

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-36882-7 - Agricultural Change: Policy and Practice, 1500-1750

Edited by Joan Thirsk

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

The chapters of the *Agrarian History* assembled in this volume deal with farming techniques, changes in the use of land, including those associated with enclosure and the growth of horticulture, and the legislation which influenced the process, including that concerning tithe payments. They cover two and a half centuries of innovations during which the range of farm products entering commercial markets broadened substantially. Surveying the scene in 1500, historians concentrate their attention on grain, cattle, and sheep production, but by 1750 they must accommodate a much more varied selection of products, ranging from rapeseed, hops, fruit and vegetables, to walnuts, pigs, turkeys, pigeons, coach horses and racehorses. Each of these, and more, has its own history that rewards exploration, for apart from the fact that each activity contributed to farmers' incomes, and most have to be fitted somewhere into the history of the Englishman's diet, all new pursuits had to be accommodated within existing farming systems, thereby causing the main concerns for grain and meat to be correspondingly modified.

The discussion of changes in land use and farming techniques has broadened in certain directions since the first publication in 1967 of volume IV of the *Agrarian History*, but it continues to focus primarily on enclosure and the two new fodder crops, clover and turnips. It is to be hoped that the publication of volume V in 1985–6 will have shifted attention to other, significant innovations which deserve further investigation. Such a shift is being helped by one quite separate surge of interest in horticulture, which sprang originally from an enquiry into the decorative gardens of manor houses and then moved to consider their kitchen gardens and orchards. The consequences of this development of vegetable and fruit growing, making it a new branch of commercial agriculture was underlined in volume V, in the whole chapter devoted to it; it was reaffirmed, indirectly, in the section on tithes, which described the disputes centering upon some of the new crops. Horticulture is one of a variety of innovations that has to be accommodated in the fuller picture of long-term change.¹

¹ See further below, pp. 8–12.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-36882-7 - Agricultural Change: Policy and Practice, 1500-1750

Edited by Joan Thirsk

Excerpt

[More information](#)

That enclosure history continues to absorb a large share of attention is evident in the recent literature: several different aspects have been reviewed in the last twenty years. The chronology of the movement is continuously being scrutinized. Ian Blanchard has pointed to the 1520s as the significant decade when land abundance and a shortage of people to cultivate it came to an end, causing the rising population from then onward to express most forcefully its resentment at the conversion of arable to pasture.²

An ingenious attempt by Ross Wordie at calculating the acreages involved in enclosure throughout England (including Monmouthshire) has concluded with the suggestion that far more land was enclosed in the seventeenth century than in either the sixteenth, eighteenth or nineteenth centuries.³ Such calculations have been helped by the work of Michael Turner in revising and publishing W. E. Tate's study of Parliamentary enclosure in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, to which he added original work and analysis of his own.⁴ This has given a firmer figure than before of the total of land enclosed after 1700 by Parliamentary acts. The calculations of Dr Wordie suggest that only 2 per cent of the land was enclosed in the sixteenth century, 24 per cent in the seventeenth, 13 per cent in the eighteenth, and 11.4 per cent in the nineteenth century up to 1914. This statistical venture, using the documents of governments which were only just beginning to think statistically, is extremely tentative, and the suggested progress of enclosure in the sixteenth century should be treated with deep scepticism. One has only to consider the incentives to enclose at that time, and the protests voiced against the hardships it caused. Some of the weaknesses in the calculations have already been pointed out.⁵ Moreover, every local investigation continues to reveal a multitude of uncontested enclosures that left no documents at the time they occurred.⁶

It may not be far wrong to suggest that the acreage enclosed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries together roughly equalled that enclosed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and it is certainly

² Ian Blanchard, 'Population Change, Enclosure and the Early Tudor Economy,' *EcHR*, 2nd ser., xxiii, 3, 1970.

³ J. R. Wordie, 'The Chronology of English Enclosure, 1500-1914', *EcHR*, 2nd ser., xxxvi, 4, 1983.

⁴ For the latest summary, with a good bibliography, see Michael Turner, *Enclosures in Britain, 1750-1830*, London, 1984.

⁵ John Chapman, 'The Chronology of English Enclosure', *EcHR*, 2nd ser., xxxvii, 4, 1984. See also J. R. Wordie, 'The Chronology of English enclosure: a reply', *ibid.*

⁶ For a good example of this, see John Porter, 'Waste Land Reclamation in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: the Case of South-Eastern Bowland, 1550-1630', *Trans. Hist. Soc. Lancs. & Cheshire*, cxxvii, 1978.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-36882-7 - Agricultural Change: Policy and Practice, 1500-1750

Edited by Joan Thirsk

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

3

likely that somewhat more land was enclosed in the seventeenth than in the sixteenth centuries. If such impressions do not satisfy, then those who enjoy mathematical games can, and doubtless will, continue to juggle with the available figures, mostly taken from the official government enquiries. How trustworthy are they? That they did record enclosures that had actually occurred has been the recent verdict of John Martin, examining some of the reports collected by the 1607 commission. (Fundamental doubts had earlier been expressed about their credibility as historical evidence.)⁷ But it is also worth emphasizing another passage in John Martin's article, citing contemporary views on the underlying intention of the enquiry, namely, to hold up for public disapproval the enclosures of prominent men, in order to teach a lesson to others.⁸ We know already that statutes at this period were intended as cautionary exhortations, rather than as laws to be enforced universally. Despite the present-day liking for mathematical precision, we should heed these reminders of a different frame of reference for "enquiry commissions": they were not intended to embrace all cases and should not be ranked alongside twentieth-century censuses.

More helpful than quantification in deepening our understanding of the progress of enclosure is the qualitative analysis of its different regional forms, purposes and advances. A notable study along these lines was J. A. Yelling's book on *Common Field and Enclosure in England, 1450-1850* (1977), drawing on many local, and particularly Midland, examples for illustration.⁹ Two more modest, but enlightening, studies of the enclosure history of Bowland in Lancashire and of north Buckinghamshire also deserve mention in this connection.¹⁰ Still more refined have been the local studies which have given a step-by-step account of the negotiations, or wrangling, that led to individual enclosures, sometimes showing in the seventeenth century notable consideration for the poor.¹¹ These can be especially helpful in explaining why and how enclosure slowly became more acceptable, as

⁷ John Martin, 'Enclosure and the Inquisitions of 1607: An Examination of Dr Kerridge's Article "The Returns of the Inquisitions of Depopulation"', AHR, xxx, 1, 1982. For the vigour with which prosecutions were conducted against enclosers who were reported to the 1517-18 enquiries, see J. J. Scarisbrick, 'Cardinal Wolsey and the Commonwealth', in E. W. Ives et al. eds., *Wealth and Power in Tudor England: Essays presented to S. T. Bindoff*, London, 1978, pp. 55-67.

⁸ Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

⁹ J. A. Yelling, *Common Field and Enclosure in England, 1450-1850*, London, 1977.

¹⁰ Porter, *op. cit.*; Michael Reed, 'Enclosure in North Buckinghamshire, 1500-1750', AHR, xxxii, 2, 1984, esp. p. 135.

¹¹ See, for example, A. Gooder, *Plague and Enclosure. A Warwickshire Village in the Seventeenth Century (Clifton-upon-Dunsmore)*, Coventry and North War. History Pamphlets of the Coventry Branch of the Historical Association, No. 2, 1965.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-36882-7 - Agricultural Change: Policy and Practice, 1500-1750

Edited by Joan Thirsk

Excerpt

[More information](#)

4

INTRODUCTION

procedures were adjusted in order to promote agreement rather than dissension. When, furthermore, a local study of enclosure is set in the context of other enclosures that were in progress round about, it can be still more enlightening, for it can explain, on the one hand, the vehemence of the opposition from peasants, feeling they were trapped by a rapidly rising tide; on the other hand, it can explain the fervour of the support coming from some of the gentry, who believed that the tide was running strongly in the direction of enclosure, and that the only problem remaining to be solved was how to make a just allocation of land between the interested parties. The strength of this last viewpoint was strongly manifest in 1656, when the final Parliamentary attempt was made to regulate enclosure. But long before that, enclosures by agreement were, in practice, making much headway. This can now be much better investigated, thanks to the initiative of Professor Maurice Beresford; a considerable sample of Chancery Decrees has been indexed, and among these are many enclosure agreements.¹²

In tune with a wider interest in riots and revolts and how they start, some work has also been directed at the outbreaks of violence associated with enclosure. John Walter's article on the Oxfordshire rising of 1596, when a bad harvest drove up grain prices, is a good example, which examines the discontent at Bletchington alongside contemporary experience of enclosures in surrounding parishes. The identification of people, places, and the personal interconnections here goes a long way towards making the local controversy more intelligible, as well as helping to explain the background to the arguments used by individuals in Parliament in favour of the two fresh anti-enclosure acts, which were passed immediately afterwards, in 1597.¹³ We also see in this example the possibility of learning more about the purposes of other agrarian legislation by enquiring into the circumstances and experiences of the MPs who spoke for it, in debates in the Commons or outside.

Agricultural techniques were comparatively briefly dealt with in vol. iv of the *Agrarian History*, although the one chapter devoted to them endeavoured to show the value of contemporary books of husbandry in describing practices not explained elsewhere. Since then the merits of the books and the personal experience of three authors have been further investigated, showing the close relationship between bookish

¹² M. W. Beresford, 'The Decree Rolls of Chancery as a Source for Economic History, 1547–c.1700', *EcHR*, 2nd ser., xxxii, 1, 1979.

¹³ John Walter, 'A "Rising of the People"? The Oxfordshire Rising of 1596', *Past and Present*, 107, 1985. For a contribution on the social class of the ringleaders who broke down enclosures, see Roger B. Manning, 'Patterns of Violence in Early Tudor Enclosure Riots', *Albion*, vi, 2, 1974.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-36882-7 - Agricultural Change: Policy and Practice, 1500-1750

Edited by Joan Thirsk

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

5

advice and practice found among both authors and readers.¹⁴ There remain, however, many opportunities, not yet fully grasped, for using the textbooks to illuminate other records.

The major innovations in agricultural practice were handled in much more detail by Eric Kerridge in *The Agricultural Revolution*, published in 1967. He devoted seven separate chapters to ley farming, fen drainage, fertilizers, the floating of water meadows, new crops, new systems, and new stock.¹⁵ Since he used the books of late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century writers to describe some of the earlier practices, however, care is needed when comparing these accounts with the evidence from earlier days, for it cannot be assumed that the procedures of 1800 were all as well developed two hundred years before.

Even in the seven chapters of Professor Kerridge's book, not all innovations received their due space. Least informative was the chapter of fifteen pages on new livestock, which discussed sheep and cattle but said nothing of pigs, and gave only a paragraph to horses. On the subject of livestock breeding, we now have a notable new study by Nicholas Russell on the breeding of horses, cattle, and sheep.¹⁶ On rabbits a book-length study by John Sheail in 1971 has been supplemented by another article on their significance in agriculture between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries.¹⁷ No one has yet tackled the poultry business, though a hint of its commercial importance by the later seventeenth century around Horsham in Sussex occurs in Brian Short's account of poultry cramming in the late nineteenth century.¹⁸

Agricultural innovations leading to the improvement of grassland have been studied from several different angles. Carolina Lane has shown the new attention paid to the composition of grassland from the sixteenth century onwards, while John Broad has publicized a significant shift of interest from temporary leys to permanent pasture in parts of the East Midlands in the later seventeenth century.¹⁹ Professor Kerridge's account of watermeadows, especially in Wiltshire, has been amplified by another careful study of their seventeenth-century spread

¹⁴ Joan Thirsk, 'Plough and Pen: Agricultural Writers in the Seventeenth Century', in T. H. Aston *et al.*, eds., *Social Relations and Ideas. Essays in Honour of R. H. Hilton*, Cambridge, 1983.

¹⁵ Eric Kerridge, *The Agricultural Revolution*, London, 1967.

¹⁶ Nicholas Russell, *Like Engend'ring Like. Heredity and Animal Breeding in Early Modern England*, Cambridge, 1986.

¹⁷ John Sheail, *Rabbits and their History*, Newton Abbot, 1971; *idem*, 'Rabbits and Agriculture in Post-Medieval England', *J. Hist. Geog.*, IV, 4, 1978.

¹⁸ Brian Short, '"The Art and Craft of Chicken Cramming": Poultry in the Weald of Sussex, 1850-1950', *AHR*, xxx, 1, 1982, p. 19.

¹⁹ Carolina Lane, 'The Development of Pastures and Meadows during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', *AHR*, xxviii, 1, 1980; John Broad, 'Alternative Husbandry and Permanent Pasture in the Midlands, 1650-1800', *AHR*, xxviii, 2, 1980.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-36882-7 - Agricultural Change: Policy and Practice, 1500-1750

Edited by Joan Thirsk

Excerpt

[More information](#)

6

INTRODUCTION

in Dorset.²⁰ The use, or rather revived use, of lime in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries has been traced in Devon, and its value described, not only on sour pastures, but in increasing the effectiveness of other manures used on arable land.²¹

Questions about new plant varieties, how and where they were introduced in the early modern period, have not yet been tackled, despite the hints given in contemporary writings, but the process by which new crops and systems were spread has excited considerable interest among both geographers and historians. The diffusion of turnips and clover in East Anglia is being studied in a new way, made possible by using the computer to record and map all references occurring in probate inventories.²² In two other investigations with a somewhat different emphasis, the social history of diffusion has been extended by identifying the individuals, and hence the classes of people, who were responsible for the spread of clover in Wales, and of tobacco in England.²³

Closer contact between botanists and historians has resulted in a lively debate on the possibility of dating hedgerows by counting the number of species of shrubs found in them. A large number of shrub species, it is suggested, denotes the much greater age of the hedge; the method has even been used to suggest the date of enclosure. Lively discussion on the reliability of this method of dating continues; in the end its validity can only be judged from a multitude of hedgerow samplings tested against sound documentary evidence. But it underlines the potential value of a closer alliance between botanists, ecologists, and historians.²⁴

Agricultural tools have not yet found their historian, with the result that much remains to be learned of improvements in their design and their geographical distribution in the early modern period. The modest literature so far available on the subject can be gauged from a substantial bibliography, published in 1984, of wider chronological scope.²⁵ As

²⁰ J. H. Bettey, 'The Development of Water Meadows in Dorset during the Seventeenth Century', *AHR*, xxv, 1, 1977.

²¹ Michael Havinden, 'Lime as a Means of Agricultural Improvement: the Devon Example', in C. W. Chalklin and M. A. Havinden, eds., *Rural Change and Urban Growth, 1500-1800*, London, 1974.

²² Mark Overton, 'The Diffusion of Agricultural Innovations in Early Modern England: Turnips and Clover in Norfolk and Suffolk, 1580-1740', *Trans. Institute of British Geographers*, new ser., x, 1985.

²³ F. Emery, 'The Mechanics of Innovation: Clover Cultivation in Wales before 1750', *J. Hist. Geog.*, II, 1, 1976; Joan Thirsk, 'New crops and their Diffusion: Tobacco-Growing in Seventeenth-Century England', in *idem*, *The Rural Economy of England*, London, 1985.

²⁴ See, for example, M. D. Hooper *et al.*, *Hedges and Local History*, Standing Conference for Local History, National Council of Social Service, London, 1971; John Hall, 'Hedgerows in West Yorkshire: the Hooper Method Examined', *Yorks. Archaeolog. J.*, LIV, 1982.

²⁵ Raine Morgan, *Farm Tools, Implements, and Machines in Britain. Pre-history to 1945: a Bibliography*, Univ. of Reading and British Agric. Hist. Soc., 1984.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-36882-7 - Agricultural Change: Policy and Practice, 1500-1750

Edited by Joan Thirsk

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

7

regards transport on the farm, the use of more commodious farm wagons, in the seventeenth century, in place of two-wheeled carts, has been analysed regionally and chronologically in the county of Huntingdonshire.²⁶ It has yielded surprises, for it was expected to show their increasing use on grain farms, whereas, in fact, they first appeared in some numbers in the pastoral areas of the county. Also noticeable in this study, though less surprising, was their frequency on the larger, enclosed farms. The complexity of factors governing the spread of new ways in farming is clearly not yet well understood, and our inspired guesses can turn out to be very wide of the mark.

The productivity of agriculture in the early modern period has prompted much speculation by economic historians and some investigations of yields, costs, and prices. The larger framework of this question is presented in the chapters assembled in volume 1 of this paperback series. But the issue is also interwoven with the question of changing farming methods and the use of land, for every technical change can be assumed to have affected productivity in some way or other. Yet historians, speculating on this score, concentrate on certain innovations only, considering mainly those affecting grain. In general, it has been argued that agricultural improvements in the early modern period raised productivity per acre. Dr Outhwaite, however, has recently turned the other side of the coin, and reminded us that by extending the cultivated area on to less good land farmers may have lowered *average* arable productivity.²⁷ This is certainly thought to have occurred in not dissimilar circumstances, during the period of population growth before the Black Death. The clear evidence of a grain surplus by the mid-seventeenth century strongly supports the view that total grain production rose significantly between 1550 and 1650, but assertions about the rise of average productivity per acre may well be over-bold.

JOAN THIRSK

TITHES

While the introduction of new crops has not yet drawn more historians to study the tithe disputes which they provoked, two publications since

²⁶ Stephen Porter, 'Farm Transport in Huntingdonshire, 1610-1749', *J. Transport History*, 3rd ser., III, 1982.

²⁷ R. B. Outhwaite, 'Progress and Backwardness in English Agriculture, 1500-1650', *ECHR*, 2nd ser., xxxix, 1, 1986. For a discussion of the separate issue of yields of wheat per acre, in the eighteenth century only, see M. Turner, 'Agricultural Productivity in England in the Eighteenth Century: Evidence from Crop Yields', *ECHR*, 2nd ser., xxxv, 1982, and two comments on this in *ECHR*, 2nd ser., xxxvii, 2, 1984.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-36882-7 - Agricultural Change: Policy and Practice, 1500-1750

Edited by Joan Thirsk

Excerpt

[More information](#)

1986 have added to our knowledge of the tithe controversy during the English Revolution. Dr Morrill has suggested that the main reason for the interruption of tithe payments was not principled Puritan objections to the compulsory maintenance of a clergy from the fruits of the land, but specific “tithe strikes” against the “intruded clergy”, who replaced ejected ministers during the 1640s.²⁸ The instances cited are few in number but add to the increasingly persuasive case for only limited disruption to established religious practice in the provinces.

What gave ordinary parishioners little more trouble than normal in the 1640s and 1650s could, however, destroy any fragile unity which remained among the puritan sectaries and assorted religious zealots who lumbered and postured their way through the constitutional china shop. Professor Woolrych adds fresh evidence of the critical importance of the tithe question in effecting the collapse of the Barebones Parliament in 1653. The close vote to reject the Tithe Committee’s proposal to maintain tithe payments for “approved” ministers was important both for itself and as final confirmation that the nominated Parliament could not perform the task which it had undertaken of effecting dutiful, principled government by the Godly. Cromwell’s continuation of tithe payments until the system could be replaced by “a provision less subject to scruple and contention” was a barely concealed admission of the intractability of the tithe problem in republican England.²⁹

The appearance of two major studies on the tithe files of the 1830s and 1840s has relevance for a student of tithes in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, since reference was frequently made in the files not only to disputes but also to earlier compromises and accommodations over tithe which were sanctioned or (less frequently) abandoned during the process of commutation.³⁰ These studies are a major advance in tithe scholarship and deserve wide consultation.

ERIC EVANS

MARKET GARDENING

Since no chapter in volume IV was devoted entirely to market gardening, and chapter 18 in volume V (ch. 6 below) concentrated mostly on market gardening in the period after 1640, more deserves to be said about the chronology of commercial gardening over the longer

²⁸ J. S. Morrill, ‘The Church in England’, in J. S. Morrill, ed., *Reactions to the English Civil War*, London 1982, pp. 89–114.

²⁹ A. Woolrych, *Commonwealth to Protectorate*, Oxford, 1982, pp. 235–50, 347, 373.

³⁰ R. Kain and H. Prince, *The Tithe Surveys of England and Wales*, Cambridge, 1985, and R. Kain, *An Atlas and Index of the Tithe Files of Mid-Nineteenth-Century England and Wales*, Cambridge, 1986.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-36882-7 - Agricultural Change: Policy and Practice, 1500-1750

Edited by Joan Thirsk

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

9

period, and the social and economic status of gardeners pursuing this new occupation.

Long before the mid-sixteenth century, when the first professional market gardeners began trading in England, seeds, plants and vegetables were sold by the gardeners of large houses, royal palaces, colleges and monasteries both at the garden gate and in markets. A sizeable trade in seeds was carried on: onion, leek, and cabbage seed was purchased in bulk by colleges and monasteries from the thirteenth century onwards. Such institutions also sold surplus seeds, and common vegetable seeds could be purchased at fairs. Merchants sent packhorse loads of leek seed from England for sale in Scotland in the thirteenth century. Garden seeds were imported from the Low Countries in the sixteenth century, and it appears that foreign seeds shipped by London merchants supplied a large share of the domestic market until well into the seventeenth century.³¹

From at least the fourteenth century the poor grew vegetables for themselves, and they would, in times of plenty, have taken any surplus to market. Langland's peasants grew peascods, leeks, cabbages, onions, parsley and chervil, and Chaucer's poor widow in the Nun's Priest's Tale had a bed of 'wortes' (cabbages) in her yard. In the 1570s Tusser advised husbandmen's wives to keep a well stocked kitchen and herb garden and Harrison observed that vegetables grew in the gardens of the poor. Justices were told to encourage the poor to grow roots in the early seventeenth century and, when the Diggers tried to transform society in the 1640s by cultivating the commons, they were derided as "poor people making bold with a little waste ground in Surrey to sow a few turnips and carrots to sustain their families". By the 1660s John Worlidge found "scarce a cottage in most of the southern parts of England, but hath its proportionate garden, so great a delight do most men take in it".³²

³¹ H. T. Riley, *Memorials of London and London Life*, London, 1868, pp. 228–9; T. McLean, *Medieval English Gardens*, London, 1981, pp. 73–4; John H. Harvey, 'Vegetables in the Middle Ages,' *Garden History*, xii, 2, 1984, pp. 95–7; James E. Thorold Rogers, *A History of Agriculture and Prices in England*, Oxford, 1866–1902, I, p. 223; II, p. 594, III, pp. 206, 555, 559, 565; John H. Harvey, *Mediaeval Gardens*, London, 1981, p. 79; Dr. H. J. Smit, 'Brennen tot de Gerschiedenis von den hande met Engeland, Schotland, en Ierland,' *Rijks Geschiedkundige Publicatien*, '5-Gravenhage, 86, 1942, pp. 385, 523, 694; Brian Dietz, ed., *The Port and Trade of Early Elizabethan London: Documents*, London Rec. Soc., 1972, pp. 63, 78; Miles Hadfield, *A History of British Gardening*, London, 1969, p. 46; William Harrison, *The Description of England*, Georges Edden, ed., New York, 1968, p. 264; John Harvey, *Early Nurserymen*, London, 1974, pp. 30–1.

³² William Langland, *Piers the Ploughman*, ed. J. F. Goodridge, London, 1959, p. 89; *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson, Oxford, 1966, p. 203; Thomas Tusser, *Five Hundred Points of Good Husbandry*, London, 1984, pp. 94–5; Harrison, *op. cit.*, p. 216; Norfolk RO, WLS XVII/2 410x5, f. 37 recto and verso; D. W. Petegorsky, *Left-Wing Democracy in the English Civil War*, London, 1940, pp. 164–5; John Worlidge, *Systema Horticulturae*, London, 1677, p. 175.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-36882-7 - Agricultural Change: Policy and Practice, 1500-1750

Edited by Joan Thirsk

Excerpt

[More information](#)

The development of full-time market gardening around London and other large towns was an inevitable result of the sustained growth of England's population in the century before 1640 and the consequent rise in population of the capital and most provincial towns. Given no dramatic changes in transport, the response of suburban agriculture to ever larger concentrations of landless town dwellers was, as von Thünen later postulated, more intensive food production as a whole, with most intensive production on land nearest the market. Producers turned increasingly to spade cultivation and row culture, to eliminating fallows, applying large quantities of fertilizers, and concentrating on high yielding vegetables: in short, gardening. Little horticultural expertise was needed to raise carrots, cabbages and turnips, and some of those who in sixteenth-century England grew these vegetables for their own families turned to full-time gardening.³³

Certain accidents of history influenced the early years of market gardening. Dutch and Flemish gardeners who settled in East Anglia and Kent from the middle of the sixteenth century provided a vital boost to the infant industry. They were experienced in both the technical and commercial aspects of gardening, and their fellow immigrants provided an immediate source of demand. These foreigners took market gardening to many places in southern and eastern England; their success prompted Englishmen to emulate them.

The foreign gardeners and the experience of food shortages after the terrible grain harvests in the 1590s greatly stimulated gardening around London in the early seventeenth century. The Dutch gardeners in East Anglia shipped many tons of roots to London for sale to the poor in the famine years and were later credited with the introduction of gardening to Surrey in about 1600. Bulk production of carrots, turnips and parsnips by native producers to the west of London was much increased in the period 1600 to 1630, encouraged by the success of such vegetables as alternative food when grain was scarce.³⁴

The shock of near famine encouraged Richard Gardiner of Shrewsbury to write, in 1599, by far the best practical work on vegetable gardening then published, forcefully advocating market gardening as the way to feed the poor. Other writers, such as John Norden, also urged root production to relieve hunger. An order from the Lord Chief

³³ *Von Thünen's Isolated State*, tr. C. M. Wartenberg, ed. P. Hall, Oxford, 1966; Hadfield, *op. cit.*, pp. 48–9; Tusser, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

³⁴ William Boys, *Collections for an History of Sandwich, Canterbury*, 1792, pp. 361, 747; *The Walloon Church of Norwich: Its Registers and History*, W. J. C. Moens, ed., Huguenot Soc. of London, I, 1887–8, p. 262; PRO, E190, 594/9; E190, 474/17; E190, 480/5; E190, 477/8; E190, 481/11; Samuel Hartlib, *His Legacie, or an Enlargement of the Discours of Husbandrie Used in Brabant and Flanders*, 2nd edn, London, 1652, pp. 8–9; Corp. of London RO, City Repertories, 49, ff. 261–3.