

Book Reviews

ALAN ROGERS (ed.), *The Making of Stamford*.

Leicester University Press, 1965. xiv+146 pp. 30s.

This interesting collection of essays came into being as a result of a bright idea on the part of the editor. Having heard that the Borough Council intended to celebrate the quincentenary of the granting of its Charter, he suggested that the celebrations should take the form, at least in part, of a series of lectures on the borough's history. The suggestion was accepted and the distinguished team brought together to give them received the support of the citizens of Stamford, four hundred of whom, on the average, attended the six lectures of the course.

The lectures are published here virtually as they were delivered. They do not claim (as the editor makes clear in his Introduction) to provide a history of Stamford: histories of Stamford have been steadily appearing from 1626 when the town clerk, Richard Butcher, wrote the first history of Stamford, and one of the earliest of all town histories to be written at all. But none of the local products attempted "to relate the history of the community; none places Stamford firmly within the context of English history." They were, indeed, examples of *local* history.

Mr Rogers's team of lecturers tries to rectify this. Professor W. F. Grimes writes on the Archaeology of Stamford, Mr H. R. Loyn on the Danish borough; Mr Rogers himself on Medieval Stamford, Dr Joan Thirsk on Stamford in Stuart times; Mr John Harriss on the architecture of the town, and Mr J. M. Lee on the nineteenth-century borough. Collected into a single volume, these separate and independent studies represent an excursion under expert guidance through the whole range of English domestic history, and though it must have been a strenuous experience for the four hundred Stamford citizens who listened to them, the adult classes who (it is hoped) use them as a basis for their courses will have been confronted with many

important general issues in their local context and also with a number of local problems of great general interest to which answers do not yet seem to have been found. Why for instance, should there have been a Stamford but not a Stamfordshire? Why, after the drama and splendour of the Middle Ages should it have suffered the anti-climax of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when it was described as a poor decayed town? How, after being a centre of international trade, did it contrive, in the eighteenth century, to adjust itself to the life of a market town and somehow learn to coin the piddling gains of the coaching and corn and cattle trades into the pure gold of Georgian Stamford? And of course, how far can the economic stagnation that descended upon Stamford in the nineteenth century (thereby saving its beauties) be laid at the door of Lord Exeter and his refusal, on political grounds, to enclose the open fields? The subject is a complicated one; more complicated, perhaps, than Mr Lee, who writes on it, would have us believe. Mr Stuart Elliott, who recently presented a Master's thesis on this subject, thinks that the evidence will bear a different interpretation. He argues that Lord Exeter's opposition to enclosure was actuated by the pursuit of purely dynastic and non-political ambitions, and that the fate of Stamford in the nineteenth century was determined by underlying economic factors which were outside Lord Exeter's control. Moreover, he suggests, other market towns in Lincolnshire were under the same influences and suffered the same fate. In spite of the six learned studies in this book, Stamford, it would seem, still has its secrets. All the more welcome, therefore, is the news, announced by Mr Rogers, that the Borough Council had already commissioned a larger study of the borough's history before these lectures were given. Would that some other towns we could mention were equally fortunate in the choice of their City Fathers.

J. D. CHAMBERS

GEORGE H. GREEN AND M. W. GREEN,
*Loughborough Markets and Fairs (through
 7½ centuries)*. Echo Press, Loughborough,
 n.d. 80 pp. 4s. 6d.

In recent years several groups of extra-mural students have been encouraged by enthusiastic tutors to produce short composite volumes on the history of their town or village. This little book is the joint effort of a W.E.A. tutor, a market manager, and a group of 17 students at Loughborough. It is not quite the first history of the markets and fairs of an English town, as its authors tentatively suggest; others have appeared for York and Preston, and there have been a few regional studies, such as G. A. Tupling's account of the markets of Lancashire. But the work of Mr Green and his group is a pioneering effort in the amount of detail it has brought together. It makes no pretence to literary merit; it would have been easier reading if the material had been more thoroughly digested; but it is written with sympathetic understanding of the locality and its characteristics. The authors have shown that, despite the poverty of our records of internal trade in England compared with overseas commerce, much can be pieced together. And much ought to be, since for centuries the market town was the hub of provincial life. Anyone familiar with W. H. Hudson's account of what Salisbury meant to the villagers of the Wiltshire Plain at the turn of the century, in *A Shepherd's Life*, will realize how great a tract of English history still lies here virtually unexplored. Loughborough is not a prepossessing town; but it is one of a number in the Midlands, often poor in architecture but rich in life, whose markets are an unforgettable spectacle. The jostling crowds who throng the market places of Leicester, Northampton, Newark, and Grantham still go about their business with the same utterly unselfconscious absorption as their forebears under the Tudors.

Loughborough's earliest market grant dates from 1221, in that expansive time when markets were being founded in hundreds all over England. Altogether at least 31 medieval

markets were founded in Leicestershire, though only six or seven have had a continuous history to the present day. Most of these 31 are mentioned in the authors' informative notes on pp. 7-11, although Stapleford seems to be omitted and Harborough (founded, as Professor Hoskins has shown, by 1203) is incorrectly attributed to the fourteenth century. In some cases little evidence of original status survives except a street-name, such as the Market Places still extant, though now empty, at Belton, Kegworth, and Shepshed. Loughborough has been more fortunate. Although it has lost its Huckster Row—the line of shops and booths which developed on an island site in the market place, as in so many towns in the time of Tudor expansion—its streets still include a Market Place, Baxter Gate, Wood Gate, and Cattle Market, whose names indicate their commercial origin. Such names are sometimes an important clue to a town's development. The wool trade, of which Loughborough was a flourishing centre in the fifteenth century, does not seem to have left a memento; but the cattle trade which succeeded it, and for which Leicestershire was famous, is commemorated in the Cattle Market, where Robert Bakewell and other famous Hanoverian figures sold their livestock.

Possibly quite as important at Loughborough was the trade in corn and malt. This seems to have been the occasion of the interminable toll dispute in which, like so many corn-markets, the town was involved in the seventeenth century. Until the navigation of the River Soar was carried up to Leicester, Loughborough was nearer than any other town in the county to a navigable river, apart from which no English market was likely to develop as a major entrepôt for grain. In all probability Loughborough's supplies came from East Anglia *via* the River Trent, as they did to Nottingham, Derby, Burton, and other north Midland towns. By the 1770's Loughborough's great trade in malt had fallen away to a purely local traffic; but the bakers of Leicester were still journeying to the town week by week to buy their grain, and the corn trade remained an important feature

of the town's commerce until Queen Victoria's reign and the advent of railways.

Long before that date, however, Loughborough's predominant characteristic had become its many inns, centres as much of trade and social activity as of eating and drinking. By 1770 there were no fewer than 43 inns and alehouses in the little Leicestershire town. Many of them were typically grouped around the market square, from whose breezy spaces they had attracted to their spacious chambers much of the town's trade in corn. A contemporary described this development as a recent one, due to the "artful management and iniquitous combinations of avaricious farmers." In fact there had been a general tendency all over England, from the latter years of Queen Elizabeth I onwards, for trade to leave the 'open market' and take place 'privately' in the halls and corn-chambers of provincial inns. On winter mornings a roaring fire and a pint of ale provided a more genial atmosphere for big commercial transactions than the market square. More important, as trade expanded, dealers and factors travelled ever farther afield in search of customers or products; they naturally met one another and their prospective suppliers in the inns where they spent the night, and bargaining followed as a matter of course. Needless to say, innkeepers were quick to respond to their customers' requirements by supplying the facilities of trade: store-rooms for their goods, stabling for their horses, yards for their wagons, private chambers for their business dealings, sometimes rudimentary banking facilities, and, of course, all the information of a gossiping countryside to extend the channels of trade.

Quite apart from all this, the inns of Loughborough, like those of more sophisticated places, became the centres of every form of social activity for the farmers and gentry of the surrounding countryside. Assemblies, balls, concerts, florists' feasts, cockfights, property auctions, anti-slavery meetings, and a hundred other activities all took place in the comfortable rooms of the

George, the Anchor, or the Bull's Head, and all are recorded in that vast untapped source of provincial history, the advertisement pages of the local newspaper. What a world it was, so full of uninhibited vigour and vitality, so rooted in its region, so full of individuality and independence! It was just such a world that George Eliot depicted in *Middlemarch*, for it was the same environment that had given her birth, not many miles away, at Nuneaton. All the more saddening, then, to read of recent proposals to banish Loughborough's market from the historic spot where it has been held for seven-and-a-half centuries, and substitute for it a municipal square, with seats, fountains, and flowerbeds. The town will then be able to vie with its nondescript neighbours in respectable inanity: and the bourgeois revolution which in 1926 transformed its toll-gatherer into a Market Superintendent will be complete.

ALAN EVERITT

SIR FRANCIS HILL, *Georgian Lincoln*. Cambridge University Press, 1966. xvii+336 pp. Plates. 8os.

"An old, dying, decay'd, dirty city," reflected Defoe in 1719, "yet it stands in a most rich pleasant, and agreeable country." He recognized a short vestibule of urbanity between cathedral and castle but the splendours of the medieval city had been draining away ever since the somewhat mysterious collapse of the city's wool trade and cloth industry over a century before. Lincoln probably never seemed more sterile or decrepit. The Restoration had led to some building of gentlemen's houses, but to almost all other appearances the urban economy was nearing stagnation. Without the response of the slowly improving countryside to distant demands for wool, meat, and corn, it would probably have gone soon into deep decline. The power of the surrounding farmland to restore the city's prosperity was scarcely yet regarded even as latent, but imperceptibly this capacity did become specific, the cathedral city was redeemed by its markets, and these became the dominant influence not only on the economy of the

town but on the whole structure and disposition of its society. The chief theme of this brilliantly lit account of Lincoln's scramble out of moribund glory concerns the way in which this economic renaissance remodelled the social hierarchy of the town, inflected its politics, and changed its very geography. It is the third volume in what is already the most remarkable piece of individually sustained research and writing to have been directed at the whole history of a single English town in this century.

On the left bank of the Witham, where it pierces Lincoln Edge, the elevation of the city which Defoe inspected rose two hundred feet within half-a-mile to reach the minster, the castle, and the gentry—to a hilltop occupied by a provincial microcosm of upper class society, a community which, its own frivolities apart, bestowed leadership, patronage, parliamentary representation, and a certain propriety, on the city at large. Under the hill, across its flat back, and on the right bank lay *congeries* of market streets and lanes, mean churches, shops, inns, port facilities, piggeries, the multiplying poor, tradesmen, civic officials—all the paraphernalia, smells, and pursuits of a market town hemmed tight by fields. Somewhat imprecisely defined though they are here, each community had its own social distinctions; but none was so indelible as the division between them. Nor did the middling and lower orders make the ascent when turnpikes gave the gentry their opportunity to vacate the Hill more than seasonally late in the eighteenth century, and to abandon it to clergy, convicts, and genteel women. The centre of gravity of local power, if not of prestige, slid instead downhill, where it was to be anchored during the Victorian period. The turnpikes were first to subdue Lincoln's extraordinary insularity; sluggishly the stage-coaches followed; but it was the scouring out of the ancient Fosdyke and the Witham itself which threw down the real barriers. They not only attached the city to the whole vale of the Trent and thence to the West Riding in one direction and to East Anglia and London in the other, but centred the county's diverse

agrarian economy more emphatically on Lincoln itself.

The discussion of these crucial innovations, derived as it is from some important new sources, is often illuminating, particularly on the competitive tensions they produced with other towns and between agrarian and mercantile users of water. The skill with which the author has squeezed significance from other scraps of information—more sure-handedly on matters of poverty than of progress—is also at times very discerning, and distinctly reminiscent of the great Clapham. But it is something of a paradox in a book of this kind to have the agrarian economy of the region better handled than the urban economy of Lincoln itself. Though somewhat more penetrating here than the earlier volumes, the author has still not been able to conjure from the sources open to him very much about the ordinary life of the town. We can recognize its *quartiers* but know few addresses; the letters and reminiscences of abovehill society give gossip its head and politics its feet; but earning a living does not come so vividly through the civic records and family papers, despite their impressive range, and the image of belowhill society is left rather smudgy and faintly magisterial. There is some unevenness, too, in contextual reference. The interconnections between city and shire come through clearly on several levels, but the author is much more diffident over placing economic and social developments in their national setting than he was in treating the evolution of the borough and Lincoln's rôle in the Middle Ages: there are a few telling glances at other towns, but no sustained comparisons. For a city set so plainly on a hill it is a pity, too, that its physical mutations should not have been examined and mapped with something of the passion that marked the author's first volume, a regret made sharper by the fine contemporary drawings of some late-Georgian streets reproduced in the plates. What is unquestionably authoritative is the painstaking record of authority itself. The focus is now on the decline of the old corporation, losing control of its own affairs but uncontrolled by the towns-

people at large. Yet how unlike the Webbs' stereotype of an association merely of producers it had become long before its reform in 1835!

Within its own limits this volume must be regarded as a distinguished and scholarly achievement, somewhat more analytical than its predecessors, and its author as a quite outstanding and intrepid amateur historian. His grand design began to unfold almost absent-mindedly: yet *Medieval Lincoln* (1948) and *Tudor and Stuart Lincoln* (1956) have been occupying the author for forty years and now he promises to make a quartet with a final volume on Victorian Lincoln—all this in the midst of a busy professional and public life on the spot. It should have a peal of bells.

H. J. DYOS

M. A. HAVINDEN (ed.). *Household and Farm Inventories in Oxfordshire, 1550-1590*. Historical Manuscripts Commission, H.M.S.O., 1965. viii+366 pp. 100s.

In this volume we have the transcription of 259 manuscript probate inventories from Oxfordshire, now housed at the Bodleian Library. The earliest is dated 4 February 1550, the latest 16 January 1591; four inventories were undated. Wills and inventories are usually very rewarding sources for agricultural history, but relatively little of this kind of material has so far been printed, certainly for the period before 1600. Thus Mr Havinden and those who helped him (their names appear in his Editorial Note) deserve our sincere thanks for adding to the collection.

As to the geographical distribution of the material within Oxfordshire, "almost every other village on average" (p. 4) is represented by at least one inventory. While about half the county's parishes are thus included, a little more scrutiny should be given to the statement that the inventories "come from a fairly even distribution of villages and towns throughout the county." Some qualifications as to their uneven *density* are made, but perhaps not sufficiently clearly. The facts are that 105 inventories, or 40 per cent of the total, come from the extreme northern angle of the

county, north of a line from Deddington to Hook Norton, an area representing about one-ninth of the whole county. What really matters about this weighting in "the northern tip around Banbury" is that its parishes are represented *in quantity* in what was a special and distinctive variant of the kind of mixed farming practised in the county at large. Mr Havinden acknowledges this distinctiveness when he writes (p. 31) of the "fertile and densely populated red marlstone loams of the Banbury region." Studies of farming regions in Tudor England, notably by Dr Joan Thirsk, suggest that the Oxfordshire clay vales shared a type of mixed farming that was widespread in the Midlands. Farmers grew and sold the main cereal crops, almost half the sown land being under barley and a quarter under wheat; most of them reared cattle, some being fattened for the butchers, others being added to dairy herds; smaller numbers of sheep, horses, and pigs were also kept.

In the variant found around Banbury, however, corn and pulses were used to fatten cattle which could then walk to market, e.g. to London. This was a sensible response in a geographical location which put the region at some distance from water transport down the Thames. (This may be the answer to the point made about the fewness of dairy cattle (p. 39), as distance from river carriage as well as nearness to a town market could affect the farmers' interest in butter and cheese production.) There were also good-sized flocks of sheep, and farmers made most of their money from beef, wool, and mutton. It would be interesting to tabulate the Banbury region's inventories against those for the rest of Oxfordshire.

Mr Havinden's concise analysis of, and commentary on, the inventories runs to forty pages. Its composition may be summarized as follows, each item being given in order of magnitude: Houses (i.e. vernacular architecture), thirteen pages, seven of them consisting of statistical summary tables; what might be termed the agrarian status and occupations of those whose inventories are

printed here, eight pages; a comparison of living standards between the 1550's and the 1580's, eight pages; farming ('The size of farms', 'Crops', 'Livestock'), seven pages; general discussion and scene-setting, four pages. Mr Havinden hopes "that readers will wish to study the inventories in more detail for themselves", so let us begin with something prompted by remarks in fact made in the introduction itself. This is fair play, because, as he says, "it has not been possible to comment on all the details contained in these absorbing documents." Consider the rôle of meadow land and hay-making in Tudor Oxfordshire. Mr Havinden is in good company when he ignores the hay-crop, so many agricultural historians having established the precedent for him! We are told that in many open-field (should this be 'common-field'?) villages "the supply of meadow and pasture land on which the livestock fed were (*sic*) scanty" (pp. 35-6). In certain manors the meadows and enclosed pastures made up only 10 to 20 per cent of the farmed land, and although their areas of common pasture are not known, "it is clear that grass was in short supply." (Incidentally, common grazing over Port Meadow may well have had a bearing on the Wolvercote farmer's regime, p. 34). Obviously these were manors untouched by the drastic and localized enclosure that led to the destruction of no fewer than 100 Oxfordshire villages, chiefly during the century after 1420. The whole question of grazing and livestock must be approached with this phase of early enclosure in mind, but even if we simply take these inventories at their face value, some rethinking may be indicated.

For instance, a surprisingly large number of farmers had a hay-crop. If we examine at random the last 59 inventories (i.e. no. 200 and all those following), we find that hay figured in 23 of them, i.e. in nearly 40 per cent of the cases. In the majority, moreover, hay is specified in its own right, not simply merged as "corn and hay" together. "A stack of Hay" could be worth as much as £1 out of a total estate of £8 (no. 241), or "Hay in the house and the rick" worth £2 (no. 251). In

some cases it stood in quantity in stack, rick, cock, or parcel; in others it was stored in hay-loft or hovel; it might even be just "a little hay fodder" (no. 223). It seems to have been fed to all kinds of animals: no. 205 records a large flock of sheep "with hay for them"; hay was stored in the loft over the stable (no. 238), and in the ox-house in no. 246 (this man also had a hay-loft). Attention should also be given to the seasonal incidence of references to hay; in this sample of 23 inventories, they ranged from 30 July, at the earliest, to 13 April at the latest; ten of them ran into the period January-March, when the need for hay was at its most stringent.

The Glossary of terms that crop up in the inventories is very useful. To see how adequately it covered the large span of 'problem words', three inventories were selected at random (nos 7, 76, 152) and their contents checked against the Glossary. It was found that only the following words were not treated: 'baken', 'upstone', 'coperye ware' (very common in the inventories in general), 'kyver' (twice), 'hackney Saddle', and 'cesterne'. In view of the frequent inclusion of cisterns in the inventories, and their rôle in this malting country, perhaps they should be given. One or two minor queries and spelling mistakes may be noted: grease (p. 326); coarse, Tournai (p. 323); is 'sorrell' obsolete (p. 333), or 'ted' dialect (p. 335)? Arras is in Artois (p. 317), and 'Caulses' (p. 260) should be 'Caulfes' (i.e. calves). While we are told that wagons began to appear in Oxfordshire after 1650 (p. 32), a 'Waynebedd' was listed with the other implements in Richard Busby's inventory (no. 251), in 1590. "The poles at the hoppe yarde" are mentioned as being "at the Rivers syde" at Witney in 1590 (p. 307).

F. V. EMERY

A. M. EVERITT, *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion, 1640-1660*. Leicester University Press, 1966. 356 pp. 35s.

The Civil War came in the middle of the great age, three centuries long, of the English counties. To all but the small minority who lived in a large town or city, the county was a

unit as significant, practically and emotionally, as the country: indeed the two words were not always clearly distinguished. The alliances, rivalries, and ambitions of the gentry were largely circumscribed by county boundaries, within which they dominated every political and judicial activity. Inevitably the county was and is the most relevant unit of local history; and most of them can add to the massive volumes on the manors and parishes a humbler work on the Civil War. Usually the battlefields, the garrisons, and the heroic decisions have been all-important: it is only very recently that the effect of the war on county government and county society has become a subject for serious and comparative study. Dr Alan Everitt has already established himself as the leading authority on the County Committees. Now, taking his earlier monograph on the Committee of Kent as a core, he has built round it the first thoroughly documented study of the community of a county throughout the twenty-year upheaval.

By 'community' he means the rulers, in the broadest sense—the gentry and those who contrived to share their power and move in their political sphere. It is dangerously easy to assume that the community was everywhere much the same. One of Dr Everitt's great merits is that he knows other counties well enough to make confident comparisons. Kent had exceptionally many gentry, three-quarters of them with only one or two manors each. There was no dominant magnate like the Earl of Derby in Lancashire, no leading family connection like the Barringtons in Essex. More surprisingly, it was not closely involved with London. The notion that Kent belonged to a solid block of 'home' counties where London merchants acquired estates and from which county families most readily sent their sons to the capital for wealth and brides does not survive Dr Everitt's scrutiny. The community was self-contained, not very 'mobile', and devoted to decentralization even within itself: the ancient independence of the lathes asserted itself as strongly as ever in the wartime committee region.

Comparative isolation from London and from the main areas of battle did not mean that Kent had a minor part in Civil War politics. Few counties illustrate so well one of the principal themes of current studies of the conflict—that the fight between cavalier and roundhead was only one of a multitude of divisions. United opposition to Charles reached its peak in 1640: there was not much of the confident puritanism that in some counties helped it to move forward. It was conservative opposition, directed against the innovations of the personal rule and the Laudian church, led by the cultured and energetic but politically fumbling Sir Edward Dering.

Having introduced the Root and Branch Bill into the Commons without realizing what he was doing, Dering made amends by organizing the much-imitated Kentish petition of 1642, which called for a "solemn free debate" to settle religion and for the political compromises that were now impossible. By the time fighting began he had become a royalist, while many of his former allies among the top gentry were parliamentarians. Dr Everitt's analysis of this situation leaves hardly a surviving shred of the simple cavalier and roundhead story. There were three 'parties' (though he abandons the word in favour of 'groups') in the county. Much the largest was the moderates, "who shaded off into mild parliamentarians . . . on the one hand and mild royalists . . . on the other." The "genuine cavaliers and parliamentarians" were "hardly more than cliques." Perhaps the case is overstated a little: Kentish gentlemen "essentially in unison in their basic convictions" did not risk their lives or even their estates for the sake of groups into which they had "shaded off" if the only real difference was between two equally unacceptable extremist positions. But it is made clear how much the war itself, even in an area remote from most of the fighting, created both new enthusiasms and new doubts that led some to abandon neutrality and others to revert to it. While Sir George Soudes told how he "boggled" at the change from king-in-parlia-

ment to parliament-and-no-king, Dering in his distress at the godless life of the cavaliers and the court resigned his commission and submitted to Parliament.

If Dr Everitt is right the fact that Parliament controlled the county fairly effectively until 1648 depended largely on the quick invasion by Colonel Edwin Sandys with troops raised in London. Once the leading royalists were arrested or driven out, "many of the old county families" gave their tacit support to Parliament. The evidence about this and the other splits, detailed though it is, is impressionistic rather than statistical. Despite the notorious dangers of any counting of heads in ill-defined categories, we sometimes need clearer terms than the variants of "few" and "many." For the 170 families picked out as "dominant," or for the "genuine parliamentarians" who are said to outnumber the "older landed families" by at least six to one, there must be some lists that would help to test the claims.

Dr Everitt has little sympathy with either the uncompromising royalists or the puritans. The former, Lovelace among them, were "a group of angry and frustrated young men" of "precarious economic fortunes." Parliamentary initiative came from the "malcontents" of Wealden wool villages, from "scattered groups of minor gentry," and from men of "violent temperament," notably Sir Anthony Weldon, the bitter expelled courtier, and Sir Michael Livesey the comparative newcomer outside the family network. The story of their struggles on the County Committee bears out the unidealistic view of the original division. It is here that we can see, and to some extent measure, the cleavage within the parliamentary side between those who came to support an all-out centrally directed war and those who continued to seek peace and the preservation of county society. It coincided demonstrably, though of course not simply nor rigidly, with a social division. One difficulty in presenting this conclusion statistically is that what changed was not so much the listed membership of the committee as the active 'core'. The leading county names were re-

placed in leadership by those of parochial gentry, townsmen, and lawyers. But the work of any institution becomes for some men an end in itself, and throughout the war a good many moderates continued to work alongside future regicides. Weldon, finding at last an outlet for his political skill, worked hard to hold the committee together. The eventual take-over by the extremists was strikingly similar to events in some—we cannot yet say how many—other counties. But Kent was unique in the complete defection of moderate parliamentarians that made possible the rebellion of 1648. This first act of resistance by a county community to the half-established parliamentary government deserves the detailed treatment it gets. It repeats in yet another key the theme of the conflict between national and county loyalties. But it showed also how much the solidarity of the county community itself had been broken: Kent remained predominantly hostile to the republic and the protectorate, but too weak and divided to rebel any more.

Seeking the 'deeper causes' of the failure in 1648, Dr Everitt mentions casually the blame put on the "yeomanry and poor labourers" who deserted the rebels to return to their homes and families. It is one of the few occasions when such people appear in the book at all. True, the subject is the propertied community. But the attitude of tenants and labourers to the war, and the effects of the war on their fortunes, must have been very much in the minds of the gentry who depended on their labour and their loyalty. A good deal of Dr Everitt's material comes from the Commonwealth Exchequer Papers which can yield a lot of information about the burdens imposed on all but the very lowest levels of society. And in 1648, in the "rising not of a single clique or class" but of a "whole countryside" their actions are well documented. Perhaps some day Dr Everitt will turn back to Kent and give us a supplementary chapter on the men who wielded the muskets while their horses were stolen, their crops ruined, their security threatened as much as that of the gentry. But the book as it stands

is a major addition to seventeenth-century studies which ought to be the model for many more.

D. H. PENNINGTON

M. A. HAVINDEN, *Estate Villages: A Study of the Berkshire Villages of Ardington and Lockinge* (with contributions by D. S. Thornton and P. D. Wood). Percy Lund, Humphries, for the University of Reading, 1966. 210 pp. 50s.

This is an interesting and unusual study in great depth of a remarkable phenomenon in the English countryside of the recent past—Lord Wantage's Berkshire estate in Ardington and Lockinge. Here was a large compact estate built up as late as the second half of the nineteenth century, where in the agricultural depression of the 1880's and 1890's the bulk of the property was taken into hand by its owner and managed as an experiment both in large-scale estate farming and in social welfare.

The last four chapters of the book are concerned with the development of the estate since 1945, its system of farm management, and the adaptation of agricultural production to recent conditions, followed by a detailed study of the present social structure of the villages, the living standards of the inhabitants, their incomes and housing, mobility of the population into and out of the area, and their educational facilities and social activities.

All of this makes absorbing reading and readers of this journal will find much of interest in the account of recent trends, but the earlier chapters are, of course, more directly relevant to historians. After details of the physical environment of the villages and their local communications, there follow chapters dealing with the villages' early history, enclosure, the structure of landownership in the nineteenth century, and the building up of the estate by the Loyd-Lindsay family. When the depression struck, the effects were disastrous: the net rental fell from £44,000 to £12,000 and many tenants gave up their farms; by 1895 Lord Wantage was farming nearly

13,000 acres. In Ardington and Lockinge the home farm expanded to some 4,000 acres and included all but one of the farms in the two parishes. But by making economies in working the land, by developing the livestock enterprises, particularly the fattening of cattle and the Lockinge stud, and by accepting a return on his capital less than might have been obtained in other fields of investment, Lord Wantage kept his estate afloat.

This achievement meant a great deal to the inhabitants of Ardington and Lockinge, and indeed it is clear that Lord Wantage based on the expansion of his home farm and its viability as an economic organization his schemes for the improvement of life in the villages. He believed that the farm workers ought to have "a practical and tangible interest in the successful workings of the farm." To this end he encouraged the men to comment on the cultivation of the land, and began a rather ill-fated profit-sharing scheme. Believing also that the rural population should be the farmers' best customers, he successfully established a village bakery and a co-operative retail store. The one village inn was run by Lord Wantage through a salaried manager, who was required to provide soup, coffee, and tea as well as alcoholic refreshment; and the profits of the inn went to pay for a reading room and street lighting. In addition, he provided model housing, allotments, and a savings bank, and opened a Friendly Society branch. Although many of his innovations have now disappeared or declined in importance, the tradition of providing for the welfare of the workers on the estate has continued to the present in the form of rent-free cottages and small cash pensions for retired workers of long service. Of course, the obtrusive paternalism of Lord Wantage had its critics and there was a certain loss of individual independence and political liberty; but the compensating gain in economic and social security in a peculiarly difficult and uncertain period must have been enormous.

Not all readers will agree with the author's interpretation of national developments in wages, working conditions, and the Poor Law,

where these are sketched in as background, and the section taking the story on from the very fully treated late nineteenth century to the detailed examination of the estate and villages in the post-1945 era seems by contrast thin and sketchy. But these are minor weaknesses which do not seriously affect the value of the study as a whole.

The book is lavishly illustrated with photographs, maps, and diagrams, and the detailed findings are admirably set out in numerous tables. Such a well-produced and attractively printed volume must be reckoned a bargain as books go today, but even if this were not so this study would still constitute essential reading for all those with a serious interest in the period, and indeed for anyone interested in village life over the last hundred years. Mr Havinden and his collaborators must be congratulated on producing so valuable and many-sided a picture of their Estate Villages.

G. E. MINGAY

A. H. JOHNSON, *The Disappearance of the Small Landowner*, with an Introduction by Joan Thirsk. 2nd edition. O.U.P., 1963. xiv + 164 pp. 21s.

To most of us, A. H. Johnson's *Disappearance of the Small Landowner* means the discussion, which it inaugurated, of the evidence of the land-tax assessments. As Dr Joan Thirsk reminds us in her Introduction, this was only part, and by no means the major part, of a wider study the significance of which deserves greater recognition than it has received. Johnson began his lectures with a reference to the difference in the distribution of land-ownership between France and Belgium on the one hand and Britain on the other and went on to declare that his aim was to "explain how and when this remarkable divergence occurred." It would be too much to claim that he succeeds in this ambition; but it would also be difficult to assert that his successors have advanced very much further. British agrarian history is only now emerging from the insularity which marked it when Johnson wrote; and the reissue of his book has a value over and above its intrinsic useful-

ness in drawing attention to the work that has still to be done. The field is sketched out in Dr Thirsk's Introduction, and it is hoped that this clear directive will not be lost now that agrarian history is at last beginning to take its rightful place in the study of English social evolution. Johnson, of course, confined himself to the study of the legal aspects of estate consolidation; but he realized that customary practices of inheritance also had a part to play. On this only sporadic and mainly local investigations have been made since his day, but sufficient has been done to show that here is an unwritten chapter on the English peasantry, and one that has a bearing on the evolution of industry (as Dr Thirsk has herself shown) as well as on the distribution of land.

In most other respects, Johnson's book is a useful and stimulating but not necessarily a safe guide. On sixteenth- and seventeenth-century enclosures the modern student has a gentle—perhaps too gentle—warning by Dr Thirsk; and his account of eighteenth-century enclosures is distinctly dated. On the subject of land-tax assessments Dr Mingay has put us all in his debt by his recent article in *The Economic History Review* (Oct. 1964) where it is shown that while these documents remain a valuable source of agrarian history, they should not be made to bear the weight of statistical speculation that Johnson and his successors (including the present reviewer) have placed upon them. That is not to say that they can be ignored; on the contrary, to the village historian they are indispensable; and the agrarian historian must take account of the general picture that has emerged from them. Johnson would still be constrained to say, with Sheridan, as he said in 1908 "these damned facts are knocking the bottom out of my notions;" but he would be less prepared to advance precise statistical notions to take their place. As he so clearly demonstrated himself, the title of his book was a misnomer; the small landowner did not disappear and the land-tax assessments are an indispensable but imprecise aid to the study of his survival.

J. D. CHAMBERS

W. G. HOSKINS, *English Local History; the Past and the Future*. Leicester University Press, 1966. 22 pp. 3s.

This inaugural lecture falls into three parts, of which the longest and central section deals with currently important fields of local study, in two of which the author has himself been a pioneer. The page or two on town topography, or those on boundaries and hedgebanks—as might be expected—are vignettes of charm and reflective depth. But what has happened before and after? Perhaps it would be as well to advise the reader to turn first to the final two lines, rather like cribbing the dénouement of a thrilling novel in the early stages. It will be seen that Professor Hoskins, who has charmed and inspired so many thousands by his books, lectures, and broadcasts, still has his heart in the right place.

Turning back to the beginning, however, one may ask what the author is grouching about. Is it that no “massive contribution” has yet come from amateur effort? Is it that his own department has less spent on it than “the glass palaces” of new science blocks? Or does he need more than he realizes to get off his chest “the scandalous history of his native place”? Whatever it may be, he seems to be hitting out wildly at the work of the amateur local historians of the past with their interests so different from those of today’s historians. Involved in this cloud over amateur effort seem to be many currently active enthusiasts at the very moment when some of their work is being so successfully harnessed to professional schemes. One thought for a moment that Professor Hoskins had somehow left out of account the lively and devoted extra-mural work in progress all over the country: but the next paragraph showed that this was not the case.

Perhaps your reviewer has misunderstood some of the points, but it was not for want of reading the lecture several times over, so extraordinarily out of character did it seem in several places. After all, Professor Hoskins’s reputation is deservedly so great that he tends to be always—perhaps wrongly—taken as speaking *ex cathedra*. This is why it

seems necessary to go into some detail. The author praises his pioneering predecessor at Leicester for his work on Anglo-Saxon charters but makes no mention—was this intentional?—of Professor Finberg’s immensely influential Inaugural of 1952 which has caused so many societies and classes to clear their decks and chart new courses. One wishes too that Professor Hoskins had given his views on the jubilee project of the Women’s Institutes, which seems to your reviewer a magnificent and widely spread piece of amateur effort at its best.

Surely it is not amateurishness and class consciousness that have held local history back. We can be grateful for the help of any who have assisted in recording the past from any angle, however different their viewpoint from the changing contemporary one. Perhaps a greater influence has been the struggle for history of any kind to be accepted as an academic discipline, and, when accepted, its long immobilization in a national and constitutional mould. Professional historians—not least Professor Hoskins himself—are giving a lead now, and encouraging a widely spread amateur effort. Some historians have found enthusiastic support and speak with gratitude and affection of the work done by their amateur students and helpers, many of them, perhaps mercifully, never candidates for ‘O’ levels in G.C.E. Their contribution may not be ‘massive’, but there is a favourable climate of opinion now and many schemes can be undertaken which depend on the co-operation and participation of the people themselves, like the Leeds dialect studies. Tutors recognize how much their students contribute to and refresh their classes, knowing when to become students themselves for a while.

With this in mind, it seems nonsense to hold that class distinctions are putting a brake on local history. Indeed, this appears to be in the same class as Professor Hoskins’s Burnham Thorpe guide which your reviewer knows well, as laughter over it nearly involved him in a car accident some years ago. The computer, too, which the author seems to resent or perhaps to envy, can give much to the

study of demography, meeting the need to reduce multitudinous facts to order so as to provide generalizations of limited truth. The computer fortunately emphasizes the limitations by only working on the precise instructions fed into it. We certainly need investigation of the demographic facts: in the period 1584-1603 Professor Hoskins's ancestor had ten children, all of whom grew up and had families: a century before, Sir Henry Colet had twenty-two children, only one of whom grew up, imbued with a lasting sense of how precious children were. We need to know whether either was typical.

Is it still necessary to say that the local story can easily be independent of and different from the national generalizations? Comparatively few of the remoter villages—like Eyam, for instance—find themselves closely linked with events that reach the textbooks. And there is fortunately gossip to be found in odd places which throws light on reality in spite of there being no attempt at systematic record. Was it not outside a Buckinghamshire alehouse that two drunken women referred to Anne Boleyn as “a goggle-eyed whore” and were not prosecuted in spite of a council informer? There appears a deal of local and national history in such trivial incidents.

These notes and glosses will show how perplexing your reviewer found this lecture. In it he feels that the past is unfairly though accurately criticized, the present assessed with somewhat ungenerous hesitation, and the future presumed to be an extension of this last. It must be difficult to live up to *The Making of the English Landscape*, and this lecture is disappointing: it inadequately represents the dynamism which Professor Hoskins has infused, and no doubt will continue to infuse, into local history studies.

P. D. WHITTING

WILHELM ZORN, *Die Geschichte der Landwirtschafts-Wissenschaft in Schlesien*. Beiheft zum Jahrbuch der Schlesischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Breslau, II. Holzner-Verlag, Würzburg, 1964. 144 pp. No price stated.

Wilhelm Zorn taught in the agricultural department of the University of Breslau from 1908 to 1945 and was director of the institute of animal breeding and milk production. In 1945 he fled westwards with his ten best cows, some fine karakul sheep, and specimens of good seed stock. Until his retirement he worked in West Germany near his birthplace in the Allgäu but separated by two frontiers from the scene of his life's work which is now in Poland. He has written a sad work of piety and nostalgia in the form of a bare record of facts, places, professors, and subjects of study.

Research in Breslau helped to make Silesia an area with a food surplus. Before the eighteenth century farmers relied upon the lore of the old writers on husbandry, the so-called Hausväter, but in the eighteenth century experiments on horses, fine wool sheep, clover, potatoes, and sugar beet began. A sugar beet factory was built in 1802: the original sugar beet produced 1 per cent sugar, but as a result of research it now produces 18 per cent. In the course of the nineteenth century true agricultural textbooks were written, e.g. J. A. von Rosenberg-Lipinsky of Öls, *Der praktische Ackerbau*, 2 vols., 1862. In 1847 a 1,000-acre farm was used by the agricultural academy near Oppeln. A herd book was established. Russia and the West had much to teach the Silesians. In 1881 it was necessary to open a department in Breslau University using rooms owned by the local agricultural society. But this led to a drop in student numbers: Halle attracted the academic students, and few practical students went to the university. Interest grew when the philosophical faculty of the university encouraged agriculture. The institutes within the agricultural department multiplied, often directed by distinguished scientists, and specialized in general farming techniques, plant and animal breeding, agricultural chemistry, bacteriology, veterinary science, agricultural engineering, agricultural economics, and agricultural history (R. Krzymowski). A new university farm was obtained at Schwoitsch. By 1913 one-third of the students were Polish. In 1921 the agricultural department obtained its own premises, main-

taining its links with eastern Europe, and did much work directly under the Prussian agricultural ministry.

Professor Zorn enumerates a long list of teachers, pupils, technical assistants, and patrons, and follows their fates during two world wars. The generation that worked in

Silesia is slowly being depleted by death. Those that survived the flight work, for the most part, in West Germany, some few in East Germany. None remain in Poland, though Professor Zorn speaks kindly of the Poles who took over in Silesia.

D. J. DAVIS

NOTES AND COMMENTS *continued from page 112*

FUTURE CONFERENCES

Owing to the disappointing attendance at the last December conference it was decided not to arrange a conference this year, but to circulate the membership about the purpose

and frequency of future December conferences. The 1968 Spring conference will probably be held at the University of East Anglia, Norwich, from 8 to 10 April. Further details will be circulated later.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Julian Bartyś is docent in the Institute of Material Culture at the Polish Academy of Science, Warsaw. He has published many articles and books on the history of Polish farming from the eighteenth century to 1914.

Ian Beckwith, B.A., is Lecturer in History at Bishop Grosseteste College of Education, Lincoln. He is engaged in research on rural life and conditions in Lincolnshire, 1600-1914, and has in preparation an edition of the Gainsborough Court Leet Book, 1614-1714.

E. J. T. Collins, B.A., is an Assistant Keeper at the Museum of English Rural Life, Reading University, and is working on agricultural production in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

E. L. Jones, M.A., D.Phil., is a Research Fellow of Nuffield College, Oxford, and is also working on agricultural production in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

R. W. Sturgess, B.Sc.(Econ)., Ph.D., is a lecturer in economic history at Edinburgh University, and is carrying out research on English landownership in the nineteenth century.

Graeme Whittington, B.A., Ph.D., is lecturer in geography at St Salvator's College, University of St Andrews. He has published articles on strip lynchets and other agricultural topics, and is now working on the evolution of farm and field boundaries on the Isle of Bute.

ESSAYS IN AGRARIAN HISTORY

Volumes I and II

Edited by W. E. Minchinton, *Professor of Economic History, University of Exeter*

David and Charles (Newton Abbot, Devon), under the auspices of the British Agricultural History Society, will issue in January 1968 two volumes of essays on agrarian history covering the period from Anglo-Saxon times to 1950. They comprise more than twenty articles, which have appeared in various learned journals, and are considered to be major contributions to the subject written in the twentieth century. They cover a wide range of topics, including techniques of husbandry, landholding, prices, rents, and the course of agricultural prosperity. Among the contributors are J. R. Bellerby, H. J. Habakkuk, W. G. Hoskins, A. H. John, E. L. Jones, Gordon Mingay, M. M. Postan, F. M. L. Thompson, and Edith Whetham.

These volumes can be bought at a specially reduced price by members of the British Agricultural History Society. Order forms are enclosed in this issue of the REVIEW.

Books Received

- ADAMS, L. P., *Agricultural Depression and Farm Relief in England, 1813-52*. New Impression. Cass. xiv + 192 pp. 1965. 35s.
- CHRISTENSEN, AKSEL E. and DAHLERUP, TROELS, *Aasum Herreds Tingbog, Register, 1640-48*. Udgivelse af Kilder til Landbefolkningens Historie, Copenhagen, 1962. 104 pp.
- CHRISTENSEN, AKSEL E. and DAHLERUP, TROELS, *Aasum Herreds Tingbog, 1640-3; Aasum Herreds Tingbog, 1643-5; Aasum Herreds Tingbog, 1645-8*. Udgivelse af Kilder til Landbefolkningens Historie, Copenhagen. 290 pp. 1957; 104 pp. 1962; 352 pp. 1956; 318 pp. 1960.
- GISSEL, SVEND, *Sjællands Stifts Landebog, 1567*. Udgivelse af Kilder til Landbefolkningens Historie, Copenhagen. 260 pp. 1956.
- HANSEN, C. R., *Præsteindberetninger om Fæstegods M.V. I. Vendelbo Stift, 1568 og 1599*. Udgivelse af Kilder til Landbefolkningens Historie, Copenhagen. 304 pp. 1964.
- HILL Sir FRANCIS, *Medieval Lincoln*. Reprint. C.U.P. xviii + 488 pp. 1965. 70s.
- HØJRUP, OLE, *Levnedsløb. I. Sørbymagle og Kirkerup Kirkebøger, 1646-1731. I. Biografierne*. Udgivelse af Kilder til Landbefolkningens Historie, Copenhagen. 146 pp. 1963.
- KUMAR, DHARMA, *Land and Caste in South India. Agricultural Labour in Madras Presidency in the Nineteenth Century*. C.U.P. 212 pp. 1965. 45s.
- OLSEN, KAREN M., *Herlufsholm Birks Tingbog, 1616-19; Herlufsholm Birks Tingbog, 1630-33*. Udgivelse af Kilder til Landbefolkningens Historie, Copenhagen. 158 pp. 1954; 390 pp. 1957.
- PEDERSEN, OLE K., *Sokkelund Herreds Tingbøger, 1621-2; 1625-8*. Udgivelse af Kilder til Landbefolkningens Historie, Copenhagen. 360 pp. 1957; 340 pp. 1960.
- RASMUSSEN, POUL, *Skast Herreds Tingbog, 1640*. Vols. 2, 3, 4. Udgivelse af Kilder til Landbefolkningens Historie, Copenhagen. 128 pp. 1963; 192 pp. 1964; 256 pp. 1964.