
ECO 2210Y

Topic No. 25: Enclosures in Tudor-Stuart England, c.1485 - 1640

Demography, Sheep, and the Cloth Trade

1. Joan Thirsk, Tudor Enclosures (London, 1958; reissued 1967), in 21 pages. See also Joan Thirsk, 'Enclosing and Engrossing,' in J. Thirsk, ed., The Agrarian History of England and Wales, Vol. IV: 1500-1640 (Cambridge, 1967), chapter 4, pp. 200 - 56.
2. Christopher Clay, Economic Expansion and Social Change: England, 1500-1700, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1984), Vol.I: People, Land, and Towns, pp. 53-101, 102-41.
3. Ian Blanchard, 'Population Change, Enclosure, and the Early Tudor Economy,' Economic History Review, 2nd ser. 23 (1970), 427-45. See also: Christopher Dyer, 'Deserted Medieval Villages in the West Midlands,' Economic History Review, 2nd ser. 35 (Feb. 1982), 19-34.
4. John Martin, 'Sheep and Enclosure in Sixteenth-Century Northamptonshire,' Agricultural History Review, 36 (1988), 39-54. [See also Tawney and Cohen-Weitzman, below]
5. Peter Bowden, The Wool Trade in Tudor and Stuart England (London, 1962), chapter 1. See also Peter J. Bowden, 'The Home Market in Wool, 1500-1700,' Yorkshire Bulletin of Economic and Social Research, 8 (1956).
6. J.R. Wordie, 'The Chronology of English Enclosure, 1500-1914,' Economic History Review, 2nd ser. 36 (1983), 483-505. See also John Chapman, 'The Chronology of English Enclosure' and J.R. Wordie, 'The Chronology of English Enclosures: A Reply,' both in The Economic History Review, 2nd ser. 37 (Nov. 1984), 557-62.

Landlords, Capitalists, Enclosures, and Productivity: the Exploitation Thesis

7. Richard H. Tawney, The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century (1912: re-issued with an introduction by Lawrence Stone, 1967). Read at least Stone's introduction, Tawney's own introduction in Part I, chapter 1; and Part II, ch. 1; and Part III, ch. 2 (Conclusions).
8. Eric Kerridge, Agrarian Problems in the Sixteenth Century and After (Historical Problems: Studies and Documents no. 6; London, 1969), pp. 17-31, 94-136. A trenchant rebuttal of Tawney.
9. Jon Cohen and Martin Weitzman, 'A Marxian Model of Enclosures,' Journal of Development Economics, 1 (1975), 287-336; and/or their 'Enclosure and Depopulation: A Marxian Analysis,' in W.M. Parker and E.L. Jones, ed., European Peasants and Their Markets (Princeton, 1975), pp. 161-76. See also Karl Marx, Capital, (English edition of 1887, edited by Frederick Engels), Vol. I, part viii: 'The So-Called Primitive Accumulation,' pp. 713-41.
10. Stefano Fenoaltea, 'On a Marxian Model of Enclosures,' Journal of Development Economics, 3 (1976), 195-98: followed by Jon Cohen and Martin Weitzman, 'Reply to Fenoaltea,' pp. 199-200.
11. Donald McCloskey, 'The Economics of Enclosure,' in William Parker and E.L. Jones, ed., European Peasants and Their Markets (1975), pp. 123-60.
12. Robert Brenner, 'Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe,' Past and Present, no. 70 (Feb. 1976), 30-75; reprinted in T. H. Aston and C.H.E. Philipin, eds., The

- Brenner Debate: Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe (Cambridge, 1987), which also includes Robert Brenner, 'The Agrarian Roots of European Capitalism,' Past and Present, No. 97 (Nov. 1982), 16-113. For the most important critic see: J. P. Cooper, 'In Search of Agrarian Capitalism,' Past and Present, no. 80 (August 1978), 20-65, also reprinted in this volume.
13. R. W. Hoyle, 'Tenure and the Land Market in Early-Modern England: Or a Late Contribution to the Brenner Debate,' Economic History Review, 2nd ser. 43 (Feb. 1990), 1 - 20.
 14. Gregory Clark, 'The Cost of Capital and Medieval Agricultural Technique,' Explorations in Economic History, 25 (July 1988), 265-94; and the reply, E. L. Jones, 'Enclosure, Land Improvement, and the Price of Capital: A Comment,' Explorations in Economic History, 27 (July 1990), 350-55; followed by: Gregory Clark, 'Enclosure, Land Improvement, and the Price of Capital: A Reply to Jones,' pp. 356-62.
 15. Gregory Clark, 'Land Hunger: Land as a Commodity and as a Status Good, England, 1500 - 1910,' Explorations in Economic History, 35:1 (January 1998), 59-82; Gregory Clark, 'Commons Sense: Common Property Rights, Efficiency, and Institutional Change,' Journal of Economic History, 58:1 (March 1998), 73-102; John Chapman, 'Charities, Rents, and Enclosure: A Comment on Clark,' and Gregory Clark, 'In Defense of 'Commons Sense': Reply to Chapman,' Journal of Economic History, 59:2 (June 1999), 447-50, 451-55.
 16. Robert Allen, 'The Two English Agricultural Revolutions, 1450-1850,' Bruce M. S. Campbell and Mark Overton, eds., Land, Labour and Livestock: Historical Studies in European Agricultural Productivity (Manchester and New York, 1991), pp. 236-54. See criticisms of Allen's methodology in Paul Glennie, 'Measuring Crop Yields in Early Modern England,' pp. 255-83.
 17. Robert C. Allen, Enclosure and the Yeoman: The Agricultural Development of the South Midlands, 1450 - 1850 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).
 18. Mark Overton, Agricultural Revolution in England: The Transformation of the Agrarian Economy, 1500 - 1800 (Cambridge, 1996), especially pp. 147-82, expressing views quite contrary to those of Robert Allen.

QUESTIONS:

1. What were the major phases of Tudor-Stuart Enclosures: when did they begin, and how? What is meant by 'enclosure,' and what forms did it take in Tudor-Stuart England? Discuss enclosing, engrossing, land reclamation, and their differences.
2. What were the basic causes of enclosure and engrossing: and how did such causes vary over time from the mid-15th to the late-17th centuries? How did the causes and forms of enclosure vary by regions in England? What role did demography play – both demographic decline and demographic growth; what role did the English cloth-export trade and the demand for wool play?
3. How did enclosures affect the property rights of peasant tenants; and did enclosure/engrossing necessarily mean 'depopulation': in what types of enclosure, in what regions, in what periods? Could enclosures and agrarian change subsequently lead to increased employment and population? Differentiate the economic consequences by region and period.
4. Why did landlords engage in or permit enclosures: what were their economic and social motivations? Did landlords 'capture' all the economic rent on land as a result of enclosure? Who gained and who lost by enclosures? Differentiate by type of landholder, region, and period; and discuss the differences in the economic and social consequences of these enclosures.