

INDOOR FARM SERVICE IN 19TH-CENTURY SUSSEX: SOME CRITICISMS OF A CRITIQUE

by Mick Reed

I can sow
I can mow
And I can stack
And I can do
My master too
When my master turns his back.¹

The system whereby farm workers were boarded in the farmhouse, often eating with the farmer's family, was an important feature of farm life for a long period of English history. As Brian Short has pointed out, it is a near orthodoxy amongst historians that this system of indoor service declined to near extinction, at least in southern and eastern England, by the early 19th century, and he is to be congratulated for demonstrating that in Sussex, and by implication elsewhere, the situation was rather more complex.² This article seeks to expand and develop some of Short's arguments, and also to examine some aspects of indoor service that, because of his reliance, as a geographer, upon spatial analysis, are not highlighted by him.

There is, though, a second strand to Short's thesis. He identifies historiographical orthodoxy regarding the decline of indoor service as 'merely the expectation derived from a theoretical stance',³ which he equates with Marxism, backing up his case with an examination of Marx's views on the role of service.⁴ The problem for this part of his argument is that he is quite wrong both in his statement of Marx's thoughts on this subject, and upon the assumed 'pre-capitalist' character of indoor service. Accordingly, a brief rebuttal of this strand of

his case must precede the main body of this paper.

I

The quotation that Short uses to head his article seems, at first sight, a little ill-chosen. What, one wonders, has this to do with indoor service? The reason soon emerges, however. By equating, in Marx's thought, the destruction of 'that special relationship between master and man which had characterized English agriculture before the advent of capitalism' with what Marx described as 'the antagonistic character of capital production and accumulation',⁵ it is possible, by showing that indoor service continued, even flourished, within capitalist agriculture, to disprove Marx's claim that capitalist production is 'antagonistic'.

The problem here is twofold. Short seems to suggest that capitalist agriculture in England is a creation of the 18th and 19th centuries, when in fact it was present in the 16th century, and doubtless earlier, though not, of course, as dominant as it was later to become. The second aspect is Short's erroneous claim that:

The household links which derived their

origin from the close bonding between the provisioners of capital and labour living under the same roof and forming a small unit of production, were seen by Marx to be very characteristic of the feudal mode of production.⁶

This last point is quite easy to deal with. What Marx actually saw as 'the basis of the feudal mode of production' (though not exclusive to it) was 'peasant agriculture on a small scale and production by independent artisans'.⁷ The point here is not that 'the provisioners of capital and labour [lived] under the same roof', but that they were the same people—the peasant family.⁸ Once the providers of capital and the providers of labour become different people, i.e. once the farmer hires the labour needed to work the farm and extracts profit from that labour, then we are seeing some form of capitalist agriculture.⁹ It matters not at all whether that hired labour force lives in the farmhouse or elsewhere.

In other words, the widespread existence of indoor service is not necessarily an indication of 'pre-capitalist' social relations in agriculture, but on the contrary it may be a demonstration of the existence of *capitalist* social relations, though of course capitalism within a particular social context. Colin Brent has made clear that living-in became increasingly prevalent as capitalist agriculture developed on the Sussex downs, at the expense of family-based farming, from the 16th century.¹⁰ Thus Short's assertion that 'capitalist farming does not preclude the living-in servant'¹¹ should not be presented as a finding, but as a truism.

Short further argues that the decline of living-in represented 'a social and spatial polarization of classes in the English countryside', and he claims that 'the concept of class polarization . . . has been too simplistic'.¹² Once more, this claim is at best ambiguous, or else is based on an unusual use of the concept 'class'. Since he is criticizing Marx's thesis, he should at least recognize the specificity of Marx's use of

'class'. Hired workers, whether or not they lived in the farmhouse, were proletarians; unless, that is, they had access to land or other means of production themselves. It is their divorce from the land or other means of production that makes them proletarians, not their removal from the farmhouse. Hence it is theoretically possible for a society to be polarized in class terms between capital and labour, in which most of that labour lives in. It is true that historians have tended to favour models of class polarization in which rural England was by 1800 effectively a two-class society, with capitalist farmers and landowners on the one hand, and landless labourers, *living in or otherwise*, on the other. It is *this* model of class polarization that is too simplistic, ignoring as it does the enormous numbers of people who were neither capitalist nor proletarian, and who played important economic and social roles within the countryside, in Sussex and elsewhere, and who *may* have been important for the continued existence of indoor service that Short demonstrates.¹³

Short has urged historians 'to adopt an experiential approach' to the study of this topic,¹⁴ and the remainder of this article will do just that, though in so doing we may find some examples of 'the antagonistic character of capitalist production' that he feels somewhat uneasy about.

II

One of Short's main sources for the extent of indoor service in 19th-century Sussex is the responses to question 38 addressed to parish officials by the Poor Law Commissioners in the early 1830s. While accepting the thrust of his argument from this evidence, I would introduce a couple of caveats. The first is that in some parishes more than one person made returns and the answers thus obtained were sometimes in stark contradiction to one another. For example, in response to question 9 enquiring whether piecework was general in the neighbourhood, two East Grinstead respondents said

it was, while another said the opposite. In Slaugham, responding to the same question, the rector claimed that piecework was general, while a landowner denied this. In Worth, in reply to question 3 on the size of farms, one respondent noted that they were generally large, between 300 and 400 a., while another observed—surely rightly—that they were generally small.¹⁵ We cannot, therefore, assume that where only a single reply was received it was even remotely accurate, and must therefore use other evidence in conjunction with these responses. Another problem is that respondents were usually highly placed parish figures like clergy, gentry or large farmers, and it is clear that these groups very often only took notice of the practices of their peers; a claim that indoor service was declining may only refer to a decline amongst wealthy capitalist farmers, and may ignore a continuation amongst smaller, less prosperous members of the agricultural community.

Better sources for the extent and decline of indoor service in particular areas are farm account books and, from 1841, the manuscript Census schedules. Study of account books from different parts of Sussex can reveal a good deal about the numbers of indoor servants on specific farms. Such sources tend to confirm the social distinctiveness of the Weald as compared to the downs and the coastal plain. In the latter

two regions indoor service was unusual by the 1830s. In Sompting in 1840 W. S. Barker seems to have had only one male indoor servant at any one time on his farm of 400 a.¹⁶ The Weald presents a very different picture. On George Mullens's farm at Lodsworth there was no decline in living-in before 1830. On this 350-a. farm Mullens had hired five male indoor servants each year from 1804 until 1829, but even in the 1830s he had three. On William Knight's farm, 150 a. in extent, in the same parish there were always three or four servants between 1795 and 1805. We have no information between then and 1841, when the Census reveals that Knight still had four male servants. Similarly in 1851 and 1861 he had four and three respectively.¹⁷

The Census gives us a fuller overall view of the extent of living-in at mid-century. A glance at the published Census data for 1851 suggests that Sussex had relatively few male indoor servants in relation to outdoor labourers, and that other south-eastern counties were very similar, as Table 1 demonstrates. South-eastern counties were very different from the highland zone in this respect: the ratios for Devon and Cornwall, for example, were 1:2.3 and 1:2.2 respectively. But Table 1 also suggests an anomalous situation when compared to other eastern and southern counties: Bedfordshire had a ratio of servants to outdoor workers of

TABLE 1
Male Indoor Servants and Outdoor Labourers in 1851

<i>County</i>	<i>Indoor servants</i>	<i>Outdoor labourers</i>	<i>Ratio of servants to labourers</i>
Berkshire	2,335	23,105	1: 9.9
Hampshire	2,535	32,798	1:12.9
Kent	4,994	40,943	1: 8.2
Surrey	1,596	18,432	1:11.5
Sussex	2,978	34,456	1:11.6

Source: *Census Reports, 1851* [C. 1691-1], H.C. (1852-3), lxxxviii-I(1).

1:29.5, Cambridgeshire of 1:22.3, and Wiltshire of 1:30.9, while for Dorset the figure is 1:31.3.¹⁸

The blanket generalization that Short criticizes, that service was virtually extinct throughout the lowland zone, is therefore clearly overdrawn. Moreover, figures based on county totals can hide important local distinctions such as that between the Weald and the rest of Sussex. Study of the Census enumerators' schedules indicates a far more vigorous existence of service than the county figures suggest. In very many parishes service was as prevalent at mid-century as in any part of the country, as Table 2 illustrates.

Moreover, the Census overstates the ratio for this reason: indoor servants are, by definition, in employment on Census day, whereas labourers may, or equally may not, be in work when the Census is drawn up. In 1851 and in subsequent Censuses the figures for labourers *employed* by farmers are usually around 50 per cent of the numbers of agricultural labourers. It would probably not be far out to assume that, as regards persons actually

employed on farms, the ratios in Table 2 should be almost halved to give a truer picture of the extent of indoor service.

The relative scarcity of male indoor servants in the coastal plain parishes of Aldingbourne and Birdham is typical of this region, and is repeated in the extreme western Weald around Rogate.²⁰ Elsewhere in the Weald of western Sussex indoor service was frequent. Moreover, in these areas it can be shown that, at any one time, something like one third of young unmarried men were employed as indoor servants.

Table 3 shows that service was very much a normal experience for single young men in the Weald at mid-century, and we can easily imagine that many of the young men not actually in service on Census day would have experienced it at some time during their youth. It becomes easy to see why, when we do get biographical details of 19th-century farm workers, we find so many who were in service at some time during their lives.

The question arises as to who was employ-

TABLE 2
Male Indoor Servants and Agricultural Labourers in Selected Sussex Parishes in 1851¹⁹

<i>Parish</i>	<i>Indoor servants</i>	<i>Outdoor labourers</i>	<i>Ratio of servants to labourers</i>
Aldingbourne	5	95	1:19.00
Billingshurst	47	225	1: 4.79
Birdham	8	94	1:11.75
Bury	11	105	1: 9.55
Lodsworth	12	50	1: 4.17
Nuthurst	28	112	1: 4.00
Petworth	40	388	1: 9.7
Rogate	14	157	1:11.21
Rudgwick	41	216	1: 5.27
Rusper	40	78	1: 1.95
Shipley	72	228	1: 3.17
Warnham	55	167	1: 3.04
West Grinstead	60	221	1: 3.68
Wisborough Green	46	325	1: 7.07
Totals	479	2,461	1: 5.14

TABLE 3

Ratio of Unmarried Male Indoor Servants to all other Unmarried Males (both in age-group 15 to 24) in Selected Parishes

<i>Parish</i>	<i>Servants</i>	<i>Other unmarried males</i>	<i>Ratio of servants to others</i>
Bury	9	25	1: 2.78
Kirdford	54	151	1: 2.80
Nuthurst	19	45	1: 2.37
Rusper	26	29	1: 1.12
Shipley	49	63	1: 1.29
Tillington	15	63	1: 4.20
Warnham	23	59	1: 2.57
West Grinstead	44	67	1: 1.52
Totals	239	502	1: 2.10

ing these people? In the Weald, farmers of all kinds hired indoor servants, both male and female. In the East Grinstead registration district an examination of the households of every 'farmer' shown in the enumerators' schedules for 1851 shows that servants were employed by most farmers to a greater or lesser extent. On the larger farms, however, they were less prominent than in the smaller undertakings. On farms larger than 300 a. indoor servants provided only 13 per cent of hired labour inputs, while at the other end of the unit size scale servants provided 79 per cent of all hired labour inputs on holdings smaller than 50 a.²¹

It would be mistaken to assume that the existence of service on Wealden farms of all sizes means that servants fulfilled similar functions within the economy of each farm. There were marked differences between those farms smaller than (roughly) 100 a. and those above this size. On the larger farms hired labour was normal and predominated over family labour, and indoor servants were employed to fulfil particular jobs within the workforce, typically the care of animals.²² On the smaller farms, hired labour was secondary to the use of family labour. Overall, on farms smaller than 100 a., hired labour comprised only about one

third of all labour inputs in the Petworth and Cuckfield registration districts, as well as in the Harting registration sub-district, while in the East Grinstead registration district only about 28 per cent of labour inputs came from hired workers. Importantly, the recourse to hired labour was not constant throughout the family life-cycle. Hired labour was used most by the younger farmers aged between 25 and 44, when children were young or still unborn. The amount of labour hired fell dramatically amongst farmers with older children, only to rise again as the children left home, though seldom to the levels prevalent with the youngest farmers. The oldest people frequently brought grandchildren, nephews, nieces and other relatives into the household in preference to hired labour. It will be seen that, in these cases, hired labour was employed merely to fill shortfalls in the supply of labour from within the family, rather than as a source of profit; and it was dispensed with as soon as the family was able to provide the necessary labour. As has been seen, on these smaller farms hired labour was mainly brought into the farmhouse, so that overall, combined with that of the family, between 80 and 90 per cent of all labour inputs in the districts mentioned was resident in the farm-

house, a very different situation from that among the larger farmers.²³

In much of the Weald these smaller family farmers were in a clear numerical majority over farmers relying on hired labour. This latter group were unambiguously capitalist, but the family farmers were not and their motivations may have been very different.²⁴ The fact that Wealden capitalist farmers hired indoor servants, whereas their counterparts on the downs and coastal plain had long ceased to do so in any numbers, may in part be due to the existence of the non-capitalist group, a point we will return to.

Censuses after 1851 do show a gradual decline in the numbers of indoor servants in all areas, but they remained a significant feature of Wealden life until after the Great War.²⁵ Demonstration of the *fact* of extensive living-in, though, tells us little about the *life* of the farm servant, and it is to that we now turn.

III

Servants of both sexes were hired for a definite period, usually a maximum of one year, and often on a half-yearly basis. Hiring took place in much of the country at the statute sessions, popularly known as the 'stattie' or 'mop'. This was, of course, the hiring fair, and is usually reckoned to have been extinct in Sussex by the early 19th century though, as Short points out, some fairs, including Petworth and Angmering, may have fulfilled a hiring role much later.²⁶

The fair was an important institution, not simply for getting a job, but also as an arena where servants could exercise collective power, of which more shortly. Short's concentration on the Michaelmas changeover, and his listing of fairs held on old Michaelmas day, may be slightly overstated.²⁷ An analysis of settlement examinations for western Sussex suggests that Michaelmas was not at all universal as the changeover date. Surviving examinations give dates for 71 *annual* hirings during the late 18th

and early 19th centuries. Of these 34 took place at old Michaelmas (10 October), 30 at old Lady Day (6 April), and seven on other dates (four on May Day and three during March). Interestingly, the Michaelmas hirings were almost entirely confined to parishes on the downs, the coastal plain, and that part of the Weald lying west of the river Arun. East of the Arun, Lady Day seems to have been the preferred changeover date.²⁸ The reasons for this await research.

As Short suggests, changeover, whenever it occurred, may in Sussex have relied upon word of mouth or door-to-door application rather than upon the hiring fair.²⁹ However it occurred, hiring was characterized by negotiation, resulting in a legally binding agreement when a bargain was struck. The law, though, was far from even-handed. If farmers broke the agreement they committed only a civil offence, but whenever servants reneged they were subject to criminal charges. The details of the agreement varied with the state of the labour market, with the prospective servant's age and reputation, and indeed with the reputation of the farmer. In 1813 Henry Mills agreed to work for George Mullens of Lodsworth for £10 a year, but discipline was strict, and Hills had like 'all the Fellows and Boys to go to bed by 9 o'clock at night'. Ten years later Mullens agreed with J. Deadman and Charles Osbourne to pay them £3 a year each, but if they were dismissed for misbehaviour *at any time* the entire wage was to be forfeited.³⁰

Compliance with the farmer's values might be obtained by threat as just described, or by encouragement. W. S. Barker of Sompting offered incentives for good behaviour. In 1845 he agreed with William Baker 'to Board and Lodge him for his labour up to Lady [Day] next', and for the spring and summer thereafter Baker was to receive 6*d.* a week 'with a trifle extry (if he conducts himself well) for his harvest month'.³¹

Once hired the servant could look forward to a year of long arduous hours at work. William Knight, who worked for George

Mullens from Michaelmas 1833, had 'to take care of the Farm Beast Sheep Hogs & all the Stock 7 days a week, to sow all the Corn if wanted, look after all Orchards and Commons at all hours'.³² Henry Hills, in return for a small wage rise of 11s. a year in 1813, had, in addition to his normal work, 'to take care of the Horses on Sundays'.³³ In the 1850s Eli Ashdown engaged with Mr. Hallett, a miller and farmer at Cross-in-Hand,

to look after three horses, the cows, do the ploughing, & c., on the farm, and the loading at the mill, and to work in the mill on the nights it was at work. This I did, and was often employed in the mill three of four nights in the week . . .³⁴

For a religious man like Ashdown the insistence that Sunday was a normal working day could be a cause of great anguish, as well as being physically demanding. One Sunday he relates that 'my master compelled me to work, greatly against my will. It tried me much to see my wife and friends going to chapel, until I was full of rebellion'.³⁵ Working as did Ashdown for a farmer who was also a miller could be incredibly arduous, since the miller would insist that the mill ran whenever there was sufficient wind.

One Lord's day morning, my master sent a message to me, saying he would have the mill run that day as there was a good wind. When the message reached me I was just starting for chapel. I returned an answer, saying I had run the mill nearly all night, and sent word what flour, etc., I had ready for the next day; that I was just leaving for chapel, and would run the mill again through the night if he wished. I went to chapel . . . but when I returned, I found my master had sent for the keys, saying if I would not work on a Sunday, neither should I work for him on a week-day.³⁶

Female servants were not exempted from the long, exhausting hours of work. A contemporary rhyme describes this.

I'm maid of all work; I've to slave like a horse.
I get up at four in the morning to work.
Then there's nothing to live on but cabbage and pork;
There's to wash and to brew, and to dairy and bake,
And every bed in the house I've to make:
I've to sweep and to clean ev'ry place you can look in,
And, worse than all that, I've to do all the cooking.³⁷

A maid servant at Early Farm in Wadhurst during the 1820s and 1830s described a similar situation.

I'd churning twice a week, and cheeing twice a week, and brewing twice a week, beside washing and baking; and six cows to milk every night and morning, and sometimes a dozen pigs to feed. There were four men lived in the house, and I'd all the bilin' to do—the cabbage and the peas and pork for their dinners—besides all the beds to make . . . One morning, I mind, I got up at four and worked till twelve at night, and then missus wanted me to pick a couple of ducks.

'No missus', I says, 'I really can't; I be quite tired.'

'Tired?' says she, 'if I was a young woman like you I should be ashamed of myself.'³⁸

For these long exhausting hours the servant got a small money wage and board and lodgings. The latter could be of varying quality. Farmers doubtless thought they were fine. Sarah Evershed, granddaughter of the occupier of Streele farm in Billingshurst, commented that in the 1830s

the fare was plentiful and generous . . . On alternate days the men and women servants had hot bacon and cabbage, and plain flour dumplings, and on other days, pork instead of bacon, vinegar in quantities being taken with the cabbage—no potatoes of course.

After work the servants relaxed in the kitchen in 'rough open settles' on either side of the fireplace. The kitchen was lit by

bundles of rushes drawn through the refuse lard and burnt one by one. The youngest serving boy sat by the upright iron rush holder, constantly moving up the rush as it burnt out . . . whilst the women sat at their needlework, and the men wrote to their sweethearts, or sang old English ballads.³⁹

And perhaps it was like this—sometimes! James Weller 'was kindly treated both by my master and mistress' when hired to a farmer in the Kentish Weald in 1818.⁴⁰ Most comments, though, are to the contrary. Coker Egerton has left us a rhyme popular amongst farm servants around Burwash at mid-century.

Pork and cabbage all the year,
Mouldy bread and sour beer,
Rusty bacon, stinking cheese,
A chaff bed full of fleas,—
Who do you think would live here?⁴¹

Bad, monotonous food and bad accommodation were also listed by Ben Potter, who was hired by several farmers around East Grinstead before the Great War. His first job was with his uncle and aunt, Tom and Emma Tester, at Smithers farm near Cowden in Kent, in 1898. In the chimney there were usually a few hams, hands of bacon and sausages drying, and crocks of pickled pork in the dairy.

But us workers did not get a lot of that I assure you, but Aunt and Uncle used to have a tuck in at these after we chaps had

gone to work, but they did give us plenty of fresh herrings, almost morning noon and night.

Despite being sickened by herrings, he returned to this farm in 1907, when things had not improved. The food frequently consisted of 'half bad kippers' for breakfast, and boiled puddings for dinner. The hands reckoned that the mistress 'did not put them in the pot until she saw us coming down the road', so that they were virtually raw and quite inedible. The hands fed them to the pigs.

The clodhoppers end of the house (was) all bare boards, with cracks between every one you can push your hand through and enough wind comes up to drive a windmill.

The room was rat-infested as well.

Potter was perhaps fortunate compared to one of his workmates on a farm near Edenbridge, who was lodged with his wife in

an old thatched barn . . . he had a large crate for a table, orange boxes for a grub cupboard, also for dressing chest covered with material, pokes of chaff for their beds . . . and they had actually got a few months old baby fast asleep in another orange box.⁴²

IV

Indoor service, then, was not remotely idyllic. 'That special relationship between master and man', that Short sees as characteristic of service,⁴³ fades the more one looks for it. Moreover, we can discern not only the hardship and inequality inherent in that relationship, but also signs of that 'antagonism' that Short implies is absent. The quotation at the head of this article illustrates the fact that, as early as the 17th century, servants would try to 'get one back' given the chance. We can discern more specific instances of conflict between employer and worker in the 19th century.

The farmer/servant relationship was inherently unequal, and that inequality was enforced both by law, as we have seen, and by the fact that servants, like most workers, had no alternative to work if they were to survive. Inequality, though, did not mean that servants were totally powerless. Like all workers, they exercised power through collectivity. Today that collective power, though limited, is exercised through the trade union. In 19th-century Sussex trade unions were absent or, at best, weak and transient.⁴⁴ Collective power was exercised in other informal institutions that are seldom revealed directly to the historian but must be inferred from observation of the way servants behaved and by analogy with other areas. In Sussex two main strategies by servants to assert collective power are discernible. These strategies seem to be partially linked to the existence of 'open' and 'closed' parishes considered by Short to be 'highly significant'.⁴⁵

The first strategy was mobility, rates of which varied considerably between 'open' and 'closed' parishes. Ann Kussmaul found that, from the 17th to the 19th centuries in eastern and east midland counties, 76 per cent of indoor servants remained with their employer for a maximum of one year, while only nine per cent stayed for longer than two years.⁴⁶ These figures are closely paralleled on farms in 'closed' parishes on the South Downs. On a large unidentified farm near Petersfield 72 out of 93 male servants (77 per cent) employed between 1799 and 1818 stayed for a maximum of one year, and only ten (10.7 per cent) remained for longer than two years. This pattern was repeated on a farm at Chilgrove on the western Sussex downs. In 'open' parishes things were different. At a farm near Pulborough between 1813 and 1839, only 49 per cent of male servants left during or at the end of the first year, and 19 per cent stayed for longer than two years. In Lodsworth George Mullens hired 40 male servants between 1805 and 1831, of whom only 17 (43 per cent) failed to work a second year, while 11 (28 per cent) remained for more than two years.⁴⁷

We may be seeing here two different strategies by servants to assert collective power. Mobility enables collective power to be exercised at every changeover. Kussmaul has argued that

frequent mobility ensured that the master was a stranger. Servants might have hoped that their bargaining position might be stronger with a master ignorant of the last wage they had received.

She goes on:

Servants preferred hiring on the open market. It was there, removed from the obscurity of the household, that they could be powerful collectively.⁴⁸

This latter statement is precisely right, though collective power arose because the employer was *not* a stranger or, rather, not an unknown quantity. This process has been described in the context of the hiring fair which, by bringing so many servants and employers together, provided unequalled opportunities for checking each other out. A story from the East Riding of Yorkshire, that occurs in similar form all over the country, will illustrate the point.

'Now my lad', said the farmer; 'just one thing—have you a reference?' 'Why, no,' said the lad . . . 'but I can get one I suppose.' 'All right, then,' said the farmer. 'I'll meet you back here at twelve sharp. If your reference is all right I'll give you the fest.' They split up and at twelve the lad was waiting as the farmer came up. 'Now, have you got your reference?' 'No, but I've got yours and I'm not coming.'⁴⁹

Even if the hiring fair was not the usual forum for gaining employment in the south-east, the opportunities for servants to confer with one another about prospective employers would not have been in any way diminished. Ben Potter described how servants on farms

around Ashdown Forest often met in a barn to chat and compare notes in odd moments of leisure.⁵⁰ Knowledge of employers was easier to acquire and circulate, since servants moved within a fairly restricted geographical locale.⁵¹ Frequent mobility ensured that servants could use their knowledge of employers at least annually, and act collectively to make it difficult for farmers who failed to provide wages and conditions considered as adequate, to find sufficient labour. Frequent mobility, in other words, gave servants some opportunity to retain a degree of control over their conditions of work.

A second strategy may be discerned on those farms in 'open' parishes where rates of mobility were much lower than in the 'closed' parishes. To be sure, mobility was probably used in the same way by the 40 to 50 per cent of servants who did change jobs annually, but another pattern is seen on these farms. Frequently, the records show *all* the servants leaving at the same time, a pattern that *never* occurs in the 'closed' parishes studied. George Mullens experienced complete turnovers at Lodsworth in 1808, 1811 and 1824. On the Pulborough farm referred to above, complete turnovers occurred in 1819, 1821, 1825, 1830, 1833, and 1834.⁵² Kussmaul notes that on a Lincolnshire farm complete turnovers took place eight times between 1780 and 1830. Significantly, on this farm rates of mobility were much lower than her overall average rates, and were very similar to those of Sussex 'open' parishes, with only 54 per cent failing to work a second year.⁵³

We are surely seeing here an institution similar to that in north-east Scotland, called there the 'clean toon', in which every hired man on a farm left when the senior man left.⁵⁴ The close relationship between the senior man and the rest of the men was attested to by William Marshall, who bemoaned the fact that, on his Surrey farm, the senior man 'all along . . . has been *siding* with the men; instead of assisting me to manage them, he has been assisting them to manage me'.⁵⁵

This institution ensured that a farmer who transgressed the norms expected of an employer stood to lose the entire labour force. Any employers who experienced complete turnovers too often ran the risk of being unable to get people to work for them, or else might have to pay dearly for the privilege.⁵⁶

Servants, then, acted to improve or at least maintain conditions of employment. They did this by banding together either within the farmhouse, or at the hiring fair, or, in its absence, in some other forum. These two strategies do seem to be linked to the existence of 'open' and 'closed' parishes. Short has claimed elsewhere that 'we should not expect to find conflict in *closed* villages'⁵⁷ but, as we can see, conflict over conditions of employment occurred in both; it was simply the strategies that varied. The question arises as to *why* they varied. Any answer requires far more research than is presently available, but perhaps speculation is permissible.

'Closed' parishes are usually characterized by large farms, often only a single farm, and by very limited social provision. In this situation the servant may have been some distance from colleagues on other farms, or from a pub. This could be a crucial bar to social life when leisure time was so very limited, and opportunities to meet other people might be severely curtailed. At work, farm workers were—and are—often extremely isolated from one another, while in the farmhouse the servants would be under the watchful eye of the employer. These factors could make it difficult to develop collective structures within the farmhouse, hence the resort to frequent mobility to improve collective contacts.

Conversely, in the 'open' parish, farms were often closer together and pubs and beerhouses were usually not far off. This enabled servants to meet together outside the house and to discuss their conditions of employment, as well as developing institutions that enabled them to assert themselves *within* the farmhouse. Hence the prevalence of the

'clean toon' type of institution in these parishes. Also in these parishes there was frequently a range of farm sizes, with often many small farms. As we have seen, small farmers were likely to hire servants to supplement shortfalls in family labour. It would be valuable to know something of the origins of servants on these farms. Were they simply labourers working as indoor servants for a period, or were they the children of other small farmers who were temporarily surplus to the labour needs of their own farm, and therefore hired out to fulfil a neighbour's shortfalls of labour? Elsewhere it has been demonstrated that, in areas with large numbers of family farmers, servants were able to maintain their positions within the farmhouse with greater success than in areas where small farms were absent.⁵⁸ It may be that the continued existence of these farms in the Weald played a role in the existence of indoor service in this region into the 20th century. Research into this hypothesis could reveal much for our understanding of rural social relations.

It would be mistaken to assume that conflict was simply restricted to the changeover period. The labour process itself was the site of other forms of conflict. This of course was not the prerogative of servants, but was common to all work on the farm.⁵⁹ Conflict in the labour process is most readily observed in those jobs that were sometimes done by the piece, such as threshing. Richard King of Bolney described how he and Thomas Divall, when both in service,

was to Thresh out a Wheat Rick for their Master Mr. Warren, and that there Master did not like it if they did not Work a Great many houres to the day in the Barn wich was longer than Either of them like to be confined to work in the Barn a Threshing and that, Thos. Divall wanted Richd. King to agree with there Master Mr. Warren that all they should Earn for there Master over & above Eight Shillings per week Each of them they should have to

themselves allowing for threshing every Quarter of Wheat two shillings & sixpence per Quarter and one Shilling per Loade for bindeing the Straw.⁶⁰

The farmer could not necessarily simply brush these demands aside. Threshing was done, like most farm jobs at the time, by hand, and this gave control to the worker, who could adjust the pace of work to a very fine degree. In 1804, on a farm run by the Petworth estate of the Earl of Egremont, piecework rates for threshing were calculated on the basis that one man would thresh in a day six bushels of wheat, or three sacks of oats, or two sacks of barley. George Mullens of Lodsworth also seems to have assumed that a day's work would produce two sacks of barley, and his piece rates were calculated on this basis. But of course the men did not always work flat out when on daywork and could work much harder if they wished. Ed Birt threshed barley for Mullens in 1825 at 2s. per quarter. He threshed $16\frac{3}{4}$ qr. in only ten days, earning £1 13s. 6d., around double the amount the current day rate of 1s. 8d. would have earned him. A little later, threshing barley by the day at 1s. 8d., he took $30\frac{3}{4}$ days to thresh $24\frac{1}{2}$ qr., thus costing Mullens 2s. 1d. a quarter, slightly more than the piece rate. It is worth noting that, whether threshed by the day or by the piece, the farmer paid about the same per quarter, but the workers' earnings could alter substantially. On the Egremont farm already mentioned James Hunt threshed $35\frac{1}{2}$ qr. of oats in seven days, which the norms entered in the same account book suggest should have taken $23\frac{1}{2}$ days, and for which he earned £2 13s. 3d. Similarly, Robert Sopp was paid just over £2 for threshing $24\frac{1}{4}$ qr. of oats in five days, rather than the 16 days the norms suggest.⁶¹

These examples illustrate the control workers had over the labour process. All workers, including servants, could alter the pace of work with great effect upon output. Day workers could, if required, be sacked provided replacements were available, but because of the hiring

agreement it was not quite so easy to dispose of servants, despite the fact that only civil law was contravened when farmers abrogated the agreement. However unlikely it might be, they *could* end up in court, and, more importantly, their reputation could suffer if servants were sacked for no good reason, and reputation was crucially important for hiring servants. Thus the farmer had to fulfil certain expectations of his servants, otherwise work might be slowed down, perhaps imperceptibly, with consequent reductions in output. This strategy could be most effective at those times when speed was essential, for instance at hay and corn harvest, or when a good market price could be gained by working rapidly.

V

Research would undoubtedly reveal many similar instances to the above. What is important is the demonstration of the fact of *conflict* between farmer and farm worker, whether servant or outdoor labourer. Short's 'special relationship between master and man', that indoor service was supposed to exemplify, is exposed as a chimera, and 'the antagonistic character of capitalist production and accumulation' that Marx argued for is found to be present in this relationship as in every relationship between employer and worker.

For it is important to realize that these conflicts are not fortuitous, but an integral part of that relationship. Farmers sought to improve profits by reducing expenditure or improving productivity, often at the expense of workers' control over the labour process, while servants and other workers tried to resist that process

and even reverse it in their favour. Both used whatever methods were available and appropriate at a particular time.

The decline of indoor service needs to be examined, not within the context of a *transition* to capitalist farming, but within the context of capitalist farming *itself*. The forms of service discussed by Short and myself are often merely a particular form of wage relationship within capitalist agriculture, and its decline relates in some way to the actions of capitalist farmers and wage workers in an 'antagonistic' relationship.

As I commented at the start of this article, Brian Short has rightly argued that service existed for far longer in Sussex than has been realized. Where he is wrong is to claim that this orthodoxy derives from adherence to Marxism. Historians of all persuasions have reached the same conclusions, as did many contemporaries long before Marx ever put pen to paper. There is nothing in Marx that insists that indoor service must decline as capitalism develops. Short has weakened his attempt at a 'closer integration of empiricism and theory'⁶² by creating a 'straw man' with illusory characteristics. It is important that historians who—legitimately—contest particular theoretical approaches and orthodoxies present those approaches accurately.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Tim Hudson for the invitation to write this article, and Brian Short for the original suggestion that I should do so. Alun Howkins and Brian Short have both contributed to the form of the argument in numerous discussions.

Author: Mick Reed, School of Cultural and Community Studies, University of Sussex.

Notes

¹Cited in Ann Sturm Kussmaul, 'Servants in Husbandry in Early-Modern England' (Univ. of Toronto Ph.D. thesis, 1978), 92.

²Brian Short, 'The Decline of Living-in Servants in the Transition to Capitalist Farming: a Critique of the Sussex Evidence', *Suss. Arch. Coll.* 122 (1984), 147–64.

³*Ibid.* 163.

- ⁴Ibid. 147.
- ⁵Cited in *ibid.* 147.
- ⁶Ibid. 147.
- ⁷Karl Marx, *Capital* (Penguin edn., introd. E. Mandel, 1 (1976)), 452–3 n. 21.
- ⁸Strictly speaking ‘capital’ is an inappropriate term in the context of peasant agriculture under feudalism. For a discussion of capital see *ibid.* esp. ch. 4.
- ⁹A qualification is necessary here. Non-capitalist peasant producers do of course hire labour on occasion, perhaps to suit the vagaries of the family life-cycle or at seasonal peaks such as harvest (see below). Capitalist production can only be said to be present when hired labour takes the place of all or most family labour, and when surplus value is derived from that labour force. This is not the place for such a discussion.
- ¹⁰C. E. Brent, ‘Rural Employment and Population in Sussex between 1550 and 1640’, *Suss. Arch. Coll.* 114 (1976), 37.
- ¹¹*Suss. Arch. Coll.* 122, 162.
- ¹²Ibid. 147.
- ¹³Mick Reed, ‘The Peasantry of Nineteenth-Century England: a Neglected Class?’, *Hist. Workshop*, 18 (1984), 53–76.
- ¹⁴*Suss. Arch. Coll.* 122, 163.
- ¹⁵*Report of Royal Commission on Poor Law*, H.C. 44 (1834), xxxiii, Appendix A.
- ¹⁶West Sussex Record Office (hereafter W.S.R.O.), Add. MS. 22776.
- ¹⁷W.S.R.O., Add. MSS. 9441, 9447; P.R.O., HO 107/1102; HO 107/1654; RG 9/626. For a fuller discussion of this material see Mick Reed, ‘Social and Economic Relations in a Wealden Community: Lods-worth 1780–1860’ (Sussex Univ. M.A. thesis, 1982), 42–8.
- ¹⁸Calculated from *Census Reports, 1851* [C. 1691–I], H.C. (1852–3), lxxxviii–I (1).
- ¹⁹Calculated from draft Census enumerators’ schedules for named parishes (P.R.O., HO 107). I have called ‘indoor farm servants’ all those people designated as such, plus those designated as ‘agricultural labourers’ but who resided in the farmer’s house and whose relationship to the head of the household is shown as ‘servant’.
- ²⁰The virtual absence of indoor servants in the extreme west of the Weald is attested to by J. A. Eggar, who never saw living-in around Farnham after 1850, believing it to have died out around 1840: *Remembrances of Life and Customs in Gilbert White’s, Cobbett’s and Charles Kingsley’s Country* (n.d.), 82.
- ²¹Calculated from the 1851 Census schedules for East Grinstead registration district comprising the parishes of East Grinstead, Hartfield, Withyham, Worth, West Hoathly, Crawley and Lingfield. A similar pattern, with slight variations, existed in other parts of the Sussex Weald.
- ²²*Suss. Arch. Coll.* 122, 148.
- ²³The statistics that justify this part of the argument are complex and demanding of space. They form part of an article that I hope will be published elsewhere.
- ²⁴For a discussion of these issues see *Hist. Workshop*, 18, 53–76.
- ²⁵Michael Winstanley, *Life in Kent at the Turn of the Century* (1978), *passim*; Georges Lemaître, *Le Weald des Comtés de Kent, Surrey, Sussex, Hampshire: Etude de Géographie Economique et Humaine* (Paris, 1931), 379–80.
- ²⁶*Suss. Arch. Coll.* 122, 150–1.
- ²⁷Ibid. 150.
- ²⁸W.S.R.O., settlement examination papers (various parishes). Most of these hirings were of male servants. Only 8 were of women: of these 5 occurred on old Lady Day, two on May Day, and only one at Michaelmas. Other evidence suggests that women were more likely to be hired at Lady Day, even when male servants on the same farm were hired at Michaelmas. See Reed, ‘Social and Economic Relations in a Wealden Community’, 102 n. 37.
- ²⁹*Suss. Arch. Coll.* 122, 150.
- ³⁰W.S.R.O., Add. MS. 9447.
- ³¹Ibid. 22776.
- ³²Ibid. 9395.
- ³³Ibid. 9447.
- ³⁴Eli Ashdown, *Gleanings by a Watchman on a Dark Corner of Zion’s Walls* (1904), 18.
- ³⁵Ibid. 28.
- ³⁶Ibid. 35.
- ³⁷Anon., *Rural Scenes: or a Peep into the Country for Children* [1825], 10.
- ³⁸J. Coker Egerton, *Sussex Folk and Sussex Ways* (1924), 38.
- ³⁹John Dendy Evershed, ‘Historical Notes related to the Evershed Family’ (unpublished TS.), 7/8–7/9.
- ⁴⁰James Weller, *The Wonders of Free Grace* (Battle, 1844), 11.
- ⁴¹Coker Egerton, *Sussex Folk and Sussex Ways*, 40.
- ⁴²W.S.R.O., Add. MS. 25212 (autobiography of Benjamin Potter), pp. 69, 200, 244, 260.
- ⁴³*Suss. Arch. Coll.* 122, 147.
- ⁴⁴For agricultural trade unionism in Sussex see John Lowerson, ‘The Aftermath of Swing: Anti-Poor-Law Movements and Rural Trades Unions in the Southeast’ (unpublished TS., 1977); Felicity Carlton, ‘A Substantial and Sterling Friend to the Labouring Man: the Kent and Sussex Labourers Union 1872–1895’ (Sussex Univ. M. Phil. thesis, 1977).
- ⁴⁵*Suss. Arch. Coll.* 122, 162. For criticisms of Short’s use of the ‘open/closed’ model see Mick Reed, ‘Social Change and Social Conflict in Nineteenth Century England; a Comment’, *Jnl. of Peasant Studies*, 12 (1) (1984), 109–23.
- ⁴⁶Kussmaul, ‘Servants in Husbandry in Early-Modern England’, 108.
- ⁴⁷Calculated from W.S.R.O., Add. MSS. 829, 9442, 9447; MP 1479.
- ⁴⁸Kussmaul, ‘Servants in Husbandry in Early-Modern England’, 113, 131.
- ⁴⁹Stephen Caunce, ‘East Riding Hiring Fairs’, *Oral Hist.* 3(2) (1975), 50. For further discussion of the fair as the site where collective power was exercised see Caunce, *passim*; T. E. Kebbel, *The Agricultural Labourer: a Summary of his Position* (1907), 94; Ian Carter, *Farm Life in North-East Scotland: the Poor Man’s Country 1840–1914* (1979), 144–52.
- ⁵⁰W.S.R.O., Add. MS. 25212, p. 253.
- ⁵¹Ann Kussmaul, ‘The Ambiguous Mobility of Farm Servants’, *Econ. Hist. Rev.* 2nd series, 34 (2) (1981), 233; *Suss. Arch. Coll.* 122, 158–60.
- ⁵²W.S.R.O., Add. MSS. 829, 9447.
- ⁵³Ann Kussmaul, *Servants in Husbandry in Early Modern England* (1981), 52–5.
- ⁵⁴Carter, *Farm Life in North-East Scotland*, 183.
- ⁵⁵Cited in Kussmaul, ‘Servants in Husbandry in Early-Modern England’, 94.
- ⁵⁶Carter, *Farm Life in North-East Scotland*, 183.
- ⁵⁷Dennis R. Mills & Brian Short, ‘Social Change and Social Conflict in Nineteenth-Century England’, *Jnl. of Peasant Studies*, 10 (4) (1983), 254.
- ⁵⁸Carter, *Farm Life in North-East Scotland*, 157–9.
- ⁵⁹For conflict arising out of the cycle of the farming year see

Alun Howkins, 'Structural Conflict and the Farmworker: Norfolk, 1900-1920', *Jnl. of Peasant Studies*, 4 (3) (1977), 217-29.

⁶⁰W.S.R.O., Par. 252/32/4/1.

⁶¹W.S.R.O., Add. MS. 9447; PHA 2853.

⁶²*Suss. Arch. Coll.* 122, 163.

A REJOINDER

by Brian Short

A formidable list of research questions is beginning to appear for those interested in the farm servant phenomenon within agrarian social relations in Sussex. In *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, 122 I concluded my paper on this subject by indicating three main research directions which might be followed. These were: firstly, the need to examine carefully the chronology and speed of the decline of living-in; secondly, the relating of this change to its location and ecological background; and thirdly, the need to examine the actual processes of change to understand how the erosion of the system took place.¹ Within these broad themes Mick Reed has now added more detailed questions relating, for example, to the role of the hiring fairs and the timing of the changeover of servants from one farm to the next; the importance of farm size and family structure in the retention of the system; and the importance of the socio-economic structure of 'open' and 'close' parishes in the perpetuation of living-in.

I am sure that Mick Reed and I would both agree with the view of one recent contributor to the subject, who has noted that there is still much to be learned about the respective importance of the local economy on the one hand, and temporal long-term structural changes in adolescent employment on the other.² Where Reed and I appear to disagree is over questions of emphasis and interpretation in my original paper, and I welcome this opportunity to clarify some of my previous points and to correct some misrepresentations in his paper. What is not at issue here is the basic amendment we would both make to earlier work, namely that living-in

persisted more strongly into the 19th and indeed 20th centuries in lowland England, and that within Sussex it persisted more strongly in the Weald than in the more southerly parts of the county.

The first point to be clarified concerns the accusation by Reed that I attempted to establish that living-in was a non-antagonistic relationship between farmer and servant, and that if such a system lingered into recent capitalist relations, then capitalist farming also becomes non-antagonistic. Both propositions are clearly untenable, and the criticisms seems to be based on a misreading of the *abstract* of my paper, rather than on a close scrutiny of the text itself. Neither would anyone surely equate the decline of living-in, antagonistic or otherwise, with the larger issue of the social relations of capitalist farming in its wider sense. There was, after all, more to capitalist farming in the 19th century than the decline of living-in.

I have no doubt that the progress of agrarian capitalism within Sussex, as elsewhere, entailed antagonism between capital and labour. Indeed, I purposely chose the quotation from *Capital* to establish this theme at the very beginning of my paper:

Nowhere does the antagonistic character of capitalist production and accumulation assert itself more brutally than in the progress of English agriculture . . . and the retrogression of the English agricultural labourer.³

Progress was progress for capital. Carter has

characterized the change in social terms as a change from 'quasi-familial master-servant relations' to openly capitalist ones, while to Macfarlane the system operated 'as a means whereby wealth and labour flowed from the poorer to the richer' while at the same time relieving the rich of the burden of excess children.⁴ Such assertions act to combine the idea of the 'family' in the farmhouse with the exploitation of the servants, whether kin or not, by the farmer. The phrase 'that special relationship between master and man' to which Reed objects does not, as far as I am aware, preclude exploitation and antagonism. The latter do, after all, exist within many family relationships. Similarly, a study of two of my sources used in the original paper would surely dispel any illusion that 19th-century Sussex agriculture was non-antagonistic. The 'rural queries', for example, are a means of obtaining perceptions of social conflict from one sector of society. The responses are permeated throughout with references to the 'careless disposition of the labourers', the 'dislike of confinement', or the disturbing influences of the beershops. The very subjective nature of these documents is a positive strength in allowing us an insight into one group's attitudes. They are, of course, no more objective than any other 19th-century opinions. Secondly, I used biographical material drawn largely from a very different sector of rural society, the labourers from the fringes of Ashdown Forest, who gave evidence of rights of user in the Ashdown Forest lawsuit of 1876-82. The attempt to privatize further the common resources of the forest was a good example of conflict. Living-in servants were sent to collect litter from the forest by farmers and landowners who were themselves commoners, and the challenging of this right places the servants well within the wider issue of conflicts over rural resources in the 19th century.

A second misinterpretation lies in Reed's belief that I subscribe to a view that capitalist farming was a creation of the 18th and 19th centuries. I dealt with the latter period because

my main focus was on the decline of the living-in servant at this time, and because of my greater familiarity with the source material. But I have described elsewhere how a sophisticated regional specialization, with its attendant agrarian improvements and social relations, existed in south-east England by the middle of the 17th century.⁵ Furthermore I did acknowledge in my original paper (p. 150) that the period from the 16th through to the 18th centuries was part of a wider transition from feudal relations. Any precise dating of the establishment of capitalist agriculture within Sussex or elsewhere is at present open to debate, but it quite obviously pre-dates the 18th century. Living-in was prominent within feudal and transitional society, but my aim was to examine its supposed decline, as an anachronism within capitalism. Its locally-persistent vigour can surely only be fully understood when seen against longer-term change. While I did provide a passing reference to the situation in pre-Georgian Sussex, Reed confines himself to the 19th century, as the title of his paper implies. Perhaps we now need more longitudinal analyses in the manner of the French *Annales* school to contextualize our studies. I would therefore disagree with Reed's contention that indoor service should be examined 'not within the context of a *transition* to capitalist farming, but within the context of capitalist farming itself'. There is surely room for more than one approach to such matters, particularly since he himself has demonstrated that many small Wealden farmers or peasants continued to exist in the 19th century on the margins of, or outside, capitalist relations.⁶

A third area of misconception arises when Reed equates and conflates two phrases in one sentence of the *abstract* to my paper. The relevant sentence was:

By separating master and man, by depriving the living-in servant of customary entitlements to board and lodging, *and* by the progressive proletarianization of agri-

cultural labour, the cash nexus was established and a landless, and mostly casualized, labourer was created. (emphasis added)

He assumes that I take 'proletarianization' to include the removal of living-in labourers from the farmhouse. But my tortuous sentence was actually an attempt to generalize *beyond* living-in and to place its decline (or perceived decline) within the overall context of that retrogression noted by Karl Marx. I would entirely agree that 'proletarianization' implies a divorce from the land and is therefore clearly an inapplicable concept for the living-in servant, who by definition has already been separated, permanently or temporarily, from the direct working of his or her own land.

Mick Reed has clearly outlined the flaws in the inadequate conceptualization of class polarization in the countryside. I would, however, like to add a further point of emphasis. His response to the simplistic models of class polarization is to insert an intermediate group consisting of 'enormous numbers of people who were neither capitalist nor proletarian, and who played important economic and social roles within the countryside'. But while agreeing with this, I would also point to another valid criticism—the neglect of the effect of distance on social and economic relations. The relationships (capitalist or otherwise) existing *within* the walls of a farmhouse between master and servants must differ from those when master and servant live under separate roofs. It is very clear that many observers felt anxious when they saw the personal and informal modes of control exerted by the farmer within his own house being broken down. In the 'open' and more radical Wealden parishes there arose the opportunity for workers to exert some degree of labour power where 'legitimation by tradition' was less obvious. Living-in had entailed the distancing of workers from each other, and distance between workers has always been a key

factor in determining control over production by the establishment of loyalty and deference, in negating militancy, and in fixing wages. Thus the relaxation of the system was viewed from above with some dismay. It is possible that the fears of landowners and tenants over the loss of this control played a large part in the longer retention of living-in in the Weald. But there was a tension between the decision of the individual farmer, made in the light of his own economic or social circumstances, to end living-in, on the one hand, and the overall maintenance of hegemonic control on the other. On the downland, of course, the system lingered longer for different reasons. Here the large, isolated farmhouse was often the only habitation of any size within the parish and the farm-centred community of farmer and workers was established at an early date, and indeed may still be seen in the modern groups of tied cottages which are still particularly important as a means of housing in West Sussex.⁷

This rejoinder has dealt with conceptual rather than empirical matters. The concepts and perspectives must be clarified before we can make further progress, and I am grateful to Mick Reed for his elaborations on such matters, as well as for the material which detailed the experience of living-in in the Sussex Weald. Many other points could be taken up from his paper, such as the ambiguity apparent over definitions of 'peasantry' and whether or not such peasants did hire servants for profit, but it remains perhaps best to hope that the discussion might be profitably pursued in similar detail beyond the borders of Sussex. The questions being posed await adequate regional responses from the rest of lowland England at least.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the editor for this chance to clarify some of the points previously made, and to Mick Reed for the continued stimulus provided by his knowledge and interest in the Weald of Sussex.

Notes

- ¹*Suss. Arch. Coll.* **122** (1984), 161–3.
- ²R. A. Houlbrooke, *The English Family 1450–1700* (1984), 173.
- ³Karl Marx, *Capital* (Penguin edn., introd. E. Mandel, **1**, (1976)), 828.
- ⁴Cited in R. Breen, 'Farm Servanthood in Ireland, 1900–1940', *Econ. Hist. Rev.* 2nd series, **36** (1983), 102.
- ⁵See, for example, B. M. Short, 'South-east England', in *The Agrarian History of England and Wales 1640–1750*, **5** (1) (1985).
- ⁶M. Reed, 'The Peasantry of Nineteenth-Century England: a Neglected Class?', *Hist. Workshop*, **18** (1984), 53–76.
- ⁷For the concept of the farm-centred community see H. Newby, *The Deferential Worker* (1977), esp. ch. 6. See also *Census 1981: County Report for West Sussex*, **1** (1982).