

boys. She finds, too, that inner value and personal merit were emphasized more strongly in works adapted to merchant and gentry readers.

Chapter 3 is concerned with six books printed by Caxton between 1476 and 1487. Bailey uses the term “instructional” to refer to these works and argues that these works reflect growing resistance to “courtesy” as superficial. Instead, growing emphasis was placed on “true” virtue as opposed to “over-courtesy” (100). Bailey, again, draws attention to differences in gender and uses *The Book of the Knight of the Tower*, a collection of stories written by a knight for his daughters, to emphasize the much stronger attention paid to virtue in works written for girls and women. Further, she argues, Caxton published works specifically with a “family audience” in mind, anticipating the significance that such small, domestic groupings had in the sixteenth century.

Chapter 4 turns to a particular type of sixteenth-century instructional manual, which Bailey refers to as “the household or parental advice book” (8) and which includes vernacular material by authors such as Richard Whitford, Robert Shelford, and William Vaughan as well as translations by Richard Hyrde from Vives and by Hugh Rhodes and Francis Seager from Bruto. Here, Bailey finds ever growing emphasis on virtue for boys as well as girls. In this literature, the household was identified as the best environment for instruction, and the voices of parents, rather than children, were increasingly inscribed in this kind of book.

Chapter 5 moves from discussion of the household to the schools. Here, Bailey emphasizes the role of schools as “transmitter[s] of social values” as well as transmitters of academic subjects (160). In this chapter, Bailey “tease[s] out information concerning social conduct from . . . descriptions of school organisation” (163). Her sources for this chapter are school statutes, grammars and other educational books, and school account books. Among the interesting points raised in this chapter is a discussion about the observation of the behavior of schoolmasters as laid out in official records. Bailey finds that the schools were concerned with “complete” education, which included socialization in terms of “outward appearance and inner behaviour” (193).

Bailey’s careful work with her source material makes this book extremely useful for scholars interested in the late medieval and early modern efforts to socialize children. Although the history she traces may feel familiar to readers who have studied conduct literature, Bailey has written a book that is thoughtful and attentive to important details. Indeed, some of her most interesting observations are brief asides about aspects of this history that puzzle her or do not fit neatly in an overarching narrative. For example, she draws attention to the disjunction between conduct literature’s emphasis on traditional family structures and the actual nature of households and families in the period: “The reality of social and economic pressures, deaths and blended families” meant this traditional structure was not “relevant to every household,” yet, nonetheless, “[i]nstructional writers paid no heed to elements outside this perfect household group. Households headed by widows, single people or those who rented rooms within a property are largely rendered invisible in didactic material” (151–52). *Socialising the Child in Late Medieval England* contributes to our understanding of education in the period by refusing to ignore such details.

Rebecca Krug, University of Minnesota

JIM BOLTON. *Money in the Medieval English Economy, 973–1489*. Manchester Medieval Studies series. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012. Pp. 352. \$110.00 (cloth). doi:10.1017/jbr.2013.127

Jim Bolton’s new book is a welcome addition to the literature of medieval economic history. Over the past two decades, there has been a substantial increase in scholarly output by numismatists and monetary historians, but much of it has been narrowly focused and published in

specialized and sometimes inaccessible venues. Given the move by economic historians away from models of population and resources toward models of commerce and distribution, the value of enhanced knowledge of money and its use is self-evident. Bolton provides a masterly guide to recent literature and a compelling rationale for situating monetary history more centrally in the literature of commercialization and economic history as a whole.

The book is divided into four sections, one thematic and three chronological. The thematic section explains some of the basic conceptual tools commonly employed by monetary historians, such as the Fisher equation and the creative ways it can be manipulated to supplement deficient empirical data. Bolton also summarizes the various definitions of money crafted by modern economists and provides an account of the basic institutional parameters within which money operated. Rounding out the thematic section is a helpful summary of how money was produced and circulated in medieval England, including succinct accounts of the coins in common use, minting practices, bullion flows, and estimates of the money supply. Specialists may not find much new in this section, but general readers will certainly find the overview helpful when they turn to the core chronological sections of the book.

Each of the chronological sections is made up of a pair of chapters, one devoted primarily to changes in the money supply and the other to considering how the changes interacted with concurrent economic factors to effect change. Bolton's chronological divisions are fairly conventional, comprising an early period when money was clearly in use but not widely distributed, a middle period when bullion supplies increased dramatically and the use of money became pervasive in society, and a late period when bullion supplies plunged and society was forced to adjust to a great dearth of circulating coinage. Each period is defined by several characteristic traits, but the key distinguishing feature is the amount of silver (and eventually gold) available to facilitate the production of coins.

Bolton's first chronological period extends from the tenth century to 1158. Hard data about the money supply is scarce for the period, and historical opinion has been sharply divided about levels of wealth and economic sophistication. Some historians have emphasized the kingdom's ability to generate high gold payments and portrayed Anglo-Saxon England as an exceptionally wealthy kingdom with an effective monetary system. Bolton aligns himself more closely with the skeptics, arguing that while the period made institutional contributions to the development of monetary standards that would influence subsequent periods, its commercial development was still rudimentary and its wealth was socially circumscribed. He suggests that the period had a monetized economy, with money being common enough to serve as a standard of value, but not a true money economy, with most parts of society making regular and recurring use of money for routine transactions. There simply was not a large enough volume of circulating silver in the period for coins to be in common use at the level of the small landholder.

The situation changed significantly in the middle of the twelfth century, thanks largely to an influx of silver from new mines brought into production in Europe, first in Saxony and then in central Europe. Bolton sees this period as witnessing the true emergence of a money economy with a circulating medium substantial enough to permeate all ranks of society. He provides an excellent overview of changing mint outputs and the striking growth in the use of money that characterized the "long" thirteenth century. This is also the period that has come in for extended analysis by advocates of the new commercial history, and as Bolton points out, the two phenomena are obviously closely related. Refreshingly, though, Bolton does not suppose that mint outputs alone can stand as a surrogate for all other economic activity, and he readily concedes that money's growing role was as much a consequence as a cause of other economic developments, such as population growth and institutional change.

Bolton's final period, from the middle of the fourteenth century to the end of the fifteenth century, witnessed a dramatic about-face, as European mines fell out of production and replacement sources failed to materialize. The period has traditionally been viewed as witnessing both a bullion famine and an unending series of tribulations, economic and other. On the whole, Bolton is more optimistic about the period than many other historians, particularly monetary

historians. He recognizes that the collapse of the silver supply served as a major impediment to prosperity, but he suggests that the situation was not entirely gloomy. From a strictly monetary point of view, he argues that the addition of gold to the money supply alleviated some of the problems associated with declining silver, and he also believes that the increasing use of transferrable paper obligations compensated to some extent for the drop in circulating coinage.

While the basic framework is fairly conventional, the main attraction of Bolton's book is the compelling way he relates monetary changes to other developments. His treatment of changing standards of numeracy, for example, is cleverly linked to better-known arguments about changes in literacy associated with the work of Michael Clanchy and others. He also provides first-rate accounts of the adoption of direct production by great estate holders in the later twelfth century, the legal enforcement of debts, and the impact of taxation at various points in time, among other things. The book manages to be both accessible and scholarly, and provides an excellent guide to anyone wishing to know more about the medieval English economy.

James Masschaele, Rutgers University

LLOYD BONFIELD. *Devising, Dying and Dispute: Probate Litigation in Early Modern England*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2012. Pp. 310. \$119.95 (cloth).
doi:10.1017/jbr.2013.128

This is a study of “contested probate”—that is, litigation over the validity of wills brought before the Prerogative Court of Canterbury between 1660 and 1700. The author, Lloyd Bonfield, employs a straightforward sampling technique in order to extract fascinating and varied material from the plentiful records of testamentary litigation collected in the archives of this court. He also incorporates evidence from the early modern legal literature, including Henry Swinburne's influential work *A Brief Treatise of Testaments and Last Wills*, first published in the sixteenth century and reprinted and relied upon in subsequent centuries as well. Bonfield provides a robust synthesis of the doctrinal history, clearly setting out the nuances of legal procedure and placing appropriate emphasis on the specificity of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction for English probate, especially in an appendix titled “A primer on probate jurisdiction in early modern England.” Some of this material also appears in the second chapter of Bonfield's book, concerning probate jurisdiction, which is less happily subtitled “England's Own ‘Peculiar Institution’ in Crisis.” Here Bonfield was likely echoing William Blackstone's description of ecclesiastical probate as England's “peculiar constitution” or alluding to the creation of exempt “peculiar jurisdictions” within the Church of England, rather than making any association with the institution of slavery, but for this reviewer the use of the phrase was jarring.

Bonfield traces several essential patterns within the litigation in the late seventeenth-century Prerogative Court. His evidence demonstrates that when wills were contested, most disputes revolved around questions about capacity: What was the will maker's mental state? Was he of sound mind and free from coercion by others? The other main focus of dispute, Bonfield shows, centered on the question of authenticity: Was the document presented evidence of an authentic testamentary act? Or, even more frequently debated, were words spoken acceptable evidence of an authentic oral (nuncupative) will? In seeking to understand why these patterns emerged, Bonfield turns to four explanatory contexts. He elucidates litigants' motives and strategies by relying upon scholarly traditions that characterize this period as a moment of transition in property law theory as it moved inexorably toward “Lockean” property rights; and as a moment of change in the “scientific understanding of mental illness” as it moved “towards more rational views” (2–6). Bonfield also usefully connects these litigation patterns to social and legal historians' recent analyses of women's legal agency and behaviors