

Book Reviews

B. P. WOLFFE, *The Royal Demesne in English History: the Crown Estate in the governance of the realm from the Conquest to 1509*. Allen and Unwin, 1971. 324 pp. £5.

This is a book for constitutional historians rather than agricultural historians; Dr Wolffe is more concerned with the *concept* of "ancient or royal demesne" than with its practice. His basic thesis goes like this: that unlike France there was no practical idea of a royal demesne in early medieval England; that it arose in the later twelfth century at the earliest for legal and fiscal purposes (indeed, that the concept arose largely for purposes of taxation helps to demonstrate Dr Wolffe's contention that English government was always based largely on royal taxation rather than on a substantial royal endowment); that even so, the royal demesne was never of great significance, financially nor politically, until the fourteenth century when the estates were expanded to endow royal offspring; that the idea that "the king must live of his own" (i.e. on the yields of his own estates) arose as a political slogan in the early fifteenth century in an attempt to escape increasing and increasingly frequent taxation under kings who as heirs to both the accumulations of royal estates and the inheritance of John of Guant, duke of Lancaster, appeared to be well endowed with landed property; that no king before Edward IV was able to make any significant profits from their estates, and that even then the reliance placed on revenue from this source could not be very great, although it was handled by the new machinery of the chamber.

This is not now very new; much of it has already been printed before by Dr Wolffe in the form of articles. (Their reappearance here as chapters in a book results in some unfortunate repetitions and other infelicities.) And the picture drawn, while convincing enough, is unsatisfying. Dr Wolffe has been led by two dominant aspects of his study—the king must live "of his own" and parliamentary acts of resumption—to isolate from the whole scene of English financial administration two relatively unimportant themes. Even on the latter,

where Dr Wolffe may justly be called the expert, some doubts over his interpretation arise. May not some of these acts, for example, have been intended by the government primarily as a means of increasing rents from lands already leased out?—they certainly resulted in such action on several occasions. And may not the newer systems of chamber administration be part of a wholesale changeover from government by assignment to government by direct livery? (It may be doubted, for instance, whether the fourteenth and fifteenth century Exchequer was ever intended to handle large sums of cash.) Dr Wolffe has dealt with two minor aspects of government finance, when what is needed is a new analysis, especially of the growth of special appropriations.

There is little in this book for those concerned with the practice of farming; even at the point where the methods of fifteenth-century estate management might be thought to have spilled over into Exchequer and household practice Dr Wolffe is disappointingly thin. There are a few tantalizing glimpses of the economic results of being on the royal demesne, but hardly anything on the changing methods of estate exploitation by the succession of government officials. The book is most valuable as a contribution to the growing discussion among medieval historians on government finances as a whole. But, as so often is the case with a thesis-turned-into-book, it is not even then the most easily read book.

ALAN ROGERS

KENNETH HUDSON, *Patriotism with profit: British agricultural societies in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries*. Hugh Evelyn, 1972. xii + 143 pp., illus. £5.25.

Founded in 1731, the Dublin Society (later the Royal Dublin Society) was the first of the agricultural societies which were established in the United Kingdom in the course of the following century or so. With the aristocracy (and where appropriate, the clergy) as patrons, these societies, usually founded at the prompt-

ing of men of exceptional enterprise and public spirit and composed almost entirely of the landed gentry, had as object the improvement of agriculture. Some were shortlived but some had a much longer period of existence while a considerable number are still functioning today. The range of activities obviously depended upon the wealth and size of the society. Their main function is seen to break down or reduce the resistance to change and in attempting to do so they used a variety of methods. Lectures were held both for members and for a wider public, transactions were published, which Kenneth Hudson suggests were not infrequently excessively technical and not capable of practical application. But the agricultural show, which requires careful planning for many months, and still continues today when some of the other activities have declined in importance, became the most important instrument of change. With the coming of the railway which made possible the movement of stock and machinery, the influence of the show greatly increased. But, as the societies continue to appreciate, the interest of the town dweller was vital to the success of the shows. Often associated with the shows, competitions were held and prizes instituted to encourage better husbandry. But the prizes awarded at shows did not always encourage the right development. The butcher wanted a lean pig to market as ham whereas the show judge favoured the fat pig. Other activities included libraries, exhibition centres, and experimental farms, which Mr Hudson argues provided "valuable experience for the new generation of scientists and experimentalists" who were employed by the societies. Stressing the importance of book-keeping, the societies provided a constant reminder that farming was a business as well as a way of life. But Mr Hudson usefully points out that the agricultural societies, while devoting considerable attention to crops, animals, and machines, paid little regard, in what was a labour-intensive industry, to the farm-workers themselves.

Like the good journalist he is, Kenneth Hudson has once again focused attention on an important but hitherto neglected subject but curiously ends his story in the late nineteenth century and does not bring it up to date.

Clearly owing its origin to an interest in his local society, the Bath and West, on whose archives he draws, Mr Hudson presents an impressionistic view of his subject within this short compass. Inevitably, therefore, in some directions Mr Hudson is forced to give an unduly condensed description of the course of events. For example, the cider research station at Long Ashton owed its establishment to dedicated propagandists like Radcliffe Cooke, pioneers like R. Neville Grenville who carried out experiments at Butleigh in Somerset, and finance from the Board of Agriculture as well as the interest of the Bath and West.

Since it would have been useful to have had some insight into the material on which this volume is based it is a pity that the bibliography lists only standard books and articles in agricultural history. And attractive as this book is, even in these inflationary days should a volume of about 150 pages be priced at £5.25?

W. E. MINCHINTON

WALTER ACHILLES, *Vermögensverhältnisse braunschweigischer Bauernhöfe im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Agrargeschichte, Band XIII. Gustav Fischer Verlag, Stuttgart, 1965. vii + 117 pp. DM 24. This is a subtle and interesting attempt to calculate the long-term changes in production inputs and outputs on peasant holdings in Brunswick during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, concentrating particularly on the period 1660-1800. Without direct data for working out budgets, the author uses marriage contracts and inventories to analyse changes in structure over the long term.

From the inventories, which were taken whenever a deceased household head left minor dependants, Achilles works out changes in the price of land. Between 1660 and 1800 it rose six times, with two sharp periods of rise in 1721-30 and 1791-1800. Throughout the period land values kept ahead of the price-rise of grain. In the eighteenth century production of grain and fodder rose by about 20 per cent, partly as a result of planting the fallow. This in turn allowed for an increase in the number of farm animals which could be supported. Taken together, total production figures would ac-

count for only a threefold rise in land prices.

There are a number of points made in the book which need to be investigated further. During the period under consideration, no class of peasant was favoured in the land market. Work animals were more important in the inventories than those raised for meat or milk. Over the long period there was a steady switch from beef cattle to milch cows. The smaller peasants had more animals per unit of land, and one would expect from the greater amount of manure production that their yield per acre would be greater. There is, however, no data to support this.

Achilles discusses in some detail the process of inheritance, preparatory to using data from the marriage contracts on the amounts of dowries and portions to gauge the changes in productivity of farms. During the seventeenth century, there was little change except for the interruption to farming caused by the Thirty Years' War and the period of about thirty-five years necessary for recovery. In one region analysed portions rose by a factor of six during the eighteenth century, and in another closer to three. While production apparently rose to quite different levels in the two areas, the price of land rose equally sixfold in each. The rise in the value of land, then, can only be partly traced to a rise in production, and much of it must be sought in the supply and demand of land itself.

This kind of work is quite useful as more of it is made available for comparative use. More information would be valuable on the geographic setting of the region, particularly with regard to the problems of intra-regional difference in production levels. Why, for example, should the demand for land be the same in areas with different levels of production? The inventories, especially, would be useful in analysing regional variations in a manner familiar to English agricultural historians.

DAVID SABEAN

WILLIAM ALBERT, *The Turnpike Road System in England, 1663-1840*. C.U.P., 1972. 300 pp. 8 maps. £5.60.

British railway history, we have recently been told, is only just emerging from an era in

which it approximated to "playing with model trains" rather than serious academic enquiry. Dr Albert has gone a long way to raising the standard of enquiry into road transport, which itself has all too often produced little more than catalogues of prohibitive costs, "sloughs of despair," highway robbery, and naïve accounts of fluctuations in activity. For this book adds significantly to our knowledge of transport improvement.

Dr Albert mixes administrative history with matter of wider importance. Here he provides a useful, if brief, survey of current knowledge of road transport in the seventeenth century, recounts the origins of the turnpike trust system and its spread, and examines trust administration and methods of road repair. These "internal" factors, while deeply and carefully researched, are not of immediate relevance to the wider economic history of the period, although the development of the more professional administrative approach which the case of turnpikes illustrates is of great significance.

It is in the area of finance that Dr Albert is happiest, and in which he asks his broadest questions. Several new conclusions emerge from his work. Toll leasing was a valuable service for trusts, not, as the Webbs suggested, the means of their exploitation. He analyses the inducements to promotion and the sources of investment in turnpikes, stressing the role of government funds from 1817 onward, particularly in such major projects as the Holyhead road. Overall, the turnpikes tapped pools of savings in the same way as the canals and railways which, historiographically, have overshadowed them. The difference lay in their earlier start, the fact that they were not profit-makers *per se*, and that in consequence they showed a lower rate of return than the other utilities.

This book adds to our knowledge of the local money supply in the eighteenth century. Even after allowing for a lagged response to shifts in interest rates in the London money market it is clear that local factors largely determined phases of activity or inactivity in turnpiking. Ashton's analysis which suggested that shifts in interest rates determined investment in public utilities is therefore questioned.

Consequently fluctuations in the agricultural sector assume greater significance for turnpike investment.

As Gay showed, Arthur Young's comments on English roads testified as much to their improvement as their badness. Painstaking analysis here of trust formation justifies Gay's comments. The turnpiking of the thirteen main roads from London was virtually complete by the 1750's. Parallel with this, "town-centred" improvement took place from the 1720's, designed to stimulate local markets. Movements in transport costs, as evidenced in Justices' returns, showed the importance of this early improvement. Costs fell significantly in the period 1690 to 1750, and stabilized thereafter until the war. Trust formation was more systematic than has been thought, and the turnpikes themselves were powerful factors in the reduction of transport costs and the integration of the home market.

If the broad analysis of turnpike activity and interest rates was a comment on the importance of agricultural fluctuations, then the two industries were more intimately connected. To 1840, the landed interest remained the dominant investing and promoting group, and the Board of Agriculture, with the G.P.O., a leading advocate of qualitative improvement. At least part of the success of the Macadam "system" lay in its labour-intensity, and in its employment of child, female, and aged labourers, facts which made it especially appealing to the southern agricultural counties after 1815. While enclosures have been seen as important stimuli to road improvement, Dr Albert has shown this to be a two-way process. In Leicestershire, turnpikes largely preceded enclosure, not as Dr Hunt argued, the reverse. The history of the turnpike has much to interest the historian of agriculture.

This is an important book. In it there are minor slips: for example, no "West Riding County Record Office" exists. But these are few in an immensely scholarly work. But this is also a limited book. It confines itself to turnpike roads and, bar the chapter on rates of carriage, much of which has already appeared in print, says relatively little in general about transport in the eighteenth century. While rivers, coastal shipping, and canals are men-

tioned, the relative roles of road and water transport are not discussed. Turnpikes appear largely as financial enterprises and as administrative units. Their use awaits the further research that this scholarly book deserves to generate. Here is a work essential to every student of the period. But one wonders how many will accept only 197 pages of text for their money.

J. A. CHARTRES

HORST-DETLEF ILLEMAN, *Bäuerliche Besitzrechte im Bistum Hildesheim*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Agrargeschichte, Band XXII, Gustav Fischer Verlag, Stuttgart, 1969. ix+141 pp., 4 plates, 12 tables. DM 32.

The author is chiefly concerned with the legal and institutional changes affecting peasant landholders belonging to the Benedictine monastery of St Michael in the bishopric of Hildesheim. By examining the records of this rich territory he re-evaluates the theses put forward by Wittich, Sold, and Lütge for north-west Germany. In particular, he finds no systematically planned abolition of the medieval *villicatio* system as Wittich did, and argues against the idea that the system broke down under pressure from the *villici* for legal and economic independence. In any event Illemaan stresses the fact that, for St Michael's at least, the *villicatio* was never a closed uniform system. The farms belonging to the monastery were strewn out over a wide area making it difficult to run a large manor farm on labour from the surrounding tenants. In fact various forms of tenancy existed side by side. Part of the possessions of the monastery were in the newly cleared areas of southern Lower Saxony where the old forms of unfree tenancy were never established.

The changeover came here, as elsewhere, during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The central administrative farms lost their functions as matters previously dealt with by them were centralized. The *Meierhof* was split off from the *Lathusen*, the latter forming a newly created *Gorichtsverband* with the old obligations stemming from their unfree status gradually becoming real charges on farm tenures. There were a number of legal differences between the *Meier* and the newly

constituted *Meierdingsleute*. The former paid dues in kind, and held tenures for periods of six to nine years. The latter had inheritable tenures and paid in money. In reality, however, the *Meier* achieved *de facto* inheritance, and there was little to distinguish the two. It was in fact uncommon for a peasant not to hold land under the two forms of legal obligation.

In this book Illemann is almost totally concerned with legal forms. Socio-economic material enters only at times when an explanation for a great change in institutional structure is called for. The now standard descriptions of the later medieval period by Abel and Lütge become the means for reinterpreting the older works by men like Wittich. What the society behind the legal forms was like can only be imagined by the reader.

DAVID SABEAN

C. R. ELINGTON and N. M. HERBERT, (eds.), *Victoria History of the County of Gloucester*, Vol. x. O.U.P., 1972, xxiv + 324 pp., illus. £14.

This, the third topographical volume of the Gloucestershire series, covers twenty-two parishes, of which sixteen lie in the hundred of Whitstone on the east bank of the Severn, and six on the opposite bank in the hundred of Westbury. The fact that the last-named, and all the other hundreds on that side of the Severn, belonged to Herefordshire, not Gloucestershire, until the reign of Cnut, is not mentioned. Nor is King Eadwig's grant of Westbury itself to Ælf here, ealdorman of Mercia, who later passed the gift on to Glastonbury Abbey. It is at any rate good to know that the beautiful Dutch-inspired water-garden at Westbury Court is now looked after by the National Trust.

The small town of Newnham acquired the status of a borough in the twelfth century, and later possessed a mayor, but its burghal history is one of long decline, and nothing remains to show for it but a sword of state now in the museum at Gloucester.

On the other side of the river King's Stanley became a fairly successful seignorial borough circa 1253, but an attempt by Robert FitzPain to establish one at Frampton-on-Severn proved abortive. Apart from these two quasi-urban

ventures, Whitstone hundred consisted mainly of agricultural land, though the Stroud Valley clothing industry extended into the eastern parishes which climbed the Cotswold scarp.

So far as can be seen, the two-field system remained the norm in Gloucestershire villages until the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, when some of them, but by no means all, graduated into a three-field rotation. The vale of Gloucester has long been famous for producing one of the finest English cheeses, but no coherent account of the manufacture can be pieced together from the scattered references that are all we find here. (How did a cheese-factor at Frocester manage to go bankrupt in 1800?) The Butter Beech, a tree at Standish under which milkmaids used to sell their dairy produce, might have rated a passing mention. Perhaps the subject is reserved for fuller treatment under the hundred of Berkeley.

Among the numerous well-chosen plates those of two splendid cloth-mills in the Stroud Valley are outstanding.

H. P. R. FINBERG

ALICE M. HADFIELD, *The Chartist Land Company*. David & Charles, Newton Abbot, 1970. 248 pp. £3 hardback, £1.50 paperback.

Mrs Hadfield's book is the most detailed study of Feargus O'Connor's scheme of 1845-51 since the publication of the six reports of the Select Committee of 1847-8 on the affairs of the National Land Company. The author has visited, to great profit, the sites of all six of the estates purchased or planned to be purchased in order to identify surviving cottages and communal buildings, and has unearthed a certain amount of fresh manuscript material in various depositories. The illustrations will be of great value to students of rural vernacular architecture. Basically the scheme was a lottery with smallholdings as prizes, and one critic estimated that it would take about fifty years to settle all the subscribers, even if the scheme had been efficiently managed. Naturally, Chartist sympathizers and others with a little money to spare (largely from the booming industrial towns of the north and Midlands) liked a flutter just as much as the British worker does today, and hoped to

"come up" on the Land Scheme. With his background as an encumbered Irish landlord O'Connor must have enjoyed himself hugely bargaining for likely English estates (even if they were not always highly desirable properties), putting down deposits on them in his own name with other people's money, and parcelling them out into spade-cultivation smallholdings in an effort to imitate in England "the finest peasantry in the world" (Carlyle's phrase), which he had known in the land of his birth. But according to the Government accountant the accounts of the National Land Company were sadly "confused," and although in 1848 John Stuart Mill thought the settlements were "well conceived," in the end they became a series of abortions, not well-rounded communities. What was the Company's solicitor, W. P. Roberts, the "Miner's Attorney General" so beloved of the Webbs, up to in allowing this state of affairs to develop? Mrs Hadfield is to be congratulated on producing a well-documented study, compassionate without being uncritical, and on having broken the Marxist near-monopoly of this subject. This is "Chartism with a human face."

W. H. CHALONER

J. Z. TITOW, *Winchester Yields: A Study in Medieval Agricultural Productivity*. C.U.P., 1972. viii+151 pp. £3.

Dr Titow has worked for many years on the account rolls of the bishopric of Winchester, which form the longest and most continuous series in Europe of documentary material for the study of medieval agriculture. This latest publication takes the form of an essay of 33 pages supported by more than 100 pages of statistical tables. These calculations replace the rather inconclusive data compiled from the same sources by Beveridge, who used hundreds of figures drawn from a limited number of manors. Titow's statistics, covering only the period 1209 to 1349, derive from thousands of yield calculations for the whole Winchester estate.

The conclusions that emerge from the mammoth exercise are that on most of the Winchester manors cereal yields deteriorated in the late thirteenth century, with a tendency for yields to improve slightly in the early

fourteenth century though often the yields of 1300-49 were still below the figures for 1209-70. The general trend towards declining productivity was much more marked in the case of oats and barley than in wheat. At first sight the decline seems slight in many examples, often less than 10 per cent, but as the area sown with cereal crops shrank after the mid-thirteenth century, it is assumed that the estate shed its least fertile land, so that the figures we have to some extent conceal a much more dramatic decline in productivity.

The statistics and conclusions drawn from them are very useful, but Dr Titow is whetting our appetites for more. We learn that the number of stock kept on the estate increased in the early fourteenth century, helping to prevent a continued decline in yields after 1300, and that often the "colonizing" manors tended to suffer from declining productivity more than old-settled parts of the estate. But we really need to know more about the techniques and organization of agriculture on the Winchester manors. Why, for example, were changes in crop rotation rare? Why were leguminous crops so unimportant? How market-oriented was the estate? (Presumably this factor helps to explain the maintenance of better productivity of wheat as compared with the productivity of lower-priced crops in the early fourteenth century.) It would also be valuable to see a concrete example, if only for a single manor, demonstrating how the landlord was able to shed poorer land when the demesnes contracted after the 1270's.

This book represents a milestone in the compilation of statistical material for the agricultural history of the Middle Ages. Fortunately Dr Titow promises a larger study of the Winchester estate, and when this appears it will be possible to see these yield statistics in the full context of the geographical and economic background.

CHRISTOPHER DYER

DARWIN P. KELSEY (ed.), *Farming in the New Nation: Interpreting American Agriculture 1790-1840*. The Agricultural History Society, Washington, 1972. ii+293 pp. \$5. The American Agricultural History Society follows the useful practice of publishing the

papers given at occasional symposia in book form for the convenience of libraries and a wider audience. This volume, a reprint of *Agricultural History*, vol. 46, no. 1, records the proceedings of a meeting held at Old Sturbridge Village, Massachusetts, site of a living historical farm, in September 1970, jointly sponsored by the Society, Old Sturbridge Village, the Smithsonian Institution, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The contributors include some of the most eminent names in the field, such as Clarence Danhof, Paul Gates, and Wayne Rasmussen, as well as distinguished economic historians like Stuart Bruchey, Robert E. Gallman, and William N. Parker. The subject was American Agriculture in the period 1790-1840, and the greater part of the discussion was concerned with sources old and new, beginning with reassessments of the work of Bidwell and Falconer, and Lewis C. Gray, together with an impressive survey by Paul Gates of the problems of agricultural history that remain for new writers to consider. Professors Bruchey and Gallman examined the problems of assessing productivity changes and marketing efficiency, while W. Ralph Singleton and Clarence Danhof contributed accounts of the origins of the plants and of the tools used by the American farmer in this period.

A further area of discussion, on the uses for agricultural historians of museums and historical farms, was opened by John T. Schlebecker and Darwin P. Kelsey. Chester McArthur Destler contributed an interesting paper on Jeremiah Wadsworth, an example of the improving gentleman farmer who combined a literary interest in the new farming of Europe with practical attempts to improve field crops and animal breeding in New England—he tried to obtain chicory seed from Arthur Young; while some geographical aspects of the agricultural practices of this period were considered in papers by Andrew H. Clark and William N. Parker.

It is, as might be expected from so varied and distinguished a group of scholars, a volume rich in ideas and full of stimulating suggestions. For the reader interested in the serious

study of the American farmer in this important and formative period the discussion of references and sources is invaluable, and this volume must be added to the select list of essential reading on the subject.

G. E. MINGAY

WERNER TORNOW, *Chronik der Agrarpolitik und Agrarwirtschaft des Deutschen Reiches von 1933-1945*. Berichte über Landwirtschaft, Neue Folge, Sonderheft 188. Paul Parey, Hamburg und Berlin, 1972. 193 pp. DM 44.9.

This volume lists the political measures and policies dealing with agriculture, fisheries, forestry, and agricultural research adopted in Germany between 1933 and 1945. It closes a gap as publications exist covering the periods 1914-33 and 1945-67. It is interspersed with a number of brief commentaries, which are concise, even excessively short, and the lists of measures, while comprehensive, are particularly laconic. Nevertheless the book outlines what was done for and to German agriculture in 1933-45. The National Socialists reacted to the world economic crisis as did many other states, controlling imports, creating marketing organizations, and keeping the peasant from bankruptcy. Because the National Socialists believed in autarchy they perhaps carried these measures further than most other countries. The National Socialists had a mystique; the whole farming population was made an estate of the realm, and there were regulations about security of ownership and inheritance. The Four Year Plan, beginning, in 1936, brought the nation much nearer to self-sufficiency, with a reserve of grain in 1939. Four hundred thousand left the land between 1933 and 1938, entering industry or the forces. The food grown in captured countries was used mainly to feed the German invading armies. Lack of labour, nitrogenous fertilizers, machine parts, and pesticides finally reduced production. In short the volume compendiously lists the measures taken, and its short but often repetitive commentaries outline their force and purpose.

D. J. DAVIS

Professor H. P. R. Finberg

THE British Agricultural History Society has lost a much respected editor and loyal friend with the death of Professor H. P. R. Finberg on 1 November 1974. In the early days of the Society's foundation in 1953 Professor Finberg gave it his warm support, and as soon as the officers of the society were elected, he was invited to become the first editor of the AGRICULTURAL HISTORY REVIEW. Professor Finberg had been a publisher before he took up his academic appointment as Head of the Department of English Local History at Leicester University; he also had a high national reputation as a typographer. To have so distinguished an expert in the field of publishing and history was a singular good fortune for the Society, and the design of the REVIEW bears the imprint of his high standards. Professor Finberg remained as editor until his retirement in 1965 but he continued thereafter on the Executive Committee of the society, and for its members their last sight of him was at the meeting on 26 September when they little suspected that his death was so near.

Professor Finberg's historical writing was centred upon agricultural and rural history and he was a recognised master of the art of unravelling Anglo-Saxon charter boundaries on the ground. But more than this, he was a master at deciphering their deeper meaning. Among his most celebrated writings was his essay on *Roman and Saxon Withington*; it was the study of a single parish, but it gave a new

turn to the debate on the Roman legacy in rural England and the continuity of rural settlement into the Anglo-Saxon period.

In 1970 the Society published a special Supplement to its REVIEW (volume 18) entitled *Land, Church, and People* in honour of their former editor. A glance through the bibliography of Professor Finberg's work, included in that volume, demonstrates the depth and breadth of his agrarian interests. Even after his retirement he continued actively with his writing. Professor Finberg had been responsible for launching the idea and laying the plan for the *Agrarian History of England and Wales*, and until his death he was its devoted and meticulous editor. He had the satisfaction of seeing volume IV, 1500-1640, published in 1967, and in his retirement he succeeded in completing his own writing for this work which appeared as volume I, part ii, A.D. 43-1042, in 1973. Finally, this summer, Professor Finberg's volume in the Paladin series, *The Formation of England, 550-1042*, appeared, written in the same compelling prose and in the polished style that one always associated with him.

Professor Finberg was a man of many parts but we are especially grateful for his contribution to Anglo-Saxon agrarian history and for his services to the British Agricultural History Society which were unique.

JOAN THIRSK

Back Issues of the Review

The following back issues of the Agricultural History Review are out of print: Vol. 2; Vol. 3, part 2; Vol. 4, part 1; Vol. 5, part 1; Vol. 10, parts 1 and 2; Vol. 11, parts 1 and 2; Vol. 12, parts 1 and 2; Vol. 13, parts 1 and 2; Vol. 14, part 1; Vol. 17, part 1.

Members wishing to dispose of back issues are asked to write to

The Treasurer, British Agricultural History Society, Museum of English Rural Life, University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading, RG6 2AG.