Unfortunately, Waites does not compare class structures on either side of the line and the distribution statistics which he uses to support his argument of significant income redistribution do not take geographical factors into account. An equally important limitation on his analysis is his adoption of the old sociological orthodoxy that a woman's position was determined by the male head of the household. Waites sets "aside any special consideration of women in the class structure and the war's impact on their condition and experiences" (6), even though the book'dust-cover shows a woman munitions worker.

There are few scholarly studies of the complex relationship between class and nation, the ambiguities and accommodations of which point to power relationships and social tensions. Waites' analysis is a welcome first attempt to deal with those issues during the Great War. The author perhaps sees the changes as greater than his evidence always suggests and there are some contradictions in the book. But, Waites recognises that he cannot come up with a definitive statement on class and industrialised warfare. This is a thoughtful and provocative work which raises more questions than it answers.

Gerald Jordan
York University

* * *

W.L. Warren — *The Governance of Norman and Angevin England 1086-1272*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987. Pp. xv, 237.

The first criterion for review of any monograph ought to be whether or not the study is a significant addition to the already existing literature. By that standard this volume is redundant. Chapters one and two recapitulate data to be found in any standard text of medieval England; indeed, Chapter two repeats in small the already published first volume of the series — The Governance of England — of which Warren's is the second volume. Chapter three, four and five are adapted from Warren's masterful *Henry II* (1973). The other chapters, numbers six and seven, cover the period 1189-1272, about which there are surely writings in abundance — even, perhaps, already too many.

The subliminal claims about The Governance in England Series, i.e., that there have been no comparable studies for the last two generations and that this series synthesizes recent research on English medieval government, not only defy logic but are palpable untrue. What is true is that although Warren lists all the studies which have been published in the twentieth century, he makes little or no use of them in his treatment of Anglo-Norman governance. Is it enough to cite an author, R.H.C. Davies, for instance, in *King Stephen* (1967), and not acknowledge that the argument one is making about the reign of Stephen is substantially that of the cited authority? Warren implies that his argument — that Stephen, as king, was deliberately planning a decentralized government — is his own; it is, in fact essentially Davis' argument.

There is another instance of this practice in Warren's study. He had early access to Marjorie Chibnall, *Anglo-Norman England 1066-1166* (1986). Chibnall argues, with considerable elegance, for the "gradual assimilation of Norman and English institutions over several decades" (2). Warren, citing her study because it reviews recent work (24, *Bibliographical Note)*, ignores all that she has written on the subject of the relationship of Norman and English institutions in order to argue that the Normans did not adapt Anglo-Saxon government. Given the absolute paucity of evidence — which Warren admits often — he ignores Chibnall at some peril.

One justification for yet another study on governance might be that the author had such felicity of language that he or she provides a new clarity or undestanding of abstruse arguments. In this instance no such justification exists. One example of tortuous language must suffice: "There were, of course, some laws defined by the crown of generally universal application embodied in 'law codes,'

but these were supplements to custom or modifications of custom not codifications of customs; ..." (43); what is the antecedent of "these"?

The monograph also includes errors of judgment or fact. Does anyone believe that, in the year 1087-1135, "[e]states with no heir reverted to the crown *and could be rented out or sold off* ..." (77; italics mine)? Everything else in chapter three contradict such a contention — as it should.

Finally, a study of governance might be quite welcome if the author incorporates new insights about neglected groups or individuals, or reveals particular sensitivity in the use of evidence. This monograh, however, is content to repeat, mindlessly, the characterization of Matilda, the daughter of Henry I, as one who "behaved with ... imperious arrogance" (90). Monastic chroniclers, from whom this particular piece of misogyny comes, are notoriously imperfect judges of character, particularly women. Surely it is time to realize that and to make allowances for women who dared to assert their rights, as Matilda did.

Warren had no hesitation in dealing with a similar assessment of character when it was a male involved: the justiciar Longchamp was "accused of acting with autocratic arrogance" (131). In the latter instance Warren doubts Longchamp was any more autocratic than Glanville had been.

Warren's elegant familiarity with the sources of Anglo-Saxon and Norman England, and his use of incidental evidence in reconstructing the governance of post-Conquest England, must not be denied. He makes particularly persuasive use of the coinage of the realm in his argument about Stephen's government. He has, certaintly, provided an important bibliography. If Chibnall had not so recently published her study, with its bibliography and historiography, Warren's monograph would have been a more particularly valuable bibliographical contribution.

Donna L. Boutelle
California State University, Long Beach

* * *