CrossMark

The author does not have a research background in the industry and this becomes apparent in her final assessments as she addresses her title, *The Wealth of England*. Her answer seems to be that wool made many people rich, notably the Crown, graziers, and large ecclesiastical and lay landlords, and that they, together with clothiers, financed some beautiful buildings. But the impact was wide and changing. Until the mid-fifteenth century, wool accounted for most of the country's exports, its ability to earn foreign currency and finance needed raw materials. The strength of the wool market allowed the agricultural sector to be restructured after the Black Death in the face of declining grain demand and the increased leasing of demesne land. The variety and value of wool was the basis for success of the cloth industry. It was a key aspect of fiscal policy in the fourteenth century and monetary policy in the fifteenth. Wool and then cloth had a marked effect on London's development in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Horses and the Aristocratic Lifestyle in Early Modern England: William Cavendish, First Earl of Devonshire (1551–1626), and his Horses

Peter Edwards, Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2018, 256 pp., £75, 9781783272884

Donna Landry

University of Kent

In early modern England, for a landowner to be recognised for the quality and soundness of his own 'breed' of horses was a matter of considerable prestige. Yet keeping a stud was expensive, far more of a drain on resources than simply keeping horses. By investigating the account books of William Cavendish, first Earl of Devonshire (1551–1626), the uncle of the famous horseman William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle, Peter Edwards returns horse breeding to its central place in aristocratic economic and social life. If economic, social, and cultural histories have come to be seen as increasingly distinct from one another, this book brings them together through meticulous detective work.

Yet Edwards remains an economic historian at heart. The core of this study consists of three disbursement books housed at the Chatsworth estate covering expenditures by William Cavendish between 1597 and 1623. There are no accounts remaining that pertain to income. Although the lack of income data is to be regretted, meaning that it is never possible to establish whether Cavendish actually made a profit on his stud, the disbursement accounts constitute a rich source regarding not only the costs of horses and horse keeping but also other aspects of what Edwards calls 'the aristocratic lifestyle'. Edwards does not regard the term as an anachronism, taking his stand with Linda Levy Peck in *Consuming Splendor* (2005), arguing that, at least among the upper classes, fashion and luxury consumption were already entrenched by Cavendish's day (a diamond ring for £300, a grey Spanish Ginete stallion for the 'huge sum' of £66 13s 4d).

William Cavendish's prudent management of money was exceptional. For a dramatic contrast, see Edwards's 'The decline of an aristocratic stud: the stud of Edward Lord Harley, 2nd Earl of Oxford and Mortimer at Welbeck (Nottinghamshire), 1717–29', *Economic History Review*, 69:3 (August 2016), 870–92. (This article is erroneously cited in the book as appearing in *Economic History Review*, 99:3.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956793318000237 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A fuller description of the accounts in the manner of 'book history' would have been helpful. Only on page 72, for example, do we learn that the 1602 accounts appear to have been written by Robert Parker, a stud servant who would be promoted to chief estate steward in 1605. Not until page 144 is it revealed that the accounts covering expenditure on Prince Charles's visit in 1616 are 'later, fair copies' and thus 'do not always list items in the correct order' (note 20). To quibble: the term 'stoned horses' for ungelded or 'entire' horses (stallions) is used throughout, whereas in the early modern sources it appears as 'stone-horses', or very occasionally, 'ston'd-horses', always with a hyphen. Edwards usefully observes that gentlemen's and ladies' horses had to be of the right quality, conformation, size, and paces for purpose, whether for the manège ('riding the great horse') with its associations of tournaments and war, or for hunting, hawking, 'running' (racing), travelling, making long journeys, or pulling coaches or carts. More could have been made of these differing types and how they were bred than Edwards's distinction between 'saddle horses' and horses for 'draught' – coaches and carts – allows. But no longer can early modern historians ignore the importance of the horse.

Servants in Rural Europe, 1400–1900

Jane Whittle, ed., Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, 2017, xiii + 272 pp., £19.99, 9781783272396

Jenny Dyer

Oxford Brookes University

This valuable collection of essays seeks to bring to rural servants the same degree of attention that historians have given to domestic servants in an urban context. Like their urban counterparts, servants in the countryside lived in the households where they worked; they were predominantly young, unmarried and bound by custom or contract to remain for an extended period. Rural service, however, was distinguished by participation in a wide range of agricultural as well as domestic tasks. These might involve year-round activities for which training and long-term attention was required, such as care of livestock and dairy production. In this they were distinct from day labourers, employed for harvest work and at other busy times in the year and usually for less skilled work. The authors set out to revisit the work of earlier research into rural societies, notably that of John Hajnal, Peter Laslett and Ann Kussmaul, using their findings as a springboard for their own investigations. They draw on traditional sources, but also on previously neglected ones, such as the intriguing mini-biographies of the deceased, written up by the priests of Vasterlas, which Cristina Prytz uses to flesh out the lives of servants in seventeenth-century rural Sweden.

A new and complex picture of service in Europe emerges with many variations and departures from the earlier model. Thus, while male servants characteristically dominated rural service elsewhere in Europe, Hanne Osthus shows us that in Norway, throughout the eighteenth century, women and girls easily outnumbered the men. The link between service and late marriage, so much a part of the Laslett and Hajnal conception of the European Marriage Plan (EMP) cannot be sustained everywhere. Nor did time in service invariably allow young people to break with their own family ties, accumulate material goods and set up independent households with marriage partners of their choosing. Thijs Lambrechts finds that in sixteenth-century rural Flanders many servants retained strong links with their families, returning home for family weddings and sending

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956793318000237 Published online by Cambridge University Press