

THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY ECONOMIC REVIEW

MEMOIRS OF THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS
IN THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY

Vol. XXXIV, No. 1

APRIL 1964

Whole No. 76

CONTENTS

Problems of the Developing Countries *Kiyoshi MATSUI* 1

General Conditions of Crisis *Shizui KAMIMURA* 16

**The Transformation of Feudal Landlord
Economy into Capitalism** *Koichi MATSUMURA* 36

PUBLISHED BY
THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY
SAKYO-KU, KYOTO, JAPAN

THE TRANSFORMATION OF FEUDAL LANDLORD ECONOMY INTO CAPITALISM

With Attention Focussed on the Enclosure Movement
in the 16th and 17th Centuries¹⁾

By Koichi MATSUMURA*

Foreword

Prof. Hideichi Horie early made it clear²⁾ that regarding the approach to bourgeois land reform in the English Revolution there were two confronting lines, i.e., the line of peasant-bourgeois reformation and the line of landlord-bourgeois reformation. Subsequently Assist. Prof. Nobuo Take analysed the process of bourgeois development in peasant economy, the economic foundation that led to the development of the former line of the English Revolution³⁾. In this study the author deals with the bourgeois development of landlord economy that advanced in parallel and in contrast with the bourgeois development of peasant economy, the bourgeois development of landlord economy that provided an economic foundation which brought about the line of landlord-bourgeois land reform, the winner in the process of the English Revolution.

However, the object of this paper is limited to the so-called 1st enclosure movement which took place prior to the English Revolution in the mid 17th century. The reason is as follows: The capitalistic agriculture of England was first established in the 1st half of the 19th century by completion of the so-called tripartite division system maintained by three major

* Lecturer of Economic History, Osaka University of Economics.

1) This paper is the summary of Chapter III "Transition of Landlord Economy to Capitalistic Economy" of *Land Reform in the English Revolution*, 1962 by Prof. Hideichi Horie, and is what follows the two preceding papers which appeared in this journal, dealing with the first and second chapters of the aforementioned book by Prof. Horie. The titles of these papers are ; "Introduction to Land Problem in English Revolution" by Hideichi Horie, Vol. XXXIII No. 1, 1963, and "The Bourgeois Development in Peasants Economy: Differentiation of the Peasantry" by Nobuo Take, Vol. XXXIII, No. 2, 1963 of this journal.

This paper, for the purposes of discussion has adopted the premises which were made clear in the foregoing two papers.

2) The aforementioned paper by Hideichi Horie.

3) The aforementioned paper by Nobuo Take.

social classes, namely, modern landlords, agricultural capitalists and the agrarian proletariat. This transition from the feudalistic agriculture to the capitalistic agriculture was performed through the revolution of mode of production in agriculture or "agrarian revolution", whose pivotal role was played by the enclosure movement, whereby the open-field system that served the agriculture of the middle ages was reformed and the merger of lands which was more convenient for private agricultural enterprises was brought about. Consequently the said movement resulted in the increased agricultural productivity and promoted the disintegration of peasantry and the capitalistic relations of production. Therefore, the enclosure movement can be regarded as an essential and typical representation of the bourgeois development of agriculture in England.

Now, this theory may explain how the enclosure movement formed the economic basis upon which bourgeois land reform in general in the English Revolution as a bourgeois revolution was carried out, but it can not sufficiently explain how the enclosure movement provided the economic foundation particularly for the landlord-bourgeois land reform and not that for the peasant-bourgeois land reform. In order therefore to clarify this aspect, the author is trying here in this study to analyse the 1st enclosure movement particularly as a force that expedited the bourgeois development of the landlord economy in coping with the bourgeois development of a peasants economy, not in a general sense that it had brought about simply bourgeois development. More concretely, we will analyse here what type of proprietorship of land serving the capitalistic agriculture was created by the enclosure movement, and as a result what sort of capitalistic agricultural enterprises had emerged at the stage prior to the English Revolution.

I. Nature of the First Enclosure Movement— Its Scale, Objective and Driving Force

The figure assessed by E.F. Gay may be used as an index in our efforts to estimate the extent of progress made by the enclosure movement in different regions of England.

Upon the evidences of inquisitions made by Enclosure Commissions organized in 1517-19 and 1607, Gay has estimated the ratio of the land affected by the enclosure movement as against the total area during the period from 1485-1517 (about 30 years) and during 1455 to 1607 (about one and a half centuries)⁴⁾.

4) E.F. Gay, "Inclosures in England in the Sixteenth Century", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. XVII, no. 4, pp. 581, 586; *do.*, "The Midland Revolt and the Inquisitions of Depopulation of 1607", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, N.S., Vol. XVIII, p. 233.

The figures obtained by the above estimate for both periods show that Midland occupied the highest ratio (1485-1517, 1.16%, 1455-1607, 6.03%), which was by far larger than the second highest figures for the eastern region (1485-1517, 0.39%, 1455-1607, 1.72%). Gay's figures therefore indicate that the area which was most seriously affected by the enclosure movement from the latter half of the 15th century until early in the 17th century was the counties in Midland. However, since the absolute values of Gay's figures are so small even in case of Midland, an idea has arisen that from the point of view of average the extent that was affected by the enclosure was therefore very limited; while R.H. Tawney pointed out that the ratio of enclosed land against the total is not a fair indication of the actual social significance of the enclosure movement upon peasantry⁵⁾.

When, therefore, we take Tawney's point into consideration, an investigation of the number of villages affected by the enclosure movement can be deemed a better method of evaluating the actual social significance of the enclosure. Though the data are available only as for one county, Leicestershire in Midland, since J. Thirsk incidentally presented the number of villages affected by the enclosure and the year when such enclosure took place, they are summarized in Table 1 below. According to this, the number of villages where the first enclosure evidence was observed is highest in the period from 1485-1517 and 1578-1607, which is exactly the period

Table 1. Progress Degree of Enclosure Movement as Viewed
by Number of Villages in Leicestershire

	Villages Where 1st Enclosure Evidence Was Observed	Aggregate Total	Villages Where Full Enclosure Took Place	Aggregate Total
12c. -1484	9	9	8	8
1485-1517	47	56	21	29
1518-1549	20	76	7	36
1550-1577	12	88	3	39
1578-1607	65	153	22	61
1608-1649	34	187	41	102
1650-1699	26	213	45	147
1700-1799	4	217	9	156
Unknown	26	243	30	186
Total	243		186	

from J. Thirsk, "Agrarian History, 1540-1950", App. I, in *Victoria County History, Leicestershire*, Vol. II, 1954, pp. 254-259.

5) R.H. Tawney, *The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century*, 1912, pp. 162-5.

when the two Commissions already referred to were in action.

If the number of villages in the medieval age assumed to have been about 370⁶⁾, approximately 40% of them (153 villages) must have somehow experienced the enclosure movement by 1607, and by 1649 about 50% (187 villages) must have been affected by it. The number of villages that underwent full enclosure is concentrated somewhat later i.e., in the 17th century, but by 1607 already 61 villages or 1/6 of all the villages are known to have completed the process of enclosure and the number of such villages has increased to 102 by 1649. This was about 30% of the total.

Therefore when we view the situation from the number of villages involved, we can understand that the progressive degree of the enclosure is much higher than indicated in the data presented by Gay; and at least in Midland it must have had an influence on society that cannot be disregarded, even though 70% of villages in Leicestershire, the heart of the movement, still retained the open-field system as late in the mid 17th century.

In this paper we shall deal primarily with Midland where the most typical process of bourgeois agrarian revolution characterized by the enclosure movement took place⁷⁾.

It is almost a fixed theory that the primary objective of the enclosure in those days was to set up pasture, particularly for sheep farms, because increased sheep farming was then more necessary as the demand for wool had increased. This was due to the rapid growth of the domestic woollen textile industry and the export expansion of woollen goods despite the decrease in wool exports since the 14th and 15th centuries. If so, how does the enclosure movement which developed in Midland mainly for sheep farming fit into the industrial structure of the process of bourgeois development?

6) W.G. Hoskins, *Essays in Leicestershire History*, 1950, p. 101.

7) Whereas the inquiries of the Enclosure Commissions had been concentrated on Midland, the open-field which was the object of enclosure in the 18th and 19th centuries still occupied the largest proportion of total farmlands in Midland. (For example, cf., E.C.K. Gonner, *Common Land and Inclosure*, 1912, pp. 268-9, App. B). This fact tells us that, in areas outside Midland, there must have been earlier enclosures which did not fall under the terms of reference of the Commissions, and it is considered that this is because in Midland the open-field system based on the typical three field system, most suitable to agriculture of the middle ages had been maintained persistently, while in the other areas there existed from earlier days, the field system which was easily adaptable to the private agriculture to be realized by the enclosure. (For example, cf., H.L. Gray, *English Field Systems*, 1915). The reason why we take up Midland as a typical case is because a model open-field system was most strongly preserved there and thus it came to be the area where the enclosure movement most concentratedly and vigorously represented the agrarian revolution.

A document of 1615 presents, in this connection, a valuable suggestion on the Midland wool market. "The woolle of the countyes of Lincoln, Northampton, Rutland, Leicester, Warwick, Oxon and Bucks are thus dispersed. One sorte of it is carried into the North parts to Leeds, Wakefield, Hallifax, Ratsdale, etc. Another sorte of it is carried parte of it into the East parts to Norwich and soe wrought by the poore people inhabiting aboute that coast as farr as Yarmouth, and parte of it into the west parts to Exeter, and from thence it is sould to the poore people of the Country thereabouts as farr as Plymouth. Some of these woolls are carried to the farthest parts of Essex and Suffolk as to Coxall, Brayntree and Malden"⁸⁾.

The above description indicates that the Midland, surrounded by the three major centers of woolen industry developed as country industry after the 14th and 15th centuries, namely, the eastern, northern and south-western regions, had played the role of supplying material wool to these woolen industries.

The social division of labour is the basis of a commodity economy and the progressive growth of the latter is the fundamental factor in creating a domestic market for capitalistic economy. The social division of labour, particularly the separation of industry from agriculture, results in the specialization of various industrial sectors. Such specialization also appears in agriculture. As the woolen industry became a specialized industry in the beginning of the stage of manufacture of English industrial capitalism, the similar specialization which proceeded in agriculture entailed the separation of sheep farming from corn husbandry and the former has become a specific agricultural sector.

Moreover, the fact that the woolen textile industry had become concentrated in the three major areas and that sheep farming and the related enclosure movement developed primarily in Midland indicates that the social division of labour took the form of a territorial division of labour⁹⁾, and therefore, the bourgeois development of agriculture, which was represented by the first enclosure movement in Midland, had a special and concrete characteristic in that it constituted a part of social and territorial division of labour in the initial stage of manufacture of capitalism.

8) "State Paper Domestic, James I", lxxx, 13, quoted in G. Unwin, *Industrial Organization in the 16th and 17th Centuries*, 1904, p. 188.

9) Lenin pointed out that the territorial division of labour was a characteristic inherent to the stage of manufacture of capitalism, because at the stage of small industries, the specialization in the production of one product could not create such extensive districts, while the development of large factory broke down their seclusion. (V.I. Lenin, *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*, Moscow, Foreign Language Publishing House, 1956, p. 469).

The detailed study of L.A. Parker on the driving force of the enclosure in Leicestershire explains that although the participation of peasantry in enclosure is observed in the latter part of the 16th century (19% of the total area of enclosed land), by far the greater part of the enclosed land had been owned by the land proprietor class. Particularly the area enclosed by the squirearchy occupied a predominant share i.e., 58.4% (1485-1550) to 72.5% (1550-1607) of the total enclosed land¹⁰⁾.

Parker, upon the basis of the inquisition of the Enclosure Commission of 1607, made a detailed calculation of the acreage classified by the social scale of enclosers, of the land enclosed to be converted into pasture during 1578-1607, the period in which the Commission made its inquisition (Table 2). According to his calculation, the ratio of enclosed land shows firstly, that the land enclosed by the gentlemen or upper classes occupied about 70% of the total, while the yeomen and the lower classes enclosed a little better than 20% and secondly, that the enclosed area per capita of enclosers was about 10 acres for the yeomen and lower peasants as against 57-100 acres for gentlemen and the upper. In other words, the enclosure by peasantry was mostly on a small scale.

Beside the above, according to Parker, out of 45 cases of enclosures made in 1485-1550, 37 cases were made by manorial lords. Likewise out

Table 2. Area of Land Enclosed by Different Social Classes and its Comparative Ratio (1578-1607, Leicestershire)

Classes	Number of Persons	Acreage (%)	Average Area per Capita
Peers, knights	16	1,240 ^a (15.8)	77.5 ^a
Esquire	24	2,479 (31.6)	102.7
Gentlemen	30	1,712 (21.8)	57.1
Ecclesiastics	9	169 (2.2)	18.7
London merchants	1	420 (5.4)	420.0
Yeomen	9	96 (1.2)	10.7
Freeholders	16	203 (2.6)	12.7
Peasants of unidentified class	152	1,526 (19.4)	10.0
Total	257	7,845 (100)	

Prepared from the figures given in L.A. Parker's "The Depopulation Returns for Leicestershire in 1607", *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological Society*, Vol. XXIII, introduced on p. 182 of *The Study of English Agrarian Revolution* by Yoshitaka Komatsu.

10) Based upon the figures given by L.A. Parker, in his paper entitled "The Enclosure in Leicestershire, 1485-1607", unpublished thesis, which was introduced on pp. 196, 200 of *The Study of English Agrarian Revolution* by Yoshitaka Komatsu.

of 60 villages enclosed during 1578–1607, 45 villages were enclosed by manorial lords. Among the manorial lords who carried out enclosure during 1578–1607, only 11 lords held the land by inheritance, while those who newly acquired manors during the 70 years preceding 1607 numbered 33. It is also known that in the period from 1485–1600, out of 73 families of squirearchy who enclosed, apart from 22 families unidentified, 20 families had lived on the manor since the early 15th century, 6 came to own the manors in the late 15th century and 25 families first became the proprietor of the land in the 16th century¹¹⁾. From what has been clarified by Parker as regards the enclosure in Leicestershire, we can maintain the following:

The squirearchy who constituted the core of the forces of the enclosure movement was, as Tawney has rightly pointed out, the rising gentry or landlords who ranked over yeomen and below nobility and who were steadily rising in power to own medium-sized or small manor¹²⁾. This fact gives us the ground for understanding that the enclosure movement in those days represented not only a bourgeois agrarian evolution in general. It can be characterized particularly as the bourgeois development within the landlord class coping with the crisis of the feudalism revealed by the downfall of the old nobility and aggravated by the bourgeois development of peasant economy that had been most typically represented by the small scale enclosure by peasantry.

II. Bourgeois Reshaping of the Feudal Form of Landed Property through the Enclosure by Landlord

As K. Marx pointed out¹³⁾, capitalism eventually creates for itself its own suitable forms of agrarian relationships out of the old forms including the forms of feudal landed property. Then how was the dual structure of the form of feudal landed property, namely, the proprietorship by feudal landlords and the land-holding by peasants transformed into the bourgeois form by the enclosure by landlords? M. Beresford¹⁴⁾, M.E. Finch¹⁵⁾, W.G. Hoskins¹⁶⁾, L.A. Parker¹⁷⁾ et al. analysed many cases of enclosures and clarified the actual process and outcome of the movement, and therefore we are not

11) Y. Komatsu, *The Study of English Agrarian Revolution*, pp. 183, 197, 233–234.

12) R.H. Tawney, "The Rise of the Gentry, 1558–1640", *Economic History Review*, Vol. XI, No. 1.

13) K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, Foreign Language Publishing House, 1959, Vol. III, p. 603.

14) *The Lost Villages of England*, 1954.

15) *The Wealth of Five Northamptonshire Families, 1540–1640*, 1956.

16) *Essays in Leicestershire History*, 1956.

17) "The Agrarian Revolution at Cotesbach, 1501–1612", in Hoskins (ed.), *Studies in Leicestershire Agrarian History*, 1949.

going to discuss its details here but will just summarize these case studies in answer to the above question.

1. Transformation of the Landlords' Proprietorship into Private Ownership through Expropriation of Peasantry from their Land-holding

The enclosures by landlords were conducted in many different ways entailing various consequences. For example, the peasants were deprived by force in the enclosure in Wormleighton¹⁸⁾, Bittesby, and Holyoak at the end of the 15th century in Leicestershire, and so were the cases in Knaptoft, Baggrave, Norseley¹⁹⁾, and Cotesbach²⁰⁾ in the early 16th century and Foston²¹⁾ in the late 16th to the early 17th century; and depopulation was witnessed in these places. While in Theddingworth, Buckminster, Sewstern, Tilton-on-the-Hill and Loddington (Leics.),²²⁾ Deenethorpe, Deene, Marholme (Northants.) and Wardley (Rutland)²³⁾, the enclosures were conducted by agreements between landlords and peasants. In Haselbech, Lamport (Northants.) and Hougham (Lincs.)²⁴⁾ and Cotesbach²⁵⁾, the enclosures were carried out with the consent of a part of the peasants but suppressing the opposition of other groups of peasants. The enclosed land was utilized in some cases as a sheep farm by landlord himself to support his sheep farming—for example in Foston or in Rushton (Northants.)²⁶⁾—or in Bittesby, Wardley, Keythorpe (Leics.)²⁷⁾, Ayston (Rutland)²⁸⁾, the enclosed lands were leased to the peasants for their use. In many cases, however, as in Knaptoft, Lamport, Hougham, Deenethorpe, Deene, Milton, Marholme (Northants.)²⁹⁾, the lands were alternatively or concurrently utilized by both landlord and peasants under lease.

However, despite the fact that the enclosures were achieved in various manners, the fundamental change brought to the form of feudal landed property remained the same. That was the disconnection of the traditional tie between the peasantry and the land, the denial of the peasant's land-holding and the establishment of private land ownership by landlord. In

18) Beresford, *op. cit.*, p. 320.

19) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-1, 86, 93, 153, 158, 175-6.

20) Parker, *op. cit.*

21) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-8, 176n.

22) *V.C.H., Leics.*, Vol. II, pp. 202-3.

23) Finch, *op. cit.*, pp. 116, 128, 130, 146-8, 156-7, 161-2.

24) *Ibid.*, pp. 15-7, 31, 87, 147, 155-6.

25) Parker, *op. cit.*

26) Finch, *op. cit.*, pp. 74, 87-8.

27) Hoskins, *op. cit.*, p. 85; *V.C.H., op. cit.*, pp. 191, 195.

28) Finch, *op. cit.*, pp. 154, 161.

29) *Ibid.*, pp. 114, 116, 128, 130.

short the net result was the expropriation of peasants from their land-holding and establishment of exclusive private land ownership on the part of landlords.

This change revealed itself most clearly in the enclosure which accompanied the violent eviction of peasants. As K. Marx defined it, the eviction of peasants was a lever of violence employed to achieve the primitive accumulation of capital. It deprived directly and by force the peasants of land and converted them into proletariat free of the means of production. In other words, the eviction of peasants reformed forcibly the then existing feudal landed property. Because, the feudal landed property was characterized by the dual proprietorship structure which after all consisted in the peasant holding of land which ensured peasantry for necessary products and landlord's proprietorship of land which guaranteed the landlords the acquisition of surplus products—or it was legally expressed as the system of peasants Gewere overlapped with landlord's Gewere—and thus it was suitable for the feudal mode of production, and while the eviction of peasants by enclosure deprived them of their land-holdings as peasant Gewere by force and liberated the landlords from double structural ownership. It also converted the land to the exclusive private ownership of landlords (the prerogative of the king as the ultimate owner of all lands being set aside). This process was in contrast with another pattern of transformation which was observed in Wigston Magna³⁰⁾ where the landlord sold his manor and the peasants land holdings were converted to the peasants proprietorship of land parcels.

Of course, as we have stated above, not all the enclosures were conducted by the use of violence and not all of them resulted in the eviction of peasants. In some cases the enclosure was made with the consent of peasants and the latter remained as leaseholders of the enclosed field. However even in such cases, the fundamental nature of enclosures—the expropriation of peasants from their land-holdings and the establishment of private land ownership by landlord—was maintained. One can call such eviction of peasants as the prototype of the bourgeois reformation by landlords of the feudal landed property, for it was the most revolutionary clearing of estates, in the sense that it was a direct and forcible deprivation of land and the clearing of estates by landlords, where the violence was used not against landlords but against peasants³¹⁾.

30) The abovementioned thesis of Nobuo Take.

31) V.I. Lenin, *The Agrarian Programme of Social-democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907*, Moscow, Foreign Language Publishing House, 1954, p. 101.

2. Transformation of Customary Land-holding into Leasehold through the Enclosure

When the enclosed land was not managed by the landlord himself but was leased to the peasants, they could continue to hold their land without being evicted but the tenure of their land had, in most cases, been transformed from the customary holding to the leasehold.

The introduction of this leasehold was not a direct product of the enclosure, but was brought about by the dissolution of villeinage and the abdication by landlords of their demesne which was accompanied by the transition from labour rent to money rent in the late 14th century.

It meant therefore that "the traditional and customary legal relationship between landlord and subject who posses and cultivate a part of the land", was "necessarily turned into a pure money relationship fixed contractually in accordance with the rules of positive law", and "the possessor engaged in cultivation thus became virtually a mere tenant"³²⁾.

Thus the leasehold appeared at first as the tenure of the former demesne leased to peasants. But later, with the development of commodity production in the 16th century and the following activation of land market, the leasing of land came to extend itself not only to the demesne but also to the part of the former land-in-villeinage which had already become the customary land of the peasants.

The enclosure movement which was proceeding just about that time played a role to accelerate this trend. In order to consolidate the scattered strips by the enclosure it was necessary to cut the traditional and customary ties between peasants and their land. As the result of such separation of peasants from their land, it became possible to lease the land to the peasants upon the basis of a pure monetary and contractual relationship and to convert the customary tenants into the status of mere leaseholders.

Thus the transformation of customary holding of land into leasehold through the enclosures by landlords changed the status of the peasant from the proprietor of Gewere into a mere tenant of the estate, even if the peasant as leaseholder occupied still the land. The ownership of the landlord on such an estate become an exclusive private ownership.

It thus denied the feudal relations of proprietorship and holding of land as a dual ownership of Gewere by landlord and peasantry.

Although such transformation of tenure may not have resulted in the direct and violent eviction of peasants, it served "to expropriate more and more the old peasant possessors"³³⁾.

32) K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, pp. 778-9.

33) *Ibid.*, p. 779.

3. Enclosure by Agreement—A Form of Expropriation of Peasant Landholder

In some cases the enclosure was made without the use of force, nor did it result in the total eviction of peasants. For example, in the cases of Haselbech, Cotesbach (the case of 1603) and of Hougham, Lamport and others, the enclosures were made with the consent of at least a part of the peasants, particularly of the freeholders or wealthy peasants. Since cases of enclosures by contract were often seen in the latter half of the 16th century³⁴⁾, it is said that, at least in Leicestershire the nature of the enclosure changed in the middle of the 16th century.

According to Parker³⁵⁾, in the latter part of the Tudor reign, the enclosure became a sustained movement and with the participation of peasants more cases of contract-type enclosure appeared and correspondingly fewer cases of the total eviction of peasants.

Beresford also divided the movement into three periods, the 1st of these being from 1450 to 1600, when the enclosure was carried out to gain usually sheep and cattle farm against public and legal opposition, and the 2nd period (1600—the early 18th cent.), when the enclosure by agreement was more often done with less opposition of social opinion³⁶⁾.

If the above changes did in fact take place, the following three reasons may be considered relevant. In the first place, the enclosure by landlords was, before anywhere else, directed to the demesnes of their manors where they had immediate control and their will could easily be enforced. But, as the enclosure movement advanced, an agreement with peasants, particularly with freeholders became necessary so that the enclosure might be extended from demesne to the customary land, and further to the free land where the peasant landholding was relatively secure. In the second place, as a result of the disintegration of peasantry which developed further in the 16th and 17th centuries, wealthy peasants emerged and some of them positively demanded the enclosure which could guarantee a management suitable for their own bourgeois development. In the third place, reflecting the slowdown of woollen textiles export as seen in the latter half of the 16th century, particularly the stagnant or rather declining price level of wool

34) It was mostly before 1550, in Leicestershire, that the desertion of villages took place as the result of eviction of peasants. Out of total of 54 villages which were deserted before 1700, except 18 whose desertion period is unknown, 32 villages (out of the rest of 36) were deserted before 1550 (Thirsk, "Agrarian History, 1540-1950", App. I. in *V. C.H., Leics.*, Vol. II, pp. 254-9).

35) Yoshitaka Komatsu, *op. cit.*, pp. 198-100, 225-6, 229, 234.

36) Beresford, "Glebe Terriers and Open-Field Leicestershire", in Hoskins (ed.), *Studies in Leicestershire Agrarian History*, pp. 78-80.

due to the economic recession in 1580's and 1620's, the lords of manors who engaged in sheep raising abandoned their business and converted their farmland management to landleasing whereby they could collect the rent from leaseholders, as will be explained later. In this case, it did not result directly in the eviction of peasants.

Then, does such change appearing in form of enclosures indicate some middle-of-the-road pattern compromising with peasant bourgeois land reform which inherently deviates from the landlord bourgeois land reform through the expropriation of peasantry from their landholdings as stated above from the standpoint of bourgeois reform of feudal landed property? It is not considered to be so. Because, it should clearly be realized, above all, that even if there was an agreement with peasants, the land proprietorship by landlord was not affected at all by the enclosure.

The ratio of freeholders to the total number of peasants was extremely low as Tawney shows, but when the various cases of enclosure by agreement are examined, it is seen that many of them were those under agreement with the wealthy freeholders who were extremely small in number within the peasantry. As the result, all peasants' holdings except a part of freehold land were transformed to the private lands of the lords on the extended scale whether it had been carried out by means of eviction of peasants or by means of conversion to leasehold. This indicates that the basic nature of enclosure that was pursued by lords, namely the conversion of peasant's landholding into landlord's private land ownership by means of expropriation of peasants remained consistently unchanged. This method of enclosure was, therefore, a more tricky way to carry out bourgeois land reform by lords, making the expropriation easier by dividing the peasant resistance through separating a minority of peasants from the rest of the agrarian masses.

III. Bourgeois Development in Farming by Landlords— Farming Forms of the Enclosed Lands

So far a study has been made of the enclosure by lords solely from the standpoint of reshaping of feudal form of landed property, but the expropriation of peasant landholding per se only means that large scale land ownership was really created. In order therefore to know whether such reform was carried out on the basis of bourgeois principle, attention shall be paid to bourgeois development in the farming of the enclosed land that demanded such transformation of land ownership to meet its requirement, viz. to capital formation in the farming of the enclosed land.

In this regard the utilization of the enclosed lands by the landlords

can be divided into the following three forms:

- (1) Cases where the enclosed lands were utilized for the farming of landlords themselves.
- (2) Cases where lands were leased to peasants.
- (3) Cases where lands were utilized both for the use of lords themselves and for lease to peasants.

1. Farming of the Enclosed Lands by Lords Themselves—Junker Type of Farming

As it has already been stated, when the manufacture stage of capitalism started centering around the woolen textile industry the progress of commodity production in agriculture brought about the specialization of pasturage, particularly that of sheep raising, and this accelerated the enclosure movement where medium and small manorial lords acted as the driving force.

A document of 1615 shows there were three types of wool producers; "those that are men of great estate, having both grounds and stock of their own, and are forehand is wealth" in addition of farmers "that do rent the king's, noblemen's and gents' ground" and "the general number of husbandmen in all the wool countries that have small livings". It also shows that "the number of those is small", and "these can afford to delay the selling of their wools and to stay the clothiers' leisure for the payment to increase the price". Those descriptions indicate that there were some lords who had undertaken sheep raising on a large scale³⁷⁾.

The following cases may be mentioned as examples which show the scale of sheep raising by the landlord class. The Brudenells owned about 4,000 sheep in the first half of the 16th century at Holyoak, Stonton Wyvill, Othorpe, Cranoe (Leics.), Deene (Northants.) in Midland, the Ishams owned around 1,500 sheep in Lamport from the 70's of the 16th century to the beginning of the 17th century, the Spencers owned 13,000 to 14,000 sheep around Wormleighton (Warwicks.) and Althorpe (Northants.) in the 70's of the 16th century, Sir Thomas Tresham raised 3,600 or 6,780 sheep at Rushton, Lyveden, Churchfield, Haselbech of Northamptonshire during the 80's and 90's of the 16th century, the Fitzwilliams raised 3,359 sheep at Milton and Marholm in 1618³⁸⁾, Anthony Faunt, esq. raised 1,300 sheep at Foston in 1588, and Sir William Turpin had 3,100 sheep at Knaptoft and other places in 1617³⁹⁾. All of them were sheep farmers who had large flocks of sheep in the enclosed lands of their own or in manorial lands which

37) "State Papers Domestic, James I," lxxx, 13, in Bland, Brown and Tawney (ed.), *English Economic History, Select Documents*, 1914, p. 354.

38) Refer to Finch, *op. cit.*

39) Refer to Hoskins, *Essays in Leicestershire History*.

had been enclosed by other lords but purchased by them. Most of these lords, except the Treshams who had rather long historical standing, were new families of lords which had become elevated after the 14th and 15th centuries from the status of small property-holders.

The introduction of sheep raising by the landlord class means that the exploitation of feudal rent which had been originally their specific financial basis had become no longer their sole economic foundation. Table 3 shows the sources of income of three representative families among those mentioned above, classified on the basis of number of sheep they owned, namely the Ishams as a typical family of the smallest scale, the Treshams of medium scale and the Spencers of the largest scale.

In the case of the Ishams, their income level is the lowest but the sales of wool, meat and stock occupy more than 60% of the total income, and the income derived from the sale of wool provides a very important element.

In the case of the Treshams, they obtained about 70% of their income by the sale not only of sheep but also of various animals, corn, hops and the like, and the income derived from sheep raising corresponds to all the profits obtained from the sale of other commercial goods.

In the case of the Spencers, the income from the large scale sheep raising also accounts for about one-half or more of their total income. These data indicate that the reaction of the lords to the feudal exploitation which

Table 3. Sources of Income of Lords
The Ishams (Yearly Average from 1572-87) (£)

Sale of Wool	Sale of Meat	Sale of Stock	Rents	Profit from Rectory	Profit from Court	Total ⁴⁰⁾
142	74	50	25	120	3	414

The Treshams (Estimate around 1590) (£)

Rents	Sales of Stock and Wool	Others ⁴¹⁾	Total
about 1,000	about 1,000-1,500	about 1,000-1,500	about 3,500

The Spencers (Estimate at the Beginning of the 17th Century) (£)

Rents	Sales of Stock and Wool	Total
about 2,500-4,000	about 4,000	about 6,500-8,000

Prepared from Finch, *op. cit.*, pp. 20 n2, 46, 63, 74-6.

40) When profits from demesne land in the common field and other miscellaneous agricultural profits are added, total profit amounts to around £500.

41) This includes the profits from the sales of horses, hogs, oxen, corn, hops, cheeses, pigeons, hides, timber, lime and rabbits.

was being affected by the declining trend of money rent which would have thrown feudalism into a state of crisis led the lords, particularly those of medium and small estates who were the so-called gentry to change themselves from the simple rentiers to the producers of commercial products. In other words, the sense of crisis of these lords pushed them to take up the business of raising sheep as the raw material suppliers of the woolen textile industry.

It should be mentioned, however, that commodity production is not synonymous with capitalist production. The commodity production in the 13th and 14th centuries by landlords who owned large manors rather intensified labour services or feudal labour rent, as has been pointed out by E.A. Kosminsky⁴²⁾. Commodity production can assume a capitalistic nature only when the labour forces disconnected from the means of production starts to be sold as a commodity itself and comes to be introduced into the direct production process. Thus, the capitalistic nature of the commodity production by the lords on the enclosed lands should be determined by the existence of wage labour.

First of all, certain clues can be obtained from the above-mentioned examples of the villages and manors showing the status of villagers after the enclosure⁴³⁾.

At Foston where Faunt was raising 1,300 sheep in 1588, there lived 21 families, but in 1622 when enclosure was completed there were only three or four labouring families besides a squire and a parson, and twenty teams had gone. At Knaptoft where Sir W. Turpin owned 1,738 sheep in 1617, there were 26 families at the beginning of the 14th century, but only five families were on the subsidy list in 1524 and all of them were levied on their wage income. At Misterton where the same lord owned 832 sheep, all the 17 families except the lord himself and the clerk had to pay tax on their wage income in 1524 and the resident families were reduced to only three in 1563. Due to the time lag between the chronological years for manorial lord management and for the status of villagers in the above-mentioned examples, it is difficult to draw a direct correlation between the two but it can readily be assumed that the management of the enclosed lands by lords had introduced such peasants who could escape eviction through the enclosure and who became poor agricultural wage earners severed from the means of production, into their business operation.

We can tell that the wage labour was practised extensively in the

42) E. A. Kosminsky, *Studies in the Agrarian History of England in the Thirteenth Century*, 1956.

43) Hoskins, *Essays in Leicestershire History*, pp. 86-9, 176.

agriculture of the 16th and 17th centuries in light of the fact that wage assessments which stipulate the maximum limit of wages were set up in respect of various types of agricultural labour. For example, in the wage assessment of Northamptonshire in 1560 and that of Wiltshire in 1607⁴⁴⁾, there are the articles regulating the wages by years of shepherds who keep the flock of sheep ranging from 600 to more than 1,000 which could only be possible under the management by lords. This reflects the fact that the weight of wage labour in agriculture, particularly in the farmland managed by the lords, was large. The study made by Tawney on the Muster Roll of Gloucestershire (1608) also indicates⁴⁵⁾ the important role played by the lords in wage labour employment, though the said Roll is related to the agriculture as a whole. According to this study, 4,072 out of 4,701 yeomen and husbandmen listed on the Roll who are the predominant majority of the total number, were self-sustaining peasants employing no servants at all, while the remaining 629 employed 824 servants, hence they had 1.3 employed servants per yeoman or husbandman, while in the case of the gentry such as knights, esquires and gentlemen, 224 out of a total of 430 employed 768 servants, giving a ratio of one member of the gentry to 3.4 servants. This clearly implies that the employment of servants in gentry farming had relatively higher ratio than that in peasant farming.

In the last place, let us see the types of wage labour referring to the Fitzwilliams as an example because this family left us comparatively accurate records of wage spending in sheep raising by the lord on the enclosed land⁴⁶⁾. The Fitzwilliams continued to undertake small scale farm management consisting mainly of breeding and sales of livestock even in the 80's and 90's of the 16th century when the family abandoned self-farming of the land on the whole and turned to let out it on lease. According to their account, the cost of keeping cattle includes wages paid for mowing, haymaking, washing and dipping the sheep, tending the cattle and breeding them, and besides this, although it is not included in the account, the cost of winding the wool and the shepherd's wage of £3 a year were actually paid. Regarding shepherds, it is said that the Fitzwilliams employed 6 shepherds for about 3,000 sheep at the beginning of the 17th century when the family resumed sheep raising on a full-scale basis.

As shown above, the capital and wage labour relations introduced

44) B.H. Putnam, "Northamptonshire Wage Assessments of 1560 and 1667", *Economic History Review*, Vol. I, no. 1, pp. 131-3; Bland, Brown and Tawney (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 346-7.

45) Tawney, "An Occupational Census of the Seventeenth Century", *Economic History Review*, Vol. V, no. 1, Tables V, VI, VII.

46) Finch, *op. cit.*, pp. 44, 123, 194.

into the direct production process by lords of enclosed land were based on the creation of poor peasants by the then-advancing disintegration of peasantry. They were also formed at the stepped up tempo by the lords who capitalistically reunited in their farmings the labour forces of the poor peasants or agricultural labourers created by the destruction of the customary combination of the peasants and the lands by means of the enclosure, and the private land of lords as the means of production which was converted from open-field to enclosed land.

This self-farming by lords of the enclosed lands may be termed a Junker type of farming in which some feudal landlords converted themselves into capitalists, and it was one aspect of the economic development which demanded landlord-bourgeois reform of the feudal form of landed property.

2. Lease of Enclosed Land

(A) Raising of Rent by Enclosure

When the rent was customarily fixed at a given level in spite of the increasing trend of prices, it meant that the increasing portion of surplus product that had to be paid as the rent in terms of money could be owned by the peasants themselves and it promoted bourgeois development of peasants economy from the standpoint of their own economy, while it constituted a cause of financial crisis for feudal landlords. If the capitalistic farming by the landlords on the enclosed land was one of the solutions of such a crisis, to recover the losing surplus product was another counter-measure on the part of the landlords. Thus, in the 16th century, while there were some gentlemen who complained that they could not live on their rent income, on the other hand there were complaints by peasants that gentlemen were raising the price of land⁴⁷⁾. In fact at the estate of a lord in Wiltshire, the rent of the land newly leased was increased more than 8 times from the beginning of the 16th century to the middle of the 17th century and this rate of increase surpassed the price increase rates of crops and wool during the same period⁴⁸⁾.

This rent increase was promoted by the conversion of customary land-holding into leasehold as above-mentioned whereby, through the raising of fines, the lords were relieved from the customary restrictions regulating the amount of rent⁴⁹⁾. Furthermore, the enclosure made a break-through on the restriction on productive forces against the increase of rent, by raising

47) E. Lamond (ed.), *A Discourse of the Common Weal of this Realm of England*, 1893, pp. 17-20.

48) E. Kerridge, "The Movement of Rent, 1540-1640", *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., Vol. VI, no. 1, p. 28, Table IV.

49) Regarding the change in the amount of rent of open-fields of the Spencers, refer to Finch, *op. cit.*, p. 173, App. II.

the productive forces which had been limited by the open-field system. This is very clearly reflected for example in the change in the amount of rent of Ayston, the estate of the Brudenells⁵⁰⁾, where the rent per acre in 1612 was only 1 shilling and 6 pence in open customary land, whereas that of the old demesne which was leased by the enclosure was 11 shillings. However, in 1641 when the former had come to be enclosed and leased the total amount of rent was increased by 4.5 times from 100 marks to about 300 pounds.

(B) Lease to Wealthy Peasants—Embryonic Form of Tripartite Division System

The subjective intention of the landlords in raising the rent might be to restore the normal form of feudal rent which had absorbed all surplus products in itself and accordingly to reinstate and to reinforce the declining feudalism. The environmental conditions at that time, however, despite such intention, had brought about the objective outcome of having accelerated the formation of capitalistic relations.

This is because the rent increase was realized as the counter-measures of the lords against bourgeois development of peasant economy, on the basis that the disintegration of peasant class was advancing to a considerable extent⁵¹⁾, and moreover it was realized as the result of the expropriation of peasant landholding which was a structural element of feudal landed property, by breaking the traditional and customary tie between the peasants and the land through the enclosure pursued by the lords. The lease of enclosed land should, therefore, be comprehended not as the relation between feudal landlords (land ownership by lords) and feudal peasants (landholding by peasants) but as that between private landowners and the simple tenant farmers, especially those who were at the stage of disintegration.

The Bradgates who were the tenant farmers in Knaptoft and yeomen of Peatling Parva were a typical example of wealthy peasants who appeared as one end of the polarization in the disintegration of peasant class, and became leaseholders of the enclosed land. Thomas Bradgate rented 340 acres of enclosed pasture in Knaptoft in 1507, and in 1539 he rented the enclosed pasture land in Elmesthorpe instead of Knaptoft. Richard, his son once again rented Knaptoft in 1572. Thomas is considered to have been the richest yeoman in Leicestershire and according to the inventories left by Thomas and Richard, the size of farming is, in the light of their harvested

50) *Ibid.*, pp. 149, 154, 159, 161. In addition, many examples can be found in various materials already referred to, which show the increase of rent income due to the enclosure.

51) Cf., N. Take, *op. cit.*

grain crops in 1539 (ten quarters of wheat and rye, thirty quarters of barley and thirty quarters of peas), estimated at not less than 40 acres under cultivation alone, but primary importance was placed on the raising of livestock, which occupied nearly 70% of the total personal estate, especially of 400 sheep.

The scale of farming in 1572 was expanded when compared with that in 1539, but when we look into its details, it is seen that whereas the harvested amount of crops remained almost the same, the livestock occupied 80% of the total personal estate and the number of sheep was increased from 400 to 1,340 and the amount of hay was increased from 30 loads to 80 loads. Besides, 1,040 sheep out of 1,340 and 69 cattle and horses out of 82 were raised on the pasture of Knaptoft. This indicates that the expansion of the scale of farming was primarily dependent on sheep raising on the enclosed land⁵²⁾.

As already mentioned, there lived five families in 1524-25 in Knaptoft on whose wage income subsidy was levied, and from the scale of farming of the Bradgates who were mainly based on the leased land in Knaptoft, it is very likely that the labour forces of these poor peasants or agricultural workers were utilized. If it was so, the embryonic formation of an early stage of future capitalist tenant farmers including the capital and wage labour relations then in the making within this farming, can be observed.

In addition to the Bradgates, three tenant farmers who leased the enclosed pasture lands in Keythorpe from their lord, G. Boyvile and undertook the farming employing their shepherds⁵³⁾, Thomas Jusly⁵⁴⁾, yeoman of Lutterworth, who rented the enclosed pastures in Bittesby and raised 280 sheep there, William Hubbard, yeoman in Barsby and John Kilby, yeoman in Queniborough who rented 120 acres of enclosed pasture land in Galby for a term of 11 years and one month⁵⁵⁾, and Mr. Philip Freake⁵⁶⁾ of Leicester who is believed to have raised nearly 500 sheep on the enclosed pasture land rented in Lowesby and others are some examples of those who were wealthy peasants who rented the enclosed lands.

All of them were wealthy peasants who had emerged as a result of the disintegration of peasantry advanced under the open-field system before the time of the enclosure and who were introduced, as mere tenant farmers, into the exclusive and private land of lords through the enclosure. Thus

52) Refer to Hoskins, *Essays in Leicestershire History*, pp. 153-4, 158-9.

53) R.H. Hilton, "Medieval Agrarian History", in *V.C.H., Leics.*, Vol. II, p. 195.

54) Hoskins, *Essays in Leicestershire History*, p. 175.

55) *Ibid.*, pp. 44-5.

56) *Ibid.*, pp. 113-122.

the profit that was produced from the newly introduced capital and wage labour relations in their farming provided a new source for rent increase by the lords, and consequently the rent itself changed to assume an embryonic form of capitalist rent which was only a portion of surplus value left over after the capitalistic tenant farmers took their profit, replacing the feudal rent that absorbed all the surplus products.

The Turpins, the lords of enclosed land in Knaptoft, the Bradgates as tenant farmers, and the poor peasants or agricultural labourers, these three are typical examples that indicate prototypes in the making of modern landlord, capitalist tenant farmer and agricultural proletariat who are the three major classes in capitalist agriculture in later days. We can thus observe the tripartite division system, the system to be established later, in embryonic formation in such interrelation among them centering around the sheep raising.

(C) Lease to Middle and Poor Peasants—Rack Renting

The lease of enclosed land to middle and poor peasants was different from that to wealthy peasants. The lease to them opened up the way to gradually expropriate the land from them as the small tenant farmers who were already deprived of all the security they could enjoy on the peasant landholding.

First of all, the enclosure itself all the more expedited the disintegration of peasantry and it served to degrade the large part of middle peasants to poor peasants. Although the wealthy peasants of considerable standing could raise the productive forces by renting the enclosed land, the enclosure did not offer such benefit to the peasants of petty farming. On the contrary, because the commons which were an indispensable part of the land for their farmings were lost as the result of enclosure, their self-sustaining farming became much more difficult to maintain.

When the enclosed land was leased, the burden of increased rent had the different degree of financial effect upon the wealthy peasants and the middle or poor peasants. Whereas the wealthy peasants could expand the scale of their farmings thanks to the growth of productive forces, even when they had to pay increased rent it was quite natural that the increased rent brought a destructive pressure upon the middle and poor peasants because the rent was increased in terms of the increased productive forces of the wealthy peasants. Let us take the examples of two peasants who were supposedly poor from the inventories in the 1580's in Wigston Magna which was then not yet enclosed⁵⁷⁾.

57) Hoskins, *Midland Peasant*, 1957, pp. 172-173.

W. Bradshaw had half an acre of barley and half an acre of pease, worth 13s. 4d. His total estate was worth then only 35s. 6d. and even if he had some livestock they would have been of negligible value and his holdings would have been less than 5 acres including fallow land. Based on 5 or 6d. rent per acre in Wigston Magna which is said have fixed since the 13th or 14th century, and if he held 3 acres he would have paid in total 1s. 3d. or 1s. 6d., leaving 12s. from the prices of his crops of 13s. 4d. From the remaining balance, he had to pay the cost of seeds and to deduct the depreciation of his tools, but even if these costs are put aside 12s. is far from being enough to reproduce labour forces when it is compared with the then prevailing wage income which is assumed to have been £1 per year. For him, self-sustaining farming was impossible and he must have relied on wage income in order to support his living. R. Jervis who had nothing but a pig, 4 hens, and a little hay and straw, provides an example of a wage labourer holding no land of his own except the utilization of commons. Moreover, no explanation will be required of the effect of the increased rent due to the enclosure upon the poor peasants who could not be self-supporting in their petty farmings even under the low rent of 5 or 6d. per acre which had been fixed since the 13th or 14th century as mentioned in the case of Bradshaw.

At Haselbech which was the estate of the Treshams, it is said "in all Hassellbiche there was not one tenant that would stay in the towne to dwell uppon improved rentes"⁵⁸⁾.

Thus, the disintegration of middle peasantry into the wealthy peasants and the poor peasants, which had been brought about by the disintegration of peasantry under the open-field system and the peasant landholding, was much accelerated by the lease of enclosed land initiated by the enclosure by landlords.

Some of the wealthy peasants farming on a large scale grew further as the leaseholders of the enclosed lands, and they introduced capital-labour relations into their management. On the other hand, many other peasants became simple tenant farmers and they lost all the customary rights they could enjoy on the peasant land-holdings. Thus they were exposed defencelessly to competition, and the increased rent which was made possible by the increased productivity of wealthy peasants acted as rack rent towards middle or poor peasants.

If the eviction of peasants had once for all expropriated peasants from their holdings, the lease of enclosed lands to middle and poor peasants were

⁵⁸⁾ Finch, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

"to expropriate more and more the old peasant possessors and to substitute capitalist tenants in their stead"⁵⁹⁾.

3. Interchange between the Self-Farming by Landlord of the Enclosed Land and Its Lease

So far two forms of utilization of enclosed land, that is, self-farming by landlord and lease to peasants, have been separately studied in their genuine models, but, in reality, a great many of them existed in mixed form. As shown in Table 4 as to sheep-raising landlords in Northamptonshire, during the period when wool prices were levelling off or declining, general trends were to shift from self-farming to lease, while when the wool prices were improving, as seen in the example of the Fitzwilliams, reconversion of lease to self-farming was observed, but from the long-range viewpoint one can see the gradual shifting from sheep raising by landlords to lease on the whole after the 1630's. Nevertheless, even at the time when the lease became a definite general trend, some landlords did not necessarily abandon their self-farmings completely. For instance, during the 1580-90's when the Fitzwilliams shifted to lease, they still held their own farm for self-farming as already seen above. Therefore at least by the middle of the 17th century, the self-farming by landlords and the lease continued to be interchanged, and neither of them had achieved predominant control.

Table 4. Trends of Forms of Utilization of Enclosed Land

Spencers	16th cent.	self-farming	1630's	lease
Fitzwilliams	early 16th cent.	self-farming and lease	1576	lease
	1629	lease	1605	self-farming
Brudenells	first half of 16th cent.	self-farming	latter half	lease

Prepared from Finch, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-48, 114-130, 138-139, 147-148.

The trend of shift from self-farming by landlords centering around sheep raising to lease after the middle of the 17th century does not immediately mean that it had brought about establishment of the tripartite division system in agriculture in general. The shift of the capitalist landlord farming which developed precociously and limpingly in the field of sheep raising to the lease was based on the fact that the middle and poor tenant farmers, who continued to engage in grain farming under conditions of the business recession in woollen textile industry and wool trade and the limited productive forces in grain farming were numerous. However, the intro-

⁵⁹⁾ Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 779.

duction of improved farming methods which gained much ground during the 17th century accelerated the disintegration of peasantry in grain farming, and consequently this invited the self-farming by landlords in the field of grain farming. In the sheep-and-corn countries of south Wiltshire, more than half the farmland was occupied by employers of considerable numbers of wage-workers by the middle of the 17th century, and among them gentlemen farmers and cultivating squires occupied the important position⁶⁰⁾. This is one of the examples of the above. Therefore, the self-farming by landlords centering around sheep raising=Junker type farming, and the lease=the embryonic form of tripartite division system; these two bourgeois forms of landlord economy were developed, with a little time lag, on the field of grain farming. In the first half of the 17th century, the two main axis, sheep raising and grain cultivation, came closer, and from the middle of the 17th century onwards, more emphasis was placed on grain farming which soon became the mainfield of the second enclosure movement.

In England where it is said that the capitalist development of agriculture took place in the most classic way and the typical tripartite division system was formed, it may seem to be strange to find self-farming=Junker type farming. But the tripartite division system is the goal where the capitalistic mode of production dominates agriculture and capital and land ownership come to have their own independent functions respectively. It is, therefore, rather impractical to suppose that through its historical development process it existed always in its pure form. If the tripartite division system is the most developed and purest form of existence of capitalist agriculture, Junker type farming shows only the form of existence in the premature stage of capital development. Therefore, during that times, the tripartite division system could exist only in its embryonic form. It can be said that this very fact made the interchange or inter-accompanying phenomena between self-farming=Junker type farming and the tripartite division system in embryo inevitable at this stage.

Conclusion

The development of an economic process which has been dealt with in this paper as the main subject has the following two factors as premises: the landed property in the 16th and 17th centuries prior to the English Revolution was basically under the control of feudal landed property supported by exploitation of money-rent, and such feudal landed property

60) *V.C.H., Wiltshire*, Vol. IV, p. 57.

constituted a double-layer system of the unification of the opposing two, viz., landed property by landlord and peasant landholding⁶¹⁾. This is the first premise. However, within this feudal landed property, commodity production by peasants gradually developed to fortify peasant landholding under the conditions of low fixed rent and rising prices in the 16th century, and thus the bourgeois development on the part of landholding peasants, or the disintegration of peasantry was accelerated thereby⁶²⁾. This is the second premise.

These two presupposed factors themselves contradict each other. The bourgeois development of peasant economy ceases to be suitable for the existing feudal landed property, and therefrom emerges the solution of its contradiction—one objective possibility of bourgeois land reform. The predominant views in Japan so far taken for the explanation of the development of capitalism in England has been to prove, from the existence of the said two contradictory factors, the way to solve immediately the contradiction at the same time. In other words, it means the course of development which follows the progress of commodity production by peasants→general establishment of so-called free and independent self-managing peasants→advancement of the disintegration of peasantry→emergence of agricultural capitalists and agrarian proletariat.

It should be said that the theoretical approach of monetary ground-rent as the form of disappearance of feudal rent→peasant proprietorship of land parcels as the transitory form to capitalist rent→tripartite division system, in “*Capital*”, Vol. III, Chapter XLVII which treats “Genesis of Capitalist Ground-Rent” was applied as such to the realities in England.

However, according to this thinking, the advancement of disintegration of peasantry has as its presupposition the establishment of peasant proprietorship of land parcels, and it is supposed to have been developed only after the disintegration of peasantry or the second premise had denied the feudal landed property or the first premise. Therefore, at the time of the English Revolution, land reform was no longer a task for the revolution, or *one* objective possibility of land reform had already been transformed into reality, and therefore there could no longer be any *other* possibility.

When we think of the English Revolution, we presupposed the above-mentioned two factors concurrently. More precisely speaking, we considered that the disintegration of peasantry (the second premise) had developed subordinating to the feudal landed property (the first premise). Even when

61) Horie, *op. cit.*

62) Take, *op. cit.*

the bourgeois development in peasant economy was advanced and the peasant landholding approached the peasant proprietorship of land parcels, it was merely an approach, and so long as the landed property by landlord was not abolished, the contradiction could not have been solved, nor is it possible to say that the peasant proprietorship of land parcels was even partially established. Therefore, it was supposed that the existence of contradiction itself did not specify the way to solve the contradiction, but it was assumed that the solution of the contradiction, i.e., *another* objective possibility of bourgeois land reform was produced therefrom. It is the existence of the objective possibility that the more the peasant economy which is subjected to the feudal landed property sees bourgeois development, and the more the peasant landholding approaches the peasant proprietorship of land parcels, the landed property by landlord which is another constituent of feudal landed property, and the landlord class, the personal expression of the former also accordingly undergoes bourgeois development. The main subject of this paper was to clarify this point.

Bourgeois development of peasant economy and the fortification of peasant landholding entailed the weakening of landed property by landlord as indicated by the financial privation of the manorial lord. In other words, feudalism itself was endangered thereby. The typical reaction of the landlord class against such a feudal crisis was the enclosure by landlord. Even if they did not intend to secure more than to obtain the maximum income from the land in whatever form it might be, and to avoid the financial crisis, the result which was objectively brought about was the bourgeois development of landlord economy itself. First, the enclosure by landlord changed the existing form of feudal landed property, namely the enclosure which was carried out by the driving force consisting of the rising small and medium size landlords either evicted peasants with violence from the land or leased the enclosed land to them by an agreement, and the peasant landholding was thus deprived with few exceptions of freeholders, and the peasants who used to hold land degenerated to the poor peasants or agricultural proletariat. Or, even if they could continue to occupy land, they became mere tenants. The feudal landed property, which constituted the dual land system of landed property by landlord and peasant landholding, was transformed into a form of landed property suitable for bourgeois development by the expropriation of the latter, the former being changed into an exclusive single private land ownership.

However, this transformation constitutes the opposite pole to another way of creating modern private land ownership, i.e., to what should be achieved via the establishment of peasant proprietorship of land parcels by

the abolition of landed property by landlord.

The enclosed land created by enclosure—private land of landlord, provided the arena in which the bourgeois development of agriculture both in productive forces and relations of production was accelerated.

The landlord who owned the enclosed land either farmed by himself on it or leased it in order to have increased ground rent. But the farming of the enclosed land was managed in a capitalistic way. It was conditioned by the social division of labour in England in the 16th and 17th centuries that belonged to the initial period of manufacture stage in capitalism, and thus in particular it developed unevenly and prematurely in the sheep raising sector that supplied the woollen industry with raw material. It took two forms of existence, the form of Junker type farming in case of self-farming by landlord and the embryonic form of tripartite division system in case of leasing of enclosed land. The landlord who carried out Junker type farming had been changing himself from a feudal landlord to a capitalist and modern landowner by introducing into his farming poor peasants or agricultural proletariat created by him. In the embryonic form of tripartite division system, on the other hand, the direction in which the bourgeois development of peasant economy tended to abolish landed property by landlord and moved toward the establishment of peasant proprietorship of land parcel was denied by taking away peasant landholding, and on the other hand, middle and poor tenant farmers were gradually expropriated to be replaced by capitalist tenant farmers and this accelerated the introduction of disintegration of peasantry, the said second premise. Thus in either of the two existing forms of enclosed land management, the prototypes of modern landowner, capitalist tenant farmer and agricultural proletariat, i.e., three major classes constituting of the forthcoming tripartite division system was already formed in embryo.

Of course in this early stage of capitalism where capital and land ownership did not secure their own independent functions respectively, this class structure was nothing but prototype and embryo. The fact that there were repeated interchanges between self-farming, the representation of the status where capital and land ownership were not separate—and leasing was the inevitable manifestation of the same.

The above-mentioned process as concentratedly expressed and developed in the enclosure by landlord was the very economic foundation that indicated the existence of an objective possibility of bourgeois land reform by landlords, or another way of solutions of the contradiction which was required by the existence of the two contradictory premises as mentioned above, i.e., the landlord type antagonistic to the peasant type in bourgeois land reform.