

Book Reviews

A. E. MOURANT and F. E. ZEUNER (eds.),
*Man and Cattle: Proceedings of a Symposium
on Domestication*. Royal Anthropological
Institute Occasional Paper No. 18, 1963.
166 pp. 63s.

This collection of eighteen stimulating papers constitutes the proceedings of a symposium held by the Royal Anthropological Institute in 1960 on the domestication and history of cattle. The aim was to bring together people from different disciplines able to present results of research in their diverse fields ranging from archaeology to animal breeding. The result forms an important contribution to the literature on the history of cattle, but in such a rapidly developing subject it is unfortunate that, as regretted in the preface, the papers were not published until over three years afterwards.

Professor Zeuner said in his introductory paper that domestic cattle appear to come from two wild sub-species: *Bos primigenius namadicus*, which seems to have given rise to the humped Zebu cattle that appear first in India, and *Bos primigenius primigenius*, the giant auroch of Europe, that was apparently domesticated first in the Near East. The ox was among the later farm animals to be domesticated, probably between 6000 and 4000 B.C., and cattle are definitely associated with agriculture, whereas recent evidence supports earlier ideas that goats and sheep, which were domesticated before cattle, may have been originally kept by nomadic pastoralists who had no agriculture. The auroch seems to have given rise to the two main European stocks, the long-horns and the short-horns. The European long-horn seems to have gained blood from the local aurochs, but the short-horn (*longifrons*) type seems to have been a distinct stock introduced into Europe, and Professor Zeuner describes its appearances on such sites as the Swiss Neolithic lake dwellings, but its origin remains a mystery.

Dr M. Degerbøl traced the gradual reduc-

tion in size of the skeletal remains found on Danish archaeological sites from the large wild auroch to the small cattle of the Middle Ages. Modern cattle have increased in size again to become about as large as the Neolithic animals. Dr P. A. Jewell traced remarkably similar changes in the size of British cattle over the same period, including the appearance of a polled stock in the Celtic Iron Age. It is in this context that archaeology can make a valuable contribution to agricultural history, and it is pleasing to note from Dr Jewell's paper that measurements from recent medieval excavations (outlined in AHR IX, p. 105) are already being used in such overall surveys.

Major C. Wheaton-Smith changed to a historical approach to cattle breeds, sub-titling his paper 'A Study in Progressive Hybridization'. He used the sensible method of surveying the major cattle types, rather than the making of a detailed catalogue of every breed, but pointed out the limitations of the historical approach owing to the inadequacy of records. His claim that selective breeding was impossible with subsistence agriculture, and that an economic incentive for improvement was necessary, is not borne out by the wide variations in modern livestock: selection, possibly partly natural, and partly unconscious, has probably occurred ever since animals were domesticated. In the first period dealt with, up to 1760, records are scanty and descriptions are largely based on colour. Illustrations found in such scenes as the Nativity, which is a useful source of livestock paintings, show a great diversity of type. It was probably during this period that the old red Dutch cattle were crossed with native British stock to produce such breeds as the Hereford and Red Poll. From 1760 onwards the stimulus of war and the demands of industrialization were answered by the breeding work of Bakewell with the Shorthorn. On the continent the Charollais expanded in France as a beef animal and the Jersey and Guernsey developed. There is historical evi-

dence that these breeds contributed to the Ayrshire, yet this link is not supported by recent blood-typing studies, doubtless owing to limitations of the method discussed below. The period 1820-80 saw the multiplication of breeds, and rightly or wrongly Major Wheaton-Smith attributed many changes at this time to the spread of the railway, just as the later development of motor transport influenced the dairy farmer. He said that as stock no longer had to walk to market it was possible to develop for early maturity, and the improvement of communications accelerated the progressive hybridization, which was the theme of his paper. Mr E. J. Boston, too, gave a historical paper covering Europe and Africa, and drew attention to the dangers in historical studies of placing too much reliance on the appearance of animals when he showed an illustration of an African cow that looked like a Jersey.

Dr A. E. Mourant introduced a series of six papers on blood types by discussing the genetic principles involved. Dr J. G. Hall showed how different blood types could be linked with hereditary characters, and said that the frequencies with which the different hereditary characters occur in different breeds provide genetic markers by which the breed can be characterized. Dr A. Robertson pointed out in discussion the difficulty of projecting these frequencies into the past because the modern pedigree system reduces the number of bulls used and allows random changes in frequency. One blood type described by Dr A. D. Bangham and found in only the Jersey, Guernsey, and South Devon breeds suggested a link with the Zebu. The distribution of another blood type detailed by Mr A. L. Ogden opposed this link, but a change of distribution might have occurred in these breeds owing to natural selection. It seems therefore that blood typing studies, although useful in supporting historical evidence, have pitfalls if used on their own.

Professor J. D. Evans described the cattle cults and bull-jumping sport of ancient Crete, and there were other papers on the social background of domestic cattle among primi-

tive peoples in Africa and Asia. Such studies when projected into the past are useful in interpreting archaeological materials and historical records.

The inclusion of detailed comments made in discussion increases the value of the symposium, but it is a pity that each paper lacks a summary and conclusions and that the published review of the symposium made by the editors is apparently the same as that hastily prepared during the conference, because the delay in publication should have allowed the better assessment and association of the evidence from these very different sources so that overall conclusions could be given. But the symposium undoubtedly brings together a unique collection of evidence which should provide much stimulus for future work on cattle history, and we are fortunate that this volume, and his own book, were published before the untimely death of Professor Zeuner removed a leading figure from this field.

M. L. RYDER

H. M. HEYBROEK, *Diseases and Lopping for Fodder as possible Causes of a Prehistoric Decline of Ulmus*. Korte Mededeling, no. 54, Wageningen. 1963. 12 pp.

This paper sets out to explain the decline of elm in pollen diagrams of western, central, and northern Europe c. 3000 B.C., and shows how a knowledge of agricultural practices in underdeveloped countries today can throw light on prehistoric farming. Climatic change and elm disease have been put forward as possible explanations for the decline of the elm in prehistoric times, but neither is convincing. Instead Dr Heybroek advances the view that the elm was lopped to provide fodder for livestock, thus causing extensive damage to the trees and inhibiting new growth. The lopping of elms enables rots to enter the wounds. More serious still, lopping restricts the formation of flower buds, prevents the tree from producing pollen and seeds, and leads eventually to the decline or complete disappearance of wych elm from the forest. Field elms regenerate from root suck-

ers and can resist lopping for a while, but if it is continued over several generations, their chances of survival are small. What is the likelihood that lopping took place? The practice is well known in the Himalayas at the present time, where hay for the winter is scarce, and leaf fodder is indispensable. Poor peasants in European countries are known to have used elm leaves in the same way, in Switzerland and Norway in this century, in Italy, Austria, France, Spain, and England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Oak and ash have been similarly used: oak leaves in India, Yugoslavia, and Turkey; ash in Italy, Sweden, and, we might add, England as well (see Thomas West, *Antiquities of Furness*, 1805 edn, p. 40). In quality, however, elm leaves are superior, and their starch equivalent (64) exceeds that of all other leaves, and even exceeds that of good hay (57). In these circumstances it is not unreasonable to suggest that lopping was the cause of the decline of elm in Europe c. 3000 B.C. and it is probably unnecessary for Dr Heybroek to quibble because he has not as yet found any references to this practice in the Low Countries.

JOAN THIRSK

H. MORTENSEN and H. JÄGER (eds.), *Kolloquium über Fragen der Flurgenese am 24-26 Oktober 1961 in Göttingen. Berichte zur Deutschen Landeskunde*, 29 Bd., 2 Heft. Dec. 1962, pp. 199-350. Bundesanstalt für Landeskunde u. Raumforschung, Bad Godesberg.

The study of the development of field systems in Central Europe has been mainly the work of geographers, with historians lending some expertise. A colloquium held at Göttingen in 1961 to assemble all active workers on the subject was provoked by a lecture by Frau Prof. A. Krenzlin at Vadstena (Sweden) during the International Geographical Congress of 1960 and, more particularly, by another at Cologne in 1961. Her point of view is briefly (p. 310), "that land tends to be divided into blocks when the rotation of crops is a matter for free choice by the individual or when the economy consists of cattle farming

based on grass. Perpetual cropping on a small part of the total agricultural area, but with emphasis on cattle keeping on forest or poor pasture, leads to the development of a field form with long strips. A field system with dispersed strips develops as more emphasis is put on growing grains, and leads to an obligation to plant agreed crops on strips in fields and to resort to fallowing."

The discussion of this idea was sharp and positive. It appears now that the long cherished idea that the 'three-field system' was established at the time of original settlement has now no supporters. While most agree that farms with long strips are original in the medieval planned settlements in Eastern Germany and are found in special forms as *Waldhufen* and *Marschhufen*, many now believe that farms with long strips are an original form of field system elsewhere. The main theme of the controversy between Prof. H. Mortensen and Prof. Krenzlin was concerned with the causes for the development of such strips. This colloquium cannot be said to have settled the problem, but it provides an excellent bibliography and a terse statement of most of the possible views, together with long pointed discussions.

The following matters are of interest. Most of the maps of German field systems date from c. 1800. Earlier documents describing landownership can sometimes be related to these, but there is an almost total absence of documentary evidence for earlier periods. What evidence is there, then? The grouping of strips in recurring series hints at the form of the original unit, subsequently split by inheritance. This permits *Zurückschreiben*, i.e. a reconstruction of the shape of the original holding. Ridge and furrow may be fossilized under forest or grass cover and so reveal some arable land units of the past. Are these technical units or units of ownership? There is the evidence of remains in lost villages in areas not now intensively cultivated. Soil that has been enriched by the assembly of humus from over a wide area can be recognized. Sometimes the documentary evidence of a series of settlements founded for a single purpose

can be linked with characteristic present field systems.

But studies are in a desperate state of flux. Inheritance customs have changed with time. Investigators are now prepared to admit that complete rearrangements of the land in a parish may have taken place as free trade in land developed in the Middle Ages. A new lord might introduce new ideas. Controversy continues about parcels of land running along the contours where perhaps they once ran up and down hill. The discussion of place-names, field units, ceramic finds continues, with little result.

One would like to hear more comment from modern practical farmers. More excavation, or at least micro-investigation of complete parishes, is required. Any student must reckon on a large number of field types in a small area. He must be prepared for a total redesigning of a field system perhaps more than once since original settlement. A characteristic recommendation by Prof. E. Otremba was to make a comprehensive collection of source materials on this subject.

An outsider might note how this controversy is carried on with minimal reference to examples in Great Britain and France.

D. J. DAVIS

T. J. HUNT (ed.). *The Medieval Customs of the Manors of Taunton and Bradford on Tone*, Somerset Record Society, LXVI. 1962.

The publication by the Somerset Record Society of the thirteenth-century Custumal of Taunton and the fourteenth-century Custumal of Bradford forms a very useful addition to the body of printed material available for that county, but as the latter occupies only two and a half pages, the rest being taken by the Custumal of Taunton and a sixty-four-page-long introduction to it, any appreciation of the volume's usefulness must depend on the treatment accorded the manor of Taunton.

Since the manor of Taunton is one of the most (if not the most) important Somerset manors, this edition of the Custumal will no doubt be warmly welcomed not only by local,

but also by general, historians. I only wish one could extend equally unreserved welcome to the editor's introduction. It contains much of real value—the early history of the manor and of the knight's fees or the note on the profits of the mills, for example—but, on the whole, it falls uneasily between two stools, that of explaining the terms or describing the practices to be met with in the Custumal, and that of commenting on changes over the thirteenth century on the basis of other evidence. The discussion of change is the weakest element in the introduction. The comments made are often too perfunctory to be adequate, some of the statements are arguable, and some of the conclusions quite unacceptable. What is the point, for example, of introducing the subject of commutation of services unless it is fully discussed, or of giving figures of the extent of the demesne in 1232 if no attempt is made to relate this to anything else? Or is it really correct to say that "the basic unit of manorial administration was the tithing," or that enquiry by jury "was an extension of democratic principle"? What is one to make at all of such statements as this: that while the rising level of entry fines "meant a significant increase in the total rent due from holdings there can be little doubt that, behind all these transactions in land, there was concealed a considerable amount of profit for the customary tenants in the form of income from rents or even some capital gains resulting from the negotiations over the agreements"? Or is it really correct to maintain that the obligation to buy manorial grain, incumbent on the customary tenants, was introduced "to secure that the greatest care and interest was taken (by the tenants) in all the agricultural operations during the growth and harvesting of the crop" and "to ensure their full co-operation in demesne production"? Similarly, to suggest that the "comparative prosperity of the villein tenants at Taunton may have attracted workers from the surrounding lands" is to miss completely the significance of the combined evidence of rising entry fines, widow marriages, predominance of the small-holders among the

tenants, heavy mortality among the poorer sections of the tenantry, and rapidly expanding population, all of which point in the direction of an acute land hunger steadily developing over the later part of the thirteenth century.

It is to be regretted that the introduction is at times marred by inaccuracies which could have been avoided with a little more care. Hundred-penny is *not* rent, nor are pannage and herbage payments *for services*. The enumeration of the meadows of the manor in the description of the demesne in 1232 is described as the "area for which the tenants were responsible"—whatever that may mean. The *Recognitiones* are said to have become fixed in amount at 100 marks by 1305, whereas it is clear from the tabulation given on the following page that they stood at that figure from 1263 onwards.

More serious, however, are the inaccuracies which will not be spotted by anybody without extensive knowledge of the Taunton Account Rolls. These are especially numerous in the section dealing with entry fines, p. xlv.

Although the low level of entry fines at the beginning of the thirteenth century is correctly noted and all the figures quoted very typical of it, they are not *strictly* correct; the lowest income from the profits of courts in the first quarter of the century was £15 12s. 3d., and the highest figures in the last quarter were thrice in excess of £80—£135 3s. 10d. in 1278, £83 9s. 4d. in 1290, and £85 11s. 10d. in 1291. The highest recorded fine in the thirteenth century was that of £53 6s. 8d. in 1278. Fines in the first quarter of the thirteenth century twice exceeded £2, fines of £7 6s. 8d. and of £6 13s. 4d. being paid in 1224. While it is true that fines of £5 or £6 are the most typical for the middle years of the century, fines of up to £8 occurred once or twice in this period and, *above all*, the upward trend continued throughout the last quarter of the century and well into the fourteenth century. The magnitude of this increase is also underestimated by using absolute fines instead of fines *per virgate*. Since most of the recorded fines were paid for holdings consisting of

fractions of a virgate, the weight of the financial burden which such fines represented to the tenants is not fully brought out.

The Custumal itself is edited very competently but a few liberties have been taken with the text on the grounds that the surviving copy is a 'corrupt' version of the original. They are all very minor but one instance needs perhaps to be mentioned. The Taunton Custumal is arranged in sections each headed by a list of jurors and each clearly representing an arrangement by tithings. Every time the list of jurors begins with a Thomas de X (=local place-name) this is transcribed as Tethinga de X, set up as a typographically distinct heading, and the list of jurors left shortened by one name. This is done on the grounds that the medieval copyist in a large number of cases (why not always?) wrongly copied the heading 'thedinga de X' as 'Thomas de X' and that his mistakes must now be corrected; all this is pure invention. It is also to be regretted that no references are given with anything mentioned in the introduction.

Mr Hunt obviously has a very extensive knowledge of the Taunton Account Rolls, but he would have done much better to refrain from commenting on change until he was able to make it a subject of a study where he could do himself, and his subject, justice. I sincerely hope that he will yet do so.

J. Z. TITOW

ORAM, R. (transl.), and FENTON, F. H. (ed.). *Court Rolls of the Manors of Bruces, Dawbeneyes, Pembrokes (Tottenham), 1 Richard II to 1 Henry IV. 1377-1399* [Manor of Tottenham Series, II], Borough of Tottenham, Libraries and Museum, 1961. xvi+362 pp. 50s.; MARCHAM, W. McB. (transl.), and FENTON, F. H. (ed.). *Court Rolls of the Manor of Tottenham, 1 Eliz. I to 24 Eliz. I. 1558-1582* [Manor of Tottenham Series, IX], Borough of Tottenham, Libraries and Museum, 1963. viii+202 pp. 42s.

The Borough of Tottenham continues its admirable work of publishing the court rolls of the manor. The latest volumes to appear

cover the last quarter of the fourteenth century and the first twenty-four years of Elizabeth's reign. The medieval volume follows on from Volume I, which was published in 1956, and spanned the years 1328-77. The Elizabethan volume is the third to be published on the sixteenth century. The rolls for the fourteenth century are the records of three separate courts, representing the three parts into which the manor was divided in 1254, following the failure of a direct heir. They show that each lordship consisted of scattered fields, and in some places portions of fields, which suggests that the division must have been a complicated affair. The method of dealing with some common rights may be indicated in the fact that two pieces of land were claimed in the court of Pembroke's manor to be common every *third* year. The holdings of tenants lay in pieces or strips in larger fields, but apart from four references to crofts and fields which were subject to common rights (including the two alluded to above), there is little evidence of any practices associated with a common-field system.

One does not usually expect to obtain a picture of the farming economy of a parish from reading the court rolls of its manors, but with the aid of an excellent subject index, and an early seventeenth-century plan of the Tottenham manors, published by William Robinson in 1840, it is possible to make some guesses which may not be too wide of the mark. There are nearly five times as many references to stock as to crops, and this almost certainly reflects the preoccupations of the peasantry, for on the map of 1619 there were still broad marshes on the eastern edge of the parish alongside the river Lea, woods on the western side, and meadows, groves, rough pasture, and 'downhills' dotted about the central parts. Horses and sheep are most frequently mentioned, next bullocks, cows, and calves, and finally pigs. Oats are referred to fifteen times, beans eight, peas seven, barley three times, wheat once, and rye not at all. Ploughing is mentioned only once, but there are twelve complaints and other comments about the overburdening of the common

pastures. In the light of all this, we may hazard the guess that Tottenham in the fourteenth century was a district of pasture farmers, who reared and fattened cattle and sheep, kept horses (possibly for the use of the traveller on his way to London, for many rode through Tottenham from Cambridge) and selected their crops with as much concern for the appetites of their stock as of their families. By Elizabeth's reign the economy had undergone little change. Perhaps there was still less arable, for there is barely a single reference to arable crops; the maintenance of hedges and ditches and the controlled use of common pastures called for a steady stream of court orders. It is noticeable how often the boundaries of each man's land in the common meadows had to be re-measured and re-staked; the operation was carried out in 1527 and 1551, and was again necessary in 1561.

As for the evidence of customary land transactions in Tottenham, every assistance is now at hand for a careful analysis. All these volumes of court rolls have place, personal, and subject indexes; there are parish registers from 1558 onwards; and now comes the news that the field book which accompanied the plan of 1619 has recently been deposited in the Middlesex Record Office.

JOAN THIRSK

HENRI PIRENNE, *Histoire Economique et Sociale du Moyen-Age*, édition revue et mise à jour avec une annexe bibliographique et critique par H. van Werveke. Presses Universitaires de France, 1963. xii+224 pp. F. 14.

Professor van Werveke, of the University of Ghent, has produced a reprint, with a new bibliography and notes, of one of Henri Pirenne's best works of historical synthesis. Written for Volume VIII of Glotz's *Histoire du Moyen Age*, it was published in English in 1936. The text, which is unaltered in this edition, is therefore well known in this country. Professor van Werveke has, however, added a useful up-to-date bibliography, with comment, to illustrate the various points made by Pirenne. Of particular interest are

the bibliographical notes to Pirenne's introduction, giving an up-to-date commentary on the famous Mahomet and Charlemagne thesis. The bibliography on agrarian history is useful in the context of what Pirenne has to say, though not to be compared with that in Professor Duby's *L'économie rurale et la vie des campagnes dans l'Occident médiéval*, published last year. The international character of Professor van Werveke's bibliography is one of its strong points. It includes a few references to work by historians in Slav countries, though not in the language of origin. Otherwise it covers most of the relevant contributions to the subject matter of Pirenne's work in all the Western European languages.

R. H. HILTON

EINO JUTIKKALA, *Bonden i Finland genom tiderna*, Holger Schilds Förlag, Helsingfors, 1963. 524 pp.

The strong school of economic historians established in the Scandinavian countries includes a number who have centred their attention on agricultural matters. Of these, none is more energetic than Eino Jutikkala, professor of Finnish history in the University of Helsinki. The language barrier has restricted the circulation of much of his work; but this has been partly overcome through his *Atlas of Finnish History* (Helsinki, 1949, 1955) which contains a generous agricultural section, his recent *History of Finland* (New York, 1962) and his contributions to the *Scandinavian Economic History Review* (of which he is the Finnish editor). Through the auspices of the Cultural Commission of the Northern Countries (*Nordiska Kulturkommissionen*), Jutikkala's study of the small farmer in Finland has now been translated into Swedish. It has already taken its place as the classical statement on Finland in the agrarian history of Europe.

The *bonde* is the most important constituent of the Finnish social hierarchy. In the representational structure of the old *riksdag* or parliament, his kith and kin composed "the fourth estate" (though both time and money

not infrequently limited his attendance). The *bonde* remains the backbone of his country today. Although Finland was cast in a Swedish mould, the Finnish *bonde* has experienced considerable differences in development from his Swedish counterpart. Some measure of the difference is obtained by comparing Jutikkala's study with Sten Carlsson, *Bonden i svensk historia* (Stockholm, 1949-56). Another indication of the difference lies in the difficulty of translating many agrarian terms from Finnish into Swedish. For the English reader, help is provided by *Maatalouden sanakirja* (Helsinki, 1958), an agricultural dictionary in the compilation of which Jutikkala himself has helped to grapple with the English, Swedish, and German translations of Finland's agrarian terminology.

Bonden i Finland genom tiderna falls into four main parts. The prehistoric and medieval section deals with the differentiation of the component parts of the farm holding—arable, meadow, fishing waters, forest (as hunting ground or burnt-over arable), and common land—and with the beginnings of the field systems. The second section (c. 1500-1680) focuses on the growth of agricultural taxation and the consolidation of rural administration. The third section (1680-1789) covers the age of military invasion and famine, the intrusion of the commercial economy upon domestic self-sufficiency, land reorganization (*storskifte*) with its great legacy of surveyors' maps, and the formal promotion of colonization. The fourth section, encompassing the international revaluation of Finland's farm and forest products, is also concerned with the vital problem of the landless proletariat (*torpare*) and with emigration. There is an epilogue covering developments during the inter-war years.

In his introduction to *Bonden i Finland*, Jutikkala calls attention to the fact that more than 150 original studies central to his subject were published between the appearance of the first and second editions of his book (1942-58). Many of these contributions were the work of his own students. They have been incorporated in his synthesis and are referred

to in more than 40 pages of footnotes. Among these studies, none are more important than the parish and provincial histories which have now been written for the greater part of Finland.

Against this background it is not surprising that *Bonden i Finland* is packed with factual detail. Yet it contrives to be immensely readable. This is explained partly by the logic with which the general scene is built up from a mass of particular illustrations. The method is seen in the analysis of farm and field names, each of which adds its minute quota to the story of the peopling of Finland. Its readability is also explained by a style which re-

calls that of W. G. Hoskins and Maurice Beresford in the same breath as that of Eli Heckscher. In the final place, its readability is inseparable from its humanity. For the book is written with a deep understanding of the *bonde* and an affection for his fields and forests. The *bonde* is above all an individualist and Jutikkala always remembers the individual. His text is alive with the brief but pregnant observations of generations of these strongly independent owner farmers. The result is a devoted and disciplined study indispensable to an appreciation of Finland and in the best tradition of rural history.

W. R. MEAD

Letter to the Editor

SIR,—I refer to your reviewer's note on my book *Old Farm Tractors*. As a parson I know full well how impossible it is to please every one; and this goes for book reviewers too. I must however point out inaccuracies. Your reviewer says I illustrate twenty-five old tractors, whereas the number is nearly double that amount.

Furthermore, he complains of few references and no bibliography. If he read the book, he would see that the references are in the text and that as the book is the first on that subject there can be no bibliography. My references were memories, other folk's memories, one contemporary handbook, and a

few sales catalogues, all of which I have mentioned.

Yours faithfully,

PHILIP WRIGHT

Our reviewer writes: The book is advertised on the jacket as having a frontispiece and 24 plates. I must apologize for not having mentioned that most of the plates contain two photographs. There are occasional references in the text to articles in journals, but the date, volume-number, and page-number are never given. The chapters on tractor trials contain much information for which no source at all is quoted.