would indeed lead to change and action; in other words, the means of literacy could be used to different ends. This optimistic conclusion may be refreshing to readers depressed by the sobering historical analysis but it also seems inconsistent with Graff’s own argument. Certainly, Graff emphasizes that human agency makes the historical process but he constantly demonstrates that literacy reinforces rather than alters the basic social formation. Thus, literacy could perhaps be a force for change in Galtung’s sense but only after “critical and constructive people” had already gotten hold of the reins of power. The book’s emphasis on social and cultural hegemony (facilitated by mass literacy) seems to offer no hope that this possibility can be reasonably expected by those with an informed historical perspective.

The Legacies of Literacy is thus an ambitious and stimulating attempt to synthesize recent studies within the diverse and changing historical contexts of Western society. By assembling the findings of an enormous secondary literature, Graff is able to insist over and over on the importance of appreciating the complexity of reading and writing as both individual and social activities whose meanings have never been uniform. While some readers may be tempted to view this complexity as evidence of the continued vitality of ethnic and cultural pluralism (despite the ambitions of public schooling and other modernization forces), Graff emphasizes hegemony and control, the “negative” (264) and predominant side of literacy. Similarly, Graff’s view of the past lends no support to those who see literacy programmes as essential to solving the social and economic problems of the Third World. He is relatively sympathetic to the work of those such as Paolo Freire but, in addition to the severe limits of the surrounding material context of such work, Graff suspects that any national programme would inevitably be a double-edged sword opening both the potential for personal fulfillment and the reality of ideological standardization and, therefore, oppression. History according to Graff teaches that social reproduction (and the hegemonic myth of literacy) rather than social change would result. This major book is therefore required reading not only for social historians but also for policy-makers and activists.

Chad Gaffield
University of Ottawa

* * *


In Capital Marx was intrigued by the “intermediary forms” making up “the background of Modern Industry” that altered the traditional links between handicrafts and agriculture (1906, 559-60). Contemporary theorists and historians of proto-industrialization, largely silent about Marx’s interest in their subject, have decisively advanced our historical understanding of the “background” of industrialization. Gay L. Gullickson’s Spinners and Weavers of Auffay adds appreciably to this history by focusing on the commune of Auffay in the pays de Caux of Normandy famous for its cereal cultivation, as a pays d’ élevage, and for its cottage industry. Auffay, in the department of Seine Maritime, has today a population of about 1,700 inhabitants and had some 1,000 in the eighteenth century. Gullickson’s study decisively invites reconsideration of the current historical representation of proto-industrialization. Her history presents a nuanced account of Auffay’s spinners and weavers, their unions as wives and husbands, their families, the gender distribution of their productive tasks, the decisions attending the ages of marriage, numbers of children, the frequency of remarriage by widows and widowers, the bearing of children out of wedlock; the periodization of the working experiences of spinners and weavers as the transition from proto-industrialization to industrialization compelled their loss of autonomy.

Gullickson in refashioning the debate on proto-industrialism places in question the accepted conventional necessary, sufficient causal conditions for proto-industrialism offered by Franklin F.
Mendels, Rudolf Braun, and David Levine. Her common sense historical proposal is that different paths were taken by different societies to develop and sustain the skills and material conditions appropriate to proto-industrial production. According to philosophers and theologians, God is in the details and in this history the details signify the presence of Clio.

Sidney Pollard entitled his recent history *The Peaceful Conquest: The Industrialization of Europe 1760-1970* (1981). Gullickson's history is not concerned with any peace that surpasses understanding in the history of proto-industrialism, but with the strategy of survival adopted by spinners, weavers and their families. The years 1751 in Auffay are presented as the best of times for spinners; the thirty years 1787 to 1817 as the critical time of transition from cottage spinning to that of the mill; and the period 1818 to 1850 as establishing the preponderance of mechanical weaving. Interestingly, when spinning jennies and mules lessened employment for women as spinners, they became the primary labor force in cottage weaving depriving men of their claims to superior strength and skills. At the same time by 1850 women made up between one quarter and two-fifths of the agrarian labor force in the *pays de Caux*.

The reader of this splendid history, where the burden of change prevails over its subjects, is inclined to reflect again on the insistence of Martine Segalen, in her *Mari et Femme dans la societe paysanne* (1980), on the complementarity of tasks and authority shared by husbands and wives in maintaining the unity of family culture in rural France. And similarly to consider again the collective work of Danièle Auffray, Thierry Baudouin, Michèle Collin, and Alain Guillerm *Feux et lieux: histoire d'une famille et d'un pays face à la societe industrielle* (1980). The history of a family responding to industrialization in a manner to be described as characterized by: “Ni immoralité, nifuite, la geste familiale se transforme, s'adapte aux mutations économiques pour mieux se préserver de ses coups plus terribles” (19).

The complexities and analytical problems central to the history of proto-industrialization propose that some shift from micro historical narrative and analysis is in order. There is need for a covering law to bring together the diverse causes of proto-industrialization generated by studies having the great merit of Gullickson’s case history. Here William Reddy’s *The Rise of Market Culture: The Textile Trade and French Society 1750-1900* (1984) is of paramount significance. The destiny of the spinners and weavers of Auffay was surely mapped by their limited resources and vulnerability as *entrepreneurs* unequal to the risks they assumed in the asymmetrical market culture identified by its historian Reddy.

Edward T. Gargan

*University of Wisconsin-Madison*

---


Une collaboration toujours plus étroite et féconde entre des médiévistes canadiens et l’Université de Provence a permis la publication de ce court recueil d’articles sur le bas Moyen Âge provençal et piémontais. Bien qu’il procède d’un vaste projet de recherche bien structuré et déjà proche de son terme, « L’horizon 1300 à Manosque », l’ouvrage offre en quelque sorte un avant-goût des conclusions de cette enquête sur la société d’une petite ville de Haute-Provence, particulièrement bien pourvue en archives criminelles, pendant les temps de « crise » que furent les XIIIᵉ et XIVᵉ siècles. Michel Hébert s’aventure donc dans la prospective en présentant dès à présent un bilan des travaux en cours, bilan qui fut dressé il est vrai à titre provisoire au cours d’une table ronde tenue à Montréal il y a trois ans. Dans l’optique d’une réflexion globale sur l’évolution de la société à la fin du Moyen Âge, il convient donc de considérer ces quelques études comme les premières pierres d’un édifice en construction.