

Summary of Research Results: Markets and Fairs in Thirteenth-Century England (R000239108)

The research focused on the great proliferation, and the subsequent decline, in the numbers of markets and fairs in England and Wales which took place between the tenth and the seventeenth century. The region was not one of the most commercialized areas of Europe, but nevertheless experienced strong economic growth, of which new commercial institutions such as markets and fairs were an important expression. It was in this period that the main framework of the internal distributive economy of Britain was established, and in the thirteenth century that the greatest numbers of markets and fairs were licensed or established. The systematic quality of English record keeping make England and Wales an important site for exploring this major phenomenon in European history. Moreover, the research drew extensively on the comprehensive and recently-completed *Gazetteer of Markets and Fairs in England and Wales to 1516* and on a database derived from it.

One set of objectives was to explore the chronological and spatial spread of markets and fairs to 1500 and their survival into the early seventeenth century, giving attention to regional variation and factors such as wealth and demography. The other, dealing primarily with the thirteenth century, addressed questions concerning the significance of politics and royal patronage in the acquisition of the right to hold markets and fairs, a right which, as elsewhere in Europe, had long been claimed as an attribute of public authority. This part of the project also examined the different classes of those who acquired this right and the ways in which, as landowners, they seem to have used and perceived the markets on their estates. One issue to resolve concerned the respective contributions of patronage and of the demand for economic institutions to the pattern of foundation of markets and fairs.

In delineating the overview from the tenth to the seventeenth century, the focus was on those places which acquired rights to a market, the most robust indicator of development. Most of those places also had one or more fairs. Information on the scale of trading at those places is sparse, but one measure of their success was whether they survived as 'market towns' into the seventeenth century. Many market centres (over 60 % where a market was established or licensed) failed, especially after 1300 when the peak number of such places in operation probably occurred. Few were established after that date. The pattern of foundation up to 1300 revealed distinctive regional trajectories which add significantly to our understanding of local economies and cultures, as do the patterns of market days and the seasonality of fairs. Many of the earliest market centres were formally recognised as towns, many (but not all) of which had more complex urban functions than those places that simply had markets. The earlier markets, and those with the highest propensity to survive, were at settlements valued most highly in the assessment of 1334. These occupied the most favourable niches for trade within a network whose main outlines was already established by the eleventh century. Rates of market proliferation varied greatly. The North's was remarkably high in the twelfth century. East Anglia had a very low density of markets in 1100, but as a result of its exceptionally high rate of acquisition in the thirteenth century it attained the highest density in 1300, but also the highest rate of subsequent failure. The foundation and survival of markets seems also to have been influenced by the strength of lordship (the exclusivity of control exercised by landowners in areas where they had interests). The overall scale and intensity of commerce within a region did not markedly influence the proliferation of market centres, most of which served very restricted hinterlands. However, changes in the pattern of the relationship between markets and the numbers of people they served that took place between the fourteenth century and 1600 support other indications of the development of a more integrated marketing system.

During the thirteenth century the peaks and troughs in market foundation were more strongly influenced by politics and patronage than commercial trends. The king or his representatives used grants of market rights to secure the support of the powerful, as a reward

for services (including attendance at court, hospitality and religious services), and as a way of raising revenue. Early in the century major landowners predominated as recipients, but by the middle of the century two thirds of recipients were landowners on a much smaller scale, many holding no more than one manor. Most of the latter group paid for their grants. A high proportion of the markets granted to the latter group eventually failed, and they may have been acquired as a mark of their owner's newly-achieved status rather than in the expectation of profit. It seems to have been the king's exercise of a licensing authority over new markets, informed by a concern to minimise conflict between adjacent market centres, rather than the evolution of 'circuits of trade', that determined the local incidence of market days.

Examination of markets on three magnate estates (belonging to the Clare and Lacy families and to the bishops of Winchester) indicated that the strong lordship exercised by such owners contributed to the survival of market centres, even when, as in the case of the bishop's markets, they were not very profitable. All three owners pursued a strong managerial line, establishing markets early at the administrative centres of their estates, attempting to catch passing trade, preserving their markets against encroachment from others, using their access to the Crown to consolidate their rights, and, in the case of the Clares and Lacys, apparently promoting the especially profitable markets on northern and Welsh estates so as to make the most of the developing pastoral economy.

These themes have been brought together in a study of East Anglia, which explores the accumulation of markets and fairs in relation to landscape, communications and major centres of trade and authority. It also examines the ways in which new commercial institutions were established within a pre-existing dense pattern and how the interests of a wide range of market owners were intermixed. East Anglia also provides the opportunity to explore some distinctive episodes of royal patronage and market foundation, as well as wider questions of lordship. For example, that the pattern of weak lordship which prevailed over much of the region seems to be part of the explanation for its unique trajectory in the acquisition and loss of market institutions.

Full Report of Research Activities and Results: Markets and Fairs in Thirteenth-Century England (R000239108)

Background

Thirteenth-century England and Wales experienced a remarkable proliferation of markets (weekly trading events) and fairs (annual trading events), part of a longer-term process of commercialization which can be measured with some degree of consistency from the tenth century onwards. Markets and fairs were, or came to be, recognized as formal institutions, each of which had an owner (e.g. the king, another lord, or a community of townsmen) who organised and managed the event and collected revenue from it. The Crown had long claimed the right to benefit from and control such occasions, but was also accustomed to alienate that right to others in return for payment or some other service. An alienation might be covered by a general grant of privileges to a beneficiary, but by the later twelfth century often took the form of a specific grant of the right to hold a market or fair at a certain place and time. Records are lacking for the foundation of many markets and fairs that are known to have existed. Many such prescriptive markets, especially in the period before 1200, were held in towns (i.e. places formally recognised as urban centres). There are many more grants of rights to hold a market or fair surviving from after 1200, in part because it became the practice to record copies of these and other acts in the royal chancery. The Crown came to use the grants as an element in a licensing system, founded on the principle of nuisance, which aimed to ensure that new markets or fairs did not undermine existing ones in the vicinity: such interference was often a source of fierce conflict. The peak in the number of towns, markets and fairs operating as trading institutions probably occurred about 1300: relatively few new ones were established after then and many of those that had been licensed or set up before 1300 failed subsequently. Of approximately 600 towns that existed in 1300 (few significant towns then emerged before 1750) about half had been established before 1200, but of the places with market rights in 1300 only 22 per cent had had them in 1200. During the thirteenth century 1,196 settlements acquired market rights for the first time, over half of them after 1250.

The establishment and development of towns, markets and fairs is a subject of central interest for understanding the economic, social, cultural and political history, especially from the point of view of local and regional identities. In the past, the spread of markets and fairs has been investigated primarily as a question in economic history. Undoubtedly, there was a strong underlying economic demand for these trading institutions, indicated by various other measures of commercialization over the period up to 1300. Conversely, the decline in the number of market centres after 1300 (the course of which cannot be measured with any precision) reflects the decline in aggregate demand which arose from severe depopulation, as well as a geographical restructuring of the economy on new commercial lines. At the same time, the strong interest of the Crown in licensing markets and fairs, the interest of lords in acquiring such rights for settlements on their estates, and questions concerning the relationship of new markets to old ones mean that the subject also has a strong political dimension. One of the principal aims of the project was to explore that dimension.

Previous studies of the development of markets and fairs have yielded many valuable insights, but have been limited by the lack of comprehensive and systematic information on the subject. An essential resource for the present project is the *Gazetteer of Markets and Fairs in England and Wales to 1516*, compiled by the grant holders and others with the aid of an earlier ESRC grant (R000237395). The *Gazetteer* is now available in print (List and Index Society, Special Series vols. 32-3, 2003) and also accessible online in an updated form (<http://www.history.ac.uk/cmh/gaz/gazweb2.html>). The *Gazetteer* provides a textual account of every identifiable market and fair in the period and of its survival to c.1600, within limits

set by the accessibility of sources. This is a far fuller coverage of the subject than previously existed for any part of the country.

Objectives

The original aims of the present project were:

1. to explore the chronological and spatial spread of markets and fairs to 1516 and their survival into the early modern period (c.1600), giving attention to regional variation and to factors such as commercialization and demography;

2. to explore a series of issues concerning markets and fairs in the thirteenth century, including the political context of grants at certain peak periods (an assessor of the original proposal suggested that this be extended to cover the early fourteenth century), the role of the king in restricting or promoting the marketing system, and the policies of landowners (including the king) towards the administration of markets and fairs on their own estates.

The first set of aims has been largely achieved. The second set has been less fully explored on account of shortage of time. Priority had to be given to creating the statistical databases which are the foundation of the first set of aims and which inform all other parts of the project and future work by others. The first reason for the shortage of time was that some unanticipated effort had to be devoted to editing and checking parts of the *Gazetteer* so that the database derived from it (see below, *Methods*) would perform effectively. Secondly, the co-applicant, Dr Letters, who had largely compiled the material for the *Gazetteer* during the earlier project, decided on a career change and left the project on 15 July 2002. This was a severe loss of knowledge and expertise. After consultation with the ESRC, however, it was decided to appoint a research officer to fill the place of Dr Letters. Dr Emilia Jamroziak was appointed with effect from 1 September 2002 to a rescheduled end date of 15 March 2004. It naturally took Dr Jamroziak some time to pick up the threads of the project, but she did so very effectively. In the Autumn of 2003 she was offered a three-year research fellowship at the University of Edinburgh, commencement of which could not be delayed beyond 1 January 2004. Thus two and a half months of the research officer's time was lost to the project.

Methods

Analysis of the contents of the *Gazetteer* was assisted by the construction of a database (in Access) of standard categories of information concerning each market and fair and the places where they were held. Tables from the database were transferred to a geographical information system (MapInfo). These processes enabled the calculation of statistics concerning geographical distribution and change over time, and the production of maps representing point data and choropleth values by county units (for a sample, see end of report).

The more localised studies of the accumulation of markets and fairs over short periods involved much visual comparison with Ordnance Survey maps. Examination of the political context of market grants for particular periods involved establishing a time line of events and categorizing the recipients of the grants according to social status, political or military role, and proximity to the king (indicated by occurrence as witnesses to royal grants).

Examinations of landowners' administration of their markets involved assessing the structure of the estates (e.g. geographical extent and the location of administrative centres, castles and residences), the income from markets (using estate surveys or accounts), and the relationship with nearby markets and estates in the possession of other lords.

Before leaving the project Dr Letters completed a study of the context of grants of markets and fairs made during the early thirteenth century and especially under the minority of King Henry III (1216-27). Subsequently, given the inevitable curtailing in the scope of the project, the programme of analysis was directed towards producing four separate but interrelated studies: an overview of England and Wales, c.900-1600; an investigation of the

political context of grants in the mid thirteenth century, the most significant of the peak periods for grants; an investigation of markets on three major estates; and a close study of the accumulation of markets and fairs in East Anglia.

Results and analysis

The overview is based on series of analyses of markets, fairs and the places where they were held, by county, region (using the regions adopted in *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain*, vol. 1) and date and also by various measures of density. The most robust set of data for indicating the spread of marketing institutions concerns those places known to have had the right to hold a market. Most of those places also had rights for a fair (69 per cent in 1300); a few places had a fair but no market (9 per cent in 1300). Unfortunately, there are few consistent indicators of the success of these institutions: records of income are sparse and information on the numbers of markets and fairs at particular places does not always correlate with commercial significance. Of the places in England and Wales that had acquired market rights by 1300, 11 percent had done so by 1100, 22 per cent by 1200 and 53 per cent by 1250. Towns account for a high proportion of the earlier market centres known (74 per cent in 1100 and 63 per cent in 1200), but by 1300 were no more than a third of the total. There were notable differences between regions. Up to 1100 the South-West had the highest percentage of its total in 1300, but thereafter the South-East occupied that position; in the eleventh century the North had by far the smallest proportion of its final total. Overall, from 1000 onwards, the greatest concentration of markets was in the counties lying between Somerset and Lincolnshire and those to the south and east of them. This broadly corresponded to densities of wealth and population. By 1300 the pattern had been consolidated and reveals two regions of particular market density, one in Somerset and counties adjoining to north and south, and the other in East Anglia and the counties bordering the Thames estuary. Within this overall pattern there were important differences in development. Somerset had had a high density from before 1100, while East Anglia had a very low density before 1200 and then, having enjoyed a result of an exceptionally rapid increase in numbers after 1200 ended up with by far the highest density in 1300. The North had even fewer market sites before 1100, but increased its total nine-fold by 1200; thereafter its rate of increase was close to the mean.

The density of places with market rights has also been measured in relation to population (poll tax payers in 1377) and wealth (assessed wealth in 1334). There was no simple correlation between the density of population and that of market centres. The lowest mean numbers of people served by a market centre were in counties with among the lowest population densities, especially a group of peripheral counties in the South-West, on the Welsh border and in the North. But other regional differences are revealed. In the coastal counties of East Anglia and the South-East the number of taxpayers per market centre was relatively small and, as in Somerset, the centres were close together. In the North (and to some extent along the Welsh border), however, market centres served small populations and were widely spaced. High population densities alone were insufficient to explain high physical densities of markets. There is some correlation between density of market centres in 1100 and those parts of Kent, Somerset and Sussex where in 1086 population densities were high (although coastal and overseas trade were also an important factor). In the large areas of very dense population in East Anglia at the same date, however, there was no such correlation. East Anglia was also notable for its lack of formally defined towns. The explanation both for this and for the lack of market centres before 1200 probably includes a significant political element, including royal policy before 1100, the absence of strong local lordship (a feature of Norfolk in particular) and the dominance of a single large urban centre, Norwich. Certainly in Norfolk, the market centres that had emerged by 1200 lay predominantly in the western and northern parts of the country, where later evidence indicates that lordship was strongest.

The correlation between assessed wealth per square km and assessed wealth per market is clearer: the higher values are apparent in the counties south east of a line between the Severn and the Humber, although Cumberland, Durham and Westmorland also had high values. The wealth of individual settlements appears to have been an important factor in determining when they emerged as market centres. Thus, the group of places that emerged as market centres in each period was worth less according to its 1334 valuation than the group in the preceding period. This pattern was almost entirely consistent across the regions up to 1400.

The days of the week on which markets were held also indicate regional differences. Overall by 1300, Tuesday and Thursday were the most popular days. Before 1200 (when the evidence is much less comprehensive) Sunday may have been equally popular, suggesting that in many localities where market centres were above average density there would have been markets within fairly easy reach on three days a week, spaced so as to minimise competition. From 1200 onwards there was a concerted drive to enhance observance of the Lord's Day by moving Sunday markets to other days, often Mondays or Fridays. This change presumably threatened the business of Tuesday and Thursday markets. In East Anglia the lack of Sunday markets reflects the high share of the total that was founded after 1200, while its exceptionally high proportion of Friday markets (elsewhere the least popular day) probably reflects the great density of markets and the high proportion of them founded after 1250. In 1300 the North had a higher proportion of Sunday markets than other regions. This may be because many markets there were remote from centres of ecclesiastical authority and because the additional attractions of meeting on a Sunday made them more viable in conditions where their few customers had to travel long distances to get to them. In general, it seems that local patterns of market days were determined by the regulation of their accumulation rather than by the development of 'circuits of trade'.

There were also regional differences in the pattern of fairs. Summer fairs were the most common overall, but the South-West, the North and Wales had a preference for autumn fairs, as suited their pastoral economies. Places that had a fair but no market represented a significantly higher than average proportion of the total in Wales up to 1200, in East Anglia up to 1250 and in the North in 1200. Factors explaining this pattern presumably include the pastoral elements in the economies of those regions and the relatively undeveloped nature of local trade. After 1250 the regions were much more similar in this respect, although in the Midlands and the North the proportions of places with only a fair were lower than elsewhere.

Of those places that had acquired market rights by 1300 only 39 per cent can be identified as surviving as 'market towns' about 1600. The rate of loss was much higher in East Anglia (24 per cent survival) and lower in the North (44 per cent survival). Markets founded at an early date and so occupying the best niches in the distributive system had the best chance of survival (72 per cent of places with rights by 1200). Nevertheless, areas with significant growth in numbers of markets after 1200 but still with low densities in 1300 enjoyed high rates of survival (Cornwall and some northern counties). There was a strong correlation between the 1334 valuation of market centres and their propensity to survive. The growing impact of London on the national market probably contributed to the pattern of survival, undermining markets in the city's immediate hinterland but selectively strengthening others at a distance as they came to be drawn into metropolitan supply lines. The density of market towns in relation to population in 1600 (if county population totals derived from Rickman's back-projections can be relied upon) presents a very different picture to that for the fourteenth century. The highest densities now lay predominantly in the south and south-east, suggesting that a degree of integration in the market system had taken place.

This bald summary of some of the findings of the overview demonstrates the value of the material and the approach for characterising regional differences in economy and culture

and for tracking change over time. It also raises important questions concerning the significance of lordship for the establishment of commercial institutions, especially before 1200.

Another body of results has concerned the degree to which politics and patronage were a factor during periods in the thirteenth century when large numbers of market and fair grants were made. Patronage was very important. At the beginning of Henry III's reign, under the regency of William Marshal (1216-19), a substantial number of grants benefited Marshal himself, his dependents, the bishop of Winchester (an important member of the government), and another powerful lord whose support was crucial to the regime. Another substantial cluster of grants was associated with the young king's journey through Norfolk in April 1226. Grants were made to the religious houses where Henry stayed, to local landlords in the royal service, to the justiciar Hubert de Burgh, to Hubert's brother, and for the benefit of an estate that Hubert held in wardship. Hubert de Burgh, who controlled the county and whose family was based there, was approaching the pinnacle of his power in government and one purpose of the progress was to demonstrate his closeness to the king. Patronage rather than economic prospects seem to have dominated the grants to the nineteen places which benefited on this occasion, all of them close to the royal route. Ten of those places were in Norfolk. Not one of them had had market rights before, and they represented almost a third of the total of places in the county that acquired such rights for first time during the period 1201-50. Only for half of those places is there any evidence that the market continued for more than a year or so after 1226, and only one of them was still a market town in 1600, a lower survival rate than for the total of Norfolk market centres established during first half of the thirteenth century (19%).

A similar analysis was undertaken for the two peak periods of grants: 1251-7 (482 markets and fairs granted) and 1267-8 (142 granted). Each period witnessed a sharp increase over the preceding years and so the peaks are unlikely to reflect immediate developments in the effectiveness of the king's right to licence. It may be that as the network of markets became denser so more owners of manors where informal trading took place would seek a charter so as to protect their interests, but that could explain only a gradual increase. Patronage is again likely to have been the strongest consideration, especially in a period when the king wished to reward his servants and build up a body of support for projected expeditions overseas. Moreover, the supply of land available to the king for patronage purposes had diminished. Grants could also be a significant source of income for the king during what this period of financial crisis. If the standard fee for a grant of a market or fair was paid (in some cases it was not), those granted in 1251-7 would have brought in more than £1600. Many of those grants also included one of free warren (hunting rights), for which the same sum as for a market would be charged. Of the recipients of grants in 1251-7, 22 per cent had a clear patronage or political relationship with the king, being members of the royal family, 'aliens' prominent at court, leading aristocrats or royal servants (including justices, most of whom regularly attended at court). Monastic houses represented 19 per cent of the recipients, and many of their grants involved a patronage element since they were associated with royal visits or another specific interest in the house. A striking 30 per cent of recipients were lesser landowners with only a scatter of manors, and 28 per cent were local lords who appear to have held no more than one manor. Most of these lesser lords paid for their grants, although in a few cases where a figure at court had played a part in obtaining the grant for a local landowner.

The cluster of grants made on the eve of the expedition to Gascony in 1252 underlines the way in which the king used this form of patronage to secure support for a particular purpose, favouring those who he believed would be of special value on a military campaign. During the campaign itself those who accompanied the king, including the marshal of the royal household, were particularly favoured with market grants, while afterwards several grants were made in consideration of service in Gascony. There was a similar, though less

marked pattern during the Welsh campaign of 1256-7, while in 1267-8, a period of settlement and reconciliation after the baronial wars, grants of markets and fairs were among the patronage tools used to reward supporters of the king.

The grants to aristocrats in this period reveal another aspect of royal policy in making them. The recipients were all notable for their personal attendance on the king and generally received their grants ten to twenty years after they came of age and into full possession of their estates, suggesting that they had to prove their value to the king before he rewarded them in this way. A notable feature of the recipients in 1251-7 and 1267-8 was the high proportion who were relatively insignificant landowners, a group where patronage considerations are least likely to have been significant. This was in sharp contrast to the earlier thirteenth century. Members of this new group of market or fair owners had generally not had a such an institution anywhere on their estates before, but were now willing to pay for a privilege which the king in his straightened circumstances was prepared to sell. The recipients may have identified some economic benefit in the acquisition of these institutions, but very little is known of their subsequent history and many failed in the long run. One reason for these acquisitions may have been that members of this class were developing a new interest in expressing their standing as local lords. As in the ancient world, a market or fair established at a manorial site could be an expression of euergetism: perhaps a source of profit, but above all an act of beneficence to the inhabitants of the locality and a way of strengthening their ties to the lord. Other expressions of status, such as the construction of a moat or an imposing house, may well have accompanied the acquisition of market rights, as the purchase of hunting rights certainly did.

The three magnate estates chosen for close investigation reveal several different scenarios for such landlords with regard to markets. The Clare family estates lay predominantly in southern England and over half their significant English manors had prescriptive markets, probably already existing by 1150. Markets played a part in the protection of their interests. Their market and castle town of Bletchingly (Surrey), for example, appears to have been set up to rival the nearby Reigate in Warenne territory, and elsewhere they forcefully objected to proposals to set up markets that rivalled their own. Their greatest concentration of markets – all prescriptive -- was at the towns established on their Welsh estates in the twelfth century. In the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century they deliberately fostered their Welsh markets, a policy which seems to have enhanced the relative value of the income from market revenue by comparison with that due on their English estates. A similar concern to promote markets is apparent in the policy of Henry de Lacy, earl of Lincoln in the late thirteenth century. This estate contained a much smaller proportion of prescriptive markets, probably because it had been built up gradually over the preceding centuries and because it included a good deal of land in the North. The prescriptive markets included those at the important Lacy estate centres of Pontefract and Bolingbroke, and lesser centres such as Weobley. During the 1280s and 1290s Lacy, who was a powerful figure at court, obtained from the king numerous grants of markets and fairs. Some established places as market centres for the first time, but others were clearly regrants of rights enjoyed by former owners, or added additional market days and fairs at those places. In this respect Lacy seems to have had a special concern for his manors in the North. Like the Clare estates in Wales, these places produced substantial sums from dues on trade. The prosperity of Henry de Lacy's northern markets ensured that 47 per cent of his markets were still active in 1600. Likewise, 52 per cent of the Clare market centres survived. Both figures are well above the mean for England. The survival rate for the bishop of Winchester's market centres was even higher (72 per cent). In all three cases, however, it seems that strong lordship -- and the management and protection that flowed from it -- were important factors in promoting survival. Despite the antiquity of the bishop's estate, which one might expect to result in a high proportion of prescriptive markets, 65 per cent of its market centres on it were created by royal grant. These largely arose from the bishops' efforts in the early thirteenth

century, when they enjoyed a high degree of political influence, to develop their estates by establishing new towns. The potential of these places for further commercial development was limited, however, and the bishop's accounts for 1300-1 reveal the low level of his market income from them, with 61 per cent of places where he had market rights producing no identifiable income of that sort.

The fourth area of investigation, concerning markets and fairs in East Anglia and some adjoining districts, was designed to explore how the specific themes outlined above related to each other on the ground. Topics investigated include the spread of market centres in relation to topography, communications, and existing urban centres; the distance between markets in both space and time; the interlocking interests of different classes of market owners, from the owners of only one manor to magnates with direct access to the king.

Overall, this research suggests that while commercialization was an important underlying factor in the establishment of markets and fairs, the peaks and troughs in such foundations are to be explained by political rather than economic considerations.

Activities

Professor Keene and Professor Britnell organised a double session at the Leeds Medieval Studies conference in 2003 on the theme of markets. Dr Jamroziak and Professor Keene each gave papers based on the findings of the project. Dr. Letters gave a paper which included early findings from the project, at the 'Thirteenth-Century England' conference in Durham in 2001 and Dr Jamroziak gave a paper on further results at the 'Thirteenth-Century England' conference in 2003.

Outputs

- The database used for the 'Overview' and other analyses has been deposited with the Data Archive, along with a set of tables of detailed statistical analysis. The latter, in revised form and with further analyses, will also be made available on the website of the Centre for Metropolitan History. In the course of the detailed research for the project numerous detailed revisions of the *Gazetteer* were made. It was possible to incorporate some of these in the printed version, and all of them are being incorporated in the web version. Early conclusions from the project were incorporated in the 'Introduction' to the *Gazetteer*; in S. Letters, 'Markets and fairs in medieval England: a new resource', *Thirteenth Century England*, IX (2003), 209-23; and E. Jamroziak, 'Networks of markets and networks of patronage in thirteenth-century England', *Thirteenth Century England* XI (forthcoming). The main results of the project are to be published in four papers now in draft and dealing with: the 'Overview'; 'Royal patronage in the mid thirteenth century', 'Markets and fairs on the estates of the Clare family, the de Lacy family and the bishops of Winchester'; and 'Markets and fairs in East Anglia to c.1300'.

Impacts

There has been considerable interest in the methodological approach of the project (including its basis in a systematic survey) among scholars dealing with markets in the medieval and early modern periods in the Netherlands and France. The wider public and professional historical interest in Britain focuses on the local information available in the *Gazetteer*.

Future Research Priorities

The project has been able only to scratch the surface in interpreting the material contained within the *Gazetteer*, although its thematic studies have laid out some methods and line of inquiry to be pursued in the future. The most promising avenues concern the further detailed investigation of the local context of markets and fairs, with a view to delineating regional characteristics and the differences between classes of landowners and their access to political influence. Another important area for future research concerns the correlation between our

knowledge of markets and fairs and the interests of their owners, and the archaeological evidence for settlement forms and the material expressions of lordship. Comparison with the growing body of evidence for specialised settlements in the period 650-900 is also likely to be extremely productive for understanding the beginnings of modern economic development. Further comparison with later periods may also be productive, should historians be able to produce more effective measures of market activity *c.* 1600 than exist at present.

SAMPLE TABLE AND MAPS

Table 1a. CUMULATIVE TOTALS FOR PLACES WITH A MARKET

Regions and counties	Area sq km	1000			1100			1200			1250			1300			1350			1400			1500		
		total	density	% inc.	total	density	% inc.	total	density	% inc.	total	density	% inc.	total	density	% inc.	total	density	% inc.	total	density	% inc.	total	density	% inc.
South East	26960	25	1078.4	63	112	509	106	100	254	238	124.5	113	384	61	70	470	22	57	495	5	54	508	3	53	
Bedfordshire	1235	1	1235	4	300	309	5	25	247	13	160	95	18	38	69	24	33	51	24	0	51	24	0	51	
Berkshire	1872	1	1872	4	300	468	8	100	234	20	150	94	26	30	72	29	12	65	29	0	65	30	3	62	
Buckinghamshire	1939	2	970	3	50	646	6	100	323	22	267	88	29	32	67	35	21	55	36	3	54	37	3	52	
Essex	3965	3	1322	4	33	991	15	275	264	41	173	97	72	76	55	83	15	48	87	5	46	87	0	46	
Hampshire	4048	4	1012	7	75	578	16	129	253	30	88	135	47	57	86	52	11	78	56	8	72	56	0	72	
Hertfordshire	1657	2	829	5	150	331	12	140	138	18	50	92	32	78	52	36	13	46	37	3	45	37	0	45	
Kent	4003	4	1001	11	175	364	17	55	235	34	100	118	67	97	60	91	36	44	100	10	40	106	6	38	
Middlesex	728	1	728	1	0	728	2	100	364	5	150	146	8	60	91	11	38	66	11	0	66	11	0	66	
Oxfordshire	1921	1	1921	2	100	961	10	400	192	18	80	107	23	28	84	26	13	74	28	8	69	29	4	66	
Surrey	1963	2	982	2	0	982	4	100	491	15	275	131	23	53	85	27	17	73	28	4	70	30	7	65	
Sussex	3629	4	907	10	150	363	11	10	330	22	100	165	39	77	93	56	44	65	59	5	62	61	3	59	
South West	20628	24	860	42	75	491	64	52	322	159	148	130	277	74	74	347	25	59	359	3	57	366	2	56	
Cornwall	3595	2	1798	7	250	514	9	29	399	21	133	171	30	43	120	45	50	80	45	0	80	46	2	78	
Devon	6687	5	1337	7	40	955	13	86	514	52	300	129	95	83	70	109	15	61	112	3	60	113	1	59	
Dorset	2192	4	548	5	25	438	7	40	313	16	129	137	38	138	58	45	18	49	49	9	45	50	2	44	
Somerset	4450	9	494	14	56	318	20	43	223	39	95	114	67	72	66	94	40	47	95	1	47	99	4	45	
Wiltshire	3704	4	926	9	125	412	15	67	247	31	107	119	47	52	79	54	15	69	58	7	64	58	0	64	
East Anglia	12191	5	2438	22	340	554	39	77	313	111	185	110	236	113	52	294	25	41	306	4	40	309	1	39	
Cambridgeshire	2147	1	2147	1	0	2147	3	200	716	12	300	179	24	100	89	34	42	63	34	0	63	34	0	63	
Huntingdonshire	869	1	869	2	100	435	7	250	124	9	29	97	13	44	67	24	85	36	25	4	35	26	4	33	
Norfolk	5305	2	2653	7	250	758	15	114	354	51	240	104	114	124	47	139	22	38	146	5	36	148	1	36	
Suffolk	3870	1	3870	12	1100	323	14	17	276	39	179	99	85	118	46	97	14	40	101	4	38	101	0	38	
Midlands	32766	19	1725	44	132	745	86	95	381	224	160	146	410	83	80	501	22	65	514	3	64	523	2	63	
Derbyshire	2643	1	2643	1	0	2643	5	400	529	10	100	264	25	150	106	31	24	85	31	0	85	32	3	83	
Gloucestershire	3290	2	1645	7	250	470	14	100	235	28	100	118	48	71	69	55	15	60	57	4	58	58	2	57	
Herefordshire	2283	1	2283	3	200	761	5	67	457	14	180	163	27	93	85	33	22	69	35	6	65	35	0	65	
Leicestershire	1959	0	0	2	200	980	3	50	653	15	400	131	25	67	78	35	40	56	35	0	56	35	0	56	
Lincolnshire	6909	6	1152	13	117	531	18	38	384	46	156	150	92	100	75	115	25	60	117	2	59	118	1	59	
Northamptonshire	2636	3	879	6	100	439	9	50	293	24	167	110	38	58	69	46	21	57	48	4	55	51	6	52	
Nottinghamshire	2035	1	2035	3	200	678	3	0	678	8	167	254	21	163	97	29	38	70	29	0	70	30	3	68	
Rutland	372	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	372	2	100	186	3	50	124	5	87	74	5	0	74	5	0	74	
Shropshire	3715	1	3715	2	100	1858	5	150	743	19	280	196	41	116	91	47	15	79	48	2	77	48	0	77	
Staffordshire	2680	2	1340	3	50	893	10	233	268	21	110	128	37	76	72	45	22	60	47	4	57	47	0	57	
Warwickshire	2348	1	2348	1	0	2348	6	500	391	22	267	107	36	64	65	41	14	57	41	0	57	41	0	57	
Worcestershire	1896	1	1896	3	200	632	7	133	271	15	114	126	17	13	112	19	12	100	21	11	90	23	10	82	
North	37602	2	18801	5	150	7520	49	880	767	111	127	339	231	108	163	287	24	131	303	6	124	307	1	122	
Cheshire	2886	1	2886	1	0	2886	1	0	2886	3	200	962	17	467	170	19	12	152	21	11	137	21	0	137	
Cumberland	4001	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	4001	8	700	500	20	150	200	22	10	182	22	0	182	22	0	182	
Durham	2672	0	0	1	100	2672	7	600	382	8	14	334	9	13	297	10	11	267	11	10	243	12	9	223	
Lancashire	5193	0	0	0	0	0	6	600	866	12	100	433	29	142	179	40	38	130	41	3	127	42	2	124	
Northumberland	5255	0	0	0	0	0	9	900	584	21	133	250	32	52	164	36	13	146	38	6	138	38	0	138	
Westmorland	2093	0	0	0	0	0	3	300	698	5	67	419	6	20	349	9	50	233	12	33	174	12	0	174	
Yorkshire	15502	1	15502	3	200	5167	22	633	705	54	145	287	118	119	131	151	28	103	158	5	98	160	1	97	
England	130147	75	1735	166	121	784	344	107	378	843	145	184	1538	82	85	1899	23	69	1977	4	66	2013	2	65	
Wales	20690	1	20690	6	500	3448	16	167	1293	29	81	713	93	221	222	117	26	177	125	7	166	124	-1	167	
E+W	150837	76	1985	172	126	877	360	109	419	872	142	173	1631	87	92	2016	24	75	2102	4	72	2137	2	71	

Notes: % inc denotes the increase since the previous date; density is measured in sq km per place with market

