

## Book Reviews

ERIC JOHN, *Land Tenure in Early England*.

Leicester University Press, 1960. xii + 184 pp. 30s.

Mr John's book is very much like Early England itself. It begins, as does our detailed knowledge of Old English society, with the introduction of written documents by Christian missionaries, and especially with the appearance of the land-book, the formal diploma; and it seems to end, although in fact it does not, with the Norman Conquest. Like Early England it is divided by the period of the Scandinavian invasions, dark and uncertain; and, again, it is uncommonly difficult to understand. If its arguments can be summarized without doing violence to their subtleties, its thesis is that the Anglo-Saxons were more like their contemporaries in Europe than they are generally supposed to have been. That may seem a simple enough conclusion, but it portends some elaborate consequences.

The only simple thing about the earliest English land-books is that those which survive have a common ancestry: they mark an innovation made by Archbishop Theodore and his followers in the seventh century, and they share an Italian tradition. Their object is to secure the rights of the recently established and endowed Christian Church, and to this end they employ the formulas of Roman law. It has long been agreed that the Roman conveyance lies behind the English land-book, but as the land-book is held not to be a conveyance and Anglo-Saxon society not Roman, the connection is taken to be very indirect and artificial. Recent work, however, and in particular Professor E. Levy's *West Roman Vulgar Law*, has shown that the Vulgar law of the late Empire was a coherent code very different from the Civil law that Justinian's advisers codified, and now Mr John argues cogently that it is from this law and not from Roman law in the commonly accepted sense that the formulas of the land-books were drawn.

Anything that diminishes the apparent differences between the Anglo-Saxons and their contemporaries in Europe is important, and even to recognize contemporary instead of archaic phrases in an imported legal instrument is an interesting matter. But Mr John makes wider claims than this for the land-books, and he argues that their purpose is not merely to protect the Church's title in a society in which the clergy were powerful and enviable interlopers, but to confer upon the Church a privilege denied to all men bound by the law of the English Folk: the right of perpetual succession.

This argument covers the first three chapters, and is really the heart of the book. If primitive English law allowed only a precarious tenure to those who enjoyed land—as opposed to those who worked it—our notions of early English society will have to be radically changed. The small freeholder has always been a vague and troublesome figure; if Mr John is right, continuous tenure would be originally a mark of inferiority, the condition of those whose rents and produce the king allotted to the warriors who served him. There would be nothing to prevent the warriors' sons from succeeding them after their own apprenticeship in arms, for hereditary succession is often as convenient as the desire for it is natural, but for a long time it would be a succession sanctified by usage and not by right, just as in later centuries villein tenements passed from generation to generation in defiance of the best legal opinion.

This practice would account for the silence of the earliest English laws, which are manifestly concerned with the impact of the Church upon Kentish society, about inheritance of land; a silence maintained, as Mr John points out, in the later seventh century, when the Church's acquisitions must have encroached substantially upon those inalienable family lands that the Folk Law, according to our received theories, rigorously maintained. In fact the Church's privileges seem

to have had a quite different effect. An assured succession in perpetuity was so attractive that laymen coveted book-right, and it is suggested here that the "fraudulent monasteries" that scandalized Bede were ordinary estates that took on the name of religious houses to secure the privileges of *ius hereditarium*, much as private estates today are made limited companies to avoid the rigours of death duties. Bede describes these estates and their lords as "useful neither to God nor to men," commenting that they provide neither religious nor military service; but it looks very much as though freedom from secular service was not the chief attraction of the pseudo-monasteries, but rather a bonus from the right of perpetual succession.

It is difficult at first sight to associate precarious tenure with social privilege, but what looks precarious to the nineteenth-century (one cannot say the twentieth-century) freeholder could well seem safe enough to its own age. The man who enjoyed a *precarium* secured it and might well secure it for his child by his services, and no services mattered more, or were more highly rewarded in primitive times, than military services. The Church's new rights, as Mr John describes them, did great damage to the traditional pattern of military obligation and its rewards, because when the Church was granted perpetual succession the sanctions that made precarious tenure tolerable had to be abandoned with the limited title. As military and other public services formed the basis of the only tenure known to the privileged orders, they ceased when an entirely new tenure was introduced; and the second phase of the history of book-right sees the public services, the 'common burdens' of building fortresses, repairing bridges, and making military expeditions, imposed upon the Church's lands. Once that was done, book-right could be enjoyed by laymen without the scandals that Bede condemns. This reading makes the origins of the common burdens particularly important, and as on the present evidence they seem to have been imposed on book-land in Mercia in the later eighth century, the vital

importance of that mysterious kingdom in Old English studies is emphasized yet again.

With book-right effectively modified and available to laymen, as Mr John argues, the Old English kings were free to reorganize their military power, and under the stress of the Scandinavian wars they did so in the late tenth century. The system that emerges is a familiar one, but since Round's day it has been attributed to the Conqueror. The last four chapters of the book argue that the late pre-Conquest *fyrð* involved a mounted feudal host, that thethane's standard holding of five hides matched the later knight's fee, and that the effective unit was the 'shipful' of sixty knights or thanes, for which some great tenants like the bishop of Worcester answered from their estates. The argument is based upon a study of the *Altitonantis* charter, a critical edition of which is printed in an appendix, and upon St Oswald's *Indiculum*, which is taken—as the Domesday commissioners seem also to have taken it—as an authentic statement of the services that were imposed upon the Oswaldsloew tenants when the liberty was created, and thereafter were owed to the king through the bishop. This section is self-contained, but it derives from the author's primary thesis that the oldest English law recognized only precarious tenure.

The whole book challenges the orthodox interpretation of Old English society, and it is evidently not long enough to substantiate such a challenge in detail. Mr John offers a hypothesis that is novel and startling, but that promises to account for the diffuse and enigmatic evidence that we have; its merits will have to be argued both in detail and in general terms. There is still a great deal of work to be done on the surviving Old English charters, on the laws, and on Anglo-Saxon society, particularly the aristocracy. If Round's theory of knight service is to be undone the relation of the post-Conquest quotas to what can be discovered about pre-Conquest hidation will still have to be explained. The debate is likely to be acrimonious; Mr John is almost as hard upon Round as Round was upon his con-

temporaries, and he disagrees on various matters with an imposing number of authorities. In a number of places, too, his style is likely to generate more heat than light. Whatever its outcome, this book is of the highest interest to every one concerned with the history of English land and its law, and to none more than the members of the Agricultural History Society. They will notice, as they read it, that there is one historian whose judgements are very tolerant, if we may put it that way round, of Mr John's—F. W. Maitland. Of the riding services at Oswaldslow, Mr John says quite justly "Maitland was not in error, he confused nothing, and his arguments have warrant from the texts; indeed they have never been refuted." That is a comforting conclusion for any one testing a theory in Old English history; it may stand its author in good stead.

GEOFFREY MARTIN

A. H. DENNEY (ed.), *The Sibton Abbey Estates: select documents, 1325-1509*. Suffolk Records Society, Vol. II, 1960. 172 pp.

This is a most commendable production of the new Suffolk Record Society. The volume introduces us to the records of a small Cistercian abbey in the eastern part of the country, which for a house of its size and insignificance seems to have left behind a remarkably interesting set of estate documents. By no means all of the records are published here, only a useful selection intended to illustrate the evolution of agrarian economy between the early part of the fourteenth and the end of the sixteenth century. These consist of detailed extents of 1325, rent rolls of 1328 and 1484, and account rolls of 1363-4 and 1508-9. Mr Denney gives, however, an account of the unprinted documents, and uses some of them for his introduction. Among the most enticing to which he refers are field books of the early seventeenth century, consisting of abstracts of court rolls for matters of custom and title, and which provide evidence going back to the fourteenth century for the accumulation of tenants' holdings. It is clear that all this evidence could provide the foundation for a

most instructive study in East Anglian agrarian history. Mr Denney does not, of course, attempt to do this. His introduction is an extended comment on the documents printed. Since he deals with them in sequence, for instance describing the expenses part of the accounts after he has dealt with the receipt side, his treatment, though useful and suggestive, is not as readable as if he had been a little more synthesizing. He does, however, draw attention to most of the matters which make the documents of interest to the historian, and this is, after all, what an editor should do.

Readers of these documents will naturally be interested to see what light they throw on Suffolk agrarian peculiarities, but also on the special characteristics of a Cistercian estate. It is, of course, important not to confuse the two. Although there was quite an income from tenants, it seems pretty clear that there was no close association between tenures and demesne. One would expect this situation where the Cistercian grange system was employed. The demesne land is described in very satisfactory detail in the extents of 1325. Much of it was enclosed or at least held in severalty. Rental value per acre varied considerably and very often a comment explains why. Low-value land is *dura* or *petrosa et debilis*, while high rented land is often described as being fit for all types of grain. The account of 1363-4 shows that although leasing of demesnes had begun, the abbey still had much land in hand. The income from sales of produce exceeded rent income substantially and this was still the case in 1372 (Mr Denney's table should distinguish arrears from assize rents), though there were, of course, fluctuations.

A substantial element in estate income came from sheep. The fourteenth-century flock was about 2,000. When sheep grazing fell off and abbey income was derived mainly from rents and farms, a sizeable dairy farm based on a herd of some sixty animals was maintained and doubled after 1510. Mr Denney tells us that by the end of the fifteenth century there is evidence of selective breeding by the introduction of a northern strain.

The documents selected tell us more about the economy of the estate than about the tenants. This is only to be expected, given the special characteristics of the estate. Mr Denney, quite rightly, touches only gingerly on the vexed question of the East Anglian *tenementum*. But the rent rolls printed show that quite a lot could be said about the tenants, and the detail in that of 1484 is such that a local topographer could reconstruct a convincing picture of the location of holdings in relation to the village street plan. In addition this rental distinguishes the different components of the tenant holdings, giving some idea of the piecemeal process by which they were accumulated. The court rolls, of which, apparently, there is a long series, would give evidence of the tenants' dealings in lands which are summarized in the rental. If Mr Denney decides to write the full history of the estate, the story of the tenantry, no doubt, would be an important feature of it.

Only one or two of the interesting features of these documents have been mentioned. There is much else besides, not least evidence about the monastic community, its organization, and its relations with the world around it. For a volume of 172 pages it is remarkably well packed with a wide selection of materials. It is this sort of production which makes one wish that all counties had well-supported record publishing societies.

R. H. HILTON

N. J. WILLIAMS (ed.), *Tradesmen in Early Stuart Wiltshire: A Miscellany*. Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society (Records Branch), Vol. xv. 1959. xxii + 146 pp. Price to non-members 45s.

One of the most intractable problems of English economic history, and hence of agrarian history in particular, is that of measuring the direction and volume of internal trade, indeed even of discovering what things were bought and sold in particular markets. The export trades produce their shoals of documents of one sort or another; but the great mass of internal trade, far greater in volume for most commodities than the export trade, produced

little or nothing on paper. Hence historians, or students at any rate, have always tended to overestimate the importance of the commodities entering into foreign trade.

In this volume Dr Williams, now at the Public Record Office, has brought together various Exchequer records arising from the economic regulation of some retail trades by the central government. So we get "a cross-section of the Wiltshire men and women who engaged in trade in the early seventeenth century." Few butchers and bakers, woolmen and corn-dealers, escaped the record; nearly every alehouse-keeper, taverner, and inn-keeper is also named. Dr Williams's introduction is a very useful survey of the records involved and of the subject of retail trading. He raises incidentally a number of puzzling questions to which agrarian historians should be able to provide an answer: for example, if Lenten fasting was really enforced, as these records suggest it was, what did the butchers do for a living between Ash Wednesday and Easter Day if they were not also graziers? I doubt, however, if there is really a problem here. Boarding-house keepers in the holiday towns of England manage to exist for an interval of nine months every year on the spoils of three summer months. It could have been no great hardship, if any at all, for the village butcher in 1600 to tide over a space of six weeks or so, and he almost certainly turned to some other sideline. Many of them were smallholders and this interval would have enabled them to get on with their tillage. Though this volume is on the margin of agrarian history, it will be found useful in more ways than one. It should also encourage local historians in other counties to search out these Exchequer records for their own counties and towns, and local record societies to print them.

W. G. HOSKINS

GEORGE EWART EVANS, *The Horse in the Furrow*. Illustrated by C. F. Tunnicliffe. Faber & Faber, 1960. 292 pp. 25s.

No agrarian historian, British or foreign, should fail to read this book. It has a few

minor flaws. But it exemplifies the way relatively recent history should be written: in the light not just of the manuscript and printed records of the muniment-rooms and libraries, nor simply of the evidence of the landscape, but of both combined *and bound up with* the indispensable verbal testimony of those whose whole lives are a part of the subject.

Mr Ewart Evans is a free-lance writer, a Welshman who settled in Suffolk some twenty years ago and whose first book, *Ask the Fellows who Cut the Hay* (Faber, 1956), was a valuable essay in the same methods, though less impressively concentrated on a theme than the present one. His purpose here is to record the story of farming when "the horse was the pivot of the corn-husbandry" of Suffolk; and to do it while there are still people about who lived that life—quite as distinctive and odd in its way as that in a Nottingham mining village or a Fiji island tribe. But Suffolk farm-life has been transformed over the last forty years, chiefly by the internal-combustion engine, which presents less of a threat in Nottingham, and to an extent that would be disallowed as inhumane in Fiji. Mr Evans does not neglect the more primitive aspects of the old, vanishing Suffolk horse-farms. His chapter on "The Horseman's Word," by which he means the secret methods, known to one or two old horsemen in every district, of exercising 'supernatural' control over horses, demonstrates, reassuringly, the proper use of folklore by historians.

The book is in four sections. The first, and best, called "The Horseman," has chapters on "the horseman's day," "in the field," "the horseman's year," "some of the ploughs," "outside jobs," and—as instructive, surprising, and valuable as any—"the horseman's dress." This section is almost wholly reconstructed from the memories of old Suffolk farming people. Mr Evans effectively stresses rural society's concern with continuity. His information tallies with all that I myself have heard in Suffolk from such characters; and in its details of plough-teams, variations in sizes of stetch, drainage, etc., it seems to me valid material to compare with, and perhaps en-

large our understanding of, the earlier, even medieval, information. Unluckily, when he gets back into earlier periods Mr Evans makes occasional slips. For instance, on p. 40 he writes of "the old medieval system"—as though there is any likelihood that in the Middle Ages there was one farming system for the whole of Britain; and on p. 127 he reveals a very odd idea of English feudalism.

The second section, on "The Farmer," is based more on conventional nineteenth-century written records—those of the worthy Biddells of Playford—occasionally supplemented by verbal evidence. Mr Evans makes no use of other forms of written record—the equally authentic autobiographical farming trilogy of Adrian Bell, or the Suffolk novels of H. W. Freeman. But, like Dr Thirsk and Miss Imray, in Vol. I of the Suffolk Records Society, he draws to great advantage upon the Biddells' 'day-books' and 'field-books'; here it is a pity there are no cross-references, especially to the Biddells' schedules of cropping reproduced in that Society's volume. Mr Evans scores high by using the 'work-books' as well, and notably by bringing out their evidence that harvesting was by no means the only "taken" (i.e. contracted) work, that in the early nineteenth century on the Biddells' farm "a large proportion of all work was contracted for" between farmer and labourers. The first two sections admirably emphasize the point made in Adrian Bell's *Corduroy* that farm work needs a high degree of accuracy and finish, as much as any of the more celebrated skilled crafts. This has been recognized only too late.

The third section is devoted to "The Horse," a history of the famous Suffolk horses, with detailed chapters on the Suffolk Horse Society, the Blacksmith, the Harness-maker, and so on. Mr Evans mentions the use of ox-teams as late as our own century, and refers to horse-teams operating in Norfolk as early as the fifteenth century. He evidently did not know the reference to a Suffolk plough-team of eight horses as early as the 1190's. The fourth section, "Folklore," an eye-opener to the conventional historian,

completes a most remarkable book, and ends with a plea: "One conviction kept obtruding itself upon the writer while he was collecting the material for this book: 'you are only touching the fringe of the work that needs doing.' This is the sort of inquiry that should be conducted by a team, backed by a university and having considerable resources at its disposal. . . Dr W. G. Hoskins of Oxford . . . has started a vigorous school of open-air historians who are as much concerned with the actual physical area studied as they are with the books and documents concerning it in the libraries. This type of approach, extended to embrace the oral tradition and conducted by a team organized by a single university or school of studies, is most likely to be fruitful in East Anglia or any other homogeneous region."

Mr Tunnicliffe's drawings illustrate the text with depth and feeling.

NORMAN SCARFE

J. P. T. BURY (ed.), *The New Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. x, *The Zenith of European Power, 1830-70*. Cambridge University Press, 1960. 766 pp. 40s.

Two questions will immediately occur to any reader of this journal who is a potential reader of this book. What is there here for the student of agricultural history? And what is new about this 'New' Cambridge Modern History? The answer to the first question is: very little. Professor Herbert Heaton devotes four or five pages of his chapter on Economic Change and Growth to discussing agriculture in terms of the increasing commercial character of farming, improvement in methods, and the greater dependence on capital. This, virtually all there is on agriculture, is well put, but inevitably is very familiar. The second question invites comparison with Volume xi—*The Growth of Nationalities*—of *The Cambridge Modern History*, planned by Lord Acton, and first published in 1909. Mr Bury's book comes out well by this test. Though it was Lord Acton who enjoined historians to study problems not periods, it is Mr Bury's mainly Anglo-American team, not Lord Acton's

European team, who more nearly practise his precept. Furthermore, this particular volume has a unity which its predecessor, and some of the recent co-volumes in the new series, lacks. Unity probably springs from tighter editorial control—the older work had three editors—and the deliberate choice of a better unifying theme. To consider the age as "The Zenith of European Power" gives a coherence and cohesion that "The Growth of Nationalities" certainly did not, and perhaps could not, have—though it is ironic that a volume with such a sub-title has only one contributor from mainland Europe. This is an admirable book.

PETER LYON

J. FREDERICK REES (ed.), *The Cardiff Region, A Survey*. University of Wales Press, 1960. xvi+222 pp., illustrated. 21s.

Not the least of the many benefits which have accrued from the annual meetings of the British Association in the post-war period have been substantial contributions to our knowledge of regional contrasts in Great Britain. The survey produced for the Cardiff meeting is a worthy addition to this series, yet one which avoids the danger of falling into an over-stereotyped pattern.

Unlike some recent volumes, it devotes less attention to the host city than to the surrounding "region," here defined for convenience as east Glamorgan, the whole of Monmouthshire, and part of Breconshire. Following the usual pattern, special attention has been paid to the landscape, climate, geology, botany, zoology, historical development, and economic structure of the area, as well as the educational institutions of Cardiff. But, as if to help narrow the gap between scientists and literary intellectuals, the volume also includes substantial contributions on the Welsh language, local place-names, and the Latin, Welsh, and English literary traditions of the area. The result is a well-proportioned introduction to the diversities that one delights to find in a borderland.

Fewer than two per cent of the insured population are employed in agriculture, yet industrialism is confined to relatively small

pockets. Even on the coalfield, ridges of Penant Sandstone have prevented the development of those drab expanses of industrial houses so characteristic of northern England. And if in the "valleys" the rivers are coal-black, many a coal-tip is now "silver with Moonshine (*Anaphalis margaritacea*)."

Close at hand the pole-cat, otter, and red squirrel are still to be found. Maps, diagrams, and photographs in keeping with the high technical standards of the University of Wales Press add to the wealth of description.

English readers would have gained if, in the evocative sections describing physical make-up and especially plant-cover, the more characteristic elements of Welsh toponymy had been explained. Rather oddly, we are twice informed in the geology section that the name Cefn Onn is mis-spelt on the Ordnance Map but are not once given the meaning of the name—Ash Ridge—which has some significant ecological implications. Students of agrarian history too may feel that more could have been written of the changes in land ownership and occupancy which accompanied industrialization. Enclosure for minerals, inflated charges for the renewal of mineral leases, and the way of life of smallholder-miners are topics that spring readily to mind. These omissions were perhaps dictated by pressure of space, but more disappointing is an error of commission in the section on early history, especially since the survey endeavours to record not only the changes which have occurred in the area but also changes in "our detailed knowledge of it." Yet there is little echo here of the stimulating debate on the survival of British villages in the lowlands of Anglo-Saxon England. Even in the Vale of Glamorgan, the Welsh are dismissed as mobile tribal groups practising a pastoral economy. We are encouraged to believe that Norman feudal lord and Saxon peasant were the first to make substantial advance into the arable potentiality of the Vale as late as the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Nevertheless items mentioned elsewhere in this volume point to a quite different interpretation. Was not some territorialization of power, a con-

comitant of arable farming, necessary in the Dark Ages to permit of exotic imports into Dinas Powis from as far afield as the Mediterranean? Celtic saints doubtless sought "a solitude," but they neither wished to fast to death there nor yet to feed themselves unaided. For this reason, these zealots little approved of wandering souls; and the cultivated fields adjoining St Illtud's monastic settlement at Llantwit Major occupied some of the richest land in a lime-rich Vale. Under such circumstances it is hardly likely that nucleated hamlets like Llanbethery, whose remaining open fields in 1840 are well illustrated in another section of the volume, were late Saxon or Norman creations. Yet such hamlets are, or at least were, everywhere characteristic of the lowlands of the area.

If in this particular respect an opportunity has been missed, nevertheless the volume as a whole is a faithful mirror of the area. Besides fulfilling its primary purpose of serving the scientific visitor, it will remain an indispensable handbook for serious students of this borderland.

GLANVILLE R. J. JONES

T. S. ASHTON, *Economic Fluctuations in England, 1700-1800*. Oxford University Press, 1959. viii+200 pp. 21s.

Professor Ashton believes that "Historians, their eyes on the long-term movements that transformed economic and social life at this period, have paid insufficient attention to short-term fluctuations." It is the short-term fluctuations that Professor Ashton seeks to detect and to explain. Agricultural historians must be primarily concerned, on the other hand, with long-term fluctuations; they must ask themselves why agricultural productivity tended to increase in the eighteenth century. Professor Ashton, in this excellent book, is not concerned with giving answers to this question. His concern with agricultural fluctuations is with the short-term ones alone: their explanation is, of course, quite simply, in the fluctuations from year to year in the weather and in the consequences on harvests. His concern with agriculture is thus limited almost

entirely to the effects of good and bad harvests on other sections of the economy. Farmers and landowners believed that what was good for them was good for the country, that high agricultural prices increased incomes so as to stimulate demand for other products and to provide general prosperity. They found, given the inelastic demand for agricultural produce, that bad harvests gave them higher profits than good ones. Bad harvests, therefore, were good for the economy as a whole.

Professor Ashton remarks that "the weight of evidence, however, is against this thesis." Farmers who normally produced a small surplus or only enough for their families suffered in time of dearth; large-scale farmers, while doing well when grain prices were high, might be able to make up for losses from low grain prices by increased receipts from animal products, the demand for which was more elastic than for grain. An abundant harvest called for additional labour and this put more money into the pockets of casual labourers by whom it was quickly spent. Furthermore, demand for consumer goods increased when harvests were good, because wage-earners had more left over after buying

necessary food. Again, in years of scarcity, exports fell and the flow of money into the country was reduced. The value of sterling therefore fell, and in war-time the cost of maintaining British armies abroad and of subsidizing foreign allies increased correspondingly. "Government deficits arising from such conditions tended to raise the cost of borrowing and to reduce confidence."

Professor Ashton observes that fluctuations in economic activity were more frequent and shorter in duration in the eighteenth than in the nineteenth century. This was primarily caused by the dominance of English agriculture in the economy. In the nineteenth century its dominance was weakened by imports and dearths were therefore shorter and less acute; in the eighteenth century, bad harvests were able to halt upward movements of economic activity.

The setting out of these arguments takes up a very small space in this book. A brief review in a periodical devoted to agricultural history cannot indicate the wide range of topics examined or pay adequate tribute to the skill with which they are discussed.

R. A. C. PARKER

## Books Received

- JAMES PIERCE CAVIN, *Economics for Agriculture*: selected writings of John D. Black. Harvard University Press, 1959. 720 pp. 96s.
- J. A. FABER and OTHERS, *Het Aantekeningenboek van Dirck Jansz*. Frysk Ynstitut, Grins, 1960. 120 pp. (duplicated). No price stated.
- B. K. NARAYAN, *Agricultural Development in Hyderabad State, 1900-1956*. Keshav Prakashan, Secunderabad, 1960. 116 pp. 5 rupees.

- ANDREAS ROPEID, *Skav*—ein studie i eldre tids for-problem (with English summary). Universitetsforlaget, Oslo/Bergen, 1960. 388 pp., illus. 14.50 kroner.
- HILMAR STIGUM, *Norsk Bondeliv, 1550-1850*. Landbrugsmuseet, Copenhagen, 1960, illus. No price stated.
- B. H. SLICHER VAN BATH, *The influence of economic conditions on the development of agricultural tools and machines in history*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam. 36 pp. No price stated.