

THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY ECONOMIC REVIEW

MEMOIRS OF THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS
IN THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY

Vol. XXXIII, No. 2

OCTOBER 1963

Whole No. 75

CONTENTS

**Contemporary Capitalism and
Law of Wage and Income
Distribution**

Minoru TOYOSAKI 1

**Business-chain between Large
and Small Firms**

Kisou TASUGI 21

**The Bourgeois Development
in Peasants Economy**

Nobuo TAKE 59

PUBLISHED BY

THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY

SAKYO-KU, KYOTO, JAPAN

THE BOURGEOIS DEVELOPMENT IN PEASANTS ECONOMY : DIFFERENTIATION OF THE PEASANTRY

By NOBUO TAKE*

I. The Problem

It is unnecessary to mention that the fundamental task of bourgeois revolution was to break up the feudal landownership, but in order to understand how the request to break up it rose among each class of society, we must first know the process in which capitalist mode of production developed in feudalistic agricultural system. Development of capitalism in agriculture has two types. One is called "American path" in which peasants, responding to the development of commodity production, strengthen their tenure and, by changing peasant landhold into peasant land proprietorship break up feudal landownership and eventually the relation of capital and wage labour is formed among peasants themselves in the process of differentiation of the peasantry. The other is called "Prussian path" in which feudal landlords deprives peasants of the land they cultivate and conducts capitalistic agriculture where peasants become wage labourers and they themselves capitalists. But the basic motive by which capitalist mode of production developed was nothing but differentiation of the self-managing peasantry that was formed in the process in which feudalism was broken up. Therefore, when we analyse the agrarian problem in bourgeois revolution, apart from the problem of transformation of landlords into capitalist, to begin with the problem of differentiation of the peasantry or bourgeois development of the peasantry which lies behind various political and economical changes in pre-revolution period.

Where then should we find the very beginning of this differentiation of the peasantry? Generally speaking, capitalist production has commodity production as its historical premise and grows from development of commodity production. And it is the transformation of rent in kind into money rent that marks the completion of simple commodity production preceeding capitalist production. According to historical research, in the case of England, labour rent was rapidly taken place by money rent from the late 14th century, and in the middle of the 15th century money rent was not only accepted almost all over the country but it kept a very

* Assistant Professor of Economics, Toyama University.

low standard. Under such condition, there occurs a possibility for peasants to accumulate "embryonic profit". Thus, in England in the middle of the 15th century, so-called "Volksreichtum" was commonly formed under small producers, which was the starting point of capitalist class differentiation. Historical research has given us sufficient support to this point, and therefore it will be proper, both theoretically and factually, to put the starting point of development of capitalist production in England in the middle of the 15th century.

In this article I should like to take the following course of discussion. First I will analyse, taking several manors and villages as examples, how from the middle of the 15th century to the English Revolution in the middle of the 17th century the scale of peasants farming changed which is the basic sign of differentiation of the peasantry, how the relation of capital and wage labour was formed inside peasants economy and how the condition of each class of the peasants was. Secondly, I will examine how the movement developed of formation of small enclosure and abolishment of open field system and how that agricultural productive forces was which hastened the movement. Finally, generalization of money rent was itself a sign of a great recession of feudalistic landownership and of an advance of peasant landhold, and we can expect that development of commodity production by peasants and development of small enclosure hastened the tendency of transformation of peasant landhold into peasant land proprietorship. Therefore I will examine the process in which peasant landhold was transformed into peasant land proprietorship.

II. Differentiation of the Peasantry

1. Wye Manor in Kent and Crodal Manor in Hampshire

In examining differentiation of the peasantry, we must pay our attention, as Lenin emphasized, not to the scale of land possession but to the scale of farm.¹⁾ But so far the scholars of English agricultural history have neglected this basically important point and have taken division of land possessed by farmers as the sign of differentiation of the peasantry. This mistake was pointed out by Mr. Akihiko Yoshioka,²⁾ and now it is clear that we have to re-examine the problem of differentiation of English peasantry with strict discrimination of the size of holdings from the size of farm in mind. But it is an extremely difficult problem to discuss, since the scholars have mainly collected and analysed the

1) Lenin, V. I., *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*, pp. 102~105, Collected Works, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1960.

2) Yoshioka, Akihiko, "Stratification of Peasantry" in England in Later Middle Age", *The Shogaku Ronshu*, Vol. 23, No. 5, 1955.

materials concerning landhold and landownership. At such a stage of the study, we have recently got two excellent works which have proved differentiation of the peasantry with strict discrimination of the size of holdings from the size of farm. One is the work by Mr. Masayuki Hamada on Wye Manor in Kent in 1452,¹⁾ and the other the work by Mr. Nobuyoshi Shinozuka on Cronchal Manor in Hampshire in 1567.²⁾ Taking these valuable works as basis, I should like to analyse how differentiation of peasantry took place in these manors.

A. Wye Manor

Table 1 shows the differentiation of the peasantry in Wye Manor. In the first place, rich peasantry with more than 40 acres of land

Table 1. The Differentiation of Peasantry in Wye Manor

Groups of Peasants	% of Total Households	% of Total Area under Crops	% of Holding and Rented Land of Total Area under Crops of Each Group		Sublet Land		
			Holding	Rented Land	% of Total Land Sublet	% of Total Area of Holdings of Each Group	
Cultivating under 5 a.	44.6	64.3	76	24	7.0	11.1	
5— 10 a.	19.7		86	14	3.0	3.2	
10— 20 a.	16.2		15.8	89	11	1.6	1.0
20— 40 a.	11.9	22.9	87	13	10.6	4.5	
40— 60 a.	4.1	13.3	83	17	29.3	19.1	
60—100 a.	1.7		7.5	91	9	4.4	4.3
over 100 a.	1.7			22.4	96	4	44.1
Total	100.0	100.0	88	12	100.0	9.2	

Made from Hamada, *op. cit.*, p. 48 Table 1, p. 51 Table 5.

possessed 45.3 % of the whole land, while poor peasants with less than 10 acres of land possessed only 16 % of the whole land. The former amounts only to 7.5 % of all farmers and the latter as much as 64.3 %, and therefore the peasant groups differ obviously as to the size of farm. Secondly, the percentage of rented land is small throughout various classes, and it is the smaller, the bigger the size of farm is. It means that enlargement of size of farm mainly depended on the purchase of customary holdings. Thirdly, peasants of each class sublet part of their holdings and especially rich peasants with more than 100 acres of land sublet 15.5 % of their land which is

1) Hamada, M. "Social Differentiation of the Peasantry in England in the Fifteenth Century" (in Japanese), *Seiyoshi Kenkyu* (Historical Journal of Europe), No. 6.

2) Shinozuka, N. "Social Differentiation of the Peasantry in the Sixteenth Century" (in Japanese), *Shigaku-zasshi* (Historical Journal of Japan), Vol. LXVII, No. 1.

44.1 % of the whole sublet land. This shows a tendency that rich peasants, as the size of farm increases, sublet more of their accumulated land.

B. Crondal Manor

Table 2 shows the differentiation of the peasantry in Crondal Manor. It is similar to that of Wye Manor. Firstly, rich peasants with more

Table 2. The Differentiation of Peasantry in Crondal Manor

Groups of Peasants	% of Total Households	% of Total Area under Crops	% of Holding and Rented Land of Total Aarea under Crops of Each Group		Sublet Land	
			Holding	Rented Land	% of Total Land Sublet	% of Total Area of Holdings of Each Group
Cultivating no Land under 10 a.	13.4 21.0	2.7	64.2	35.8	0	0
10—20 a.	12.4					
20—30 a.	17.2	14.4	87.2	12.8	0	0
40—60 a.	16.6	23.1	96.2	3.8	1.2	0.29
60—80 a.	10.8	21.5	96.7	3.3	17.8	4.48
over 80 a.	8.6	32.9	98.7	1.3	81.0	10.10
Total	100.0 (186 house-holds)	100.0 (6466 $\frac{1}{4}$ a.)	94.0	6.0	100.0	5.9

Made from Shinozuka, *op. cit.*, p. 9 Table 3, p. 13 Table 7, p.14 Table 8.

than 60 acres of land equal to 19.4 % of all peasants and possess 54.4 % of the whole land, while poor peasants with less than 10 acres equal to 34.4 % of all peasants and possess merely 2.7 % of the whole land. Therefore differentiation of the peasantry is clear. Secondly, the percentage of rented land in the whole agricultural land is small, and is the smaller, the bigger the size of farm is. Thirdly, as for sublet land, farmers with less than 30 acres have no sublet land at all, while rich farmers with more than 80 acres sublet more than 10 % of their possessed land which is 81 % of the whole sublet land. Here again we can see the tendency of rich peasants subletting part of their holdings as the size of farm increases. Thus at this time differentiation of peasantry had a certain limitation. But this statement needs some modification when we look more closely at details of farm of rich peasants who were able to sublet their land. For instance, Richard Allen, the biggest subletter, had 87.5 % of the land enclosed (the average rate of enclosure was 81.5 %), and the area of his enclosed land was 16 acres at the biggest and 7.5 acres at the average (the average area of an enclosure was 4.3 acres). James

Hobson, the second biggest subletter, had 89.7 % of the land enclosed, and the area was 16 acres at the biggest and 5.8 acres at the average.¹⁾ Therefore, even though rich peasants sublet part of their accumulated land, they paid more attention to improved farming and increase of agricultural productive forces than ordinary peasants.

From what we have seen concerning differentiation of peasants in these two manors, we have got the following three conclusions. The first is that the case of Wye Manor in the middle of the 15th century proves that with money rent prevailing, the bourgeois development of the peasantry was proceeding, and that the case of Crondal Manor in the late 16th century shows that such development progressed throughout the 16th century. The second is that in both manors the percentage of rented land in the whole land was very small and that at this stage differentiation of holdings practically corresponded to that of the size of farm. The fact that enlargement of the size of farm was accompanied by decrease of the rate of rented land shows that the enlargement mainly depended on the accumulation of customary holdings and that rented land played only a small part in farm of rich peasants. The third conclusion is that in both manors rich peasants tended to sublet part of their accumulated land as the size of farm increases, and that the differentiation of peasantry did not straightly led to forming the relation of capital and wage labour, but developed with the relation of subtenancy. But because rich peasants themselves who sublet the land were most active in the improvement of their farming, we can presume that bourgeois development of peasantry was continually in progress, even though it had a certain limit.

2. Agricultural Structure in Gloucestershire in the Early 17th Century

So far we have examined differentiation of peasants in Wye Manor in the east England in the middle of the 15th century and in Crondal Manor in the south England in the late 16th century. How then was the situation in the 17th century immediately before the Bourgeois Revolution in Great Britain? I should like to choose Gloucestershire in the west England, and examine its agricultural structure in the beginning of the 17th century, using the valuable study by Mr. and Mrs. Tawney about an occupational census in Muster Roll in 1608.²⁾

1) Shinozuka, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

2) Tawney, R. H. and Tawney, A. G., "An Occupational Census of Seventeenth Century", *Economic History Review*, Vol. V, No. 1, Oct, 1934 (2nd Ed. 1957). As for reliability of Muster Roll as a historical document, see the detailed criticism of Tawneys (*op. cit.*, pp. 25-35). It seems to be a very accurate and comprehensive document, except that the number of gentry engaged in agriculture is not clear.

First of all, the structure of industrial population in Gloucestershire in 1608 was as follows. Among 19,402 men from 20 to 60 years of age recorded in Muster Roll, there were 109 men who were "unable in body" and 2,247 men with no specified occupation. We can guess the social status or occupation of the other 17,406, 1,232 of whom lived in the cities (Gloucester, Tewksbury and Cirencester) and 15,814 in the rural districts. In the three cities only 48 men (3.9 %) were engaged in agriculture, and even in the rural districts 7,835 (49.5 %) were so, which means more than half of the inhabitants had an occupation other than agriculture.¹⁾ This was a result of textile and other non-agricultural industries and showed development of social division of labour.

Then what kind of relation between capital and wage labour was being formed inside agriculture itself, corresponding to the development of social division of labour and commodity production? Table 3 shows

Table 3. Independent Producers and Employees in Agriculture

Independent Producers (Exclusive of Sons and Brothers)		Employees	
Yeomen	927	Servants to yeomen	387
Husbandmen	3,774	Servants to husbandmen	437
Farmers	2	Shepherds	93
		Husbandmen servants	87
		Estate servants	31
		Miscellaneous	18
		Labourers	1,831
Total	4,703		2,884

From Tawney, *op. cit.*, p. 49, Table V.

the numbers of independent producers and employees in agriculture in Gloucestershire at that time. Independent producers were mainly yeomen and husbandmen. Employees consisted of (1) servants to yeomen and husbandmen, (2) shepherds, husbandmen servants, estate servants and other servants to yeomen, husbandmen and gentlemen, (3) labourers living outside the above-mentioned three cities. 4,703 yeomen and husbandmen had 824 servants, which, in other words, is that 2.4 yeomen had one servant and 8.6 husbandmen had one servant. 2,060 men belonged to the group (3) which can be divided into those employed by rich yeomen and gentlemen and other 1,831 men simply called labourers. Although all of these 1,831 men were engaged in agriculture

1) See Tawney, *op. cit.*, p. 36, Table 1.

according to the record, quite a number of them actually must have been engaged in other occupations, and so the number of servants was really much smaller. It must be noticed too that the record does not include 430 knights, esquires, and gentlemen with no specified occupation and 750 servants of them, but we have to take them into account when we examine the structure of agricultural population at that time. However, there is no way of guessing how many of them were engaged in agriculture. If we suppose all of them were, then the number of independent producers and employers in agriculture in Gloucestershire at that time was about 5,100 and that of servants was about 3,300. Even if we suppose half of the whole gentry were engaged in agriculture, the number of independent producers and employers was still much bigger than that of servants.¹⁾

Thus we can suppose that the relation of capital and wage labour was not greatly remarkable in agriculture in Gloucestershire at that time. The point is worth further examination. Table 4 shows distribution

Table 4 Servants in Agriculture

Nos. of Servants	Knights, Esquires, & Gentlemen		Yeomen & Husbandmen	
	Employers	Employees	Employers	Employees
30+	1	32		
20+	1	25		
10+	14	160		
5+	37	213	3	18
4	22	88	9	36
3	26	78	25	75
2	49	98	103	206
1	74	74	489	489
0	206	0	3,074	0
Total	430	768	4,703	824

From Tawney, *op. cit.*, p. 51, Table VI, and p. 52, Table VII.

among different employers of servants in agriculture in Gloucestershire in 1608. We can lead to two conclusions from this Table. The first is considerably large number of servants employed by gentlemen. The number, however, is not very definite, since how many of the gentlemen were actually engaged in agriculture is not clear and as the record has been based on a supposition that all of them were. But we can safely

1) Tawney, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

surmise that at least half of them were,¹⁾ and so it is possible, to some extent, for us to assume the number of servants employed by gentlemen. Among 2,060 servants and labourers who do not appear in the table living outside the three cities, 69 husbandmen servants are recorded to have been employed by gentry. Tawney adds to it half of estate servants, shepherds, and other servants, and a quarter of 1,861 labourers, who, he thinks, were employed by gentry, and he supposes that one gentleman had about 3.1 servants.²⁾ There are other 283 servants with no specific occupation and no name of the employer, and if we add them too, the number of servants employed by gentlemen will be still larger.³⁾ Secondly, the rate in management by farmers is not very high. According to Table 4, among 4,703 peasants, only 624 or an eighth of them have servants. They have 824 servants and the maximum number of servants employed by one employer is eight. The number of servants employed by peasants was relatively small. As for servants and labourers who were not regularly employed, if those who were not employed by gentry were under the control of peasants, then the number of those employed by peasants, either regularly or not, was about 2,260, or, 2.1 peasants had one employee. As it is obviously groundless to suppose all of the 1,831 labourers were engaged in agriculture, the number of servants employed by peasants really must have diminished.

From what we have discussed, we can lead to the following conclusions. One is that, although the relation of capital and wage labour was clearly being formed in peasants economy in Gloucestershire in the early 17th century, it had not yet greatly developed and that the middle peasants were considerably numerous. The other is that the number of servants employed by gentlemen was fairly large and that the scale of farming was comparatively large. Thus, in the agriculture in the early 17th century Gloucestershire, differentiation of the peasantry was under way but still remained a great number of middle peasants above whom a few gentlemen carried on a large scale farming.

3. Leicestershire, Lincolnshire and Others

A. Leicestershire

In the case of Leicestershire, it is not possible, as it has been in other cases, definitely to show how far peasants economy was differentiated or how far the relation of capital and wage labour was formed. I will try to examine the situations of various classes of farmers,

1) Tawney, *op. cit.*, pp. 50-51. n. 2.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 51.

3) *Ibid.*, p. 47, Table IV, and p. 51.

mainly using the subsidy assessment record in 1524 and probate inventories of peasants, and to see how the differentiation was taking place. Subsidy in 1524 was assessed on those with land, movables or wage income of more than one pound a year. Even if there were a few below this standard, it was assessed on almost all the inhabitants of the village, and therefore the record can be used to see its class structure at that period. But, as the record has no reference to the details of assessed movables, it shows only the property differentiation of peasants. On the other hand, probate inventories of peasants record every kind of their movables, from clothes, household goods, crops, cattle to farming implements, and are useful to show the details of farming of each peasants. But this record by its nature is found only sporadically and does not refer to all the farmers in a certain village at a certain time. Therefore it cannot show how far differentiation of the peasantry developed as a whole. By using these two kinds of documents together, we can assume the actual state of differentiation to some extent.¹⁾

In order to re-examine from the viewpoint of scale of farming class structure of peasants based on the value of movables, we have to make clear the relation between the value of movables and scale of farming. As for the the latter, it is suitable to take a peasant who possesses land of one yardland wide as a standard middle peasant. In Leicestershire the area of arable land per one yardland was 30 to 40 acres, they had 16 to 20 acres under crops every year. One yardland can raise 30 to 40 sheep.²⁾ As for movables, if we take the average amount as the standard, it was £ 14 7 s. 4 d. in probate inventories of Leicestershire farmers in the years 1500 to 1531.³⁾ Let us take this figure as the standard and examine the relation between scale of farming and the value of movables of each farmer. J. Rothley in Syston and W. Copeland in Queniborough had average amount of movables worth £ 14 14 s. 4 d. and £ 15 12 s. 2 d. and had 20 acres and 24 acres under crops respectively, and so were middle peasants. W. Tanner in Long Whatton had less than average amount of movables worth £ 8 4 s. 6 d. and a small area of 10 1/2 acres under crops, and was lower middle peasants. On the other hand, J. Palmer in South Croxton had a little more than average amount of movables worth £ 23 5 s. 6 d., 36

1) The following will mainly depend on such books as Hoskins, W. G., *Essays in Leicestershire History*, 1950, do., *The Midland Peasants*, 1957, Parker, L. A., "The Agrarian Revolution at Cotesbach, 1501-1602" in *Studies in Leicestershire Agrarian History*, ed. by W. G. Hoskins, 1949.

2) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Essays*, p. 144.

3) *Ibid.*, p. 135.

acres under crops, 80 sheep and 13 cows, and was a middle peasant on his way to a rich peasant. Robert Barnwell in Drayton had movables worth £91 6 s., 44 acres under crops, 200 sheep and 27 cows, and obviously was a rich peasant. These examples show that the amount of movables corresponded to the scale of farming. According to Hoskins, the percentage in a peasants movables of crops, cattle and productive means like farming implements is constant regardless of the class he belongs to, which is about 6/7.¹⁾ If he is right, we can take the amount of a farmer's movables as an index to differentiation of the peasantry.

Now I will proceed to examine how differentiation took place in several villages in Leicestershire.

(1) Wigston Magna²⁾

Table 5 shows the class structure of Wigston Magna according to the subsidy assessment in 1524. If we take the above mentioned

Table 5. Property Differentiation in Wigston Magna
(Based on the Subsidy Assessment in 1524)

Groups of Tax Payers	Persons	Total Value of Movables of Each Group	Reference
£ 1	25(37.3%)	£ 25(12.3%)	All were assessed on wages
£ 2-4	30(44.8%)		
£ 5-9	9(13.4%)		
Over £ 10	3 (4.5%)	£ 39(19.1%)	{ W. Astyll £ 10 T. Whyte £ 13 W. Chamberlain £ 16
Total	67(100%)	£204(100%)	

Made from Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*, pp. 113-114.

figure as the standard and guess the situation of differentiation, it is clear that the number of lower middle peasants and poor peasants with movables worth 2 to 9 was 39 which is 58.2 % of the whole peasants. In other words the percentage of small peasants was high. 25 farmers (37.2 %) were taxed on their wages. Among them 10 were sons and brothers of yeomen and husbandmen on their apprenticeship in other people's farms.³⁾ If we exclude them, there are still 15 labourers (22.4 %) who mainly depend on wages and the percentage is considerably high. On the other hand, three biggest tax payers had 19.1 % of the whole movables, and the amount of

1) Hoskins, *Ibid.*, pp. 147-148, p. 154.

2) Concerning the details of agricultural development in Wigston Magna, see Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*.

3) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*, pp. 146-147, *do.*, *op. cit.*, *Essays*, pp. 129-130.

each was 16, 13 and 10 respectively. Judging from the above mentioned standard, their scale of farming was not more than that of a middle peasants. Thus in the early 16th century Wigston Magna, middle and small peasants farmers were still great in number, even though there was a class of wage labourers which amounted to 22.4 %, and differentiation had not yet developed very much.

Next I should like to examine details of peasants economy in this village, using their probate inventories. Table 6 shows the inven-

Table 6. Details of Peasants Inventories in Wigston Magna

Peasants	Date	Value of Movables	Crops	Stock	Larming Implement
R. Herrick	1534	In the £ 9-5 group in 1524.	Pease 35s. 8d. Barley 40s. Hay 20s.	£ 4. 15s. 8d. Cattle horses pig 6 4	
W. Astell	1554	Assessed on £ 10 in 1524	occupied the form of 3 yandlands	Sheep cattle horse pig 100 12 12 16	Waggon pulled by 6 bullocks
R. Freer	1557	£ 94 16s.	£ 8	{ Sheep £ 40 Wool £ 16 } £ 72 { Cattle etc. £ 16 }	
R. Jarvice	1581	£ 4. 2s. 8d.	Barley $\frac{1}{2}$ a. (13s. 4d.)	1 pig, 1 hen	
W. Bradshaw	1586	35 s. 10d.	Pease $\frac{1}{2}$ a.		
J. Winter	1603	£ 17 13s. 8d.	Pease and hay	15 sheep, 1 cattle	

Made from Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*, pp. 157-159, 172-173.

tories of six peasants of the village. The amount of movables of R. Herrick is not clear, but, according to the subsidy assessment in 1524, he belonged to the group with movables worth five to nine pounds, and judging from the value of his crops and the number of his cattle, he must have been a middle peasants. W. Astell was a middle peasants with ten pound worth movables in 1524, but when he died in 1554, he was rich peasant with a three yardland wide farm, 100 sheep, 12 cows, 12 horses. 16 pigs, and a waggon drawn by six bullocks which was the first of kind in the village. R. Freer, according to the inventory made in 1557, had the greatest amount of movables in the village and, though his crops and cattle are shown only in monetary value, we can think that the size of his farm was probably larger than that of Astell.¹⁾ R. Jarvice, W. Bradshaw and J. Winter are called labourers. There is no doubt that Jarvice and Bradshaw had almost no means of production and made their living mainly on wages. Winter had 15 sheep and 15 cows, which is as

1) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*, p. 158.

many as that possessed by a farmer with 1/2 yardland. But there is no proof that he held strips in an open field and so probably he shared no grazing right. Peasants like Winter or cottagers with small land of five to ten acres worked in a rich peasant's farm and, borrowing from him as compensation carts, or getting an allowance in hay, were able to maintain a small farm.¹⁾ This fact shows that development of agricultural productive forces at the time was still too immature to be free from such small farm. But on the other hand, because agricultural production is unique in that its demand of labour depends greatly on seasonal changes, existence of such a class as a source of labour supply was convenient to rich peasants. Basically peasants of this class should be regarded as poor peasants or proletariat.

Thus as the 16th century advanced, Wigston Magna produced rich peasants like Freer and Astell on one hand, and on the other poor peasants or proletariat like Jarvice and Bradshaw who were dependent on wage. I cannot mention here the exact percentage of each class of peasants, but the differentiation must have developed to a great extent, since among 130 to 140 families in Wigston Magna in 1605,²⁾ only 34 people got their land at dividing of manors in 1586-1588 and in 1606,³⁾ though there were still 1000 acres of freehold land left.

(2) Galby and Frisby

Frisby was a small village which separated from Galby in the beginning of the 13th century, but as the two villages had the same character, they can be treated as one. The subsidy assessment record in 1524 is applicable only to Frisby and Table 7 shows the class structure of the village as the record shows. Frisby in 1524 was a small village with only ten families, and there were three people whose wages were taxed. On the other hand, J. Dand, W. Ward and another peasants had movables worth 30 pounds, 20 pounds and 10 pounds respectively, which amounted to about 74 % of the whole amount. W. Ward, according to his inventory in 1533, had 20 1/2 acres under crops⁴⁾ and obviously was a middle peasants. Four peasants whose less than ten pound worth movables were taxed seem to have been lower middle peasants or poor peasants. J. Dand whose movables have not been specified was an upper middle peas-

1) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*, pp. 173-174.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 171.

3) *Ibid.*, pp. 95-115.

4) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Essays*, p. 60.

Table 7. Property Differentiation in Frisby (Based on the Subsidy Assessment in 1524).

Groups of Tax Payers	Persons	Value of Movables	Reference
Assessed on wages	2 (30)	£ 3 (3.8)	{ Unknown £10 W. Ward £20 J. Dand £30
Under £10	4 (40)	18 (22.2)	
Over £10	3 (30)	60 (74.1)	
Total	10 (100)	81 (100)	

Made from Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Essays*, p. 41.

ants or a rich peasants judging from the above mentioned standard. In 1557 John Lewyn who was one of the richest peasants in the village had as much as 39 acres under crops according to his inventory.¹⁾ Thus from the beginning to the middle of the 16th century, this small village too produced such classes as rich peasants, middle peasants, poor peasants and proletariat.

Galby was enclosed by its landlord immediately before 1630, and I should like to examine its state before the enclosure. W. Warner who died in 1606 had, according to his inventory, movables worth £ 249 17 s. 2 d., 250 to 300 sheep and other cattle worth £ 28 18 s. 7 d. and crops worth £85 19 s.²⁾ Judging from these figures, he was certainly a rich peasant. According to a record in 1567, there were two freeholders and twelve copyholders or leaseholders in the village, the numbers found also in a record made in 1610.³⁾ According to the record in 1610 when the manor in Galby was acquired by a new landlord, W. Whalley, gentlemen, it contained 300 acre wide arable, 40 acre wide meadow, 300 acre wide pasture and 23 acres of other land, so that it had 663 acres of land in all, excepting two freehold lands.⁴⁾ As Whalley, the landlord, was not then living in the village, this 663 acre wide land seems to have been possessed by about twelve copyholders or leaseholders including Warner, at the time of Warner's death in 1606. It is not clear how wide Warner had under crops, but because one acre Wide land under open field system could raise 1.5 to 2 sheep,⁵⁾ he must have needed at least about 150 acres to raise 250 to 300 sheep he owned. It

1) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Essays*, p. 60

2) *Ibid.*, p. 63.

3) *Ibid.*, p. 35, p. 38.

4) *Ibid.*, pp. 29-30.

5) *Ibid.*, pp. 144-145.

means he occupied one fifth of whole land in Galby. Although we cannot know how the situation of other peasants was, the existence of such a rich peasants on one hand implies by itself the existence of poor peasants and proletariat on the other. Thus in the early 17th century Galby too, differentiation of the peasantry was clearly in progress.

(3) Cotesbach

Cotesbach went through enclosure in about 1501 and in 1603. According to a record made in 1589, the village had 520 acre wide arable land which was divided into three fields, and therefore open field system had still its power.¹⁾ In other words, enclosure and open field system co-existed in this village for about a century. We cannot in this case use the subsidy assessment record in 1524, and instead I will choose the inventories of five peasants who died in the 1550's and five other peasants who died in the 1580/90's, in order to examine the situation of the peasantry on the eve of enclosure. First I will take the peasants of 1550's. In Gotesbach the area of one yardland was about 20 acres and each farmer shared the right to raise 30 sheep, 3 horses and 4 cows in the land.²⁾ The average amount of movables of a Leicestershire farmer in 1500 to 1530 was, according to the probate inventories, £ 14 7 s. 11 d. Judging from this figure, W. Cross with £ 11 2 s. worth movables and W. Chamberlain with £ 12 11 s. 6 d. were lower middle peasants or poor peasants. Thos. Wenall with £ 17 and E. Heeles with £ 17 5 s. belonged to the middle peasants so far as the amount is concerned. Th. Wenall, though he had only one acre under crops, owned 35 sheep and 7 cows, nearly as many as owned by a possessor of one yardland. Perhaps he was a small grazier who rented part of the enclosure, freed himself from open field husbandry and devoted himself to cattle-raising, and so he can be regarded as a middle farmer. It is worth noticing that enclosure made such a form of farming possible. Thos. Lord with £ 39 2 s. worth movables had a fairly wide area of 30 acres under crops and was an upper middle peasants or a rich peasants. He had about 45 acres of arable land including fallow, and as the percentage of arable land in Cotesbach was a little more than 60,³⁾ he seems to have possessed about 70 acres of land. Cross or Chamberlain possessed only 10 acres or so judging the number

1) Hoskins, ed., *op. cit.*, *Studies*, p. 50.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 56.

3) *Ibid.*, pp. 53-54.

of their cattle.¹⁾ The differentiation was no doubt in progress.

Next I will examine the cases of five peasants in 1580-90's. According to the probate inventories, an average Leicestershire farmer in 1588 had £46 16 s. 8 d. worth movables 20 $\frac{3}{4}$ acres under crops and thirty sheep:²⁾ the figures that can be used as the standard. J. Warde who died in 1586 had £44 2 s. worth movables which included £34 3 s. 4 d. worth crops and £44 48 s. 9 d. worth cattle and farming implements.³⁾ He was an upper middle peasant or a rich peasant. J. Williams who died in 1580 had £78 worth movables which included £15 19 s. 10 d. worth crops and 45 6 s. 4 d. worth cattle (110 sheep, 12 cows and 5 horses).⁴⁾ W. Smith who died in 1591 had £70 9 s. 4 d. worth movables which included £14 4 s. 7 d. worth crops and 50 sheep, 12 cows, 5 horses and a few pigs.⁵⁾ Th. Flannel who died in 1582 had £57 worth movables which included £20 10 s. 5 d. worth crops and £21 1 s. 11 d. worth cattle (48 sheep, 8 cows and 5 horses).⁶⁾ These belonged to the upper middle peasants. H. Hilton who died in 1580 had a little less than average amount of movables (£41 16 s.) which included £11 1 s. 11 d. worth cattle (5 cows, 2 horses and 5 pigs) and £21 14 s. 9 d. worth crops.⁷⁾ He can be treated as a middle peasants. It is interesting is that, so far as these five farmers are concerned, the area of land under crops does not always correspond to the number of cattle, and so crop farming was separating itself more clearly from cattle-raising. Th. Wenall, as we have seen, was a typical case. Such a phenomenon was possible because the 220 acre wide enclosure made by the landlord in the beginning of the 16th century was now divided and rented to farmers who were able to raise more sheep in the land. In Cotesbach from the early 16th century to the early 17th century, enclosure and open field system co-existed, and the former had some influence on the latter. Anyway all of the five peasants had average amount of movables and belonged to the middle peasants or the upper middle peasants. According to the survey in 1588, 600 acre wide leasehold in Cotesbach was possessed by thirteen leaseholders⁸⁾ who included these five peasants or their successors. Their successors were opposed to the second enclosure in 1603 and had to go through the banishment from or reduction of their possessed land.⁹⁾

1) Hoskins, ed., *op. cit.*, *Studies*, pp. 53-54.

2) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Essays*, p. 135.

3), 4), 5), 6), 7) Hoskins, ed., *op. cit.*, *Studies*, pp. 52-56.

8) *Ibid.*, p. 50.

9) *Ibid.*, pp. 66-69.

In the anti-enclosure riot of Midland in 1607, Cotesbach was one of the centres,¹⁾ and these farmers probably played an active part in it. Thus in Cotesbach from the middle of the 16th century to the 17th century, differentiation of the peasantry was to some extent remarkable, but middle peasants were still in power and developed agricultural production

B. Lincolnshire

We shall now briefly see the case of Lincolnshire which is next to Leicestershire, using the study by Miss Thirsk.²⁾ Table 8 shows areas of

Table 8. Arable Land of Lincolnshire Peasants in the 16-17th Century (Based on Probate Inventories)

Groups of Peasants with Sown land	Number of Peasants	
	1530-1600	1630-1700
1— 5a.	33	9
5— 10	32	8
10— 20	31	10
20— 30	33	8
30— 40	18	4
40— 60	1	5
60—100	4	2
100+		3
Total	172	121

Made from Thirsk, J., *English Peasant Farming*, 1954, pp. 42, 75, 86, 99, 149, 188.

Table 9. Stock of Lincolnshire Peasants in the 16th Century (Based on Probate Inventories)

Groups of Peasants	Number of Peasants			
	Cattle	Horse	Pig	Sheep
With no stock	14	56	127	155
// 1— 5	130	135	194	49
// 6— 10	169	153	86	42
// 11— 20	135	49	59	66
// 21— 30	65	6	6	37
// 31— 40	15	3	1	27
// 41— 50	5	—	—	25
// 51— 80	11	—	—	39
// 81—100	—	—	—	21
// 101—150	1	—	—	26
// 151+	—	—	—	18
// 300+	—	—	—	4
Unspecified	—	13	38	6
Total	515	515	515	515

Made from Thirsk, J., *op. cit.*, pp. 34, 72, 87, 106.

land under crops of Lincolnshire peasants in the 16th and 17th centuries, based on their probate inventories, and Table 9 shows the stock of 16th century Lincolnshire peasants, based also on the inventories.³⁾

1) Hoskins, ed., *op. cit.*, *Studies*, p. 73.

2) Thirsk, J., *English Peasant Farming*, 1947. Though the book deals with the inventories in many places, it does not show them in their original forms but in the statistically modified forms. The inventories can be used when we guess differentiation of the peasantry only show the actual situation of the class so that we can recognize the existence of rich peasants and poor peasants. Unfortunately therefore the book is not of great use from our present point of view.

3) Miss Thirsk has divided Lincolnshire into four sections and examined the special feature in agricultural development in each section. However, I have ignored such divisions, since our purpose is merely to see the areas of land under crops and the numbers of cattle.

We cannot, as we did in the case of Leicestershire, here show how the peasantry differentiated in each village or how the actual situation of each peasant was. But we can at least recognize the existence of a poor peasant with one to five acres under crops and one to five cattle on the one hand, and on the other a rich peasant with more than 40 acres under crops and 150 to 300 sheep, which is enough to indicate the tendency of differentiation.

C. Other Cases

We have made it clear that in the 16th 17th century England differentiation of the peasantry was in progress in various parts of the country. Especially in the late 16th century progress of price revolution lowered the value of rent, and under such favourable condition commodity production by the peasantry still more developed and eventually the class of rich peasants appeared which in English history is usually called the rise of yeomanry.¹⁾ I will now mention a few of such rich yeomen as the living examples of bourgeois development of the peasantry. The first is George Elmdon, a yeoman in Weasenham, Norfolk, in the east England. According to his record, he had in 1589 146 $\frac{7}{8}$ acres under crops or 194 $\frac{7}{8}$ acres including fallow. In 1588 he had an enclosed arable and 71 acres of pasture, and as the size of farm increased, he paid attention to improvement of his farming.²⁾ We find in Devonshire in the west England a rich farmer named George Hoskins with the movables worth £ 704 19 s. We can easily see how big his scale of farming was when we remember that the average amount of movables of a Leicestershire farmer in 1613 was £67 2 s. 3 d. according to the probate inventories.³⁾ In fact he had 500 sheep, 48 cows, 12 horses and a few pigs, the value of which amounted to £ 310. He must have been a big cattle-farmer, but as his crops were worth £ 152, the scale in this aspect must have been also large.⁴⁾ In the contemporary England, such a rich farmer was appearing in various places.

Finally I will summarize the results of examining differentiation of the peasantry before the English Revolution.

Firstly in England, when money rent became common in the middle of the 15th century, the differentiation of peasantry started to proceed

1) Regarding this point see Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Essays*, pp. 150-159, Campbell, M., *The English Yeoman*, 1942, pp. 157-220, etc.

2) Gray, H. L., *English Field System*, 1915, pp. 320-321.

3) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Essays*, p. 135.

4) Hoskins, W. G. & Finberg, H. P. R., *Devonshire Studies*, pp. 400-402.

and it continued throughout the 16th and 17th centuries. Moreover at this period differentiation of holdings usually corresponded to differentiation of the size of farm, and enlargement of the size of farm mainly depended on accumulation of peasants holdings.

Secondly, however, at this period, the differentiation had a certain limit and rich peasants, as the size of their farm increases, sublet part of their accumulated land, and so differentiation developed, accompanied by subtenancy. But perhaps this was not a very big factor.

Thirdly, just as the differentiation had a limit, formation of relationship of capital and wage labour inside peasants economy was not very conspicuous. Though the differentiation was in progress, we should not overemphasize the phenomenon but notice the importance of middle peasants in English villages before the Revolution.

III. Growth of Small Enclosures

1. The Progress of Small Enclosure

I discussed in the previous section of this article development of differentiation of the peasantry which followed generalization of commodity production and was a sign of greater development of commodity production. When commodity production became common among peasants, the form of possession and utilization of land under open field system like Flur-Zwang, Gemenlage, or intermixed holding, common right, gradually became restraint to the peasants who were involved in commodity production. Therefore they started to consolidate the various strips which existed separately in each furlong, enclose them with a hedge or a fence, and thus carry on independent farming instead of collective farming which had prevailed before. This is so-called small enclosure or enclosure by peasants. It was already discriminated then from large enclosure for sheep-raising by the landowners. For instance, John Hales, when he charged Royal Commission in 1548, ordered that they should exclude small enclosures by peasants from the inquisition,¹⁾ and the author of the well-known "A Discourse of the Common Weal of This Realm of England" positively defended small enclosure, while he harshly criticized enclosure for sheep-raising.²⁾ It is also well known that small enclosure has been recommended by the agronomists such as Fitzherbert and Tusser.³⁾ As is generally known, Professor Tawney said that this

1) Hales' Charge to the juries impanelled to present enclosures, in *T. E. D.*, Vol. I, p. 41.

2) Lamond, Elizabeth, ed., *A Discourse of the Common Weal of the Realm of England*, p. 49.

3) Fitzherbert, *Surveying*, in *T. E. D.*, Vol. 3, pp. 22-25; Thomas Tusser, *Five Hundred Points of Good Husbandry*, in *T. E. D.*, Vol. 3, pp. 63-68.

formation of small enclosures was nothing but the historical forerunner of the movement of enclosure for sheep-raising in the 16th century,¹⁾ and gave for the first time clear historical significance to the two types of enclosure. In Japan his point of view has been more advanced so that we can see the problem in relation to "Two paths" in the development of agricultural capitalism. How it has been done was already shown in the previous article. Anyway small enclosure was an inevitable result of development of commodity production by peasantry, and the process in which open field system was taken place by small enclosure so that farming became more individual was a fundamental point in the development of modern farming. In this section I want to discuss how far small enclosure had developed and how agricultural productive forces had developed which enabled small enclosure, in English villages immediately before the Revolution.

Usually, when a land is enclosed, there are three steps in the process. First the strips which lie scattered in an open field are consolidated by exchanging or buying and selling the holdings (change in the form of arable land). Secondly the consolidated land is enclosed by a hedge or a ditch so that free individual farming is possible (emancipation from Elur-Zwang). At the same time common meadows and common pastures are enclosed and possessed individually (abolishment of common rights). Fitzherbert has put the way in which enclosure takes place in an open field villages. Each peasants by exchange consolidates arable land and leys or a ley in each field, and in the same way pastures and meadows are consolidated in one field, so that he has six closes. Three of them are used for arable land, one for a ley, and another for meadow and pasture, which he thinks is the ideal form of a small enclosure.²⁾ There are several cases in which the whole land of a village was enclosed in this way with general consent of villagers, which we can find in surveys of the 16th century.³⁾ But probably these were rather exceptional, and usually enclosure developed in a smaller scale and partly in the form of individual exchange of strips or an occasional enclosure of common pastures and common medows.

Then when and how far did this small enclosure start to develop? It is extremely difficult to give a quantitative estimation to this problem by its nature. We can only sometimes find the cases of small enclosure in the records of manors. Though we have no decisive evidence, we can at

1) Tawney, R. H., *The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 147-173.

2) Fitzherbert, *Surveying*, in *T. E. D.*, Vol. 3, p. 22.

3) Regarding these cases, see Tawney, *Agrarian Problem*, pp. 157-158.

least try to trace the history of small enclosure with these few cases in hand.

(Case 1) In Wye Manor, Kent, in 1452, the average area of arable land per strip was 4.2 acres at East Kyngssnothe and 3.4. acres at West Kyngssnothe, which shows that strips were being consolidated and small enclosure was in progress.¹⁾

(Case 2) In Forncet Manor, Norfolk, as early as 1404, quite a number of tenants enclosed their land in open fields, for which they were fined. The same thing happened in 1438 and 1441. By the time of survey in 1565, 2/3 to 1/2 of the arable land in Forncet Vill had been enclosed, and almost all of the enclosures were 3 to 15 acres wide, most of which were used for arable land. In other words in this manor small enclosure started as early as the beginning of the 15th century and developed throughout the 15th and 16th centuries.²⁾

(Case 3) At Ket's Rebellion in 1549, the peasants rose and requested that enclosure of commons by the landlord should be broken up, while they defended their own enclosure.³⁾ The fact seems to show development of small enclosure.

(Case 4) In Crondal Manor, Hampshire, in 1568, formation of small enclosure was remarkable in all of the eight tithings except in Crondal Tithing. In Swanthrop Tithing 95.4 % of the arable land had been enclosed, and in Long Sutton and Warblington where the rate was lowest 57.1 % was. The average rate was 81.5 % and open field system had nearly been extinguished. In Basing Stoke which is next to Crondal Manor, small enclosure developed from the beginning of the 16th century to 1640's, and so in Crondal Manor where the movement developed very rapidly, it started probably in the middle of the 15th century.⁴⁾

These cases may not be sufficient, but we can assume that there was a sign of small enclosure already in the 15th century and it gradually developed in the 15th and 16th centuries.

Next I should like to examine the situation from the late 16th century to the early 17th century, using as a more comprehensive document, the extracts from the surveys in Tudor and Stuart ages which are contained in the appendix of *English Field System* by H. L. Gray.⁵⁾ We

1) Hamada, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

2) Davenport, F. G., *The Economic Development of a Norfolk Manor, 1086-1595*, pp. 80-81.

3) Bland, A. E., Brown, P. A. and Tawney, R. H. eds., *English Economic History, Select Documents*, 1914, pp. 247-248.

4) Shinozuka, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-26.

5) The following examination has been based on Gray, H. L., *English Field System*, pp. 438-449, pp. 510-535, pp. 549-559.

have the records in this book about sixty odd manors, in some forty of which enclosure developed to some extent. In thirteen manors more than 50 % of the whole area had been enclosed and in twelve manors 30 to 50 % had been enclosed, which shows small enclosure developed considerably from the late 16th century to the early 17th century. But as for the details of enclosure, in Kingsbury, Norton St. Philip and Curry Mallett in Somersetshire, Farnham in Buckinghamshire, and Sonning in Berkshire, the rate of enclosed arable land was 44.1 %, 31.4 %, 46.3 %, 33.4 %, 36.6 %, respectively, and it shows that enclosure of arable land had developed to some extent. However, the rate of enclosed arable was lower and its scale smaller than those of pasture and meadow, if we see the situation as a whole. It means enclosure of arable land was more difficult than enclosure of common pasture and common meadow. Generally speaking, enclosure for improvement of farming and enclosure of waste started in a great scale in the late 17th century, and even at the time of Parliamentary Enclosure in the middle of the 18th century, nearly half of the arable land in England was still open field.¹⁾ Judging from this, small enclosure had not greatly developed in English villages before the Revolution. There were some manors where enclosure took place in such ideal form as Fitzherbert said or rapidly developed as in Crondal Manor, but on the whole in English villages before the Revolution open field system was still great in power and small enclosure developed only partly.

2. Development of Agricultural Productive Forces

Development of small enclosure which I have discussed was accompanied by the corresponding development of agricultural technique. Therefore next I will examine development of agricultural technique which facilitated small enclosure.

Table 10 shows how land was used by seven farmers in Lutterworth, Leicestershire, in 1607. Each farmer possessed arable land and so open field system was clearly maintained. At the same time there existed in an open field leys which amounted to about 15 % of the whole arable land and were distributed fairly irregularly in each field. Generally

1) According to Johnson, the area of arable land enclosed after 1700 is 4,464,189 acres, 4,220,344 acres of which was enclosed after 1761 (Johnson, A. H., *The Disappearance of the Small Landowner*, p. 90). According to G. King, on the other hand, the area of arable land in England and Wales in 1588 was about 9 million acres (King, G. *Natural and Political Observations and Conclusions upon the State and Condition of England*, 1696). By a rough calculation based on these figures, the rate of enclosed arable land before Parliamentary Enclosure was about 50 %.

Table 10. The Land Use in Lutterworth, 1607

Peasants	Total Area (acre)	Close	Arable in Common Field			Meadow			Ley			
			I	II	III	I	II	III	I	II	III	Pasture
1	50	$\frac{3}{4}$	12	12	12	3	$2\frac{1}{2}$	$3\frac{1}{2}$	1	1	1	$1\frac{1}{4}$
2	$59\frac{1}{4}$	$3\frac{1}{4}$	12	14	12	3	$2\frac{1}{2}$	$2\frac{1}{2}$	$1\frac{1}{2}$	3	$1\frac{1}{2}$	1
3	$59\frac{1}{2}$	$2\frac{1}{2}$	$12\frac{1}{2}$	12	$12\frac{1}{2}$	3	$2\frac{1}{2}$	3	$2\frac{3}{4}$	$2\frac{3}{4}$	2	4
4	$18\frac{5}{8}$	1	4	$4\frac{1}{4}$	4	1	$\frac{3}{4}$	$1\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{3}{8}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{9}{2}$	1
5	$22\frac{1}{4}$	$1\frac{1}{4}$	6	$6\frac{1}{2}$	5		2		$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	1
6	$53\frac{1}{2}$	$1\frac{3}{4}$	$12\frac{1}{4}$	$13\frac{1}{4}$	$12\frac{1}{2}$	3	$2\frac{1}{2}$	3	$1\frac{1}{4}$	$1\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	2
7	$32\frac{5}{8}$	$\frac{3}{8}$	8	8	8	$1\frac{1}{2}$	2	$1\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	1
Total	$295\frac{3}{4}$	$10\frac{7}{8}$	$202\frac{3}{4}$			$44\frac{1}{4}$			$37\frac{7}{8}$			

Made from Gray, *English Field System*, p. 445.

* I, II, III mean the division of fields.

speaking, a ley is a piece of land which was originally a strip in an open field and, after temporary enclosure, was emancipated from the old Elur-Zwang for a certain period to be used individually. Therefore the existence of leys implied a partial change of open field system. A ley was commonly used for pasture or meadow, but there is a proof that it was later used for arable land, in which case a primitive convertible husbandry must have been adopted.¹⁾ But as it was called temporary enclosure,²⁾ every year on Lammas Day (August 1st) its fence was removed and it obeyed common of shack again. Also it was under various restrictions while it was used.³⁾ Thus its individual use had still some limitation, but its existence itself had a great significance in the following point. By using some of the strips in open field for leys, farmers were able to be free from shortage of pasture and meadow, so that they could raise much more cattle. This development of productive forces in cattle-raising caused the same kind of phenomenon in crop farming. For instance in Leicestershire, introduction of leys increased the number of cattle by 50 % and harvest of corn per acre by 100 %, from the early 16th century to the early 17th century.⁴⁾ The appearance of leys in an open fields made a new epoch in development of agricultural pro-

1) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Essays*, p. 140. do., *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*, pp. 161-162.

2) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*, p. 150, p. 163.

3) *Ibid.*, p. 163.

4) Franklin, T. B., *British Grass-Land*, p. 74, p. 85.

ductive forces, since it showed that individual farming was entering inside open field system, if partly, and that a new convertible husbandry was gradually being formed. Such development of productive forces was the cause which enabled development of individual farming in enclosures.

Leys became more common among farmers from the late 16th century to the early 17th century, but there are some evidences that they already existed in the 14th and 15th centuries. For example in Slawston Manor in Leicestershire in 1359-60, one Peter Taillour had, together with 29 acre 1/2 rood wide arable land and one acre wide meadow, thn several pastures which were distributed in the field.¹⁾ In Wymeswold, Leicestershire, in the beginning of the 15th century, a ley was used for several pasture and as the village by-law has a reference to how to use it, it seems to have been fairly common then in the village.²⁾ In the 16th century Fitzherbert in his "Surveying" in 1539 said that it was getting common in the contemporary English villages.³⁾ They are the references to the early development of ley husbandry from the late 14th century to the early 15th century, and we can think that it developed from the 15th century to the 16th century. Perhaps it answered the demand of peasants to improve their farming at the time of development of commodity production by peasantry. The rapid popularization of ley husbandry from the late 16th century to the early 17th century which is generally recognized corresponded to development of differentiation of the peasantry, development of the home market and development of commodity production by peasantry. Thus agricultural productive forces continued to develop for a long time among peasantry, which was followed by the small enclosure. As we all know, modern agriculture in England owed much to agricultural technique of the Continent, but the peasants were mature enough to accept it.

We shall now see the case of Wigston Magna, Leicestershire, as an example which shows the way in which ley husbandry developed in the 17th century. The village had a ley already in the 15th century,⁴⁾ and in 1588 when the peasants sued the landlord, they requested that they should be granted freedom to enclose leys every year until August 1st so that they could use them seperately,⁵⁾ which shows the system had be-

1) Hilton, R. H., *The Economic Development of Some Leicestershire Estates in the 14th & 15th Centuries*, p. 115, n. 1.

2) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Essays*, p. 142, do., *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*, p. 163. *Victoria County History, Leicestershire*, Vol. 2, p. 194.

3) Fitzherbert, *Surveying*, in *T. E. D.*, Vol. 3, p. 22.

4) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*, p. 67.

5) *Ibid.*, p. 105.

Table 11. The Size of Strips and the Percentage of Ley in Arable in Wigston

Farm Date Areas	Size of Strips	$\frac{1}{2}r$	1r	$1\frac{1}{2}r$	2r	3r	1a	1a	total	% of Ley in Arable
1577($11\frac{3}{4}$ a.)		—	20	10	4	—	1	—	35	17%
1582($6\frac{1}{2}$ a.)		4	6	—	7	—	1	—	18	23
1602(11a.)		4	26	—	8	—	—	—	38	26
1693(1 yardland)		4	19	—	33	4	5	—	65	20
1696(3 ")		1	66	2	43	17	8	17	154	31
1697($\frac{1}{4}$ ")		1	11	—	6	2	—	—	20	18
1703($2\frac{1}{4}$ a.)		—	7	—	1	—	—	—	8	0
1704($\frac{1}{4}$ yardland)		—	4	—	3	1	1	2	11	20
1712($\frac{3}{4}$ ")		4	7	12	15	9	2	4	53	20
1714(1 ")		—	24	—	21	10	5	2	62	25
1745($\frac{4}{1}$ ")		—	8	6	11	2	—	1	68	30

Made from Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*, pp. 152, 231.

come common among most of the peasants. Table 15 shows the sizes of strips in the open fields and the rate of leys in several farms of the village. Leys amounted to 20 to 30 % of the whole arable land. In Wigston Magna the rate of leys in the whole arable land was usually about 1/5 which was constant from the end of the 16th century to the first half of the 18th century.¹⁾ The table also shows the following fact. In the farms from 1577 to 1602 single strips of one rood amounted to about 60 % of all the strips and more than two rood wide strips amounted merely to one fourth, while from 1693 to 1745 the larger strips increased up to 16 % (12 % of all the strips were more than one acre wide), which means exchange and consolidation of strips had greatly progressed. But it is said that these larger strips were usually enclosed and changed into grass-lands,²⁾ and development of leys led to formation of small enclosure. In fact we can find in Wigston Magna not only temporary enclosures but permanent enclosures.³⁾ But the areas of such small enclosures were not very wide and until the time of Parliamentary Enclosure, most of the arable land in Wigston Magna remained open and most of leys were merely temporary enclosures.

The case of Wigston Magna typically shows how productive forces

1) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasant*, p. 233.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 232.

3) *Ibid.*, p. 106, p. 163, p. 231.

developed in an open field village. Of course, as we have already seen, there were manors where small enclosure was adopted typically, and in the 17th century, as many books on agriculture recommended enclosure, more rational convertible husbandry became systematized. So fairly improved husbandry might be practiced in advanced villages where enclosure for improvement of farming had developed. But since even on the eve of Parliamentary Enclosure in the middle of the 18th century about half of the whole arable land in England remained open the rate of open fields in the middle of the 17th century before the Revolution must have been still greater. The case of Wigston Magna shows that in English villages before the revolution development of agricultural productive forces had reached the stage where popularization of ley husbandry caused partial adoption of a primitive convertible husbandry in open fields.

In this way development of agricultural productive forces before the English Revolution was still slow but steady, corresponding to development of commodity production by peasantry. Moreover the way of development on each class of peasants differed each other. For instance, Table 12 shows the rate of enclosed arable land and the average area of

Table 12. The Percentage of Enclosed Arable and the Average Area of Close in Crondal Manor

Size of Farm	Percentage of Enclosed Arable (%)	Average Area of Close (acre)
10a.	50.1	2.6
10—20a.	65.5	2.3
20—40a.	83.9	3.6
40—60a.	75.4	3.6
60—80a.	86.5	4.3
80a.	84.9	6.0
Total	81.5	4.3

From Shinozuka, *op. cit.*, p. 24, Table 16.

enclosure according to the size of farm in the case of Crondal Manor, Hampshire. It is clear that the bigger the size of farm is, the rate and the average area are bigger. Thus rich peasants at once enlarged size of their farm and accumulated the land with high productivity. In other words, enlargement of the size of farm was not separated from rationalization of farming. As differentiation of the peasantry developed, the difference in productivity in farming got bigger, which in turn developed the differentiation. But the difference was not yet so decisive as com-

pletely to abolish small farm of poor peasants and to establish totally the relation of capital and wage labour in agriculture. This was the reason why the differentiation of the peasantry had a certain limit as we saw and why the relation of capital and wage labour was still immature inside peasants economy.

IV. The Transformation from Peasant Landhold into Peasant Proprietorship

Development of productive forces among peasantry which we discussed in the previous section was actually restricted to a great extent by landownership by the lords which was still powerful at the time. Therefore it was necessary for the peasantry to abolish such form of landownership, in order to improve their farming corresponding to development of commodity economy and to develop their productive forces freely. In this way commodity production by peasantry and the accompanying movement towards small enclosure necessarily led to the request to abolish feudal landownership. In the present section, I should like to examine the process in which such request rose among peasantry due to development of commodity production by peasantry and in which peasant landhold transformed into peasant proprietorship, thereby extinguished feudal landownership.

1. Two Forms of Extinguishing Feudal Landownership

So far we have seen how bourgeois development of peasantry started with the adoption of money rent in the middle of the 15th century and how such development caused the peasantry to request abolishment of feudal landownership. But we must not forget that money rent had a possibility to abolish feudal landownership to the opposite direction. That is, as Karl Marx has put it theoretically, as money rent further develops, there may be two ways of the break-up of the feudal landownership. The one is that the old peasant holders are expropriated and are replaced by capitalist tenant farmers. Another is that the former peasant holder transformed into an independent peasant with complete ownership of the land he cultivates.¹⁾

In England money rent was not only originally kept on a low level, but was still more lowered due to the price revolution starting from the second half of the 16th century, and so far as defrayment of rent was concerned, copyhold was practically freehold. But copyholders who were protected by a different custom in each manor held their land more insecurely than freeholders who were protected by common law. They were more under restraint of the landlord, and especially those whose

1) Marx, K., *Capital*, vol. III., Ch. 47, Sect. IV., pp. 778-9, Moscow, 1959.

fine was not constant or tenants at will who had no copy held the land still more insecurely. Moreover, as commodity production developed among such peasantry and as improvement of farming was required, the peasants naturally wanted to strengthen their right to the land as the basis of reproduction, abolish various restriction of the landlord and develop productive forces freely. Thus, the peasantry eagerly wanted to change peasant landhold into peasant land proprietorship which was freer. To this, the landlord changed copyhold of inheritance into short-term leasehold, imposed a high fine and used such means as enclosure or raising of rent. As the result peasants had to face either eviction from their holdings due to enclosure by the landlord, or high rack-rent or improved rent. The conflict of these two movements is a characteristic point in the history of English villages in the 16th and 17th centuries. But I will not deal with how the landowners deprived the peasant holders and in the present article discuss only the process of transformation from peasant landhold to peasant land proprietorship, taking the case of Wigston Magna where the request of the peasants was typically fulfilled.

2. The Process of Break-Up of Feudal Landownership in Wigston Magna

As we have already seen, in Wigston Magna, the peasantry gradually differentiated from the 16th to the 17th century, and simultaneously ley husbandry became common among the peasants, a movement towards small enclosure appeared and such development of farming economy started to overwhelm feudal landownership. The village was divided into Oxford Manor and Turvile Manor, and I will first examine the case of the former. In 1543, half of this manor was owned by John Nevill, fourteenth Lord Latimer, and another half by Elizabeth, the wife of Sir Anthony Wingford.¹⁾ There already occurred a trouble between Lord Latimer and two copyholders concerning the character of tenure sometime between 1543 and 1547.²⁾ Soon after that, the new lord of Oxford Manor and all the copyholders had to experience a decisive confrontation. In 1577 Sir John Danvers got married with the daughter of Latimer, Elizabeth, and acquired one half of the manor, and then in 1585 bought another half from Sir Robert Wingford and thus had a complete ownership of the manor.³⁾ In this way the manor which had been divided was now re-united. Immediately after that, in 1588, thirty-one customary tenants of the manor were united, elected eight representatives and sued

1) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*, p. 103.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 104.

3) *Ibid.*, p. 103, p. 105.

the new lord and his wife to Chancery. The prosecution contained the following points.¹⁾

- (1) According to the custom in Wigston, copyhold should be copyhold of inheritance, and fine should be fixed, which is one fourth of annual rent.
- (2) The manor has two kinds of land, namely bond land and berry land. The rent of the former should be 13 s. 4 d. per one yardland (6 d. per acre), and that of the latter 10 s. per one yardland (5 d. per acre).
- (3) Either of the aforesaid land can be transferred or bought and sold, like freehold, according to the copy of the court of the manor.
- (4) Copyholders should have a right to fell the trees in their holdings.
- (5) Copyholders should have a right to enclose customary lands in the open fields and to keep them in severalty until Lammas Day (August 1st).

These requests basically can be summarized as the following two points. Firstly, request of copyhold of inheritance, fixed rent, fixed fine and freedom of dealing with the holdings practically leads to peasants proprietorship. Secondly, request of freedom to enclose and keep them in severalty until Lammas Day shows their intention to develop agricultural productive forces corresponding commodity production. The fact these requests were clearly mentioned in the suit shows that temporary enclosure had become a fairly common custom in Wigston Magna and that development of productive forces in such a form was obstructed by the landlord. Therefore the peasants had to try to extinguish the obstacles, the right of the landlord, and establish peasant land proprietorship, in order to improve their farming and to develop productive forces. In this way, the request of establishing peasant land proprietorship was closely connected with the request of development of agricultural productive forces.

To these requests, the landlord asserted as follows.²⁾

- (1) Customary land should not be of inheritance but for one life.
- (2) Fine should not be fixed, but be decided at the will of lord.
- (3) Berry land is demisable only at the will of the lord.
- (4) The form of surrendering and regranting of copyhold land is not lawful or valid unless made before the bailiff of the manor.
- (5) Letting of customary land for more than a year without license from lord, unlicensed exchange of land and temporary enclosure and felling of trees without permission are all illegal.

1) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasant*, p. 106.

Firstly, the first four points mean that the landlord, by putting them into practice, tried to put the land under his strong restraint and to prevent peasant landholding from strengthening. It led to substitution of leasehold for copyhold and imposition of high rent and fine, and eventually the landlord could weaken peasant landhold and deprive them of land. Secondly, restriction of exchange and consolidation of land and temporary enclosure clearly obstructed development of agricultural productive forces by the peasants themselves. In this lawsuit, the request of peasants to establish peasant land proprietorship and to develop agricultural productive forces was markedly opposed against that of the landlord to weaken peasant landhold and stop the development of productive forces by them.

The suit was dismissed by High Court of Chancery in November and was referred to Assizes of Leicester.¹⁾ The result is not clear, but perhaps it was unfavourable to the landlord and in 1606 the manor was sold to the peasants. Table 13 shows the numbers of purchasers and the areas of purchased land. The sale was unique in that only twenty peasants bought back their holdings, and that poor peasants had no share.

Table 13. Purchasers of Oxford Manor

Area Purchased (yardland)	Number of Purchasers
$3\frac{1}{4}$	1
$2\frac{1}{2}$	2
$2\frac{1}{4}$	1
2	5
$1\frac{3}{4}$	2
$1\frac{1}{2}$	1
1	2
$\frac{1}{2}$	4
$\frac{1}{4}$	2
30	20

(Seven leaseholders who don't appear in table)
occupied $2\frac{1}{2}$ yardlands in all.

Made from Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*,
pp. 113-114.

1) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*, p. 107.

Seven leaseholders who were unable to purchase the land remained as leaseholders, and possessed part of the purchased land, which was only 2 1/2 yardland in all. The second point is that the land was not directly sold to the peasants but through four trustees who were conveyed all the property in question and afterwards conveyed to each of the copyholders the freehold and inheritance of his tenement.¹⁾ Out of the four trustees, Walter Chamberlain was not among the purchasers, but Thomas Lawe, gent., Robert Fryer and William Johnson were big purchasers who bought 2 yardland, 3 1/4 yardland and 2 1/2 yardland, respectively,²⁾ which means the purchase was conducted with the leadership of rich peasants. Thus in Oxford Manor the right of the landlord was abolished when the peasants established proprietorship of land through purchasing back the feudal right. Though the request of establishing peasant land proprietorship was a natural result of development of commodity production by peasantry, the fruit of land struggle went to the hand of rich peasants and poor peasants had no share. This is not surprising when we think that the struggle was led by rich peasants, as the unique way of the purchase shows. The result of this purchase clearly shows development of differentiation of the peasantry in Wigston Magna, which we discussed in this article, and the existence of peasant proprietors of land parcels promoted the already clear differentiation.

Next I will briefly see the case of Turvile Manor, another half of Wigston Magna. This manor was divided and sold by the lord Henry Turvile between 1586 and 1588, and his right extinguished. Fifteen

Table 14. Purchasers of Turvile Manor

Area Purchased (acre)	Number of Purchasers
120	2
80	1
70	2(joint)
60	1
40	1
36	2(joint)
30	3
25	1
20	2
711	15

Made from Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*, p. 100.

1) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*, p. 109.

2) *Ibid.*, p. 109, p. 113.

persons acquired proprietorship of land, and Table 14 shows the numbers of purchasers and the areas of purchased land.¹⁾ We know little about how the opposition leading to this result was between the lord and the peasants. But we know that rich peasants had greater shares, as in the case of Oxford Manor, because the bigger purchasers with more 60 acres acquired more than 60 % of the whole land. The case of Turvile Manor was fundamentally the same as that of Oxford Manor in that it meant the victory of the peasantry against the feudal landowner with the development of commodity production as its background and that the profit was that of rich peasants.

This is how the right of the landlord was extinguished in Wigston Magna. In English villages from the 16th century to the first half of the 17th century, peasants movements were very active either as an open revolt like Ket's Rebellion in 1549 or Midland Revolts in 1607 or as legal suit. Of course such movements had complicated characters and differed from one part of the country to another. But almost always the basic motive was the request of peasants to protect their customary rights and to establish proprietorship of their land. In such situation, we can recognize a great significance in the case of Wigston Magna in which all the peasants were united and abolished feudal landownership, even through the process of purchase, to establish their own proprietorship as the case gives an outlook toward peasant revolution.

The differentiation of the peasantry I have discussed is actually the differentiation of the peasants with holdings under feudal landownership, that is, of customary tenants and especially copyholders. Development of productive forces had the same background. In Wigston Magna, when peasant landhold overwhelmed seigniorial landownership and was transformed into peasants proprietorship, each peasants merely changed his holding into his landed property under the already developed differentiation, and moreover the form of purchase made poor peasants lose their holdings and become leaseholders. But it is may be said that in England the case of Wigston Magna was an exception, and usually the landlord won the struggle by depriving peasants of the land they possessed and feudal landownership was transformed into modern landownership. This point will be discussed in the following two articles. We have not got an important problem.

The differentiation of the peasantry I have discussed is the differentiation among the peasant holders and the peasant holding itself which

1) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, *Midland Peasants*, pp. 98-101.

is the basis of the differentiation seems to be deprived and denied by the landlord. Indeed the history of English peasantry after this stage is the process in which they are deprived of their holdings and become mere leaseholders. But the process does not deny the true point of the differentiation. The rich peasants we have dealt with take the form of capitalist farmers or rich farmers as leaseholders while the poor peasants being deprived of their holding become proletariat. In the case of England, the course taken by the landlord was unique, because it denied the peasant landhold which was the basis of differentiation of the peasantry, and still it reserved the result of the former differentiation of the peasantry in modern landownership which was transformed from feudal landownership. The structure of English agriculture, though it followed the "Prussian path" is different from that of Prussia. This point will be fully understood when Mr. Matsumura has discussed the Enclosure Movement in the following article.