

cas du corsaire le *Duc d'Ayen* où 36 des 48 membres de l'équipage présentent au capitaine un procès-verbal rédigé à bord qui demande de cesser la course et de rentrer au port d'attache (p. 79). Les officiers-mariniers apparaissent presque toujours au premier plan de la mutinerie car, par leur formation et leur origine sociale, ils sont plus aptes à mener la contestation. Rien de vraiment spectaculaire dans la plupart de ces soulèvements dont les causes renvoient à la personnalité du capitaine, à une mauvaise alimentation, à l'ivresse, ou encore à une mésentente sur le mode de rémunération.

Certains lecteurs regretteront peut-être que l'auteur n'ait pas distingué davantage la désobéissance individuelle de la désobéissance collective. La distinction semble importante. Dans le premier cas, le conflit concerne quelques individus qui s'affrontèrent généralement de façon spontanée et violente. L'issue en est parfois fatale. Le deuxième type apparaît comme une action plus organisée, voire même préparée pendant une période assez longue. Elle se déroule dans le calme et se termine souvent bien. D'autres lecteurs trouveront peut-être que l'auteur n'a pas suffisamment insisté sur le développement de l'action ainsi que sur les mots et les gestes des acteurs. Il est vrai qu'il passe rapidement d'un cas à un autre et nous prive parfois de descriptions intéressantes de cas particuliers. Mais il ne s'agit là que de remarques de détail.

Le deuxième enseignement de ce livre réside dans la belle recension que fait Cabantous des moyens de répression des mutineries et des désertions. Même si d'après l'ordonnance de la Marine de 1681 l'auteur d'un acte séditieux est susceptible de la peine de mort, les autorités se montrent dans la pratique plutôt tolérantes et généreuses envers les coupables. Ceux-ci sont souvent graciés dans la mesure où ils peuvent justifier leur insoumission - par exemple, à la suite d'un mauvais traitement. Il est fréquent de supprimer la ration de vin ou de pain, de recourir à l'exposition forcée et de châtier avec le fouet. Dans les pires cas, le coupable est condamné à la « cale » : ce châtiment consistait à le hisser, au moyen d'une corde, jusqu'au bout de la grande vergue et de le laisser tomber subitement à la mer (p.115). Sa chute était souvent mortelle. Autre manifestation de désobéissance, la désertion fait l'objet de punitions et de réglemens particuliers. Les peines sont infligées en fonction des circonstances et de la durée de la fuite. Elles sont nombreuses et diversifiées, allant d'une simple restitution des avances à une condamnation aux galères, et parfois jusqu'à la peine capitale. De nouveau, l'auteur se garde bien d'exagérer le phénomène. Il rappelle que la marine française ne connaît pas la « presse » (l'embarquement forcé) et que les déserteurs ne représentent jamais plus de 2 % à 3 % des inscrits maritimes. La désertion atteint des proportions beaucoup plus élevées en Angleterre où la presse est pratique courante. Pendant les guerres de Sept Ans et d'Indépendance américaine, toujours plus de 12 % des marins anglais sont portés déserteurs (p. 91).

Ce livre est neuf et stimulant. Il remet en cause bon nombre d'idées reçues sur les mutineries et nuance fortement le stéréotype du mutin et du déserteur. L'auteur situe admirablement ces gens de mer dans leur contexte socio-culturel et il explique d'une manière convaincante leurs comportements. Nul doute que son ouvrage représente une contribution importante à l'histoire et à l'ethnologie des populations maritimes. De plus, il est écrit dans un style clair et vivant, toujours agréable à lire.

Laurier TURGEON
Université Laval

* * *

PETER CLARK — *The English Alehouse: A Social History, 1200-1830*. New York and London: Longman, 1983. Pp. xiv, 353.

Peter Clark is no stranger to social history, and *The English Alehouse* is social history at its best: the facts are there, but so, too, are the persuasive interpretations and the long-term trends. The book is divided into four sections covering *circa* 1200-1500, 1500-1660 (the core of the book), 1660-1750, and 1750-1830.

After distinguishing an alehouse from an inn and a tavern and after discussing the misty, medieval gestation and birth of the alehouse, Clark skillfully attacks the thorny problem of estimating the number of alehouses. He is acutely aware of the need to include unlicensed alehouses if he is to determine the importance of alehousekeeping. While trying to avoid, in his words, "building statistical castles in the air" (p. 45), Clark convincingly argues that the ratio of alehouses to inhabitants was one to fewer than 100 by the early Stuart period, falling to one to 282 by 1830. Clark embeds the alehouse in ever-changing contexts and proposes a relationship between number and location of alehouses and living standards, Puritanism, demographic changes, and physical mobility.

With quantitative analysis and anecdotal evidence, Clark demonstrates that alehouses were not mere boozing dens. Alehouses were numerous and popular because they fulfilled physical and psychological needs. Customers frequented alehouses for drink and food, fellowship, tobacco, entertainment, lodging, and information, and to ratify agreements, settle disputes, conduct private and governmental business, marry clandestinely, and sell a wife (a lower-class form of divorce). Throughout the centuries covered by Clark, unskilled and semi-skilled workers comprised the largest group of customers, although by the eighteenth century the more wealthy also visited alehouses. In the earlier centuries especially, alesellers, most of whom were male and many of whom were newly arrived in their communities, sold beer as a form of by-employment. By the eighteenth century both buyers and sellers, reflecting an improving economy, were more prosperous than their predecessors.

Many alehousekeepers and patrons were not the type of people who left records, except in courts of law and probably as defendants. It is therefore not surprising that when Clark discusses these people he uses "maybe", "probably", and "perhaps". While uncertainty is also necessitated by his small samples of ten alehousekeepers here and eighteen there, most of Clark's samples are large enough for valid statistical comparisons.

Our perception of Tudor-Stuart alehouses is filtered through the hell-fire-damnation tracts of Puritans. Clark believes that the virulent criticisms were "almost certainly exaggerated" (p. 159). Interestingly, Clark de-emphasizes the importance of religion when he occasionally and correctly points to social divisions between lower-class sellers and buyers and middle- and upper-class critics.

By about 1600 "typling was virtually out of control" (p. 49) as alehouses proliferated. But within a century and a half "the alehouse problem" was under control, and the image of the alehouse improved until, by the early nineteenth century, it had evolved into the public house. The principal instrument of control, Clark argues, was the justice sitting at petty sessions and refusing to license alesellers who presumably would not have been licensed in earlier centuries. It can also be argued, however, that prior to the Civil War leet officials were the chief agents regulating alehouses and that their rapidly declining influence after the Civil War resulted in fewer prosecutions for illegal alehousekeeping. While greater vigilance by Restoration justices may partially explain the decline in reported unlawful activity associated with alehouses, the effect of the diminished role of leet officers must also be considered.

To what degree this improved image was due to the decline of Puritanism is unknown, Clark admits, but it probably was substantial. Other factors analyzed by Clark include less turnover among alesellers, fewer indigent customers, more lavish furnishings and specialized rooms, and the increased cost of operating an alehouse which excluded the poor from aleselling. By 1750 the alehousekeeper had become an "ally" of the political system.

But by the early nineteenth century the alehouse was in decline. Causes of decline parallel in reverse the reasons for the growing importance of the Tudor-Stuart alehouses: competitive drinks (gin, tea, coffee) now available, more numerous and available newspapers that provided information formerly obtained at the alehouse, the rise of more varied forms of entertainment available outside the alehouse, and the eclipse by the pawnbroker of the alehousekeeper as credit-lender.

Clark's book is refreshing because the title honestly represents the contents. Far too often a county study is masked by a title that suggests but does not contain a national perspective. Clark frequently points to differences between London and the provinces, north and south, east and west,

lowlands and highlands (also called “backward”, p. 204), rural and urban, and “open” and “closed” villages.

Valuable as this book is to a much-neglected topic, it has some weak spots. Clark does not consider whether court leet licensing of alesellers in some localities had any effect on the completeness of his sessional lists of alesellers. Clark is at his weakest when discussing drunkenness. Admittedly, “too little is known about levels of consumption” (p. 109), but his evidence and impressions indicate considerable consumption. Yet, he never comes to grips with the fact that very few persons were charged with drunkenness. This reviewer’s research indicates that fewer than one in 200 offenders at courts leet and quarter sessions were accused of drunkenness in Stuart England.

Clark’s stimulating book is impressively documented. He is exceptionally at home with secular and ecclesiastical manuscripts at all levels of authority and with their limitations, as well as with published primary and secondary works. The grouping of many references at the ends of paragraphs, however, annoyed this reader. The wealth of information, the encyclopedic documentation, and the sound arguments make this the standard work on early modern English alehouses. There are nine figures, twenty-one illustrations, and a useful index.

Walter J. KING
Northern State College, South Dakota

* * *

JEAN-LOUIS FLANDRIN — *Familles: Parenté, maison, sexualité dans l'ancienne société*. Paris : Éditions du Seuil, 1984.

Since the only difference between the 1976 and 1984 editions of Flandrin’s pioneering survey of families in early modern Europe (actually France and England) is an appended, up-dated bibliography, the reviewer can only assess how useful the original text still is and how useful a revised text would be.

Rereading *Familles: Parenté, maison, sexualité dans l'ancienne société* confirms initial impressions that the breadth of the undertaking, especially the attempt to combine anthropological, demographic, and “sentiments” approaches to the family, is its main contribution to the field. Although Flandrin pays homage to Lawrence Stone’s *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England*, his own survey remains far more nuanced, both in its awareness of variations in family forms and its sensitivity to family relationships. Conversely, the “review” edition revives earlier concern about internal contradictions in the interpretation and evidence. The contrast between its attention to the economic bases of family forms in the first chapters, and emphasis on religious reform and enlightened opinion as causes of the shift towards marital affection and parental concern in later chapters, is less acceptable since the appearance of J. Goody’s *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe* and R. Trumbach’s *The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship and Domestic Relations in Eighteenth Century England*. Neither is cited in the new bibliography. While Goody argues an economic motivation for the Church’s long-standing efforts to break down kin ties in favour of the conjugal family, Trumbach sees the economic and political security of the English aristocracy in the eighteenth century as responsible for their adoption of a domestic morality. More specifically, Flandrin contends that the new morality promoted family limitation, yet his own figures on fertility show different trends in different areas. Subsequent village studies reinforce the point that fertility can best be understood in the local economic context.

Elsewhere, too, the text would have benefited from revision in the light of the large number of specialized studies published since — and even before — 1976. In so far as Flandrin posited causal