ing the North and West into the national orbit? Does the political history of England between 1629 and 1660 bear out the contention that the House of Commons had become the dominant political body in the country? Had enough of the “old” landlord-tenant relationship really survived the vicissitudes of the fourteenth century to be further significantly undermined in the late sixteenth? Has Crisis defined the distinctions between “medieval” and “modern” with sufficient respect for the diversity of developments in the earlier period or their ambiguity in the latter? The new book turns its back on all these questions to which its parent addressed itself.

Family and Fortune, for author and reader alike, comes after The Crisis of the Aristocracy. It will probably be read more for what it says about its predecessor than for what it says about itself. While we must not take too seriously its author’s claim that it tests the greatest arguments of the earlier book, we should be clear about what it does in fact accomplish vis-à-vis Crisis. It provides an independent treatment of statistics, many of which also appear in Crisis, which enables us to reconsider a number of the specific statistical propositions of Crisis where they employ data involving the families that the new book investigates. Where we can carry out these comparisons the results do not encourage us to treat the earlier statistical arguments as settled; indeed, they would seem to reinforce the conclusions of several of the earlier book’s reviewers that the case for an economic crisis and recovery is not proven. Once this has been said it is necessary to emphasize once again that the importance of The Crisis of the Aristocracy does not depend, alone or most importantly, on the correctness or the proven correctness of its thesis of economic crisis. Family and Fortune takes up the argument of Crisis at one of its least convincing points and does little to strengthen it. The new study should not for that reason detract from an appreciation of the central merits of the earlier book. Those merits were, and are, that it brings to the question of how social change may help to explain the Civil War a breadth of vision and a depth of specialist learning which are unique among recent interpretations of the “causes” of the mid-seventeenth century conflict.

R. B. Goreen,
Carleton University.

* * *


Those of us who had used Dr. Wilfrid Prest’s work previously were very pleased at the appearance in 1972 of his The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts, 1590-1640, a work which grew out of his valuable D.Phil. thesis. Members of the four inns of court, both those who became barristers and those who passed through these societies untainted, or relatively untainted, by the legal education available there, appeared in almost every walk of Tudor-Stuart life. Therefore an understanding of the life and workings of these institutions and their relationship to English society is very important for an understanding of the period. This Dr. Prest provides. In ten chapters he discusses the structure of the inns, their membership and administration, the education attained there, the cultural and religious life of these societies, and the role they played in the events leading up to the civil war.

The inns are never seen as isolated from society. They were, after all, surrounded by the bustle of London life and the activities of the royal court and parliament. Dr. Prest connects, in most suggestive ways, the trends he finds in the inns with those found in society in general. Thus, for example, the rebellions in the inns against their governors, the benchers, are seen as examples of a difference in attitude which separated the generations, a difference which has been traced in other institutions at this time, most importantly in parliament. Again, the decline in violence among the members of the inns is
Dr. Prest’s careful use of statistics is a model for historians of the seventeenth century. He tries to be as concrete as possible. Tables provide not only important but relatively straightforward information such as a list of admissions, the social rank and regional background of members and the number of bar calls, but also more elusive material such as an analysis of the side benchers supported in the first civil war and a breakdown of acts of violence occurring at the inns. Dr. Prest is, of course, very aware of the risk involved in the “use of quantitative evidence from a pre-statistical age” (p. 32). Figures are used with care and sophistication. The reader is warned of the dangers and is always made very aware of the weight the statistics will bear. Indeed the discussion of the merits of the statistics and the method of their compilation is almost as interesting as the picture Dr. Prest draws with them.

Not only is Dr. Prest constantly aware of the exceptions to the trends which his statistics indicate or which they may hide because of their inadequacy, but he attempts to destroy myths and generalizations concerning the inns. Thus the tradition of the seventeenth century inns as forming a “hotbed of puritanism” (p. 197) is replaced by a complex picture in which the support by the common lawyers of the puritans is “at best an incomplete and temporary alliance” (p. 211). Not only were there always Laudian and other anti-puritan elements among the profession, but the barristers were generally attacked as being too secular, not too puritan.

Dr. Prest describes the learning exercises in detail and also considers the other aids and guides to legal education available to the law student. He sees the inns as having failed in their educational role. Their failure to provide supervision and their lack of control over the young men learning the law meant that the members of the inns were free to pursue any social or cultural interest which might interest them. Nevertheless Dr. Prest points out that the inns as such ceased to be creative centres during this period.

In examining the Restoration inns I have given more weight to the tradition of benchers and senior barristers giving aid to students than Dr. Prest does, and this and other considerations has resulted in a slightly more favourable view of the inns as centres of legal education than that presented here for the earlier period.

Dr. Prest’s occasional comments on life at the inns after the Restoration are too general and sweeping, but this was not the area of concern of his book.

At the end of his work Dr. Prest provides a valuable note on the archives of the four inns of court. However, the book does not contain a bibliography which would have been useful.

The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts will be a basic book for those studying the legal profession during this period. It is suggestive of further work and will provide background and a starting point for many other studies. Also, because of the importance of the Tudor-Stuart legal profession and because of the quality of Dr. Prest’s work, this is essential reading for all those seriously interested in early modern England.

Thomas W. Evans,
Memorial University of Newfoundland.

*   *   *   *


A competent modern analysis of the social changes in the Highlands of Scotland in the period 1746-1825 has long been needed. Much has been written around the topic in