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(a) The early middle ages, 400-1100

The extent to which we should allow for continuity across the seemingly great divide of Roman withdrawal and Anglo-Saxon incursion raises perennial problems that are well illustrated in this year’s literature. Oosthuizen (in Antiquaries Journal) uses archaeological and place-name evidence, as well as that of the Tribal Hidage, to argue for considerable continuity of settlement patterns and landscape in Cambridgeshire, though the evidence is stronger east of the Cam than to the west. She has followed this up with a case study (in Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society) suggesting that a block of land bisected by Ermine Street at Caxton preserved a prehistoric field pattern as medieval furlong boundaries in a subdivided field. In a different context, Proudfoot and Aliaga-Kelly examine archaeological and place-name evidence possibly relevant to the organization of early multiple estates in south-eastern Scotland, suggesting widespread continuity in the location of central places between prehistoric periods and the middle ages. By contrast Jones offers a sceptical look at some of the arguments that have been used to demonstrate medieval continuity with the Celtic past in Wales. He distinguishes sharply between the \textit{maenor} and \textit{maenol}. The former, which existed by the ninth century, he identifies as a geographically restricted unit of lordship, confined to the more populous regions of Wales, and with only weak territorial definition, whereas the \textit{maenol} was territorially well defined, and created in the course of an unsuccessful administrative experiment by the rulers of Gwynedd in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The \textit{maenor}, he argues, was of transient significance, and of doubtful relevance to arguments about historical continuity.

Some characteristics of the early Anglian settlement are illustrated by Taylor, Duhig, and Hines, who record 26 excavated interments with associated grave goods from a cemetery of the sixth century at Oakington (Cambs.). Although the population in question had suffered hardship, and its members had known hard work to the detriment of their health, they possessed imported ivory, beads, and amber. The development of long-distance trade in the early Saxon period recurs as a theme in Norton’s study of the topography of Anglian York. He examines evidence relating to the pre-Conquest cathedral in relation to the Roman \textit{colonia}, and proposes a chronological analysis of the development of the precinct from the seventh century to the eleventh. In discussing York’s development as a commercial centre, which led to the early destruction of the Roman walls on the city’s southern half, he proposes that an Anglian lay community
was growing vigorously from the seventh century, and that major redevelopment may have occurred during the eighth.

The reliability of the Llandaff charters as evidence for early Welsh institutions has been examined independently and from different perspectives by two authors. Maund analyses the narrative element in the 158 charter texts, which purport to span a 500-year period, and argues that the narratives were so heavily reworked in the early twelfth century, and are so formulaic, that they should be rejected as evidence of earlier conditions in south Wales. Davies looks closely at the polemical context in which the surviving collection of charter texts was compiled, arguing that the Liber Landavensis was produced during a legal dispute with the bishops of St David’s and Hereford between 1119 and 1134, and proposes that one of the hands that wrote it was that of Urban, bishop of Llandaff from 1107 to 1134.

(b) 1100-1350

Bailey’s survey of recent work on medieval economic and social history of the period 1086-1500 (in Journal of Medieval History) highlights some areas of uncertainty and disagreement. He stresses the unevenness of commercial development and the limited extent to which standards of living improved as a result of commercialization. Certainly evidence of new investment and new initiatives continues to come to light both in archaeological and in documentary sources. Clarke, for example, records the excavation of a sunk-postmill of very early design within a moated enclosure near Boreham (Essex). But the problems to which Bailey draws attention do not yield to such direct observation. He carries his analysis further (in this journal), and evaluates both the opportunities opening up for peasant families and the constraints on their ability to benefit from trade. Given the decline in the size of peasant holdings, he looks for evidence of compensatory strategies. His observations on the qualitative unevenness of the institutional marketing structure, and of the capacity of peasant households to benefit from it, incline him to pessimistic conclusions, especially given the number of external shocks, such as harvest failures and high taxes, against which villagers had little redress. The extent to which peasant families shared in the opportunities and risks of the market economy is demonstrated further by Dyer (in The British Numismatic Journal), whose article argues that archaeological evidence of coin finds from village sites is a misleading indicator of the extent to which villagers used money. He assesses the extent to which both the number of households and their requirements of currency for rents and taxes increased during the thirteenth century but then fell away during the fourteenth and fifteenth. He also examines the importance of peasants as traders and consumers, demonstrating that this required the handling of large amounts of coinage even if many transactions were accomplished without it.

Some of the most profound disagreements concerning the twelfth and thirteenth centuries have long concerned the reasons for arrested agrarian expansion and population growth around 1300, and these arguments are carried forward in this year’s literature. Campbell surveys the evidence for responsiveness to marketing opportunities in the medieval English countryside between 1086 and 1300 and shows how an impressive growth of output was achieved by increased inputs of land, labour, and capital, a widening range of products, technical innovation, and increases in specialization. He argues that the growth of productivity and output was hindered more by restricted demand than by the
unresponsiveness of supply conditions. Thoen, in reply, suggests that Campbell overstates the development of English agriculture by 1300. He maintains, however, that Campbell’s evidence should be used to argue that supply constraints were unimportant, since the economic structures of medieval society were not always readily malleable by economic opportunity, and in the analysis of economic change supply and demand are not as independent of each other as Campbell’s analysis implies. Certainly supply constraints dominate in Cowley’s survey of the first two centuries of Margam Abbey (Glam.), which shows that though the thirteenth century was mostly one of prosperity for the abbey, which traded through Bristol, its fortunes declined from the 1280s for a variety of reasons, among which he describes floods, wars, epidemics, and dispossession.

The extent to which taxation assessments are usable as economic evidence in these debates has long been a matter of some uncertainty. Jenks conveniently summarizes a vast amount of information about the levying of lay subsidies between 1275 and 1334, including the sums raised from each county in each subsidy. By demonstrating a close correlation between fluctuations in county yields and those from London, he demolishes a number of sceptical positions concerning the value of the subsidy returns as economic evidence. He then supports the argument that the goods assessed for taxation were the surplus available for trade by establishing a correlation over time between tax yields and the propensity of landlords to establish new markets and fairs. This evidence suggests that there was in fact a good deal of obedient cooperation between local communities and the Crown. The moral foundations for this cooperation with expanding government demands are examined in two articles relating to Crown and country in the thirteenth century. In examining the developing relationship between government and society that allowed an ambitious royal agenda to be followed through at the same time as access to royal justice was broadened, Hershey outlines the deficiencies of the writ system of initiating pleas in the royal courts and shows how, as a result of the Provisions of Oxford in 1258, procedure by plaint without writ became more acceptable, both in the conduct of government investigations and in personal suits before royal justices, even if it remained a procedure of subordinate importance. Scales has some valuable observations on this theme from the Cambridgeshire ragman rolls. He comments on the misleading impression of the records of Edward I’s inquest of 1274-5 created by the printed edition of 1812-18, where the complexity of bureaucratic processes apparent in the original manuscripts is concealed by the uniformity of the printed format, and illustrates the point from some unpublished returns from Chilford, Papworth, Wetherley, and Whittlesford hundreds. He observes the care taken by the royal commissioners recording complaints against the king’s officers, and shows how the form of the inquest allowed local priorities to surface alongside, or even at the expense of, royal ones.

The risks involved in making easy generalizations about the development of settlement forms in this period of expanding population are demonstrated in a useful study by Muir, who discusses the relationship between nucleated and dispersed settlement in the Yorkshire dales, showing the variety of circumstances and dates at which nucleation occurred, and recommending Christopher Taylor’s concept of the ‘polyfocal village’ to describe some of his examples. In some instances nucleation was transient, since some nucleated villages were vulnerable to decay. Lomas illustrates some dispersed patterns of new settlement in Durham during the thirteenth century by means of a charter, whose text he edits, recording both a previously unknown hamlet of ‘Croc’, carved out of the waste, and two new farms, Beckley and Andrew’s House. Harvey analyses three as yet
unpublished surveys of Shaftesbury Abbey estates (one of c. 1125, one of c. 1170, and one of c. 1190) insofar as they relate to the manor of Bradford on Avon, which included the borough among a cluster of rural townships. He shows how the fluidity of boundaries allowed vills to come together in new forms of organization. Some outlying townships were still growing during the twelfth century. At the most nucleated end of the scale of rural settlement, Hesse reconstructs the medieval field system of South Creake (Norfolk) from medieval terriers and charters and from early seventeenth-century maps, showing how regularly the furlongs were laid out, probably as a result of planning. She also discusses the development of the foldcourse system there, which reached its classic, landlord-dominated form in the sixteenth century following considerable concentration of land tenure in the village during the later middle ages.

Village life in medieval England is most vividly illustrated in Schofield’s study from the records of Hinderclay (Suffolk). He analyses an exceptionally well-documented feud between two men of Hinderclay between 1295 and 1307 involving accusations of debt, adultery, and violence, showing how for leading villagers local courts were accessible as part of the machinery of interpersonal disputes. He argues that substantive legal matters were truly at issue in the procedures of this manorial court, even though litigants might seek to sway the opinion of the court by appealing to social norms and by manipulating gossip. Jones, in another instalment of the merchet evidence from Spalding Priory estates, shows that after 1300 merchets were more likely to be paid by husbands than by fathers. Turville-Petre draws attention to an interesting survey of the manor of Gressenhall, c. 1315, written in English. He introduces and partly edits the text, though his comments concern the language of the document more than its historical content. The development of rural industry is implicit in Hall’s discussion of the manufacture of pottery in Scotland, where the scattered location of kilns seems to explain the poverty of archaeological evidence. The article supplies some detail concerning the chronology and spread of White Gritty Ware (twelfth century) and Redware (from the mid-thirteenth century).

The expansion and multiplication of towns is illustrated in a number of new studies. Treveil and Rowsome report briefly, with useful maps, the medieval findings from ‘the largest archaeological excavation seen in the City of London in recent years’ on a site at the eastern end of Cheapside, demonstrating how the Poultry was built up with a row of buildings from the tenth century, how new streets developed subsequently, and how by 1200 the remaining open spaces were being filled in with substantial stone properties as the district was taken up by merchants. Archaeological research has proved the most productive source of new information about a number of provincial developments in this period. Courtney brings together archaeological and documentary evidence relating to Leicester and its suburbs before c. 1300, suggesting that the town was very small until the eleventh century, which is one reason for the poverty of middle and late Saxon archaeology there. The argument, supplemented with some useful maps, implies vigorous growth from the eleventh century to the thirteenth. Shaw’s report on some archaeological excavations in Northampton describes two sites, one at the centre and one in a suburb of the late Saxon borough, and appears to illustrate both expansion up to c. 1300 and a subsequent setback. The central site, which was occupied by the eleventh century, had substantial timber construction by 1150, and was further developed with stone construction in the thirteenth century, continued in occupation through the late middle ages. The suburban site was built upon from the twelfth century, but was derelict after about 1400. Ward reviews the evidence from Chester relating to the
development of both ecclesiastical and secular buildings. The surviving secular structures date mostly from the period after 1250, by which time the Rows were already developed. There was a building boom in the later thirteenth century, perhaps associated with Edward I's military activity. The article has a useful map of late medieval Chester, showing walls, churches, and built-up areas.

The use of plan analysis for the topographical history of towns is demonstrated by Lilley, who identifies the two Park Streets of Coventry with a property in the park of Cheylesmore manor referred to in 1348, and suggests that this bit of parkland was laid out as streets some time before 1200. Vincent (in Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society) discusses the foundation by the Crassus family of the borough of Chipping Sodbury on the road between Bristol and Cirencester, away from the manorial centre, probably about 1218. He appends an edition of some interesting thirteenth-century charters, whose originals are missing, but casts grave doubt on the reliability of their texts. Brooks supplements the information to be found about early thirteenth-century Farnham in Robo's book, including some evidence for striking commercial growth there during the 1240s. To illustrate the lowest forms of urban life, Foreman records a short-lived experiment to lay out plots beside the main road at Boreham, Essex, some time in the period 1100-1300; a market was authorized there in 1281. Yet more shadowy are those towns that never left the drawing board. Welsh proposes that the new town at ‘Gotowre super Mare’ in Studland (Dorset) commissioned by Edward I in 1286 was intended to be on a site where the Claywell Valley runs into Poole harbour, but doubts whether such a town was ever constructed.

The expansion of urban life on Anglo-Norman patterns to regions of new conquest is illustrated by Dargan’s study of Nobber (Meath), the site of an Anglo-Norman castle (c. 1196) and borough (chartered in 1227). Mullowney discusses early settlement at Kildare associated with the monastery there and the impact on the site of the Conquest of 1169, which was followed by the establishment of a castle. The whole question of early urban development in Ireland, and the degree of continuity across the Conquest, is bravely tackled by Valente, whose arguments favour discontinuity. She questions whether early Irish monasteries were really very favourable sites for proto-urban development, and suggests that the propensity of historians to assimilate monasteries to towns rests on a certain amount of confusion. She doubts whether in fact any ‘monastic towns’ had developed by the twelfth century, and suggests that where towns developed near monasteries, usually in an Anglo-Norman context, they depended upon fashions in secular lordship rather than on any monastic stimulus. O’Connor supplies a useful general survey and bibliography relating to medieval settlement forms and associated buildings in medieval Ireland.

Two papers concern aspects of the institutional maturing of thirteenth-century London. Sutton examines the nature of the mercers’ London trade in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and discusses the forms of association they would have required before the first documentary mention of an organized mistery in 1304. Her analysis, which includes comparisons with other London crafts, implies that the mercers needed communal organization long before 1304 in order to regulate artisans and to register the right of individual mercers to share in the liberties of Londoners. Vincent (in Journal of Ecclesiastical History) documents the career of Goffredo de Prefetti, elected bishop of Bethlehem in 1244, and his focused efforts to raise funds in England and Scotland between 1246 and his death in 1258-9. This was the context for the foundation of the Bethlehem hospital in London in 1247, originally a base for foreign fund-raisers, though from the
1390s it acquired a reputation (as Bedlam) for accommodating the insane. The article is an interesting comment on the supposed economic backwardness of thirteenth-century England.

In a rare study of medieval urban property values, Goddard uses the fine collection of Coventry deeds (edited by Peter Coss) to assess activity in the property market there during the thirteenth century, taking account of both the sums of money exchanged at the time of the sale and the rents which sellers were able to reserve. The evidence shows that urban property prices rose in line with grain prices, though there seems to be an inverse relationship between the fluctuations in the two series.

(c) 1350-1500

In two important articles, Whittle demonstrates the capacity of comparative method over both space and time to illuminate some of the problems of late medieval social change. In Past and Present she sets out to identify where deep-rooted links between peasant families and their land were strong, and to account for them where they occurred. Change over time at Heveningham (Norfolk) suggests that the greater availability of land after 1350 encouraged trading in larger blocks and weakened the role of inheritance in transfers within families. Comparison between Norfolk and the midlands suggests that manorial restrictions on the land market were more important than peasant sentiment in restricting transfers outside the family. She therefore questions whether either peasant atavism or non-peasant individualism are satisfactory models for understanding the peasant land market since neither of them takes account of the economic and institutional constraints on peasant choice. In Continuity and Change she examines circumstances affecting women’s access to land by inheritance, gift, bequest, and purchase, and the cultural values that preferred men to women and widows to daughters as recipients of family land. She looks both at changes over time—especially changes in land values—and at the effects of restrictions on the land market—especially the differences between the vigorous land market of Norfolk and the more constrained market of the midlands—but sees more evidence of continuity than of change between the medieval and early modern periods.

Continuity between late medieval and early modern is a recurrent theme elsewhere. Hanawalt, Helmholz, and McSheffrey individually comment on the implications of Marjorie McIntosh’s Controlling misbehaviour, exploring further, in the process, the late medieval foundations of sixteenth-century attitudes and responses to misbehaviour. There is a brief response from McIntosh, emphasizing the essential continuity of the principles of social control between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries. Jones and Zell examine 361 frankpledge presentments from Fordwich (Kent) between 1451 and 1570 to assess their implications for gender relationships. The article concentrates mainly on scolds, and concludes that because 33 out of 37 presentments of scolds were against women, and since 21 of them came between 1491 and 1510, there was perhaps a temporary crisis of gender relationships around 1500.

Social conflict of other kinds is represented by two articles on the Peasants’ Revolt. Prescott evaluates the large bulk of administrative and legal documentation of the subject as a source of information about the ideas, emotions, and language of those involved and argues (against Steven Justice) that they have considerable interest as a record of contemporary ways of thought and
expression. Eiden describes the activities of rebels in Essex and Norfolk in 1381 and supplies maps to mark where manorial records were destroyed and to locate other incidents of unrest, demonstrating how widespread these were. He emphasizes the coherence of the revolt in the shires. Investigation of a large number of insurgents known from judicial and administrative records uncovers a significant number of servants, labourers, and craftsmen among them.

Dyer (in *Vernacular Architecture*) analyses ways in which studies of vernacular architecture and economic history can interrelate, commenting particularly on the character of social divisions, contrasts between town and country, the impact of commercialization, technological development, and the chronology of change. He also comments on the relevance of buildings to themes in social history, notably the structure of family groups, the definition of classes, attitudes to privacy and status, and the extent of regional differences. Some of these points are well illustrated by Dymond, who edits five Suffolk building contracts from the 1460s—a mud wall, a barn, two houses, and a house extension—and discusses their implication for building practices.

Various intimations of the relative comfort of late medieval life, and the flowering of late medieval cultures, are scattered through the journals. Watkins looks at the institutional structure and trade of small towns in the Forest of Arden, emphasizing their responsiveness to commercial opportunity and finding few indications of decay in the early sixteenth century. Meredith argues that though there were professional entertainers in fifteenth-century England, the evidence does not support the idea that any of them were professional actors, whether travelling or otherwise. Cox lists 50 separate inns and taverns in London with 41 different names in the years 1423-6. A more repressive side of London society is examined by Seabourne, who discusses a series of 24 cases recorded in the plea rolls of the city of London of 1421 involving allegations of usury, and argues that they represent a concerted campaign by the secular authorities against some manifestations of usury in commercial practice. Although the pleas contain echoes of ecclesiastical law and teaching on usury, the cases are not the sort that usually came before church courts, and were not handled in the same way; they demonstrate that ethical objections to usurious practices were not confined to the church authorities.

Landed society and the sources of accumulation are the subject of a few useful case studies. Saul traces the origins of the Dallingridge family, one of the principal gentry families of Sussex in the later fourteenth century, showing how they rose from yeoman origins by means of royal service together with favourable marriage alliances. He compares their rise to that of other careerist gentry elsewhere in England during this period. Bothwell shows how Alice Perrers expertly used her position at Edward III's court to acquire property, and protected her acquisitions by the creation of trusts. She proved herself to be an astute businesswoman, though this cannot have done anything for her reputation. There is a list and a map of her far-flung acquisitions. Driver examines the career of Richard Buckland, citizen of London, merchant stapler, fishmonger, shipowner, and (from 1413) collector of customs, who contributed to the war effort as victualler of Calais from 1417, MP for Northamptonshire in 1425 and 1431, and JP for that county from 1434 until his death in 1436. His career illustrates the close links that existed between prominent Londoners, county society, and the political establishment. In a challenging comment on the *mores* of landed society, Payling argues that private vengeance was more powerful than fear of the courts as a deterrent to crime in fifteenth-century landed society, and that the Crown would not normally intervene to punish vengeance-takers.
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This implies that it is anachronistic to see such vengeance as evidence for failure of government to enforce the law. For the period c. 1300-1450 Thomson provides a commendably clear and useful account of the records and procedures of the annual eyre of the justice of Chester, which exercised both criminal and civil jurisdiction and heard debt cases. The article discusses the social origins of jurors, judges, and suitors. There is little new discussion of the problems of late medieval economic trends. However, Sussman challenges the bullion famine hypothesis for the years 1395-1415 from French evidence. He questions the idea that precious metals were drained out of Europe in exchange for luxury goods of the East, and suggests that hoarding and dishoarding were the principal determinants of fluctuations in the level of minting. The year’s more specific studies of late medieval trade have no particular focus. Wetzig shows how the growth of English trade with Iceland from the late fourteenth century came to constitute a challenge to the authority of the distant kings of Denmark until it met the aggressive opposition of Jón Gerreksson, appointed bishop of Skálholt in 1426, when he arrived on the island in 1430 as a vigorous champion of the rights of the Crown. Grummitt explains how the costs of the Calais garrison were normally borne as a charge on the duties on wool exports, so that this part of royal revenue bypassed Exchequer control. When this principle was temporarily abandoned in 1406 to accommodate the king’s shortage of immediate funds it led to a mutiny of the garrison. Forte discusses the various ship types listed in royal grants of shipping tolls to Edinburgh in 1428, 1445, 1454, 1471, and 1482 and comments on the growth of trade through Veere (Campveere), which seems to explain why the 1482 list includes ships called ‘caumferis’.
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(ii) 1500-1700
NIGEL GOOSE
University of Hertfordshire

While departments of economic history are increasingly subsumed within generic
history departments and student applications for the subject fall, the literature
on offer this year indicates that the discipline is very far from moribund. Not
only are there a number of notable contributions to economic history per se,
there are many more that straddle the amorphous divide between economic
history, social history, historical demography, and even political history.

Agriculture, however, remains sparsely treated in relation to its economic
significance. Griffiths makes an important contribution to what is rapidly becom-
ing the new orthodoxy by pointing up the degree of agricultural improvement
in east Norfolk, well before the much vaunted developments in eighteenth-
century west Norfolk, through a detailed study of the activities of Sir Henry
Hobart of Blickling. Hobart was very actively managing his estate from the early
seventeenth century, engaging in costly building programmes, investing large
sums, proselytizing, and advising others, with a fundamental commitment to the
‘idea of improvement’, a process that was interrupted by the civil wars, but
resumed in the period of falling prices that followed, when landowners more
generally felt compelled to increase the efficiency of their estates and to experi-
ment with new ideas. How typical Hobart was, of course, remains to be seen.
At an altogether different level of generality, Scott, Duncan, and Duncan offer
a time series analysis of English wheat prices in the period 1450-1812 to detect
a short wavelength fluctuation of five-six years, and a medium wavelength of
13-16 years, movements that are clearly apparent only from the end of the
sixteenth century. Multivariate analysis shows the medium-term movements to
be correlated with weather conditions, unlike the short-term movements which,
it is postulated, might have been driven by economic factors or (even more
tentatively) by regular epidemics of fungal grain pathogens. Readers’ views will
no doubt differ as to the value of such statistical artefacts and speculations, but
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the only detailed empirical research referred to is previously published material on the marginal community of Penrith in Cumbria, where short wavelength price movements correlate with established mortality cycles. Another broad assessment, by Clark, discusses whether land was primarily a status good or an economic commodity in England in the four centuries after 1500. Using evidence from the Charity Commissioners’ reports, Clark compares estimated returns from land with data from rent charges and, for the late seventeenth century, from mortgages, to conclude that the psychic benefits that some owners derived from the possession of farmland did not drive returns much below those available from comparable assets, except perhaps after 1800. The landed classes did not, therefore, have to choose between owning land and maximizing their income, as, no doubt, they were themselves very well aware.

Industrial contributions this year are more narrowly focused. Morris analyses the under-utilized coastal port books to discover a dramatic growth in the Ipswich sailcloth industry from the 1580s to feed the London market, a trade that remained under the control of a small group of merchants but without any evidence of vertical integration. As a contribution to knowledge of the malting trade, Umfreville offers a brief analysis of the wills and inventories of 42 individuals, representing 15 per cent of the adult male population, for the market town of Henley-on-Thames in Oxfordshire in the years 1629-41. The relative wealth of maltsters at this early date is demonstrated, and this period is identified as marking the beginnings of malting as an urban industry, paralleling the experience of the larger town of Reading nearby. Using a wider variety of sources, Evans takes a broad look at forgers in the iron trade between 1500 and 1850, re-emphasizing the early impact of immigrants from the southern Netherlands, and finding that the technological advance of the two-stage ‘Walloon forging’ was spread largely by internal migration. The skilled labour force in the trade remained dynastic and kin based from the mid-sixteenth century to the early eighteenth, becoming geographically extensive but remaining socially close knit, and this gave them considerable bargaining power vis à vis the ironmasters who employed them.

Contributions to overseas trade and colonization concentrate upon the seventeenth century. Marshall discusses the import of The Tempest in 1611, arguing that the play does not actually call into question the Jacobean process of colonization across the Atlantic, but for contemporaries would have confirmed the view of the hegemony of Great Britain as an island nation. Related to trade as it impacted upon foreign policy is Chancey’s assessment of the Amboyna massacre in English politics. Although, in some senses, the beheading of 10 English merchants by the Dutch governor of Indonesia in 1623 was a relatively minor incident, it is argued that it assumed great importance in English politics at the time, and influenced Anglo-Dutch relations for over a century. On a broader canvas Pincus argues that English Commonwealth thinking was far more the product of a developing commercial society than it was a flowering of classical republican ideas. From this viewpoint the likes of Harrington and Milton are cast in a distinctly conservative mould, while ‘possessive individualism’ is similarly rejected as an explanatory tool, for rampant self-interest is not apparent in the pamphlet literature upon which this assessment is based. Contemporary writers steered a middle course, understanding that it was possible to be modern, commercial, and polite on the one hand, but also to marry this with a profound commitment to the common good. The touchstone for the emergence of the first truly self-conscious commercial society does not, therefore, lie in the realm of ideas, but was the product of ‘the massive expansion of English trade,
domestic and foreign, in the early modern period', a conclusion that might be
grist to the mill of the economic determinist while raising an eyebrow or two
on empirical grounds. Trade and war join forces in Fox's two articles on hired
men-of-war. The last large-scale use of merchant ships in the English battlefleet
occurred in the Second Anglo-Dutch War of 1664-7, and they were integral to
the nation's sea forces during the period of their hire while also producing
reasonable returns for their owners. By 1666, however, their inferiority as battle
vessels had become clear, and they were never used again. Charles II might
have learned a lesson from his father, for while Lynch emphasizes the importance
of the Royalist capture of Bristol in July 1643, crucial to the maintenance of
arms supplies from the continent, he also argues that the merchant vessels that
were so readily supplied by members of Bristol's shipowning class could not
challenge regular warships, and hence never posed a threat to the naval
supremacy of the Parliamentary forces.

In the area of internal trade and communications, Brayshay, Harrison, and
Chalkley together offer a fascinating insight into the speed, volume, and cost of
postal communication under Elizabeth and James I. Using over 480 individual
examples from the records of the royal postmasters, allied to the ledger of the
Huntingdon postmaster for August 1585, they find that transit times were
markedly shorter than can be found in recorded instances for the fifteenth
century; in many cases the time taken was reduced by half. This was particularly
true for places on the major posting network, while transit to more remote areas
remained slow. These conclusions are cast within the framework of the increase
governance that characterizes Tudor and early Stuart England. More amorph-
ous is the contribution of Ogborn, who examines the excise inspection networks
revealed in Charles Davenport's travel diaries and published writings to argue
the need to understand the economic and political nature of taxation in terms
of the roles, practices, and spaces of the early modern state. The communication
of scientific ideas on the European stage is dealt with by Lux and Cook,
who emphasize the importance of travel, personal contact, and correspondence,
rendering the sociology of early modern science little different from the sociology
of early modern knowledge more generally. The communication of ideas is also
examined by Ben-Chaim, who traces the influence of the dominant seventeenth-
century form of influencing opinion, the sermon, upon the writing of Isaac
Newton. That this particular scientist should employ such a mode of exposition
is not surprising, given the religious significance that he attached to his work,
but in so doing he was also conforming to the conventional manner of exposition
of university-based scholarly work.

Turning to finance and banking, there are just two contributions. Carter (in
Southern History) traces the career in Tudor financial administration of the
Cornishman Sir Wymond Carew, a notable administrative pluralist whose financial
success owed as much to his energies in the realms of patronage and court
politics as it did to either industry or ability. The result was the establishment
of his family among the leading gentry of Cornwall. Carlos, Key, and Dupree
offer an interesting study of the Royal Africa Company, the second largest joint
stock organization of its time, and the much smaller Hudson's Bay Company,
in the years 1670-1700. By constructing a time series analysis of share trans-
actions they are able to show that significant individual activity was already
under way before 1689, and hence the development of open capital markets
was not simply a product of the legal and property changes that accompanied
the Glorious Revolution. They emphasize learning as the key issue, individual
investors learning both to make and to lose money in ways that were not directly
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involved with productive processes, and the concomitant rise of specialized brokers from within the ranks of the financial community.

No attention is paid to prices and wages this year, but there are three notable contributions to general economic history. Hoyle (in this journal) enters the debate about whether or not there was a ‘mid-Tudor crisis’ to argue that the compound effect of successive taxations between the 1520s and 1540s was bound to cause economic difficulties, particularly as the taxes were levied on goods, stock, and debts that were not necessarily readily convertible to cash. Detailed comparison of the returns for 1522, 1524, and 1525 for Babergh hundred in Suffolk and for the city of Coventry confirms that assessments were reduced over time, particularly for the more wealthy. The view that this might reflect rising tax avoidance is rejected, and it is estimated that declared capital may have fallen by 20 per cent in 1522-5 and, far more speculatively, by 35 per cent in 1541-7. This is a problematic area. Detailed work on other towns has revealed dramatically reduced assessments during the 1520s, reductions that could not possibly be explained by capital depreciation through taxation alone, while the 1540s assessments are notoriously unreliable. And given that the focus here is upon urban wealth, one wonders how this can be generalized into a wider economic crisis, since landowners were taxed relatively lightly. Woodward explores the ingenuity of early modern man in his limitless exploitation of natural resources and agricultural by-products, for food, fuel, medicine, shelter, furnishing, and industrial uses. He discusses the long-term developments that changed this situation, but also emphasizes how the literature of improvement and the associated process of agrarian change from the seventeenth century onwards increased hostility to the free exploitation of many natural resources and led to the suppression of traditional use rights. In a magisterial survey, Hatcher examines labour, leisure, and economic thought before the nineteenth century. The clear evidence of rising real wages and especially family wages in the later seventeenth century sits uneasily with the widespread contemporary view that increased reward led to decreased effort, but the two are not necessarily mutually exclusive: short-term leisure preference in response to windfall earnings, evident in the coal industry, is perfectly compatible with long-term efforts to increase family income, while some might increase both leisure and consumption, the latter encouraged by the increased availability and affordability of consumer goods in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. The change from the mercantilist view of wages as merely a cost of production to the classical one of wages as also a source of demand was protracted, spanning much of the nineteenth century as well as the eighteenth. And if by the nineteenth century the broadening pull of consumption, growth in the size of units of production, and the division and supervision of labour led to a significant erosion of irregular working and leisure preference, a large section of the labouring population continued to resist time discipline. This is clearly a topic that deserves more detailed consideration, examining the effects of life-cycle stages in employment and the variety of experiences and opportunities to take leisure, while more attention might be paid to the position of agricultural labour in particular.

Another valuable clutch of contributions to historical demography appears this year, most challenging of which is Hindle’s examination of pauper marriage, which builds upon his detailed work on the parish of Frampton in Lincolnshire. While Wrigley and Schofield have stressed the centrality of nuptiality to seventeenth-century demographic trends, their apparent assumption that marriage partners were free to choose is questionable, for there were institutional constraints in the form of apprenticeship and, most notably, in the outright preven-
tion of pauper marriages by local poor law officers, a practice that finds reflection in considerable contemporary comment, particularly in Restoration England after demographic pressure had slackened. Such prohibition, it is argued, may thus have contributed to the high celibacy rate that served to check population growth. The problem with this argument is twofold. First, more widespread evidence of such practices would need to be produced. Second, it would need to be shown that there were enough paupers, a significant number of whom were of prime marriageable age, to impact meaningfully upon national nuptiality statistics. Studies of pauper populations published to date fail to suggest the existence of these conditions. In a very different vein Hughes examines the treatment meted out to Sir Thomas Browne (1605-82) by his mother and stepfather during his minority. His patrimony was poorly administered until his paternal uncle took charge of his affairs, with the Court of Orphans authorizing a payment of £1,500 to his parents to secure complete withdrawal of their involvement. Medical matters and the importance of patronage are highlighted by Dawbarn’s appraisal of the membership of the College of Physicians in Jacobean England, with particular reference to the careers of Leonard Poe and Francis Anthony. Patronage was crucial to the fortunes of both, although the patron-client relationship was less one-sided than was usual, since here the patron, as provider and patient, was in a far more vulnerable position than was the case with other forms of patronage. In a fascinating examination of maternal mortality among the aristocracy across four centuries, Lewis finds that under 5 per cent of her sample of 1,251 women died in childbirth, a figure far lower than received wisdom or contemporary comment appears to indicate, although comparison with the population at large is unfortunately impossible. Early modern rates were significantly lower than those that prevailed in the later eighteenth century, and the figure fell below 4 per cent in the late seventeenth century. The key variable appears to be the degree of emphasis upon maximization of fertility to ensure male succession, and hence ‘it was the long years of very short birth intervals that killed’. Arkell and Whiteman wrestle with the problem of estimating mean household size through a detailed analysis of the corn certificate of 1557 for Clackclose hundred in Norfolk. Household size varied widely between parishes, from a low of 4.3 to a high of 6.7, while comparison with late seventeenth-century listings suggests a degree of under-recording of small and female headed households to indicate a mean of 4.8-4.85, rather than the figure of 5.1 which unadjusted calculation gives. The difficulties of interpretation are reinforced by a re-working of the data for Poole in 1574, to suggest a mean household size of 4.9 rather than the figure of 5.3 calculated by Laslett. Very sensibly, it is suggested that a range of means should be applied when attempting to calculate population size from household listings, and for the mid-sixteenth century the preferred range is 4.5-5.1. Parkinson compares the Compton census returns of 1676 for that part of Llandaff diocese which lay in Glamorgan with the hearth tax data for 1666 and 1670. Analysing the 32 parishes for which the evidence is comparable, she concludes that as many as 26 of the 32 Compton returns appear to omit poorer cottagers, and in nine cases possibly other households as well, rendering the returns of little value as a source for estimating total population. This methodology might well be applied elsewhere in England and Wales to test the reliability of the Compton returns, for it seems clear that they varied widely in quality. In the field of migration, Monson’s piece on noblewomen of the Huguenot refuge provides some relief from the usual emphasis upon the middling and lower orders by examining the experience of the widow, daughter, and granddaughter of Barthélemy Herwarth, who sought refuge.
in England as persecution increased following the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Whelan turns the reader's attention to Huguenot refugees in Ireland, finding that all their narratives reveal a tapestry of their origin, struggle for survival, and flight into exile, with a view to the preservation of this heritage for their descendants. It is suggested, however, that there is a need to move beyond this view of these refugees as victims turned heroes, and remember too that they were colonizers of Ireland, and shared the same priorities as other colonial presences: power, possession, security, and subjugation. Whelan finds clear signs of a wrestling with the problem of religious imperialism in the early eighteenth century, while Noonan demonstrates that Irish immigrants to London in the mid-seventeenth century were increasingly harshly treated, at least in those parishes that possessed a stable leadership, enabling the translation of ideology into policy. This is explained in terms of the Irish rebellion of 1641, and particularly the impact of John Temple's treatise on the subject, which emphasized both religious and ethnic differences, and exerted great influence at both local and national levels.

Under the broad heading of social structure and relationships, Havinden revisits the rise of the gentry debate through a case study of Somerset. Extant listings reveal a dramatic increase in the number (as opposed to wealth) of the gentry between 1501/2 and 1623, when the number of resident gentry rose from one in every five parishes to one in two. The primary causes, he argues, were the flood of land onto the market after the Dissolution and the proliferation thereafter of family settlements, among older gentry, whose estates were divided between sons and other relatives. Wealth was mainly landed for the new settled gentry, with lawyers, merchants, and clothiers accounting for just 13 per cent. Havinden's suggestion that they grew in self-confidence and power, and used the Commons to challenge the Crown and aristocracy in the 1640s, is positively Notesteinian, if not Tawneyesque. The *Journal of British Studies* publishes a series of papers delivered to a symposium on Marjorie McIntosh's book *Controlling misbehaviour in England, 1370-1600* (Cambridge, 1998). Hanawalt's contribution is largely late medieval, and particularly emphasizes the breakdown of community resulting from the devastation of the Black Death and consequent enhanced mobility, but finds that short-term fluctuations in misbehaviour (or, more accurately, its prosecution) can quite generally be related to crises such as plague and famine. Helmholz argues for a basic continuity in the prosecution of sexual offenders by the ecclesiastical courts into the early Stuart period, puritanism bringing nothing that was wholly new, but also finds a general tightening of the reins of disciplinary jurisdiction to parallel the expanding range of human activities punished by the church courts. McSheffrey focuses upon fifteenth-century London and Coventry, and finds the jurors here more self-confident and aware of their religious and moral responsibilities as civic leaders than those in the smaller centres upon which McIntosh concentrated. Lake takes us to more central ground, accepting the need to de-couple puritanism from social regulation while still insisting that it possessed potentially divisive tendencies that, in conjunction with a host of other variables, could and sometimes did lead to social conflict. He very sensibly reminds us that the Reformation did, after all, happen, that the altars were indeed stripped, and that this must surely have been accompanied by some change in contemporary notions of the relationship between religion and social attitudes and behaviour. McIntosh's response focuses particularly on the question of periodization, but also establishes an agenda for future research. Hence she re-emphasizes the importance of detailed local studies, and highlights the particular need to examine the social
construction of gender, the formation of popular opinion, the influence of ecology upon religion, and the possibility of regional variation. McIntosh’s new offering this year is an examination of the diversity of social capital in English communities in the late medieval and early modern periods. Voluntary organizations, informal and formal institutions flourished among the lower ranks of men and women, producing social capital of value to their own membership and the wider community. Female networks, however, were increasingly disapproved of in the sixteenth century, as new definitions of female credit emerged to challenge the older patterns of social credit, now focusing upon the dangers of female speech and sexuality. Pittman analyses the seating plan of St Andrew’s church, Calstock, in 1587/8, finding that an array of factors were taken into account in the careful allocation made, although the overall degree of affluence remained the key. Women were separated from men, and precedence was given to wives over spinsters and widows. The plan represents a complex social structure, and in turn helped to maintain community self-awareness and reinforce its identity.

Hindle has been busy this year and his second piece (in *Historical Journal*) offers an analysis of power, poor relief, and social relations in 10 parishes in Holland Fen between 1600 and 1800, though much of the substantive material is taken from the vestry minute book of the parish of Frampton. He demonstrates the extraordinary scale of poor relief in the local context, and emphasizes how the vestry acted as a political, governmental, and ideological agency, behaving paternalistically towards the settled poor but necessarily showing hostility towards strangers. One would perhaps have liked to see more attention paid to change over time, for surely demographic and economic pressures must have fluctuated across these two centuries, though no-one would argue with the conclusion that throughout the period a basic asymmetry of power lay at the very heart of institutional poor relief. Hindle’s third contribution (in *Past and Present*) is a study of the enclosure dispute of 1635-9 in Caddington in the northern Chilterns, where attempts to enclose were eventually successfully resisted. Paradoxically, substantial landholders who were likely to benefit from enclosure were prominent among those resisting; it is argued that this demonstrates a real concern for the interests of their poorer neighbours as well as fear of rising poor rates if common rights were lost, and shows how social configurations could vary in different local economic and social situations. A similar example of the power of tenants is provided in Scott’s study of the Kendal tenant right dispute of 1619-26. Here rents had become fixed at levels well below those of the market by the early seventeenth century, but when landlords tried to increase rent yields or even to remove customary rights altogether their disunity rendered them relatively ineffective in the face of a united and well coordinated legal campaign by the tenants, a campaign that benefited from the fact that many wealthy men also held customary land and were thus prepared to support their more vulnerable neighbours. Brumhead provides an analysis of the social structure of 10 hamlets in north-west Derbyshire in 1650-1775 using hearth tax and probate documents. He finds a clear distinction between yeomen and husbandmen, not based upon wealth but according to whether land was owned or rented. Where industrial activity was their prime concern, individuals identified themselves accordingly, even when they also had substantial farming interests. The ‘dark peak’ areas exhibited greater gradations within the social hierarchy than the ‘white peaks’, while the well-attested involvement of women as a source of rural credit is also confirmed. Porter’s study of the Charterhouse almshouse in late Elizabethan and early Stuart London, a high profile, well-endowed establishment, reveals that it failed to live up to expectations as an orderly and regulated society, but experi-
enced problems of drunkenness, disorder, and misconduct that reflected the social problems of society at large. On a much broader canvas Gaskill (in *Social History*) employs the evidence given by deponents in murder cases before magistrates’ and coroners’ courts to argue for a different perception and ordering of reality in the early modern period. Evidence was often presented within a supernatural narrative framework, and the fictive strategies deployed by witnesses frequently expounded moral truths whose validity depended more on opinion than on objective reality. Before 1700 such testimonies were often accepted as evidence, at least in the pre-trial stages, provided that they confirmed community convictions, while after that date testimony was less commonly recorded in this way, as the cultural cohesion of communities broke down and more modern and familiar rules of evidence emerged.

A number of contributions merge into political history. Stoyle continues his analysis of Cornish particularism through an analysis of the civil war career of Sir Richard Grenville, ‘a villain for our own times’, who starved prisoners of war to death and attempted to bolster his own position by exploiting ethnic differences. Accordingly, his men fought for Cornwall rather than for the king and hence, it is argued, the civil war should be viewed as a conflict of five peoples rather than three kingdoms. Self-interest was expressed rather differently, Peck reveals, by John Cusacke, an Irish gentleman who worked on the fringes of the Court of Wards, who sought favour for various personal projects by firmly rejecting the centrality of Parliament and the common law to insist that the Crown was the law maker. O’Callaghan reveals that the poet and MP Christopher Brookes took a very different view, strongly opposing royal impositions as a threat to the rights of Parliament and the subject, a view fully expressed in his *Ghost of Richard the Third*, indicating how parliamentary debates entered the wider realm of contemporary literature. In the context of altercations between Crown and Parliament in the early seventeenth century, Kyle suggests that the participation of Prince Charles in the parliaments of 1621 and 1624 led him to believe that he was able to manipulate them for his own ends, an assumption which had disastrous consequences when he came to summon his own parliaments after 1625. Durston offers a reassessment of the reasons for the fall of the major-generals in 1656, agreeing with Roots that they were, to some extent, authors of their own misfortune, but also emphasizing the characteristic dithering and evasiveness of Cromwell in his half-hearted defence of his own placemen, besides the effectiveness of the campaign launched by the small group of MPs around Lord Broghill who sought their removal in order to pave the way for the return of the monarchy.

Literary culture at the end of the sixteenth century is examined by Voss, who identifies a sharp decrease in the number and generosity of literary patrons in the 1590s, the reasons for which deserve fuller exploration. In consequence, printers, publishers, and authors, via advertising, courted a new group, the growing number of individual readers in and around London. Articles on popular culture concentrate upon witchcraft. Focusing particularly upon the prosecution of a Kentish farmer in 1617, hence removing the gender factor from the equation, Gaskill (in *Historical Research*) contextualizes witchcraft prosecutions within three lowest common denominators: belief in witchcraft, the existence of statute law condemning it, and the existence of unresolved conflict within local communities. Witchcraft cases often represent a proliferating web of grievances, reflecting contemporary perceptions of confrontation and competition, and hence they provide a window through which to perceive popular mentalities. Attitudes to, and the meaning of, witchcraft cannot, however, be forced into an overarching
framework, but must be approached through the realities of specific, local social relations. Much narrower is Gibson's comparison of a pamphlet published in 1612, *The Witches of Northamptonshire*, with an anonymous manuscript account entitled ‘A Brief Abstract of the Arraignment of Nine Witches at Northampton July 21th 1612’. Inconsistencies of fact between the two accounts are highlighted, besides minor differences in terms of the degree of condemnation they offer, but the wider question of contemporary perceptions of witchcraft is taken no further than this, and little is provided in the way of historiographical context. For Scotland, Goodacre argues (in *Social History*) that it is necessary to place witchcraft prosecutions firmly within the context of the enhanced level of godliness demanded by the Scottish Reformation state, particularly with regard to sexual matters. Patriarchy thus had a broader remit, one that was only partly expressed through the high proportion of women prosecuted for witchcraft, but was by no means dependent upon it. The relationship between women and witchcraft was therefore real, but indirect and bi-directional.

Religious history retains its remarkable popularity. On the issue of Reformation religious policy, Bernard (in *Historical Journal*) argues that Henry VIII rather than Cromwell was very much the dominant force in policy making, and that this policy is best characterized as a search for the middle way. He extends this theme (in *History*) to argue at length that Elton's presentation of Cromwell as the architect of the ‘Tudor revolution in government’ is incorrect and, more briefly, provides evidence from Cromwell’s remembrances to suggest that he faithfully carried through the king’s wishes rather than acting on his own initiative. Marshall provides an example of a swift reaction to the papal convocation of the Council of Mantua in 1536-7, in the form of the burning of John Forest for heresy, partly for his deceit and dissimulation but largely because of his adherence to the Papacy. Chibi offers a social and regional analysis of the Henrician episcopacy, finding its members far less select than they had been in the fifteenth century or were contemporaneously on the continent. It may be going too far, however, to describe them as a representative microcosm of early modern society, for while only some 30 per cent were of gentle birth none listed stands lower than the status of yeoman, a term that is problematic in itself.

The Catholic resurgence noted in last year’s review gathers pace this year. Questier continues his analysis of northern Catholicism, focusing upon the period 1595-1608, to argue that conformity was conceded less grudgingly under James I than under Elizabeth, as the Catholic community felt that he offered greater promise of toleration. Anti-papistry became less coherent after his succession, as Catholicism was no longer as clearly associated with a perceived political agenda. On a narrower canvas but much broader time frame, Sheils provides a detailed study of Catholicism in Egton chapelry in the north Yorkshire moors between 1590 and 1780. He emphasizes the extent of Catholic survivalism in the sixteenth century, reinforced by Counter-Reformation missionary activity in the 1590s, to produce a community where fully one-third of the adult population were Catholic by 1676. Interestingly, little evidence of social polarization or friction between Catholics and Protestants is to be found, Catholicism surviving and prospering through accommodation and compromise, which, it is argued, were factors equally as important as firm conviction to the faith. Towards the upper end of the social spectrum, the writings of Sir Thomas Shirley, a Catholic antiquarian, examined by Cust, reveal concerted attempts to maintain respect and recognition in an essentially Protestant milieu. Hence while his writings are typical of the gentry at large in the first half of the seventeenth century in focusing upon lineage, such considerations receive even greater emphasis here, as the one sure
basis upon which the Catholic gentry could compete with their Protestant peers. Most interesting of all, although based upon the possibly fragile foundation of recusant reports, is Sulston's analysis of Catholicism between 1585 and 1602 in, of all places, Norfolk. Geographically, recusants were quite dispersed across the county, but some major concentrations were found in remote, sparsely settled, and poor districts, lacking the focus of local Catholic gentry that has often been seen as central to the existence of thriving Catholic communities. It is suggested that up to 21 per cent of Norfolk gentry may have been Catholic, a surprisingly high proportion, but that popular Catholicism by no means always depended upon their influence.

Two articles bridge the gulf between the rival religious camps. Hence Hunt argues that the sacraments and predestination have been unduly counterposed by historians, for the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper (as Holy Communion came to be known) remained central to Church of England practice. It may have been held infrequently, but was in popular demand at Easter, as a result of its use as an instrument of reconciliation, a reinforcement of social distinctions, a focus for charitable activity, and a means to cement parochial identity. For puritans, moreover, the regular receipt of the sacrament remained important as a means to confirm faith, if less important than the Word. Ultimately, however, popular interest was undermined from the 1640s by ministerial emphasis upon preparedness to receive it. Walsham (in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*) offers reflections and speculations on the parochial roots of Laudianism, to argue that support could indeed be found but that it was selective, few parishioners accepting the full Laudian package. It is suggested that there was probably a direct line of descent from Elizabethan Catholicism to Laudian reform, and (more speculatively) possibly also an element of recoil from Calvinism. Returning to more immediately pressing problems of the Anglican church, Carter (in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*) provides an analysis of clerical polemic in support of ministers’ maintenance from the earliest days of the Reformation through the Elizabethan period. Hooker was just one among many to reflect the consistently held view of lay impropriations as sacrilegious, besides expressing concern that the social status of the clergy would be impugned in the process, impeding their ability to spread the gospel. But while Anglicans and Presbyterians agreed that ministers should be adequately maintained, they disagreed about the means by which this should be achieved. Usher believes that royal depredation of church property may have been exaggerated, at least in relation to the bishoprics of Durham and Winchester. While the handling of the estates of these wealthy sees may have been opportunistic, hasty, and unwise after 1559, the Crown did not act in the imperious and punitive manner that is often assumed, and the church regained the greater part of its ancient estates. Hooker features more centrally in Perrott’s interpretation of *The Laws* as a contribution to the Elizabethan conformist tradition, presenting them as a unique attempt to resolve the disunity of the Church of England by strengthening its authority as a legislative body, and building the confidence of its members in its laws. Robinson explores the work of a group of historians and textual scholars employed by Archbishop Parker in the 1560s and 1570s engaged in editing and publishing documents of medieval ecclesiastical history, who set out to reform the English past by reforming its texts, purging them of the ‘corruptions’ of Catholic influences in an attempt to construct a purified past to testify to the truth of the English Protestant present. McCullough re-examines Laudian censorship, to argue that the edition of the works of Lancelot Andrewes by Laud and Buckeridge reveals a kind of positive censorship, promulgating approved texts rather than simply
suppressing objectionable ones. Milton expands on the same theme, responding to recent attempts to play down Laudian censorship by asserting that there is indeed evidence of attempts to control the output of religious material, besides an effective tightening of regulation in the 1630s. This was not an all-embracing European-style censorship, but a more subtle attempt to control what opinion passed for orthodoxy in the church, often representing a struggle to control the middle ground rather than simply a repression of extremes. The reminder, almost as an aside, that there was clearly a contemporary perception of tighter control, may be the key point to note. Thompson reinforces the notion of enhanced censorship through an examination of the career of G. R. Weckherlin, whose replacement as political licenser for the press by Francis Windebank reflects the greater control sought by Charles I after 1627.

Godly reformation features less prominently this year. Gilbert provides an analysis of the impact of church and gentry alliance at King’s Norton in Worcestershire in 1655-60, largely through examination of alehouse regulation, to suggest that here at least it was more successful than has often been suggested. With Walsham’s re-examination (in *Historical Journal*) of the career of ‘Frantick’ William Hacket, an Elizabethan false prophet, we move into the shadowy realms where religious fanaticism and insanity reside cheek by jowl. Hacket was an illiterate maltmaker, who plotted a civil and ecclesiastical coup, and was duly executed in 1591. His behaviour, however, remained firmly rooted in popular culture, through from his habitual drunkenness to the employment of both white and black magic. It is suggested that it may be a mistake to assume an unbridgeable gulf between the ethos of the godly elite and the outlook and lifestyle of the ungodly multitude, but one must doubt if the example of Hacket can really be used as a peg for this particular argument, even if his description as ‘contradictory and amphibious’ (*sic*) owes more to the vagaries of the modern spellchecker than it does to his rather unusual theological convictions. In a far more discursive piece that takes us from William Harrison to William Perkins to William Shakespeare and beyond, Kaufman also argues that it is far too simple to view puritans as universally determined to withdraw from and impose moral discipline upon the lower social orders: some clearly strove to reach across caste barriers, to include and to level rather than to divide. Few would take issue with the conclusion that a bipolar model of society is far too simple, doing no justice to the gradations of the social hierarchy or to the wide variation of local emphasis and practice. Adding to the complexity of the issue, McGee wrestles with the problem of defining puritanism through a case study of Thomas Adams, preacher at St Gregory’s in London, who some historians have labelled as ‘puritan’ even though he used the term pejoratively himself. His written work does reveal a number of attitudes and concerns, with predestination, sabbatarianism, hostility to theatre, general moral severity, and anti-Catholicism, that are part and parcel of accepted puritan mentality. But he was also hostile to the extremes of the Separatists and Anabaptists, and even to Presbyterian contentiousness about discipline, and was quite prepared to countenance a degree of ceremony and church embellishment. The conclusion drawn is that he was not a puritan, but a mainstream Calvinist Protestant of the ilk of Bishop Hall, but one must wonder if this begs the wider question. When is a puritan not a puritan? When he is (only) a Calvinist? Merritt is also concerned to blur the lines, by arguing that the polemic between puritan neglect of churches and Laudian beautification is a contemporary one and the evidence for London shows a sustained revival of church building and enhancement well before Laud’s emergence, even if he was responsible for significantly intensifying the campaign.
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Harley attempts to give a shade of definition to the Calvinist majority of the Jacobean Church of England by arguing that while there was general disapproval of the practice of medicine by clergymen in this period, Calvinists offered objections that were more theologically based. Harley shows that the overwhelming majority of men who did indeed pursue these two occupations were non-Calvinists. The relationship between puritanism and liberty is revisited by Coffey, who argues that while puritans sought a godly society rather than a pluralistic one, a minority argued forcefully for toleration of heresy, blasphemy, Catholicism, non-Christian religions, and even atheism, even if their arguments were couched in deeply traditional terms. The view that the New Testament paradigm required the church to be a purely voluntary, non-coercive community linked the radical sectarian with the Levellers, a link that became increasingly severed as the Levellers lost their spiritual moorings while the sects drifted further towards an obsession with the saints.

Gender studies are again well represented. Straddling the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries is French’s study of the growing number of women’s parish guilds, as revealed in extant churchwardens’ accounts. These provided opportunities for both single and married women to organize, raise funds, socialize, and worship, exemplifying the broader account of late-medieval social capital by McIntosh discussed above. Paradoxically, however, they also affirmed and reinforced ‘appropriate’ female behaviour, interests, and status, for few women rose above guild office, it was rare to find a female churchwarden, and some parishes required women to relinquish their positions upon marriage. Gender and social control is the subject of Jones and Zell’s study of Fordwich in Kent from 1450 to 1570. The borough court records reveal heightened concern about social behaviour, of women in particular, in the period 1491-1520, and a dramatic decline between 1531 and 1570, adding to the growing evidence of a campaign of moral regulation during the reign of Henry VIII, which may have been associated with frequent outbreaks of epidemic disease, chiming neatly with the interpretation of Hanawalt discussed above. Few of the accused were economically or socially marginal, and hence the driving force was certainly not social control as usually construed, nor were such campaigns necessarily contingent upon rising population and poverty. These very interesting results must, of course, be qualified by noting that Fordwich was a very small borough, its courts producing an average of only three cases per annum over this 120-year period. More broadly based is Whittle’s study of female landholding in six north-east Norfolk parishes between 1440 and 1580. Using wills, manorial court rolls, and estate surveys, she provides a detailed appraisal of the proportions of female tenants, their participation in the land market, the inheritance of property by daughters, married women’s joint tenure, the provisions made for widows, and the connection between land and remarriage. Women’s inferior legal position and a cultural hostility to female landholding are the basic explanations of the generally low number holding land, while the precarious economic position of women explains why many did receive land in bequests. Differences between manors may have been due to variations in demand for land and variant tenurial arrangements, but this is overshadowed by a remarkable constancy over time, indicating the pervasiveness of basic cultural attitudes. This is an excellent article that repays close reading. Churches tackles much the same theme through a case study of Whitehaven in 1660-1750, presenting her evidence in a series of mini-biographies rather than in quantitative form. Using a wide variety of sources, she finds that the evidence relating to ordinary families more than bears out the conclusions of Amy Erickson, indicating a much more equitable distri-
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bution of assets to wives and daughters than has been found among the landowning classes. Moreover, the capable handling of those assets corroborates hints that women must have participated in business prior to the death of their fathers and husbands, even if they clearly played second fiddle, an argument that can be supported by probate evidence from a number of early modern provincial towns. Less stimulating is Deal’s study of widows and reputation in the diocese of Chester, which argues that while language was a powerful tool for all women to defend their honour and tarnish that of others, widows were essentially the same in this respect as adult women generally. Evenden’s study of the Barber-Surgeon Company in seventeenth-century London produces no surprises either, for while the numerous unlicensed female surgeons no doubt made a major contribution, very few received the legitimization of a licence, and those who did had to prove that they were exceptionally well qualified. Roberts offers a close reading of the conduct books of Thomas Tusser (c. 1570) and Gervase Markham (1615). He finds that they were not straightforwardly prescriptive, but also took observed areas of women’s competencies into account (for example, in the malting trade), and can thus be deemed a valuable source for social history, not merely a means to ascertain contemporary perceptions of appropriate gender roles. On a broader canvas, Pollock provides a detailed analysis of the Barrett-Lennard archives to adjudicate between those historians who portray the seventeenth-century family as a sanctuary of emotional support and those who prefer to emphasize female oppression, sibling jealousy, and inter-generational rivalry. Very sensibly, she concludes that it could be both, simultaneously or serially, and hence such a divide is too simplistic. Pursuing a now familiar theme, she also finds that women could indeed be assertive, but concludes that male insecurity was more often the product of the threat posed by other men. Rape is the subject of Walker’s analysis of over 100 seventeenth-century narratives from both common and canon law courts, mainly centred upon Cheshire. She finds that, in order to deflect notions of female complicity and disorderliness that could undermine accusations of rape, reports were articulated in terms of male violence rather than as a sexual act, physical resistance was played down, and rape was rarely depicted as successful, avoidance being usually attributed to flight or the intervention of third parties.

A variety of urban studies appears this year. While accepting that the notion of urban decline and crisis in the period 1350-1650 has been ‘both compelling and elusive’, Hoyle (in Northern History) finds clear evidence of financial difficulties in York between 1525 and 1536, partly alleviated by reduced financial burdens after 1536 but only fully resolved by the impact of the mid-Tudor inflation on the city’s fee farm. His pessimistic view of York’s financial plight is thus less qualified than that of Palliser, but it is good to see some recognition of the positive impact of inflation upon mercantile fortunes to counterbalance the usual emphasis upon its negative social effects. Hipkin explores the maritime economy of Rye in 1560-1640, detecting a veritable boom into the 1560s and marked contraction thereafter, the town thus providing a distinct contrast to more orthodox versions of general urban fortunes across these years—a debate with which the author does not engage. The symbiotic relationship between overseas trade, coastal trade, and fishing lay at the heart of Rye’s difficulties, for its economy, it is argued, depended upon the existence of flexible opportunities for the deployment of capital and equipment. The distinct revival in the 1630s was due to favourable external circumstances, but demonstrates that harbour silting was only one reason for its decline and not, as is often suggested, the whole story. Tittler further explores a theme familiar to all who have read...
his recent work, arguing that the emergence of civic portraiture in the later sixteenth century reflected a political agenda, designed selectively to reconstruct the collective memory of particular communities and thus to legitimize the authority of urban governments. Patterson also explores the mechanisms that provided stable government in English provincial boroughs but provides a broader and more compelling analysis, emphasizing the importance of consensual decision making and the minimization of conflict through frequent recourse to third-party adjudication by borough patrons. Late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century disputes centred upon questions of precedence, honour, office, money, and property, and determined efforts generally led to their resolution, but when religion and politics came to the fore, as the nation lurch towards civil war, the will to compromise was lost, and the wholesale removal of those with whom one disagreed became the norm. An unfortunate omission from this otherwise very interesting article is consideration of the potentially divergent interests of different social groups. Urban government in the later seventeenth century is investigated by Halliday, who examines the commissions of association granted to county justices in 21 towns in 1664-88. While there was some element of self-interest behind this, notably enforcement of excise collection, it is argued that the most important factor determining their use or otherwise was provincial agitation, and hence credence must be given to the integration of central and provincial authority as well as the elements of conflict they reflect. Short takes a detailed look at the Letter Book of the Corporation of Hull in 1685-8, which reveals the success of James I's agents in rigging the membership to ensure support for his preferred MP. Had the parliamentary elections gone ahead, the Hull evidence suggests that James could indeed have been successful in packing the House of Commons. Furdell provides a detailed analysis of the stock and business of Dorman Newman, a substantial London bookseller and publisher, between 1670 and 1694. Newman carried a wide variety of books, including religious, political, scientific, and astrological works, and published over 200 titles himself during the period, besides running a pharmacy from his premises in the Poultrey. The business may have been crude compared with that of many eighteenth-century London booksellers, but nevertheless flourished by catering to a variety of purses and interests and using a range of advertising methods which responded to consumer needs and behaviour. Over-extension led to bankruptcy in 1694, however, indicating the inherent risks of the book trade in late seventeenth-century London. Tiller's analysis of the 1685 inventory of William Brock, mercer, of Dorchester reveals varied but sparse merchandise, while a wider examination of shopkeepers' inventories shows a similar pattern across south Oxfordshire, a marked multiplication of retail outlets emerging only after 1730.

Finally, other regional and local studies not discussed elsewhere in this review include that by Bennett, who finds greater instability and uncertainty with regard to the burden of levies and appropriations in Wales than in England during the First Civil War, punctuating the regular and heavy taxation levied by Royalist and Parliamentarian regimes before and after. Further north, two contributions add to the understanding of the administration of more outlying provinces. Thornton extends the discussion of the problem of multiple kingdoms through examination of the continuing autonomy of the Isle of Man which, for different reasons, both English and Scottish kings continued to regard as Scottish. Goodacre (in Scottish Historical Review) focuses upon the attempt to subdue and integrate the Western Isles of Scotland. Through an examination of the context of the Statutes of lona of 1609, he argues that they should be removed from
centre stage, preferring to emphasize the gradual nature of change under James I, echoing a theme which runs through a number of the contributions on offer this year.
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Never before has the long-running debate about the standard of living during the industrial revolution been conducted on so many fronts, and now the battle-lines have moved firmly in favour of the pessimists. In his recent Tawney lecture, Feinstein declared that he was not optimistic that his latest contribution would finally settle the argument, but his careful construction of a new series of real earnings for manual workers strikes a powerful blow for the pessimists’ case. Applying a more sophisticated cost of living index than that used by Lindert and Williamson, Feinstein estimates that the net improvement in the standard of living of an average working-class family was no more than 15 per cent between 1780 and 1850. Szreter and Mooney together add to this dismal picture by compiling life expectancy tables for large English cities which reveal rising levels of mortality in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, the result, they argue, of declining vaccination rates and the increasing virulence of disease. Further gloom is dispensed by Humphries, who draws on the Cambridge dataset on household budgets to show how female-headed households were poor and getting poorer. Using the same dataset, Horrell, Humphries, and Voth document the extreme deprivation of the children of lone mothers in terms of their health, early-age working, insufficient nutrition, low level of skills and productivity, morbidity, and low earning power. One of their findings is that boys in such households were significantly smaller in stature than their peers. However, the debate about the utility of height data stagnates on, into technical obscurity. Razzell complains that the results of Voth and Leunig are inconsistent with what is known about the history of smallpox in London. By relying on the Floud, Wachter, and Gregory dataset of Marine Society records instead of consulting the original sources, Voth and Leunig understate the prevalence of smallpox as a childhood disease and overstate the extent to which it reduced heights. Heintel and Baten calculate the modal heights of Marine Society recruits and conclude that there is no evidence of the effect of smallpox on height. They accuse Voth and Leunig of ignoring the impact of the changing minimum height requirement for recruits. In their reply, Voth and Leunig appear to misinterpret Razzell’s point about ‘dubious entries’ in the records, and as their totals for recruits ‘without the pox’ are at odds with Razzell’s own figures, they would do well to heed, rather than ignore, his advice to go back to the sources. They are on firmer ground, however, when they point out that modal heights were unaffected by changes in the minimum height requirements, and that some of Heintel and Baten’s results suffer from small sample size. Komlos (in Journal of Economic History) has no difficulty in accepting heights as a useful proxy for the biological standard of living. Surveying the factors which conspired to reduce heights, he argues that economic rather than epidemiological explanations are more convincing. Komlos (in Journal of European Economic History) also estimates that, without food from the New World, English GNP would have been 10 per cent lower in 1816, and the proportion of the population on a subsistence diet would have more than doubled. Thus, at the margins, transatlantic supplies may have mattered in sustaining demographic growth through the Malthusian trap and beyond, which is in accord with the argument made, rather obscurely, by Morineau.

Historians continue to be divided about the extent to which the old poor law relieved poverty during the industrial revolution. On occasion, the uncertainties
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appear within the same article. Ottaway commences by telling us that poor relief was not significant for the elderly, but concludes by stating that the ‘care package’ of money and in-kind relief was crucial for this group, even though the real value of parish pensions fell rapidly in the late eighteenth century. Lindert finds the English pattern of rising, then falling levels of poor relief peculiar in Europe. He offers a ‘pressure-group’ explanation in which relief declined from the 1830s when electoral power shifted to the towns and away from labour-hiring farmers. Hindle uncovers local relief policies in Lincolnshire which consistently aimed at excluding outsiders while providing a substantial level of support for the indigenous poor. By contrast, Song (in Continuity & Change) argues that in Oxfordshire magistrates were more effective than parish officers in controlling labour mobility through the use of the settlement laws. Those deemed more employable were granted certificates and they migrated over shorter distances than those issued with removal orders. Furthermore Song (in this journal) contests that the formation of poor law unions enhanced the control of the gentry over local labour markets, so that the great variation in the scale and method of relief reflected not parish autonomy but different strategies among the landed classes. Too often, work on the poor law presents the pauper as the passive victim, buffeted at will by economic forces and institutionalized power. An important corrective is provided by Howells, who examines records of assisted emigration under the new poor law, and discovers that many of the poor knew their rights and were able to bargain with the authorities over the level and form of assistance. In the petitions of poor would-be emigrants there are some startling examples of their assertiveness and sheer bloody-mindedness when confronted with parish bureaucracy. Murdoch, by contrast, presents a more traditional picture of emigrants from the Scottish Highlands, pushed out by sheep farming and rising rents from the 1730s, and providing a consistent, largely positive image of America in their letters home.

Scholars continue to explore how tough the labour market was for those involved. Gorsky finds that the most rapidly growing regions had the highest rates of friendly society membership, Tuttle discovers rising levels of exploitation of child labour in the textile industries, and Green counts trade disputes in London newspapers. More novel and more interesting is the research of Voth, who uses data collected from witnesses’ accounts at Old Bailey trials to reconstruct time at work. He finds that the number of days worked each year increased during the second half of the eighteenth century, chiefly due to working on Mondays and holy days. This, he suggests, helps explain the apparent conundrum between falling real wages and rising per caput consumption during this period, and also points to the relative insignificance of productivity improvements in explaining output growth during the industrial revolution. Those who believe in the survival of Saint Monday will be sceptical of the London bias of Voth’s data, and of his claim that abstention—from leisure rather than consumption—was more important than invention for economic growth. Hatcher argues that the ‘leisure preference’ of workers was not just a figment of the imagination of those who had a vested interest in keeping labour down. His evidence suggests that during the eighteenth century additional real income was spent mostly on small, perishable low-cost items, which were not sufficiently attractive to overturn the propensity to take time off work when earnings rose. By the beginning of the nineteenth century the evolution of a fully fledged industriousness and consumerism had still to be completed. Clark and van der Werf also reject the notion of an ‘industrious revolution’. Basing their arguments on wage data for farm labourers and sawyers, and making some mighty assumptions such as full
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adult male employment, they find little gain in hours or intensity of work per day, and a norm of around 300 days worked per year between the thirteenth century and the nineteenth. According to Ashworth, however, there was certainly an intensification of work in the naval dockyards between 1796 and 1804 under the management of the redoubtable Samuel Bentham. True to the family philosophy, Bentham rationalized, mechanized, increased vigilance, depersonalized decision making, and standardized forms of accounting with the aim of making the labour process completely transparent. These reforms are said to have saved the Admiralty some £17,000 annually in Portsmouth alone. In a similar vein, Hay uncovers a close working relationship between a small number of highly active local magistrates and employers in the enforcement of labour law during the eighteenth century. As with the poor law, however, workers were not without bargaining power when confronted with authority. Evans finds a continued ‘obduracy’ and ability to control definitions of skill among forgemen even after the new process of puddling had doubled their workload, while Wark notes a shift from subordination to negotiation in the workplaces of Yorkshire domestic servants as they became excluded from the nuclear family. Hewitt finds that the Manchester poor were largely immune to the feverish activity of domestic missionaries as would-be agents of social discipline. King presents data which indicate the rising levels of indictments of juveniles for property crime, especially in urban areas, with the young increasingly being dealt with under summary jurisdiction from the 1820s.

A bountiful harvest was reaped in agrarian history this year. The prolific Clark (‘Renting the revolution’), using data from the land tax and the Charity Commission, rejects the new agricultural rent series produced by Turner, Beckett, and Afton as understating the true rental value of land by as much as a factor of five. In reply, these authors dismiss Clark’s claim that they have tended to measure customary rather than market rents. They suggest that Clark’s rental values are grossly inflated by urban landholdings, and reject the land tax as a good proxy for rents. With such huge unresolved disparities in estimates, this debate should be continued, if only for the peace of mind of the lay reader struggling through the thicket of leases, copyholds, fines, and market and customary rents. Clark (in Research in Economic History) presents his datasets, compiled from the Charity Commissioners’ reports, on capital assets, on land and house values, and on the enclosure status of land. He finds that land rentals c. 1700 imply a high level of productivity, and that subsequently productivity rose by less than 25 per cent, that the Glorious Revolution had no impact on prices or the rate of return on private assets, that government debt crowded out little private investment during the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, and that the cost of housing between the 1770s and the 1820s increased at twice the rate suggested by Feinstein. Elsewhere Clark (‘Commons sense’) argues that rents did not double as a result of enclosure. There were only modest enclosure profits to be made, suggesting the relative efficiency of most commons land. Clark (in Explorations in Economic History) constructs a series for rates of return on land transactions between 1560 and 1909, and compares this with returns on other assets. He finds that until the nineteenth century the price of land per £1 of return was, on average, a mere 9 per cent above that of non-status assets, suggesting little or no ‘psychic premium’ from holding land. The landed classes did not have to choose between owning land and maximizing income during this period, and it was only in the Victorian era that land moved from being a commodity to a status good.

After the fireworks from Clark, the work of other agrarian historians may
seem a little dull. There are, however, several other useful contributions this year. Scott, Duncan, and Duncan find that, while medium-term cycles (13-16 years) in grain prices were correlated with the weather, short-term cycles (five-six years) were driven by economic factors, by the one-year-lagged autoregressive effects of harvests, and, more speculatively, by regular fungal epidemics in grain. Wade Martins and Williamson together argue, contrary to Arthur Young, that in East Anglia the long lease was not a crucial factor in the improvement of farming. They also find, however, that husbandry prescriptions in leases became increasingly standardized towards the end of the eighteenth century, reflecting a tendency to bureaucratization and the increasing negotiating power of landlords over tenants. Turner uses the ‘invasion returns’ to estimate national livestock totals c. 1800. He suggests that sheep numbers rose from 14 million to 19 million by the late 1860s, contrary to the decline suggested by contemporary estimates. Dodgshon reconstructs long-run livestock trends in the southern Highlands of Scotland, and finds evidence of an increase in sheep numbers before the mid-eighteenth-century clearances. He concludes that the clearances were part of a series of ongoing adjustments in stocking. Many ‘sheep farms’ continued to produce substantial amounts of grain, which in turn acted as a restraint on stocking capacities well into the nineteenth century. Moore-Colyer offers an upbeat assessment of enclosure in a Northamptonshire parish, where the benefits of woodland common grazing were marginal and where those disposing of freeholds did not fall inexorably into the ranks of waged labour. Beckett, Turner, and Cowell demonstrate how farming continued through enclosure and how commissioners actively monitored the process to assure a smooth transition. However Pearson’s study of a communal protest against a rapacious Essex farmer’s encroachment on common land reminds us that traditional rights were sometimes defended with vigour. Other contributors to agrarian themes include Hallas, who describes landownership patterns in north Yorkshire; Seymour, Daniels, and Watkins, who examine the ways in which Sir George Cornewall managed his estates in Herefordshire and Grenada; and Pearson and Collier, who use a geographical information system to map cultivation, tithe rents, and landownership in mid-nineteenth-century Pembrokeshire.

While the output of agrarian historians rose sharply this year, that of ‘industrial historians’—a genre announced by a new journal launched this year—remained steady. Wellington explores relative factor prices, but finds little evidence of greater incentives to innovate in England compared with Europe. Instead the ‘best support’ for a purely economic explanation of English innovation lies in the cheaper cost of borrowing. Despite the jargon, one is able to discern Inkster’s point that what mattered for industrial growth was technological transfer, not technological creativity. Britain was distinctive because of the relatively free transmission of technical information through ‘collectively constructed networks’ and among ‘diverse social groups in diverse localities’. Stewart is also not very clear when he argues that the ‘market for machines and ideas’ shaped mechanical experimentation in eighteenth-century Britain. Success or failure in the promotion of public science depended upon a representation of social utility, especially by the type of fashionable, peripatetic science lecturers found by Fawcett in Bath. Stobart (in Textile History) uses early eighteenth-century probates to map textile occupations in north-west England, and discovers what was already known, that there was a geographical specialization of production, and that most finishing and dealing took place in towns. Harley demonstrates definitively that no ‘average’ price for cotton yarn and cloth can represent the experience of the entire cotton industry. New technology at the end of the eighteenth century had widely
differing effects on different products. The greatest price decline was in fine yarn and in the new muslins made from it, while coarse cloth fell least in price, so that the relative cost of common calicoes rose. However, the most dramatic price movements were over by 1800, and it was production costs, not consumer demand, that ultimately determined what manufacturers produced. Parthasarathi argues that the competitive advantage of textile producers in southern India during the eighteenth century lay in the greater productivity of rice cultivation over grain farming in Britain, which allowed money wages to be lower and cloth cheaper. Industrialization in Britain and Europe was thus ‘a means of overcoming relative agricultural backwardness’. Smith (in this journal) discovers from trade data that there was an increase in North American production of basic consumer items such as nails in the decades before the revolution. Most consumer needs continued to be met by imports, but local manufacturing output kept pace with colonial population growth. Using census data and trade returns, Geary also finds no evidence of deindustrialization in Ireland before the Famine. Even by 1851 proportionately more workers were employed in textiles in Ireland than in Britain. Most of the job losses in the 1840s can be explained by technological change and by population decline, rather than by trade with Britain. Cookson explains the long delay in mechanizing Yorkshire card making by limited demand and the small circle of potential innovators. Burt argues that much of the metal-mining industry in England before 1800 was small scale and fitted the proto-industrial model of growth. Ellis argues that the cartels in the Tyneside coal industry before 1750 were largely defensive and quite effective. Hopkins emphasizes the importance of export markets in determining the fluctuations in Birmingham’s economy between 1793 and 1815, while, for the same period, Behagg demonstrates the flexibility of Birmingham gunmakers in being able to respond to increasing demand without huge inputs of fixed capital. Jarvis looks at fraudulent practices in the building of Liverpool docks and the Liverpool-Manchester railway.

In a special issue of Business History on the emergence of modern retailing, Barnfield usefully describes the internal organization of joint-stock flour and bread retail societies established before 1820, and demonstrates how competitive they could be, while Fowler argues that the late eighteenth century saw significant changes in retailing practice, which included the decline of the wholesale trade at fairs, and the rise of fixed place and specialist retailing. Stobart (in Urban History) looks at shopping streets in eighteenth-century Chester. Hancock argues that ‘conversation’ between producers and consumers enhanced the integration of the Atlantic economy and led to the creation of new products such as Madeira wine. McCloskey, who emphasizes cultural discourse as well as profit maximization as a factor underpinning commercial growth, would endorse Hancock’s notion of innovation as discursive and reciprocal, driven by the imperatives of both consumption and production. In a more neo-classical vein, Smith (in Slavery & Abolition) argues that British West Indians failed to grow more coffee, not because it was a ‘boom and bust’ commodity, but because of a fiscal regime which normally discriminated in favour of tea and sugar and because of the navigation laws which raised the cost of re-exports.

As usual there were few articles on financial topics for this period. In a splendid piece, Hollis and Sweetman examine the hundreds of funds supplying ‘microcredit’—the average loan was around £4—to one in five Irish households before the Famine. They dismiss the notion that the Irish poor were ‘not ready’ for banking. These loan funds successfully chartered moral hazard and enforcement problems and made a surplus in a market which banks found
unprofitable, because they made better use of local information. Newton and Cottrell explain the slow growth of branch banking in England after 1826 by the continued number of private banks, the declining importance of note issue, and the spectacular failure of a few large district banks. Michie examines how arbitrage—the buying and selling of securities simultaneously in different markets, profiting from price differentials—underpinned the development of a ‘relatively sturdy’ international monetary system during the eighteenth century. However, before 1850 arbitrage operated under two constraints, namely the tendency for securities held abroad to be repatriated continually as they were redeemed, and delays in communication which increased exposure to the risk of price movements.

Lin-Lee and Loschky estimate a set of regressions to explain long swings in population growth and real wages in England. They conclude that because of the different time-lag effects, the response of real wages to demographic change was different in the late seventeenth century, when population growth was held back by rising death rates, than in the late eighteenth century, when population growth was fuelled by a rising birth rate. Wrigley suggests that the rise in marital fertility between the mid-seventeenth and mid-nineteenth centuries was due to a decline in the incidence of stillbirths. This decline, together with changes in nuptiality, accounted for nearly all of the population growth in this period, suggesting the importance of improvements in maternal nutrition, and in turn the impact of economic change. Lewis argues that maternal mortality among aristocrats ought to have been lower, but for class-specific reasons which removed the advantages of wealth, such as too much or too little medical intervention, the effects of starvation diets prescribed by fashionable accoucheurs, teenage marriages, and short birth intervals facilitated by wet nursing. The culpability of the medical profession in another area, however, is mitigated by Jackson, who argues, from the evidence of one contested will, that early nineteenth-century taxonomies of mental deficiency owed as much to lay concerns about the protection of family inheritance rights as to the professional self-interest of doctors.

Transitions in the definitions of gender continue to be the focus of interesting work. Wahrmann uses dramatic prologues and epilogues to argue that around 1780 there was a sudden shift towards a more censorious view of sexual ambiguity. This, he suggests, was caused by a ‘gender panic’ brought about by the American Revolution, which became a metaphor for the breakdown of family relations. Sixty years later, when gender boundaries were presumed to be more rigidly drawn, Robson finds an ‘unresolved encounter’ between the ideal of the ‘perfect girl’, presented in the conduct literature of the 1840s, and the visions of exploited working girls revealed by the Children’s Employment Commission. The concept gave the middle classes a yardstick for measuring how far conditions in the industrial districts had deteriorated, but idealized images of girlhood survived this attack and continued to proliferate for another 40 years.

Two articles on social mobility reject the Stones’ thesis of a closed elite. McCahill concludes that both French and English aristocracies were open to newcomers during the eighteenth century. However, in France new entrants contributed to the fragmentation of the nobility, while in England they became integrated into a coherent entity. Wasson, from data collected on English parliamentary dynasties, finds no evidence of increasing exclusivity in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Churches, examining chancery suits conducted between the Lowther family and their tenants, claims that the readiness of Whitehaven folk to turn to the courts reveals their belief in the rule of law against arbitrary
behaviour, although the cases also demonstrate how litigation could provide the means of pursuing local grudges, commercial rivalries, religious bigotries, and political ambitions. Sweet argues that a civic ideology of independence remained a powerful force in borough politics throughout the period 1770 to 1830, while Morris contests that over this period a concept of ‘civil society’ emerged, which identified with the free market, the rule of law, and a strong, pluralist associational culture. Nenadic examines portraiture as a vehicle for the instruction of the Scottish middle class in the Enlightenment values of sociability, rationality, and sensibility. Mayhew finds that geography books combined scholarly and commercial traditions in keeping with the values of the ‘English Enlightenment’, and Raven argues that historians should be ‘decoding’ the eighteenth-century reading experience, without offering many ideas as to how do this. Also in a postmodernist vein, Joyce blames the Enlightenment for containing the root of modernity’s ‘denial of ambivalence’, and castigates academic historians for clinging to the delusion of ‘historical objectivity’ and for failing to recognize the operation of power in the creation of historical discourse.

Gibson claims that accusations of corruption against the Hanoverian church were unjustified, and even finds scruples among those who refused bishoprics. Pluralism created a ‘squarson’ class of affluent clergy who helped to shore up political and religious peace. There was little peace for early Methodists, however, hounded by the local crowds in the Pendle Forest riots of 1748 described by Snape, or thrown into turmoil by mass revivals, such as those in Cornwall examined by Rule. Rule dismisses exogenous explanations for Cornish revivals, and argues instead that they acted as a release valve for the expected penitent conversion of a pool of young ‘hearers’, which had built up over time. Davies discusses how newspapers reported cases of witchcraft and magic and how these reports helped to sustain such beliefs into the early twentieth century.

Finally there was the usual crop of articles on empire, popular politics, and reform. Magennis argues that the Oakboy disturbances in Ireland in 1763 reflected the increasing political independence of Protestant freeholders below the landed elite, while Quinn claims the United Irishmen were more innovative in their views on social issues than has been realized. Griffin uses the writings of Charles Lucas, the ‘Wilkes of Ireland’, to examine connections between Irish and American radicals on the eve of the revolution. At the same time as colonial discontent was increasing, Bowen claims that a vision of a more integrated empire was emerging among writers who recognized the interdependency of trade between Britain, the West Indies, India, and America. Christie’s study of Thomas Whately, Grenville’s secretary to the Treasury in the mid-1760s, lends much support to Bowen’s case. Harris and Whatley together argue that royal birthday celebrations in the reign of George II provided one means by which a loyal presbyterian Scotland found a clearer political identity of its own. In contrast, Széchi describes the plight of patrician Scottish Jacobites unable to come to terms with exile after the 1715 uprising. Turner narrates the career of Perronet Thompson as an anti-corn law agitator, and Lopatin argues that the political unions of the early 1830s stood in a tradition of popular constitutionalism which stretched from the 1770s through to Chartism. There was no sympathy for this tradition from the ultra-tory Robert Southey, whose obnoxious authoritarian views are analysed by Harling, while a softer image of conservatism is presented by Gambles, who argues that protectionism appealed to tories because it was promoted as a kind of ‘public economics’, which aimed at increasing domestic consumption and ensuring balanced growth.
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In a paper assessing the lessons of the industrial revolution and its aftermath, Crafts observes that ‘Trying to understand the somewhat surprising ascendancy of Britain and how the nation then fell back to being an also-ran has been a staple of British economic history and has generated a rich literature.’ This is something of an understatement since the preoccupation with economic underperformance and the quest to specify Britain’s economic peculiarities has now become an ideology of declinism. With no master narrative in modern British economic history, and with the profession continuing to be divided between a minority of cliometricians and a majority who follow the linguistic turn, we have a huge and diverse literature but accordingly few settled conclusions. Crafts’s useful survey demonstrates how conventional neo-classical growth models cannot readily explain why Britain lost its early lead, whereas more recent endogenous growth theory, with its emphasis on productivity growth as the outcome of incentive structures that may differ between countries, can—but not wholly so, as it cannot encompass some important characteristics of the British experience. In so doing he assists in refining the research questions that now need to be explored.

The quest to identify the forces responsible for relative economic decline thus continues to dominate the modern British writing on the subject. However, that debate has changed out of all recognition in recent years from the search for scapegoats—particularly the long-standing culprits of entrepreneurial weaknesses and dysfunctional industrial relations—to something much more nuanced: as much the study of government failure as of market failure. However, among the non-cliometricians there are anxieties that some protagonists are not being historically realistic about the counterfactual policies and other market-government reforms which, on the basis of later implementation and probable efficacy, might have been of assistance if transplanted to earlier periods. Assessments of what was administratively and politically possible, and what was not, thus form a new fault line.

Representative of this tension is the exchange in Business History prompted by the 1996 paper by Broadberry and Crafts on economic policy and performance, c. 1945-60. They had been particularly critical of the Attlee governments which, while delivering macroeconomic stability, had not been sufficiently attentive to the competitive environment in goods markets or to the bargaining structure of industrial relations necessary to secure rapid productivity growth. While this was hardly a novel thesis, Broadberry and Crafts had provided a fresh twist with their econometric estimation of a bargaining model which confirmed that market power and unionization were statistically significant explanatory variables in the British and Anglo-American productivity records. Tomlinson and Tiratsoo take exception to this old tale freshly told. They contend that Broadberry and Crafts overstate the degree of cartelization and the extent and seriousness of restrictive practices. They also object to the econometrics, although these are easy (and necessarily unresolvable) criticisms which focus on the questionable nature of the proxies that Broadberry and Crafts are forced to use for some dependent variables.

The role of government in economic decline—both what it did and, increasingly, what it did not do—has been the focus of a number of other studies. Garside (in Business and Economic History) details how the post-1945 British
state never had a coherent developmental strategy and could not, therefore, mould and alter the inherited structures, markets, and technologies to augment competitiveness and thus reap the opportunities for growth and modernization which presented themselves to most west European countries and to Japan. One attempt at a modernizing strategy was the creation of the National Economic Development Council in 1962. Ringe introduces the background to this and also edits a witness seminar on its early activities and effectiveness, sponsored by the Institute of Contemporary British History. Also worthy of note, although its range is much wider, is the report by Rhodes of activities of the 1994-9 Whitehall programme on the changing nature of British central government, sponsored by the ESRC. This contains a select bibliography of publications, many of which add greatly to the understanding of what actually constrained economic and social modernization because there is now a much fuller record from contemporary civil servants and politicians to place against the retrospective academic assessments.

The economic implications of geopolitical choices made in the early postwar period also continue to be an active research area. British resistance of the 1940s and 1950s to participation in continental integration projects is explored in Deighton’s study of the creation of the Western European Union, ostensibly a defence umbrella organization forged during the Cold War but in reality illustrating much about why Britain adopted the stance it did at the 1955 Messina conference. This refusal to join early in the efforts to create the EEC has been seen both as one of the greatest mistakes of postwar statesmanship and as a contributory factor in economic underperformance during the golden age as British firms were sheltered from the full force of European competition and did not enjoy the trade creation benefits of the new customs union. An important corrective to whether Britain ‘missed the boat’ at Messina is provided by Schaad who demonstrates that some within Whitehall did appreciate the significance of Messina although the dominant voice was that of ‘traditional’ British benevolent non-participation. Rollings explores the attitude of British industry towards prospects in European markets if Britain attained membership, including an exploration of the question whether earlier entry would have offered a cold shower of enhanced competition. Finding that British industry was not as heavily protected in the 1960s as many have maintained, he also demonstrates that the Confederation of British Industry took a much broader approach to the cost-benefits of potential membership than simply tariff reform. Forster provides a useful review article on why Britain did not attain EEC membership before 1973, and Steinnes conducts a detailed exploration of the motives for the first application in 1961.

Archive-based studies are thus now penetrating into the 1960s but are constrained by the 30-year rule which, in practice, means there are as yet few official papers open beyond 1964. One subset of these studies concerns economic relations with the Commonwealth. McKenzie examines this subject in relation to the Anglo-American loan negotiations of 1945 which first revealed to British policy-makers that victory in war was quickly replaced by competition in peacetime and which highlighted for the dominions the sorts of strategic economic choices that would have to be made to preserve sovereignty. Singleton explores New Zealand’s attempts to secure a measure of independence from London in its financial policies, while, in a welcome return of a genre in monetary history, Stockwell charts the legacy of empire through the creation of a central bank in newly independent Ghana.

There have been few recent studies of domestic economic policy or of the
links between economics and policy. Garside (in History) reviews the constellation of short-term expedients and longer-term forces which brought about the abandonment of free trade in 1931-2. Jarvis provides a valuable corrective to the usual simplistic accounts of the 1958 resignation of the Chancellor and his entire Treasury ministerial team. Whiting examines the tax reform strategy of the 1964-70 Wilson governments, one in which—unusually—a leading role was played by an academic economist: Nicholas Kaldor. Known and reviled in City circles as one of the dreaded Hungarian ‘twins’ Buda and Pest (Balogh and Kaldor), Buda is also the subject of Morris’s paper on how Balogh quickly appreciated the vast economic and political implications of North Sea oil and gas and worked tirelessly to ensure that the economic benefits accrued to taxpayers as well as to the production companies. Clarke contributes a useful review article on Keynes and the Keynesians and also one on the rise and fall of Thatcherism, and Oliver has written on the transition from Keynesian to ‘delphic’ monetarism using the recent work of Alec Cairncross as a springboard. Cairncross himself, in one of his last papers, contributes some reflections on the past century of Scottish as against English economics, while Besomi reconstructs from disparate archives the activities of the 1930s Oxford Economists’ Research Group which unusually for economists sought actually to enquire from businessmen why they act as they do.

One of the sectors in which the postwar British state was most interventionist was the motor vehicles industry. While 1998 was not a boom year for vehicle production, it was for historical studies of a sector which has come to be seen as a microcosm of Britain’s economic decline (and possible post-1979 renaissance). Bowden and Turner survey the industry from the end of the war to the nationalization of British Leyland in 1975. Applying theories from both mainstream economics and the political economy tradition, they demonstrate the difficulties that this, the largest British manufacturer, had in adjusting to change with, at various times, all of the usual suspects for national economic decline implicated and with management shown to be particularly idiosyncratic and of poor average quality. But they stress also the costs of forces external to this sector, notably the delayed entry into the EEC and the destabilization and uncertainty resulting from ‘stop-go’.

One other factor often invoked in explanations of the decline of this sector is the consequence of location of industry policies. Rosevear examines these for 1945-51 using this sector as a case study. He shows that Board of Trade officials were frequently out of their depth in negotiations with motor manufacturers, while in any case regional policies were not as radical (and thus intrusive) during this period as is often claimed. Labour struggled and failed to impose its will on businesses. For the same period, French studies public policy and the commercial vehicle sector, again illustrating the limited capacity of the state in practice to enforce its will on private companies. Thus there occurred no dramatic reconstruction of the sector and, while the export drive yielded short-term benefits, these came partly at the expense of longer-term competitiveness.

Two papers by Bowden and Maltby (in Financial History Review and in Accounting, Business & Financial History) complete this year’s output of motor vehicle studies. Both relate to the antecedent of British Leyland, the British Motor Corporation during the 1950s and 1960s. The first explores how deficiencies in corporate governance resulted in a short-termism which contributed to commercial underperformance, and the second comprises a comparative analysis of financial management, managerial control, and corporate governance.
which finds this British manufacturer deficient relative to the leading American-owned companies.

Recent economic history has not been much in evidence, although Brenner’s special report on the world economy since 1950 contains much of interest on Britain, while two papers in the *Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin* are useful surveys of recent performance in the manufacturing and service sectors. The first, by Cameron and his colleagues, undertakes a disaggregated analysis of productivity growth and levels in manufacturing since 1970. This permits them to consider the extent to which labour productivity and total factor productivity growth in manufacturing may be attributed to shifts in resources between sectors, rather than to productivity growth within sectors, and assesses the contribution of individual sectors to changes in aggregate productivity. The second paper, by Julius, a member of the Bank’s Monetary Policy Committee, provides a perspective on deindustrialization through the growth of the service sector which now accounts for two-thirds of GDP and three-quarters of employee jobs.

The economic history of the interwar period is also little represented. Turner and Bowden provide the only paper on what used to be a central topic: whether unemployment was essentially Keynesian or classical, and while they find for the former this paper is equally noteworthy as one of the few examples of recent econometric work on Britain. Nor has much been published on the fortunes of individual industries between the wars, another formerly highly populated topic. Bowden and Higgins question the traditional characterization of the interwar Lancashire cotton-spinning industry as one of individualistic and ultimately destructive competition. Instead, they highlight that firms, perceiving the ‘real’ problems confronting their sector as external, adopted defensive collusive actions (price maintenance and short-term working) to protect marginal firms which, while delaying the scrapping of excess capacity and resulting in X-inefficiency, were none the less rational given uncertainty about the long run in a rapidly changing and competitive world industry.

The literature on the economy from the mid-Victorian period to the First World War addresses a number of well-known themes. Boyer provides a further instalment of his labour market studies, the latest being on the influence of London on southern England before 1914. Toms examines the business strategy of pre-1914 Lancashire textile entrepreneurs, seeing in the character of capital ownership and accumulation rational reasons why professional management hierarchies did not develop, while Burt returns to the theme of Victorian capital market segmentation. Using a case study of non-ferrous mining, he finds that although there was no strict separation between home and foreign investment markets, in practice ownership of profitable domestic mining was retained by knowledgeable local insiders while more risky/overseas investments were dominated by speculators operating on the London market. Collins examines the long-standing comparison that is frequently drawn between the financial provision for industrial companies made by English and continental European banks in the half-century before the Second World War. He finds that there was an unexpectedly large degree of similarity in the lending practices of banks across Europe and that England was not alone in not developing universal banking, notwithstanding Britain’s greater financial institutional maturity. Accordingly, with respect to bank lending to industrial customers, English exceptionalism was more apparent than real.

Another complaint of English exceptionalism is examined in Michie’s study of whether the City of London since 1900 was a closed or an open elite and the extent to which this influenced its activities. Largely on the basis of
impressionistic evidence combined with an examination of the entry and membership policy of the London Stock Exchange, he concludes that before 1914 it was relatively easy for outsiders (defined as foreigners or those not a member of elite families and social networks) to gain entry to the City, but that this changed with the world wars which encouraged a more nationalistic attitude. The City began to become more open once more from the mid-1960s, and indeed by the 1980s was as open as it had been before 1914. None the less, Michie makes the important point that between about 1945 and 1960 the City did not attract the best talents and there is then an obvious potential link to economic underperformance during the golden age. Even so, as Schenk shows in her article on the origins of the Eurodollar market, the City in the 1950s was perfectly capable of being financially innovative. It all depends on which aspect of the City is under discussion. Moreover, as Turvey shows, at least office rents in the City of London behaved in the way an economist expects.

The year saw a wide variety but limited volume of technological diffusion studies in both economic and social history. Campbell-Kelly’s study of the Post Office Savings Bank reveals that while it had established a large-scale data processing operation by 1890, mechanization of these business functions was delayed until 1926-30, this lag being a function of both rational and irrational resistance to office machinery within what he aptly describes as a ‘culture of institutional fossilization and hostility to newfangled inventions’. Not surprisingly, he concludes that the resistance to technological innovation that pervades the declinist literature now needs to be extended to the information sector, although it appears that the bank was neither much better nor much worse than most contemporary British bureaucracies, public or private, all of which mechanized much later than their US counterparts. By contrast, according to Neushul, Marie Stopes was distinctly more effective through her popularization of birth control techniques in ensuring the diffusion of these technologies. Her work in establishing birth control clinics is well known, but Neushul also explores the business relationships developed with the manufacturers of birth control techniques and the implications of her strong preferences within these technologies for the overall effectiveness of the birth control movement. Sowing seeds of a different sort is Conford’s study of the role of the New English Weekly in the development of the British organic husbandry movement. Before the establishment of the Soil Association in 1946 this magazine was a central proselytizing instrument for that coalition of farmers and consumers concerned about health and nutrition, rural reconstruction, deforestation, and the growing dominance of agribusiness. While the magazine folded in 1949, and only ever attained a small circulation, Conford has established it as an important component of the reactions against secular modernism which would eventually bring forth a much larger and more vocal British environmental movement.

Business history continues as the dynamic branch of economic history. There are new topics (Beckerson on tourist marketing); micro-regional studies which provide insights on broader national themes (Mackie on business structure); detailed examinations of previously neglected sectors, as for example in the issue of Business History devoted to retailing which is introduced by Alexander and Akehurst (see also Morelli on price and non-price competition in early postwar grocery retailing); and a most welcome propensity now to study sunrise as well as sunset sectors, although even here declinism can lurk as it does in the ‘cautionary tale’ by Froud and colleagues of the postwar pharmaceuticals industry. There is also an encouraging trend to study the foreign demand side for British products. Johnman and Murphy explore failure in the largest postwar
overseas market for British ships, that of Norway, and how this presaged a broader crisis in the industry’s product-oriented strategy which would eventually underpin its near total collapse by the mid-1980s. While the usual declinist suspects are all here, and ably discussed in terms of deepening price and non-price uncompetitiveness, this sector stands as an exemplar of British industry’s wider failure in international, and ultimately in domestic, markets.

Arnold explores the profitability of the armaments industry during and immediately after the First World War and finds new evidence of the benefits of war, to firms such as Vickers and Armstrong Whitworth, as well as new material on the nature of business-state relations. Research on multinational enterprises (MNEs) has also been prominent, although there has been nothing significant on small or medium-sized enterprises. Kim continues his investigations of the pre-1914 activities of J. & P. Coats with an examination of how the firm came to dominate the US market for cotton thread, while Scott explores how and why British trade unions waged a major campaign during the 1930s against overseas MNEs which had established UK operations. Business groups also feature, with a piece by Jones and Wale on British trading companies in Asia before 1945. Finally, in a wide-ranging paper, Wilson (in *Business History*) uses the example of Ferranti’s international business strategy to question the general applicability of theoretical frameworks offered by Dunning and Casson when, in practice, other influences, including family predilections and local managerial and governmental pressures, exercised a critical role.

The closely linked accounting history also continues to prosper. Matthews provides a deep and nuanced history of the accountants’ role in British management from the late nineteenth century to the present, this qualifying in important respects the corporate lag thesis of Chandler and others. Boyns also confronts the problem of scientific management through the introduction of cost accounting techniques in the early decades of the twentieth century, and again derives more optimistic conclusions about British businesses. Wilson (in *Accounting, Business & Financial History*) provides further insights into how Ferranti became one of the most successful firms within its sector, this through an exploration of its extensive financial reporting system and the advantages that accrued to its senior management.

After something of a dearth in recent years, comparative economic and social histories have been revived. Broadberry continues his comparative growth studies with a sectoral analysis of why the US and Germany caught up on UK productivity levels, this giving a most welcome new emphasis to the service sector which is the least explored aspect of Britain’s relative economic decline. Other comparative quantitative work includes two studies by Greasley and Oxley. One (in this journal) uses modern time series methods to demonstrate that the disparate macroeconomic records of Australia and Canada since 1870 can be explained by their respective links with the UK and US economies, this confirming a process of conditional convergence. The other (in *Explorations in Economic History*) is strictly an Anglo-American comparison, again time-series based, which confirms convergence but indicates that nationally specific industrial technologies evolve in the two economies and that the levels of, and returns to, higher education underpin much of the observed disparities in twentieth-century economic performance.

Davis and Neal report some preliminary results on how operating rules affected the efficiency of the London, Paris, and New York stock exchanges before 1914, and Hannah examines the survival and size mobility of the world’s 100 largest industrial corporations in 1912 and 1995. While today’s giants are different from
those in 1912, the probability of a British 1912 giant surviving into the 1995 top 100 was over twice that of a US giant—a result distinctly at variance with Chandlerian conventional wisdom. Andermann and his colleagues provide a quantitative analysis of land-labour relationships for France, Germany, and the UK in the century to 1990. This reveals that in Britain the advance in labour productivity to c. 1940 was due more to advances in mechanical technologies, whereas in the comparators efficiency gains were mainly the product of biologically enhanced land productivity. The effects of technological changes were then much more substantial for all three countries after 1940, with mechanical innovations dominating biological ones. This is also noteworthy as one of the few studies of the agricultural sector which, as with its modern employment share, seems to be of diminishing academic interest. The only other agricultural contributions of substance are Moore-Colyer on structural adjustment in interwar Welsh farming and Howkins an the social history of wartime rural England.

Labour history seems to be experiencing something of a renaissance, and is no longer preoccupied, as it was a generation ago, with trade unions and collective bargaining to the exclusion of employers’ organizations and managerial structures and strategies. The extent of progress, together with a sharply defined prospectus of where there is still substantial disagreement, is encapsulated in the exchange between Gospel and Adams on markets, firms, and national collective bargaining in the early twentieth century. On a very different note, Martin essays the British tradition of pragmatic, policy-oriented empirical industrial relations research as exemplified by the work of McCarthy. As organizational questions have been eclipsed within labour history, increased research attention has been given to ideological forces. This is reflected in Thompson’s analysis of the genesis of the Trade Disputes Act, 1906, which affirms the variety of views about trade union rights coexisting within Edwardian liberalism.

The economic and social history of crime continues to be of interest, although many studies are—perhaps for funding reasons—related to contemporary concerns. Taylor challenges the accepted view that relative to population growth criminality declined after 1840 and instead argues that criminal justice was, largely for reasons of economy, supply led and not demand led. Criminality was thus subject to budget constraints, with, for example, the much cited invariance in the number of reported murders (and thus prosecutions) between 1880 and 1966 a product of rationing and not of changes in criminality. The dangers for urban order posed by rival gangs of youths also feature, with Davies writing (in *Journal of Social History*) on masculinity and violence in late Victorian Manchester and Salford, and (in *Social History*) on Glasgow’s travails in the 1930s, the point at which lurid press reports resulted in the city becoming widely seen as the gangland capital of Britain. By way of contrast with disaffected youth, Proctor explores how dress and uniform were used to construct the Girl Guide and Boy Scout movements to satisfy the hierarchical and social control ambitions of the founding family. While a mass movement was attained by 1939 it was only possible by embracing diverse groups, such that for many—especially working-class—boys and girls the Baden-Powell ideology did not swamp the complex of personal and class motives for membership, nor the reality that membership could be both personally liberating and an act of rebellion against one’s class.

Research on women’s role in the labour market has been active for some time, while gender history is also increasingly concerned with women’s identity beyond the labour market. In both respects, and in part no doubt because of the approaching sixtieth anniversary of its outbreak, the Second World War provides a natural research focus. That the war caused significant shifts in the
demand for and supply of female labour has been well documented, not least by Summerfield who, continuing her study of women’s personal work histories, now turns her attention to demobilization and the longer-term impact of wartime experiences for women’s subsequent labour market participation.

Another oral history project is reported in Day’s account of women’s wartime employment in the Portsmouth Dockyard. While this sample of case studies reveals little widening of employment opportunities after the war for the majority there was an undoubted longer-term impact on female consciousness, and this study provides a richer story than many of the reconstruction of ‘separate spheres’. Goodman explores the construction of patriotic femininity during the war within the context of official concerns about its impact on women’s morals. In the fractured public/private spaces that women could now occupy in wartime, patriotic femininity is shown to be something that both belonged to women and also controlled them; a social construction that could be used to empower them, to legitimate their experiences and behaviour, but also to contain them (see also Rose on sex, citizenship, and nationhood during the war and Ramsden’s study of British war films of the 1950s and their role in perpetuating particular images of and attitudes to the conflict). While the gender division of labour has long been recognized as one means by which relations between men and women are structured, Schwarzkopf’s paper on late nineteenth-century Lancashire weaving sheds provides an interesting case study of a workforce which was virtually undifferentiated along gender lines but in which there were enormous pressures upon women to succeed as skilled workers because, relative to male opportunity sets, weaving provided almost the only available route to personal and financial security.

Medicine, education, and health provide another focus for recent gender history. Dyhouse contributes two further installments of her history of female medical education. The first (in Women’s History Review) uses life histories of women who became physicians to examine medical education in the half century before 1939, and the second (in Gender and History) provides a more detailed exploration of the experiences of women medical students in London between the wars. Her anatomy of a masculine culture tells us as much about men as about women, but again war is confirmed as the most significant force in opening up opportunities for the early generation of medical women. Another group seeking recognition was midwives whose professional identity was secured by legislation in 1902 which provided for training, registration, and the gradual elimination of the untrained practitioner. However, as McIntosh shows in her study of midwifery in Sheffield before and after the 1902 Act, there was no significant change in the practice and profile of those in this occupation, in part because (male) physicians ensured their continued subordination on economic grounds.

The impact of women’s behaviour on the health of their children is explored in two papers. Fildes examines the impact of infant feeding practices on infant mortality rates between 1900 and 1919, a critical period in the longer-run fall in premature deaths. Conducting a statistical analysis of the annual reports of the medical officers of health, she confirms demographers’ long-held suspicions that exclusively breastfed children were more likely to prosper and that changes in infant feeding practices contributed significantly to the contemporaneous decline in infant mortality. (The decline in mortality between 1870 and 1914, in terms of economic factors and in relation to public health expenditures, is also the focus of Millward and Bell and of Bell and Millward, respectively.) Using the 1911 census, Garrett finds that women’s work was potentially bad
for their babies, although it was not work *per se* that was bad but the nature of
that work and the area in which the child was born and raised. The perils
associated with life in the industrial cities are thus reaffirmed. Another perspective
on the lives and reproductive histories of early twentieth-century working-class
women is offered by the study of abortion in the 1930s by Thomas and Williams.
This is a notoriously difficult research area but, using a unique source, they
have been able to enter the private sphere. While they derive no firm statistical
conclusions about abortion rates from their unrepresentative sample, they do
show how a dataset, designed for another purpose, can through sensitive quanti-
tative and qualitative analysis yield much about the past reality of personal and
group existence. Another micro dataset full of promise is the *New survey of
London life and labour* which was undertaken at the LSE in 1929-31 and which
is now being computerized, with some early results on poverty lines reported in
the article by Hatton and Bailey who argue that the interwar social security
system deserves more credit for alleviating poverty than it has received so far.
This is the first of many papers from the project and it is most encouraging
that the dataset has already been deposited in the ESRC data archive, with
superb documentation to encourage reuse.

Public health and safety provide another active research topic at the moment,
in part as a product of continuing interest in the regulatory aspects of government
growth but also as a search for antecedents of contemporary concerns on issues
which now have a high prominence. Fisher’s account of cattle plagues past and
present provides a vital historical perspective on the nonsense of current public
debate over BSE. (Munting on lotteries provides a further example of this type
of historical study.) Within the occupational health literature no other sector has
attracted as much attention as the dangers of asbestos. Bartrip subjects public
policy responses to the usual critical model of ‘too little, too late’, and finds
that, in this particular instance, the Home Office moved speedily to regulate
once the Factory Inspectorate became aware of the significance of the problem.
Most accusations of delay derive from late twentieth-century observers, being
part of the continuing health preoccupation with asbestos. The healthiness or
otherwise of food and drink also features within this vein, with Phillips and
French writing (in *Rural History*) on the pure beer campaign at the close of the
nineteenth century and, more generally (in *Twentieth Century British History*), on
concerns about adulteration and the campaign for food laws in the 40 years
before the outbreak of the Second World War. Aspirations for a healthy environ-
ment are also the concern of Sheail who, in a most welcome broadening of
studies of the Attlee governments’ reconstruction efforts, explores the pressures
for and constraints upon pollution controls.

The transition from war to peace has also featured elsewhere, as indeed has
that from peace to war. Weinbren continues his interest in the Woolwich
Arsenal with an examination of the post-First World War campaign to diversify
production towards civilian use as a means of easing the town’s undue reliance
upon munitions. Lockwood looks at an interwar Sussex land settlement scheme,
born of the rural myth and mass unemployment, which sought to transform
soldiers into ‘peasants’. Little was to come of either project. On an altogether
grander scale, however, was the 1939 evacuation of children, mothers, and
teachers from the cities. Addressing the Titmuss thesis on the significance of
this unprecedented event for social policy, Welshman (in *Twentieth Century British
History*) uses a case study of the School Medical Service to demonstrate that
evacuation did lead to a major reassessment of the effectiveness of health services
for schoolchildren and to significant policy changes. In Medical History the same author writes on the school dental service to 1940.

In recent years interest in the development of the British welfare state has been matched by works examining non-state welfare provision and pre-welfare state developments. Gorsky on nineteenth-century mutual aid and civil society is an example of both as well as being a model of a local study (on Bristol) suggesting answers to bigger questions, in this case on the capacity of friendly societies to generate ‘social capital’ (upon which see also Hall’s important new paper which more properly belongs in next year’s review). Another local study is by Johnston on a labour colony charity’s efforts to offer an escape from urban destitution for Glaswegian men between 1890 and 1914. The rural myth was evident here also, but this is another useful case study of the important shift in social policy that saw paternalistic notions of charity provision eroded by the acceptance that individuals had rights to social welfare. The fundamental inquest into the poor law that occupied the first decade of the twentieth century was built upon such local experiences and the diuturnity of local traditions of individualism in welfare has been too much neglected by the dominant Whig version of the development of the British welfare state.

The continued vitality of voluntarism after the Beveridge report is attested by Hinton’s article on the sizable membership and significant activities of the Women’s Voluntary Services, while Keating explores how the Roman Catholic church squared its traditional commitment to self-help, and emphasis upon unintrusive government, with the gradual encroachment of the welfare state on family life. While the Beveridge report both reflected and created a new climate of state-citizen expectation for the majority of practising Catholics, Keating shows how a number of Catholic intellectuals (not least Colin Clark, formerly a close associate of Keynes) continued to equate individual responsibility with the pursuit of godly destiny. Finally, there is another instalment of the New Jerusalems debate with Tomlinson’s counterblast that it was austerity, born of Labour’s economic priorities and Treasury pressures to limit expenditure, and not extravagance which in practice characterized at least the early years of the British welfare state.
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