after, while Fourcroy de Guillerville, whom she identifies as an “enlightened doctor” [p. 13], was in fact an army officer and legal officier who happened to write on child-rearing); and in that neither R. Chartier, M.M. Compère and D. Julia, L’Éducation en France du xvi<sup>e</sup> au xviii<sup>e</sup> siècle (Paris, 1976) nor F. Furet, J. Ozouf, et al., Lire et écrire: l’Alphabetisation des français de Calvin à Jules Ferry (Paris, 2 vols., 1977) appear in her extensive bibliography, one might question whether her knowledge of primary education under the old regime and up to the July Monarchy is adequate to allow her to recognize, rather than presume, significant changes, should they have occurred.

Strumingher is to be commended for not having contented herself with an analysis of Carraud’s texts, but for having investigated the author’s career and for attempting to trace the influence of her primers. Carraud was a friend and correspondent of Balzac, as well as herself a mother and schoolmistress (pp. 48-51). Strumingher having gained access to the archives of Hachette, was able to show that in the two decades after their publication in 1864 Carraud’s two texts sold nearly 800,000 copies and were used in more than twenty departments (pp. 51-52). In the final chapter the author attempts to gauge the effectiveness and influence of Carraud’s texts. Some of her source material here, such as the notebooks of primary school students, is extremely suggestive. But to determine whether or not a student is effectively being socialized to new values on the basis of school compositions is a delicate matter and Strumingher’s treatment of it not sufficiently comprehensive to carry conviction.

This book might have benefited from a fuller knowledge of primary education from the later eighteenth century to the 1830s, particularly the texts of moral suasion in the form of histories, tales and anecdotes that abound in this period. The author would have been well advised to indicate the sources of her many graphs and tables in the figures themselves. I feel, too, that the opening and closing sections are somewhat thin. But these reservations and the rather silly title of the book notwithstanding, this is a serious work of social history, clearly and well written. Strumingher has performed a service by bringing Carraud and her remarkably successful texts to the attention of students of the period.

Harvey CHISICK
University of Haifa

***


This is a fine if controversial contribution to the history of nineteenth-century Lancashire. Dr. Phillips has substantially revised a 1971 doctoral thesis to produce an important study of Bolton, Preston, Stockport and Blackburn between 1832 and 1870. By following the lead of Kitson-Clark, who wrote of the crucial interplay between politics and religion in Victorian England, he studies denominationalism as a “reflector of class tension” (p. 7) in the parliamentary and local politics of these four important cotton towns. This major study should be read with Ward’s Religion and Society in England 1790-1850 (1972). His evidence supports a contemporary notion that the vast body of adherents of the Church of England, from “conviction, sentiment and tradition” (p. 5), could stomach no concept of reform. By contrast, most Methodists and other nonconformists, as well as Catholics and free-thinkers, were found on the side of liberalism.

In contrast to current levels of agnosticism and atheism in England, mid-Victorian Lancashire was a veritable centre of Christian belief. On Census Sunday in 1851, the last
time the state asked a question about church attendance, 43 percent of Stockport, 38 percent of Blackburn, 37 percent of Bolton and 22 percent of Preston attended service in church or chapel. Everywhere, except in Preston, members of the established church were the dominant group among attenders. In Preston Catholics predominated. The vast majority of Catholics, wherever they were found, were Irish. Methodism (and here Phillips differs from Ward) was growing, especially in Bolton. Congregationalists (Independents) tended to be solidity working-class. Their lay ministers preached against “laziness, theft and deceit” (p.11), exhorting them to accept their subservient role while looking on factories as morally beneficial for the regularity they imposed on workers’ lives.

In Bolton, as elsewhere, sectarian identity seemed more important than class and perhaps “helped to subdue the lines of class conflict” (p. 24). The explosive force throughout the period was anti-Catholicism, directed against Irish immigrant labourers. Phillips does not suggest whether this arose principally from their adherence to the “whore of Babylon”, or from ethnic prejudice, as seen from the vantage point of a cotton factory operative. Catholic adherence to the Liberal cause was made the easier by the virulent anti-Catholic Orange Order’s clear identification with the Tories. Of the four towns in his study, Bolton serves as the clearest example of voters dividing along denominational rather than economic or occupational lines.

The unique importance of Catholics in Preston derived from its earlier history. The town had remained a centre of Catholicism throughout the Reformation era and the subsequent penal times. Jesuits had established a mission there in the eighteen century, and founded their great school, Stonyhurst, nearby. There anti-Irish feelings were particularly divisive. In violence, Preston surpassed the others; and in 1851 the government built Martello towers, the Victorian equivalent of Norman keeps, as the most overt sign of the fear engendered there by sectarian and class violence. More productive time was lost in factories through industrial action in Preston than in any other of the towns. Mill-owners sought help from capitalists elsewhere and recruited black-leg labour from Ireland to break working-class resistance, whether Irish Catholic or English Methodist.

Of the towns, Stockport’s working class was the most highly politicized and the earliest to develop its rhetoric. Grievances focused on fundamental concerns: low wages, economic depression, unemployment and factory working conditions. In contrast to erecting masonry fortifications, parliamentary attention came to Stockport through royal commissions to study the Irish in 1835 and the poor in 1842. Here as elsewhere in Lancashire, the influx of the Irish, especially evident from the 1790s, created conflict among workers. Typically such immigrants worked on construction sites, while their women and children were employed in factories. It was the wave of famine workers in the 1840s, the most important invasion of England since the eleventh century, that created severe social tension. In June 1852 Stockport witnessed a celebrated anti-Catholic and anti-Irish riot. Yet as Irish Catholics were rarely voters, politics in the town were largely fought out on denominational lines between competing groups of Protestants. Poll book evidence for Stockport and Bolton indicate that voters from the same social and economic background divided along sectarian lines. From other forms of evidence for Blackburn, Phillips concludes that “sectarianism divided society vertically, crossing class boundaries” (p. 107).

In Blackburn the Anglican-Tory elite remained largely unchallenged. Where Patrick Joyce earlier emphasized the importance of paternalism among factory owners, whatever their political affiliation, in controlling workers’ lives, Phillips sees “sectarianism as a broader and more crucial factor in determining political and social alignments, at least in the earlier and middle decades of the century” (p. 109). While not denying the importance of class, he insists convincingly that sectarianism “drew the lines of political conflict in a way that diminished specific working-class aims and consciousness” (p. 109). Extreme anti-Catholicism, the work partly of the Orange Order, blurred working-class objectives, and blunted their
assault on capitalists in Lancashire as elsewhere, notably in Glasgow, as Young found in his *Rousing of the Scottish Working Class* (1979). It is important that those who advocate the use of class exploitation as the principal explanatory tool for nineteenth-century English history begin to take sectarianism into account and give it the importance that seems its due.

**Julian Gwyn**  
*University of Ottawa*

---


This study presents earlier works as having the serious flaws of considering policy rather than reality and concentrating on types of housing, such as the philanthropic model, which provided only a minority of dwellings. It concentrates on the private investment which provided the bulk of worker housing in the nineteenth century. M.J. Daunton provides summaries of earlier research and closely reasoned critiques of existing theories. His thorough, carefully detailed research lays the foundations for his challenges to existing approaches as well as for the presentation of his own. Case studies of several different towns and regions, including Tyneside, Leeds and Plymouth, allow intelligent distinctions to be made between national and local conditions. Patterns of housing development in other nations are often included, providing an added dimension to the case study approach and leading to the conclusion that “In international terms, it is the unusual style of housing in England which demands explanation” (p. 58).

The pattern of nineteenth-century working-class housing was neither uniform nor static, not a foregone conclusion but the product of the subtle interplay of many forces including the availability of land, the system of tenure, the price of land and building materials as they varied across time and place, the size of the building firm, the demand for houses, the wage levels of the workers, and the nature and extent of local housing regulations. Lying behind each of these elements is yet another layer of complex forces and interrelationships. For example, building by-laws varied from town to town and were determined by such things as the time of their passage, the composition of the local council, and the balance of political power in the community: “The explanation of housing form thus merges with the structure of local politics” (p. 185). Meanwhile, the payment of rent, that essential but mundane act of tenancy, had a wide ranging impact on the lives of the workers: “The frequency of rent collection affected budgetary habits; the length of the let controlled labour mobility; the strictness or flexibility of attitudes towards arrears and eviction determined the response to periods of economic pressure” (p. 132).

Standards of working class housing improved overall, especially in the latter part of the nineteenth century. This process was accompanied by a change in the pattern of the private space of the house from “a promiscuous sharing of facilities to an encapsulated or self-contained residential style” (p. 12). At the same time, public space lost the “cellular” quality which had allowed the mixing of public and private use of common space, and acquired a more open texture, becoming “waste space...which was to be traversed rather than used” (p. 12).

The end result of these processes was that the distinction between private and public space became more clearly drawn, a factor which underlay such developments as an increasing emphasis on domesticity on the one hand and a growing official control of behaviour in public places on the other.