WILEY

Review

Authors(s): Hilda Stevenson

Review by: Hilda Stevenson

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 11 (Sep., 1893), pp. 494-495

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Royal Economic Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2955703>

Accessed: 27-03-2016 05:18 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Royal Economic Society, Wiley are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to
The Economic Journal

<http://www.jstor.org>

stances of their own time. 'The early nineteenth century English economists deduced their doctrines, not from the study of the works of their predecessors, but from the actual experience of England during the war' (p. 148). 'Ricardo's ruling interests were no less practical than those of Malthus (p. 388). 'The minor lights of the Ricardian period were likewise for the most part pamphleteers and reviewers, who wrote because they were interested in the politics of the day' (p. 388.) All this is admirable; but it is a little surprising that Mr. Cannan should take a different line in writing of Adam Smith, and describe the *Wealth of Nations* as in the main 'a scientific and not a practical treatise' (p. 383). The grounds of this opinion are not fully stated; it seems to depend on a theory of the composition of the *Wealth of Nations*, which is indicated more than once, but not fully worked out. Under the circumstances it would be premature to attempt to criticise this theory or the remarks on Adam Smith which depend upon it. Mr. Cannan accentuates the physiocratic influence on certain parts of the *Wealth of Nations*, and is inclined to find fault with the general plan of the work: if he regarded it as a treatise written in a practical interest there would be less ground for some of these criticisms. This may serve to illustrate a defect in Mr. Cannan's manner of writing; he is not a sympathetic critic; sometimes his remarks sound a little captious, and he does not seem in every case to have set himself to appreciate the strong points in the various writers whom he examines so carefully.

W. CUNNINGHAM

The Old English Manor. By CHARLES M. ANDREWS. Johns Hopkins University Studies. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1892.)

MR. ANDREWS has collected a great deal of information on the early English manor, and is able to treat the subject with very considerable detail. Apart from the introduction, which occupies more than a quarter of the book, he has divided it into six chapters: the Lands of the Manor, the Lord and the Tenantry, the Landless, Followers and Slaves, the Special Workers, the Yearly Routine of Work, the Farm and House Utensils and Recreations. The introduction is devoted to a discussion and comparison of various views which have been held on the questions connected with the origin of the English manor. The author's own view, for which in the absence of any definite proof he claims some probability, is that one source of the seigniorial element which, he believes, existed from the beginning, is to be found in the composite organisation of the subtribal group consisting of a body, not of voluntarily associated freemen, but of related tribesmen united under a chief whose office would be probably hereditary. His power would tend to increase with the military nature of the conquest, and on settlement he would receive a larger share of the land, booty, and slaves, and might ultimately, under

pressure of circumstances, become a lord of the manor. Another source would of course be found in grants of lands and jurisdictions from the king, and the tribal element might in some cases be supplied by Celtic communities falling within such grants, or incorporated with other agricultural groups, or by the formation of such groups by slow accretion round an estate newly granted from the waste. Mr. Andrews lays stress on the fact that no singleness of origin can be looked for in the Anglo-Saxon manor. He believes, however, that the Roman influence only came later through the Church. In the chapter on the tenantry he identifies the *geneâtas* with the *gebûras* as the original members of the agricultural communities. The *cotsetlas* were probably of later origin ; they would become necessary as new land was brought into cultivation. Unlike the *gebûras* they paid no *gafol*, and their holdings 'formed no organic part of the peculiar field system.' The bulk of the tenants were originally free, capable of political and legal recognition though economically dependent, but the development of their predial subjection and of the jurisdictional supremacy of the lord would tend ultimately to bring about their political disability also.

Mr. Andrews has not any new documents to bring forward, and has not much to add to the main outlines of manorial life which Mr. Seeböhm and other writers have made familiar, but he has collected some interesting detail, chiefly from the *Rectitudines* and the manual known as the *Gerefa*, and his book is well put together. In dealing with questions which are still a matter of controversy he is careful to give the opinions of leading writers often with a suggestive criticism. His book should prove useful to students who wish to increase their knowledge of this side of Anglo-Saxon economic life.

HILDA STEVENSON

Carl Friedrichs von Baden brieflicher Verkehr mit Mirabeau und Du Pont. Herausgegeben von der badischen historischen Commission. Bearbeitet und eingeleitet durch einen Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der ersten französischen Revolution und der Physiokratie von CARL KNIES. 2 vols. 8vo. Pp. 446, 398. (Heidelberg : C. Winter, 1892.)

MEMOIRS have been defined by a somewhat spiteful aphorism to be 'the backstairs of history.' Beyond doubt it is well that the history of economic theory should be primarily acquired by direct study of the great writers ; but this stage once passed the memoirs of the chief economists, their lives and letters, are 'backstairs' by which the hard-working specialist must inevitably go.

Of all periods in the development of economic science, the physiocratic is easily the richest in personal interest. The lives of its leading figures—the sober and profound Quesnay, the fiery Marquis of Mirabeau, the amiable Du Pont de Nemours—are veritable romances.