems concerned with the origin, the upkeep, and the transformation of some roads from one use to another—from cattle tracks to pedestrian thoroughfares, from tribal paths to sacred ways which were later Christianized and placed under the truce of God—but he does no more than scratch the surface. Perhaps one day a historian will probe these questions more deeply and, while exploiting the valuable informa-

tion assembled by Mr Forbes on the materials and techniques of road-building, shed light

as well on the structure of the societies which built them.

JOAN THIRSK

NOTES AND COMMENTS (*continued from p. 24*)

or on the administrative records of large estates.

In this situation the University of Reading's Museum of English Rural Life believes that if research into this branch of farm economics is to be encouraged a central collection of historical farm records is essential, and it is now actively engaged in establishing a manuscript and microfilm collection of pre-1940 material, to be geographically representative of all farming regions. In addition, the Museum hopes to publish a special catalogue to include not only the items in its own collection, but also detailed information about relevant farm records in other repositories.

VETERINARY HISTORY

The Veterinary History Society was founded in October 1962, with the object of promoting interest in veterinary history by all suitable means, such as the sponsoring of meetings, publications, and exhibitions. From the outset the Society has been an integral part of the Faculty of the History of Medicine and Pharmacy and the Worshipful Society of Apothecaries of London. Membership of the Society is open to any person with an interest in veterinary history and forms of application for membership may be obtained from the Secretary, 32 Belgrave Square, London,

S.W.1. There is a single enrolment fee of three guineas payable to the Faculty and an annual subscription of 10s. 6d. payable to the Society.

GARDEN HISTORY

A Garden History Society was founded at a meeting held in London on 24 November 1965. Its purpose is to promote the study and the preservation of landscaped gardens, and its work will be directed towards compiling and maintaining an index of historic or notable gardens in this country (later to include those of other countries), encouraging study and research into horticultural history and publishing the results of such research in a quarterly newsletter and a *Garden History Review*, encouraging the formation of local study groups, and building up a library of photographs and slides of historic gardens. Mr H. F. Clarke of Edinburgh University, past president of the Institute of Landscape Architects, was elected president, and Mrs K. N. Sanecki (6 Cangles Close, Boxmoor, Hemel Hempstead, Herts.) honorary secretary. A leaflet about the society is in preparation and will be obtainable from the secretary, to whom anyone interested in joining the society should write for further particulars. The annual subscription is 2 guineas.