5. Content Analysis, Contributors, Distributions

Specifications of the Content Analysis

The different sections of this content analysis of all the articles, debates, notes and 'problems' appearing in the *Journal of European Economic History* during the first 20 years of its existence are based on the computer print-put — construed in the form of a classified subject index — created by Dr. Costanza D'Elia. Book reviews and conference reports are excluded because they do not represent the *Journal*'s own self-determination or self-identification: in large measure the editor does not maintain the initiative over which books are received for review (or which reviews are finally produced). In addition the *Journal* has accepted the obligation of giving as full a listing of new publications in economic and social history as possible. The vehicle for this has been the comprehensive 'books received' list, which has appeared in every issue. If the book reviews are not representative because of their limited coverage the 'books received' list is too comprehensive and all-embracing to merit analysis in thematic terms. Such an exercise would reveal little about the *Journal* itself.

As Dr. D'Elia has commented, creating a subject index for a journal which covers a very broad spectrum of themes is by no means a mechanical task. This is particularly the case where more abstract or conceptual 'key words' are involved because their changing incidence registers the trends in the historiography of the subject — with the evolution of economic and social history itself as a discipline, or group of disciplines. Something more is said about these problems in the second section of the content analysis under 'themes' and subjects.

The initial 'geographical range and coverage' section of the content analysis does not embody complications of this nature. Like an index of persons its message is more obvious and less subject to methodological obfuscations. This is not to say that the distributions which the analysis reveals are not important on their own terms — because one of the dimensions of significance of the *Journal* has been the width of its coverage and the editor's operational definition of 'European' right from the first issue, which has a symbolic resonance for the readership and, indeed, for the Bank. Some brief explanations are due as to how the groupings in this section have been made and certain ambiguities resolved. The extent of double countings between the different sections also needs to be identified.

The main intention of this section is to identify the broad trends in the distribution of contributions to the *Journal.* To specify many of the pieces and their authors individually would require too much space; as would more particular descriptions of the contents of individual articles. In addition, given the large numbers involved, even giving individual references to articles by way of the title and page reference to the issue of the *Journal* in which thay appeared is too demanding of space. An ultimate check is, of course, possible through the pages of the *Journal* while the original print-out prepared by Dr. D'Elia is printed as an appendix to this text.

Double counting exists between the two sections of this contents analysis — the 'geographical' and 'thematic' coverage. For example, the article by B.J. Best, 'Insurance in Imperial Russia' *(Problems,* Vol. XVIII (No. 1), 1989, pp. 139-170) is included in this section under 'Russia' and in the subject analysis under 'insurance'. Some cross-referencing — and therefore the degree of double counting — is more complex: E. Hertzig, 'The Iranian Raw Silk Trade and European Manufacture in the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries' (*Articles,* Vol. XIX, No. 19, 1990, pp. 73-90) is clearly of relevance to Iran (or the Middle East) and Europe in the geographical section and to silk (as a raw material and as an industry) in the subject section. Equally, J.B. Collins, 'The role of Atlantic France in the Baltic Trade: Dutch Traders and Polish Grain at Nantes, 1628-1675' (*Articles,* Vol.

XIII, No. 2, 1984, pp. 239-290) concerns Poland, France and the Netherlands geographically and 'trade' and 'agriculture' thematically. A. Maczak, 'Money and Society in Poland and Lithuania in the 16th and 17th Centuries' (*Articles,* Vol. V, No. 1, 1976, pp. 69-104) is a further example. Clearly instances of such necessary double counting are legion, if only because many economic and social activities which form the subjects of analysis are also spatially specified. Some subjectivity remains in the decision of whether to include a piece under a particular category. Only the principal orientations can be determinant; and 'key words' in keying in data to the computer file have to be limited in number if the resultant aggregations are to maintain significance — a very long list of ungrouped items cannot be construed. In some instances a title (which generally determines the 'keying') may be misleading and unidentified as such.

Double-counting within this 'geographical' section also exists where two or more locations are the essential co-ordinates of an article. The comparison of Barcelona and Glasgow as ports (A. Montanari, *Problems,* Vol. XVIII, No. 1, 1989, pp. 171-190); cultural investment in Rome, Amsterdam and Paris (P. Burke, *Articles,* Vol. VII, No. 2/3, 1978, pp. 311-336); Genoa's trade links with Spain (O.R. Constable, *Problems,* Vol. XIX, No. 3, 1990, pp. 635-656); or French economic relations with central and Eastern Europe (R. Cameron, *Articles,* Vol. X, No. 3, 1981, pp. 537-552) are typical examples.

In the original print-out articles specified by country (with the country named in the title acting as a 'key word') are separately listed from those specified by town or locality. They have been aggregated in the lists which follow — excluding items on Barcelona, Castile, Segovia, Seville, Toledo and Valencia from the total listed under Spain, for example, would not do justice to the coverage given by the *Journal* to Spanish economic history — and the same is true for all the major national economies cited in the lists. Nine articles relate to places in Germany separately listed. In addition to 31 listed under 'Germany'; 26 are cited under Italian towns and regions in addition to

32 under 'Italy'. I have eliminated all double-counting in such cases, whereas some double-counting survived in the original print-out.

Some indeterminacy survives where articles cover several countries (and may have important things to say about such individual countries) but are identified with a wider economic region — such as Western Europe or Eastern Europe, the Baltic, the Levant, the Mediterranean, the Balkans etc. In most cases, where the point of the article is to consider structures or trends according to regional criteria, I have not 'double counted' with the individual countries included in the region — for example, where an article coming under the general area of the Ottoman Empire is primarily concerned with Thessaly (Greece): S.D. Petmezas, 'Patterns of Proto-industrialisation in the Ottoman Empire, the case of Eastern Thessaly, c. 1750-1850' (*Articles,* Vol. XIX, No. 3, 1990, pp. 575-64. Inevitably changes of name and national identities over the centuries create complications: Belgium is listed separately from the Netherlands throughout; Austria separately from Hungary; Bohemia from Czechoslovakia etc. Discretionary judgments have to be made where aggregations are necessary.

For all these reasons detailed cross-checking in this section of the contents lists has its hazards because arithmetical precision is elusive. However, the broad trends of the distributions are not in doubt and it is this general significancs about the spatial coverage of the *Journal* which the data seek to reveal.

The Contributors

A further mode of analysing the contents of the *Journal* is to identify the distribution of contents according to authors. The aggregate distribution, which includes all the different categories of contribution (articles, notes, problems, review articles, conference reports, debates, reports on journals and book reviews) is given in the accompanying table; and the individual authors whose names are concealed within these totals can be identified in the alphabetical index of authors in the appendices.

However, it is difficult to know what significance to attribute to this distribution, or even to the various disaggregations it is possible to effect. As far as articles, notes, and problems are concerned, the editor of the *Journal* has operated primarily in a responsive mode; that is to say, the initiative for submitting manuscripts has lain principally with the individual authors, and has not been consequential upon an editorial initiative eliciting the contribution. Any exception to this in a minority of cases has been where the author of a paper given at a conference (particularly at the annual international Settimana di Studi at the Istituto Internazionale di Storia Economica «Francesco Datini» at Prato) was invited to publish.

Thus the main presence and distribution of original material in the *Journal* originates with an initiative by the author, subject to the decision of the editor as to whether to accept the manuscript submitted or not. Authors will have their own views about placing the 'portfolio' of their publications across the wide range of learned journals accessible to them. The fact that only a small minority of authors have published more than one article in the *Journal* concerning original material (i.e. contributions other than book reviews, review articles, conference reports), shows how widely their submissions to journals are spread. The other inference is also true: that the *Journal of European Economic History* has become a standard feature in the publishing plans of a very large number of economic and social historians — a major presence on the scholarly and research scene. This is particularly true for medieval European economic history, eastern European and Russian topics, the commercial history of the Eastern Mediterranean and the Levant, medieval Italian history, European monetary and banking history.

In contrast to the presence of original work, contributions concerning book reviews, review articles, reports on journals and conferences are consequent upon the direct initiative of the editor, issuing the invitations concerned. This accounts for the greater concentration of contributions from these categories, although it must be stressed that a high proportion of the authors reviewing books received only one, or at most two.

With these qualifications to the aggregate distributions in mind, certain individual comments can be made. By far the largest number of contributions (in all categories) came from authors making a single appearance in the pages of the *Journal* (526 out of 712). Eighty-four authors made two contributions over the 20 years, 39 authors made three; 29 authors, four; 10 authors, five, and 11 authors six contributions each. Beyond this six authors contributed on seven occasions, three on eight; and four on more than eight.

The most stalwart supporter of the *Journal* has been Professor Di Vittorio, of Bari, with 20 contributions reporting on conferences and journals, with two review articles and 14 book reviews: *fidus Achates* to the editor in this, as in other ways. This exemplary case of dedicated service, primarily through reviewing, is supported by J.P. Cuvillier of Toulouse University, (12 reviews, and a note); Shepard B. Clough of Columbia University (an original member of the Editorial Board) with 10 reviews and a review article; Frank Spooner (eight reviews); R. Mantelli (six reviews and two review articles); John Davis of Warwick University (an assistant editor and member of the Editorial Board) with six reviews and two conference reports. With seven contributions each, mainly reviews, followed Angelo Olivieri (five reviews, a conference report and a review article), Domenico Sella (six reviews and an article); Ugo Tucci of Venice (six reviews and an article); M. Wolfe (seven reviews). The list of authors with multiple contributions to the *Journal* continues to be dominated by reviewers of books at lower levels of numbers; for example, six contributions in the 'review' category appeared from W. Bratz, J.C. Cairns, M. Edelstein (four reviews and two conference reports), R. Herr, F. Jequier, J. Luckin, J.H. Mundy (three reviews and three articles); Biagio Salvemini (three reviews, two conference reports and a review article); Mira Wilkins (four reviews and two articles), and I. Zilli. The same pattern continues amongst authors making three or four contributions.

This distribution is anticipatable. The editor follows specialist expertise (and trusted response) with reviewers, which will tend to concentrate invitations: while the demands made upon authors by

a book review or a conference report are less demanding, and of a different nature, than producing the manuscript of an article. For the most part, too, articles were not elicited by editorial intitiative, as has been stressed. For these reasons the analysis of authors of articles to the *Journal* has a different emphasis.

The leading contributor — so far — to the *Journal* was Eliyahu Ashtor, of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, who authored no less than 10 articles before his death in 1990 — a remarkable sequence — to which must be added three review articles and four reviews of books. These contributions collectively account for the major commitment of the *Journal* to medieval Levantine and Eastern Mediterranean trade. In this field, which has attracted relatively few scholars, with the formidable demands it makes on linguistic and archival range, Ashtor was an acknowledged — if on some themes a controversial — expert. Equally, for him the *Journal* was an attractive publishing outlet on the international scene in a national context where equivalent opportunities were so much less favourable for a scholar of his specialised interests. Following Ashtor, Paul Bairoch of Geneva and J. Komlos of Pittsburgh University were the next most frequent contributors of articles to the *Journal* with six each — and three book reviews in addition by John Komlos.

Paul Bairoch launched in the *Journal* the preliminary results and major findings of his macro-economic studies of European industrialisation, urbanisation and foreign trade — again, as an international journal this venue was particularly attractive, certainly more attractive than national journals in Switzerland — for publishing research data offering a European-wide comparative analysis. For John Komlos, also, the prominence which the *Journal* gained as a publisher of material on Central and Eastern Europe, enhanced its general status for him as a specialist in the process of economic growth and industrialisation in Austro-Hungary. For scholars in Eastern European countries the opportunities of publishing in an international review of high prestige and wide circulation in the *lingua franca* of English, in circumstances where their own national journals were isolated by language, specialist appeal, and ideological constraint,

became extremely attractive. The *Journal* served an important international role in providing a forum for Eastern European scholars in what was for them a repressive local political and intellectual context.

David J. Losky contributed five original items to the *Journal* (four contributions to debates and one 'note' in addition to two book reviews), two being concerned with his substantive research interest in early modern social and demographic developments and three with the methodological debate concerning the 'new' economic history, which has the conceptual issue of 'counterfactuals' and the means of testing them at its heart. Another section of this analysis concerns the historiographical and methodological commitments of the *Journal* — here we note one of the principal contributors to this aspect of the work published.

Other major contributors, with four articles each, include P.H. Clendenning, whose research concentrated on economic relations between Russia and the Western Europe in the eighteenth century — representing a solid commitment of the *Journal* in this field. Indeed, a prominent commitment to trade and commerce has been a general feature of the distribution of the articles published. J.D. Gould, of Christchurch, New Zealand, also published four main articles; the main contribution to nineteenth-century migration studies, as well as his earlier research interests in sixteenth-century monetary history. Arnost Klima, of Prague, is a further Eastern European scholar who found an international audience through the pages of the *Journal* in circumstances which constrained his freedom to publish in Czechoslovakia — another example of the important role played by the *Journal* in encouraging work in the economic and social history of Central and Eastern European countries and providing a forum for scholars from all countries in this field of scholarship. Arnost Klima concentrated on industrial developments in Bohemia and the Czech lands during the early modern period. B.M. Ratcliffe, of Laval Universitity at Montreal, also contributed four articles on French business history in the nineteenth century — another strong feature of the coverage of the *Journal*.

It is not feasible to document the distribution of articles by author in detail beyond this point. However, in tribute to those who supported the *Journal* over the first 20 years of its existence by contributing three original articles, their names should be listed: Gerhard Benecke, R.C. Blitz, N.F.R. Crafts, the editor himself Luigi De Rosa, Richard Goldthwaite, Andre Gunder Frank, Robert Horvath, Ian Inkster, M.R. Jackson, R.M. Jennings and Andrew P. Trout, Hermann Kellenbenz, A.J. Kondonassis, J.H. Mundy, J.A. Perkins, and Charles Verlinden.

Table 2: Contributions to the Journal analysed by author: Numbers of contributions contributed by each author
[all categories of contributions cited (including reviews of books); with each author counted, including joint authors]

526	author(s)	made(s)	1	contribution(s)	each
84	"	"	2	"	"
39	"	"	3	"	"
29	"	"	4	"	"
10	"	"	5	"	"
11	"	"	6	"	"
6	"	"	7	"	"
3	"	"	8	"	"
1	"	"	9	"	"
1	"	"	11	"	"
1	"	"	13	"	"
1	"	"	18	"	"

Chronological distribution of contributions published

Before discussing the distributions themselves, and their significance, some qualifying remarks are in order prior to judgments being made in the light of the results. To what extent does the *oeuvre* appearing in the *Journal* reflect the balance of research and publication in economic and social history relating to Europe — can it be taken as a proxy for the pattern and trends over time of the

historiography; of the inputs into the discipline — or to what extent is the *oeuvre* more specific to the *Journal* itself, reflecting not so much the work which is extant but the policy of the editor and other influences which may create a distortion between what appears in the *Journal* and what is being produced by the profession?

Within the accepted general policy for the range of the *Journal* — to be European in its widest sense — the editor has not sought to emphasise one period or theme or methodology at the expense of others. There has been no editorial policy in this sense which has sought to determine the balance of the *Journal,* by giving it a particular emphasis or specialisation. The policy has been to remain 'receptive' rather than 'pro-active'. This is modified to the extent that the editor has personally encouraged those whom he has known to have given well-regarded lectures, or whose work has been personally recommended, to submit manuscripts. But this has not been with a view to pushing the *Journal* in a particular direction — unless it has sought to get innovative significant research reflected in its pages without self-conscious specifications — nor will this have been the case for a significant percentage of the manuscripts submitted. At the margin, the contents of any particular issue may be influenced by the desire to create a 'balanced number' but over a volume or series of issues the contents are determined by supply rather than by demand. This is doubtless common to most academic journals which aim, in principle, for wide comprehensive coverage of their field. In this basic sense, therefore, we can broadly take the contents of the *Journal* as a mirror in which we can see reflected the balance of work in the subject.

One or two other considerations apply within this wider parameter. The *Journal* quickly established itself in the field and became well-known to all potential academic authors. Failure to know about the *Journal* is not an explanation for particular biases in its coverage. That coverage has also been demonstrably eclectic enough not to become self-determining in any major restrictive way, although articles on specialist themes may well be offered in first preference to journals who are identified with such specialist themes (and also enjoy

a high academic reputation) rather than to a periodical with a wider range.

The *Journal* also has particular attractions for authors writing in languages other than English because it provides them with an international forum in English, the main *lingua franca* of the academic world in economic and social history. Indeed, it was the specific objective of the *Journal* at its inception to provide such a forum. The offer to organise and fund translations in many cases (particularly for Italian authors) and to pay honoraria for articles published offered further attractions. Few other academic history journals provide such services to their authors. This may have made the *Journal* relatively more attractive to non-anglophone historians than to the anglo-phone — for whom, in addition, there would have been relative greater opportunities for publishing in journals appearing (in English) in their own countries, particularly in Britain and the United States. This may have influenced the balance in the inflow of manuscripts to the *Journal*.

These judgments are being made on the material published rather than material submitted — it is unfortunately not possible to judge one flow against the other retrospectively. But, again, editorial policy has been to establish a threshold of academic and professional standards in general terms, as the criterion of acceptance within the overall parameter of relevance, rather than on particular grounds of selectivity. There has been no systematic institutional policy of referring manuscripts for independent assessment by 'peers', which has become increasingly the norm (spreading into history journals from established practice in science, medicine and the social sciences), but much informal consultation by the editor.

The other way of putting the contents of the *Journal* in a wider perspective with a view to making judgments about its overall range and proportionalities of the parts to the whole world would be to produce an equivalent contents analysis for other main-line anglo-phone economic and social history journals — say the *Economic History Review* and the *Journal of Economic History*, as reflecting an international perspective based on Britain and the United States

respectively. This would, indeed, be a useful experiment, but too elaborate to carry out in conjunction with the present investigation. Besides, such a comparison, despite widening the basis for judgment, would be relative to other data-bases with biases of their own rather than against some objective, universal norm. All things considered, in my judgment, one can have confidence that the content analysis revealed in this chapter broadly reflects the balance of research activity, the relative flow of work being done, the relative numbers of economic historians working in different countries and on different periods. This is reflected in the spatial distribution as well as the chronological.

* * *

Table 3: Contributions to the Journal by historical period

Period	Early Medieval (to 1300)	Late Medieval (1300-1500)	Early Modern I (1500-1650)	Early Modern II (1650-1800)	Modern (19th Century 1815-1914)	Twentieth Century 1914-45	Contemporary (post-1945)	Total
Number	13	58	82	83	155	49	17	457
% of total	(3)	(13)	(18)	(18)	(34)	(11)	(4)	(100)

Notes: Categories of contributions omitted: book reviews, conference reports, journals, historians.
Where a contribution covers more than two periods or is not specified in chronological terms it has been omitted.

The most surprising aspect of the chronological table of contents is, perhaps, not what it contains but what is totally absent — entries concerning the classical world, whether that of Greece or Rome. This is also a major disappointment about the coverage of the *Journal,* which has evidently acquired a self-defining limitation in this respect. No formal deterrence has been offered to classical economic and social historians — no mention is made of their exclusion in the notices for authors which appears in the 'prelims' of each issue; no attempt to dissuade has come from the editor. To some degree the small numbers of ancient economic historians form a guild of their own and see themselves as a constituency among the classicists. It has sometimes proved difficult, for example, to organise an ancient history section in the four-year international congresses of the International Economic History Association (the executive committee being determined to maintain this presence if at all possible). Clearly the field of ancient economic history has attracted giants of scholarship over the generations, including Rostovtzeff, A.H.M. Jones, Diakonov and, during the life of the *Journal,* M.I. Finley. There are distinguished practitioners active now.

The distribution of articles over period revealed in Table 3 will not contain any great surprises, particularly for editors of other general journals of economic and social history. It is to be expected that the medieval period, in particular the early medieval period, will produce a much smaller flow of research than the later period. Within this small total work on the Dark Ages — in fact from the beginning of the Christian era through to the ninth century — is almost entirely absent in terms of 'straight' economic history. Monetary theory, in the shape of the usury laws, and Christian ethics in economic matters have lone representation: P. Brezzi, 'Christianity and Economics: from the Origins to the Middle Ages' (*Problems,* Vol. II, No. 3, 1973, pp. 671-687). The late medieval period (1300-1500 AD) attracted 13 per cent of contributions (in large measure, as will be discussed, thanks to articles concerning Italy), which is certainly higher than the equivalent proportion in the *Economic History Review.* However, the greater signficance lies in the major presence of articles covering the

early modern period as a whole (1500-1800), which form over a third (36 per cent) of all articles published. This is not a 'skewed' distribution but almost equally divided (82 versus 83 entries) between the first half of the period (1500-1650) and the second (1650-1800). On general grounds of sources this result is not to be expected. More sources tend to survive for the modern period, with a greater range and diversity in the economies concerned. Contemporary documents tend also to be easier to read in later periods with more regular hands, better accounting methods, more effective public bureaucracies and the like.

In common with most journals the nineteenth century is the period which attracts more historical research destined for periodicals than any other period. All the trends in relation to source material mentioned as relevant for the second half of the early-modern period apply with greater force for the nineteenth century. It is also probable that the nineteenth century features more prominently in teaching syllabuses for history degrees. The other side of the 'bell curve' then swiftly ensues for articles concerning the twentieth century. The popularity of the twentieth century (particularly the popularity of the inter-war period) is growing rapidly as a field of research, but has yet to make a major impact on the pattern of publication in the *Journal*. This can scarcely be explained on grounds of the availability of sources (although in many countries public records are more difficult of access for the years after the Second World War and the same is true, for example, of business records). Possibly 'contemporary history' connotates a different academic constituency, replete with journals of its own, being institutionalised outside the main-line historical tradition.

The periodisation chosen for such a table is inevitably arbitrary and does violence to any publication which crosses one or more frontiers. Changing the boundaries of the periods in question does not remove the problem. The shorter the number of years covered the greater the extent of 'double-counting' or the greater the exclusion of articles covering the *longue durée*, or the more arbitrary the choices which have to be made; the longer the periods chosen the less

discriminating the results. The choice of boundary chosen in the present instance is designed to identify the periodisation into which much research falls (or the periodisation into which *more* research falls than with other choices). However, the consequences should be noted before quantitatively precise conclusions are to be sought from the table. If the periods chosen had been of equal length, for example, the disparity between the medieval and the modern would be shown up as much greater. Keeping the present allocation within the periods chosen, 0.29 articles appeared per decade for the later medieval period; 0.55 for each decade in the early modern period; 1.56 per decade for the nineteenth century, and 1.58 per decade for the inter-war period.

Geographical Range and Spatial Distribution

The tables listing contributions to the *Journal* by the countries to which they relate are self-explanatory. Nevertheless they reveal important dimensions about the historiographical significance of the *Journal,* which need to be emphasised. If, as has been stressed, there has been no specific editorial policy determining the orientation of the contents, the *Journal* began with a general objective in relation to its geographical coverage — which was to be as comprehensive as possible in its definition of what was to be identified as 'European' and hence what came within the basic parameter which set the scope of the *Journal* and gave it an identity. This matched the wishes of the Bank of Rome, as has been mentioned, whose directors saw the Bank as a multi-national enterprise. The Bank's policy, dramatically fulfilled during the life of the *Journal,* was to extend its branches throughout Europe and world-wide. Sponsorship of an academic journal with European-wide dimensions of its own, drawing on authors internationally and being distributed world-wide, thus reflected, in its own academic and intellectual worlds, the objectives of the Bank.

This inspired the *Journal* from its inception. In the first volume of 1972, for example, out of 36 articles, eight were concerned with

Eastern European countries (Transylvania, Roumania, two about Hungary and four about Poland), with reports on eighteenth-century Russian translations of western economic writings, historical work in Austria, American textbooks of European economic history, and the first articles by E. Ashtor on 'banking instruments between the Muslim East and the Christian West'. There could have been no clearer declaration of intent. Nor did this determination to maintain wide horizons for the *Journal* fade. In 1990 (Volume XIX) out of 28 articles there were pieces on Austria and Russia, and others concerning Europe's relations with Iran, the Levant, the Ottoman Empire, the Third World and the United States (2). In Volume XVIII (1989) six articles were concerned with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, one on the Middle East, one on Argentina and one on China. A more systematic search of the contents of each volume reveals the same pattern.

Another principal aspect of the *Journal*'s range concerns the interface between Europe and extra-European regions. Here, again, generosity of interpretation prevails. Topics find a place in the *Journal* where Europe has a relationship with the country or region concerned, or where mutual influences have been significant. These have included intellectual and cultural matters as well as more material forces — one article documents the reception and influence of Adam Smith's work in China, for example (C. Chung-Lai, 'Adam Smith and Yen Fu: Western economics in Chinese perspectives', *Notes,* Vol. XVIII, No.2, 1989, pp. 371-82). China also features (with India) in relation to trade imbalances with Europe (A.J.H. Latham, *Articles,* Vol. VII, No.1, 1978, pp. 33-60) and the consortium system of business relationships with the West (A.B. Chan, *Notes,* Vol. VI, No. 3, 1977, pp. 597-640). The Levant and the Middle East are strongly represented, mainly through trading links — Iranian raw silk supplies for the European silk industries in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is an important example (E. Hertzig, *Articles,* Vol. XIX, No.1, 1990, pp. 73-90). The Levant trade, with the trading and banking connections across the Eastern Mediterranean, was a particular interest of E. Ashtor who published much of his research

in this area in the *Journal* (*Articles,* Vol. I, No.3, 1972, pp. 553-573; Vol. V, No.3, 1976, pp. 533-586; Vol. XII, No.3, 1983, pp. 475-522; Vol. XIV, No.3, 1985, pp. 427-432; Vol. IV, No.3, 1975, pp. 573-612; Vol. III, No.1, 1974, pp. 5-53; *Review Articles,* Vol. XIV, No.2, 1985, pp. 361-386; Vol. II, No.1, 1973, pp. 187-206)). In turn interest in the Levant was closely linked with Venice, which attracted eight articles in the *Journal.*

Trading relations between Europe and Asia, as with Third World countries more generally, form the basis of vigorous debate about the exploitation of primary produce exporters whose foreign trade was in the hands of European merchants. This debate has featured in the *Journal,* with A. Gunder Frank (*Problems,* Vol. V, No.2, 1976, pp. 407-438, 469-472); P. Bairoch (*Articles,* Vol. II, No.1, 1973, pp. 5-36; *Debates,* Vol. V, No.2, 1976, pp. 473-474); S. Pollard (*Debates,* Vol. VI, No.3, 1977, pp. 745-49) and A.J.H. Latham (*Articles,* Vol. VII, No.1, 1978, pp. 33-60. Two studies specify the institutionalisation of European-Asian trade through the Dutch East India Company (F. Lequin, 'A new approach to the history of the Dutch expansion in Asia, the personnel of the Dutch India Company in the XVIIIth Century', *Notes,* Vol. VIII, No.2, 1979, pp. 431-438 — which draws on the remarkably complete surviving records of the Company) and the Genoese East India Company of the 1640's (S. Subrahmanyam, *Articles,* Vol. XVII, No.3, 1988, pp. 559-582).

European colonial empires in the New World, in both Spanish and Portuguese expansion, receive greater attention, and later connections, through nineteenth and twentieth century emigration, also create a bridgehead between Europe and the Americas in the pages of the *Journal* (e.g. *Articles,* Vol. VII, No.2/3, 1978, pp. 337-378; *Articles,* Vol. XVIII, No. 1, 1989, pp. 37-69; *Notes,* Vol. III, No.3, 1974, pp. 705-724). European links with North America have been less represented — apart from the three major articles by J.D. Gould on European migration (*Articles,* Vol. VIII (No.2), 1979. pp. 593-680; Vol. IX, No.1, pp. 41-112; Vol. IX, No.2, 1980, pp. 267-317)) and the role of the United States in the international economy affecting Europe in the twentieth century.

Table 4: Geographical Coverage by Country and Region

Great Britain/England (including Birmingham, Glasgow)	78	*Russia*	25
Ireland	5	*Poland* (including Poznan, Warsaw (2))	21
Italy (including Bologna, Campagna, Florence (7), Genoa (3), Lazio, Lombardy (3), Lucca (3), Montepulciano, Naples, Piedmont Pisa, Pistoia, Rome, Sicily (2), Venice (8))	68	*Other central and eastern European countries*	47
		Albania 1	
		Armenia 1	
		Austria 10	
		Balkans 3	
		Bohemia 2	
		Bulgaria 1	
		Central/E. Europe 6	
France (including Cahors, Champagne, Ile de France, Lyon, Marseilles (2), Paris (2), Rouen, Troyes)	53	Czech lands 2	
		Hapsburg Monarchy 3	
		Hungary 13	
		Roumania 4	
		Transylvania 1	
Germany (including Bavaria, Cologne (3), Frankfurt, Hamburg, Krefelt, Nuremburg, Ruhr, Wupper)	41	*Low Countries*	14
		Belgium 3	
		Flanders 1	
		Netherlands 10 (incl. Amsterdam 3)	
Scandinavia	18	*Extra-European Regions*	
'Baltic' 5		*The Americas* (including Argentina (2), Brazil, Mexico (4), Spanish America (2), USA (7))	16
Denmark 2			
Elbing 1			
Finland 1			
Norway 3			
Sweden 6			
Spain and Portugal	35	*Levant and Middle East* (including Anatolia, Cyprus, Egypt (2), Iran, Levant (7), Ottoman Empire (3))	15
Spain 30 (including Barcelona, Basque, Castile, Segovia, Seville, Toledo, Valencia); Portugal 5			
Greece	5	*India and Far East* (including Asia (3), China (3) India, Dutch and Portuguese Asia (3))	10
Switzerland (including Basel, Zurich, Alps)	3		

Notes: Where articles concern a specific location within a country they are aggregated under the name of the country concerned, and indicated. Articles covering wider regional groupings in Europe (e.g. 'Europe', 'Western Europe') have not been included. Articles listed under 'Extra European Regions' mainly concern European relations with those countries and regions.

The general distribution of articles within the different countries of Europe tells its own tale about the width of coverage in this spatial sense. The prominence of the representation of the Central and Eastern European countries has already been stressed and is apparent from the table — 93 articles from the total count of 454. This compares with 35 for the Iberian peninsular, 18 covering Scandinavian countries and 15 for the Low Countries (Belgium, the Netherlands and their predecessor regions). Although such a claim cannot be documented, I would assume that the representation of Central and East European countries (Russia apart) is greater, relative to the total volume of historical research and the number of historians at work in these countries, than for most other regions.

The substantial presence of all the major countries is anticipatable and it is difficult to make particular comments about this distribution which are not self-revealing in the numbers. It must be remembered that articles of wider geographical scope which cannot be allocated to these more specific locational categories have been omitted from the count in Table 4 — for example, a further 41 articles are essentially European-wide in scope according to their titles and are excluded. By definition such contributions are 'indiscriminate' according to the spatial criteria in this table; in the same way that articles covering several time periods cannot be accommodated in the tables with the distribution of contributions by chronological sequence. At the other end of the scale, small — not say micro-economic — national entities are represented as with Albania (T. Hocevar, 'The Albanian Economy 1912-1944, a survey', *Notes,* Vol. XVI, No.3, 1987, pp. 561-568); Cyprus (R.M. Kesner, 'Britain and the rehabilitation of the Cypriot economy', *Problems,* Vol. VII, No.1, 1978, pp. 169-190) or Elbing (N. North, 'A small Baltic port — Elbing in the XVIth and XVIIth Century', *Notes,* Vol. XIII, No.1 1984, pp. 117-128). Needless to say 'micro-studies' of individual parishes and localities are present in demographic and proto-industrial studies (e.g. P. Kriedte, 'Demographic and Economic Rhythms: the rise of the silk industry in Krefeld in the XVIIIth century', *Articles,* Vol. XV, No. 2, 1986, pp. 259-290; H. Kisch, '...the early growth of the Wupper valley textile

trades', *Articles,* Vol. I, No.2, 1972, pp. 298-408; T.B. James, '....capture-recapture analysis of population for St. Lawrence parish, Southampton, 1454-1610', *Debates,* Vol. V, No.3, 1976, pp. 706-718; F. Devoto, 'The origins of an Italian neighbourhood in Buenos Aires in the mid-XIXth century', *Articles,* Vol. XVIII, No.1, 1989, pp. 37-64). The justification for research within a small compass, and for the publication of such articles, is that they are *microcosmic* in significance rather than merely *microscopic.* Within the restricted context (and, in many cases, *because* of the intimate scale) major forces for change can be identified and fully analysed with all relevant variables specified, the dynamic of which may be hidden if the form of analysis is the larger macrocosm. 'Hard' data rigorously analysed within a 'microcosm' context can also test (potentially test to destruction) grand theories devised in general terms not subject to the discipline of empirical reality. In this sense the mouse of the empirical microcosm can frighten — even threaten — the elephant of a portentious macrocosmic theory. *De minimis curat scientia.*

Analysing the distribution of the contents of the *Journal* by chronological period in spatial terms of necessity offers a static uni-dimensional analysis. A further dimension is given to the significance by plotting the geographical distribution of articles against the chronological — the results of which are summarised in Table 5.

Table 5: Distribution of contributions by period and region

Regions	Early Medieval (to 1300 AD.)		Late Medieval (1300-1500)		Early Modern I (1500-1650)		Early Modern II (1650-1800)		Modern (19th Century) (1800-1914)		Twentieth Century (1914-45)		Contemporary (post-1945)		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
W. Europe	7	(70)	20	(42)	20	(27)	47	(57)	63	(44)	23	(53)	9	(53)	189	(45)
Central and E. Europe	1	(10)	3	(6)	14	(19)	13	(16)	34	(24)	11	(26)	2	(12)	78	(19)
North West Europe	1	(10)	0	(—)	6	(8)	4	(4)	7	(5)	—	(—)	—	(—)	18	(4)
Medit. countries	1	(10)	21	(44)	26	(36)	9	(11)	30	(21)	7	(16)	6	(35)	100	(24)
Extra-European	—	(—)	4	(8)	7	(10)	10	(12)	9	(6)	2	(5)	—	(—)	32	(8)
Total (%)	10	(100)	48	(100)	73	(100)	83	(100)	143	(100)	43	(100)	17	(100)	417	(100)
% of aggregate no.		(2)		(12)		(18)		(21)		(34)		(10)		(4)		(100)

Notes: — categories of contributions omitted: book reviews, conference reports, journals, historians

— contributions covering more than two periods or two regions omitted. Contributions without period or region specified (e.g. methodology, historiography) omitted.

— regional attributions: *Western Europe* covers France, Germany, Britain, Low Countries, Austria (specified as such); *Central and Eastern Europe* includes Austro-Hungarian Empire, Balkans, Russia; *North Western Europe* includes all Scandinavian countries and Baltic (where specified as such); Mediterranean countries include Italy, Spain, Portugal and Mediterranean region; *Extra European* includes Ottoman Empire, North America, Latin America, Africa, Middle and far Eastern regions.

N.B. These distributions differ in certain respects from those covered in the chronological distribution table and in the detailed discussions of the spatial distributions, for reasons stated.

Again, the results may be thought to reveal few surprises. The general dominance of Western European topics, broadly conceived, is clear. The total number of articles for the early medieval period (10) is so small that percentages can exaggerate the reality. One controversy inspiring several spirited replies (in this case about scattering of holdings in open fields) skews the whole distribution. More representative is the wider spread of geographical coverage for the early modern period, which reduces the Western European contributions to just over a quarter of the whole. The pattern revealed for the nineteenth century (with articles about Western European countries forming 44 per cent of the total) comes closest to the aggregate average, encouraged statistically (of course) because the nineteenth century attracted by far the largest number of contributions (143, which form 34 per cent of all pieces in the table).

The Mediterranean countries find their strongest representation in the late medieval and the first early modern period — particularly by virtue of the Italian contributions, reflecting both the weight of scholarship and the prominence of this European region in these centuries. Equally, the number of articles concerning Europe's relations with the wider world peak in these same times: this is also understandable save that it emphasises the relative scarcity of work in the *Journal* covering the world-wide relationships of many European countries in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in the period of the 'new imperialism' and prominence of Europe in the international economy. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe (including Russia) maintain relatively their presence in the pages of the *Journal* from late medieval times to 1945; unlike the North West European region where representation is concentrated between 1500 and 1914.

With more elaborate permutations in 'keying' in all the items published in the *Journal* which are covered in the print-out it would have been possible to establish other correlations in detail; making relationships between the variables multi-dimensional. However, the extra input of time would have been substantial and the results perhaps as predictable as the conclusions established by the existing tables. Certainly this seems to be the case resulting from spot-checks

of contents for base-line years, short of a comprehensive analysis. One such additional distribution would be to correlate with the present analysis by period and by geographical area the distribution by topic. Over time, the relative balance of topic changes from agriculture (although this continues to grow in absolute number of citations to the nineteenth century) towards trade, currency and banking, and thence to themes concerned with industrialisation, economic policy and the various roles of the state. Correlating topic by country shows a most diverse distribution. The entries for North Western Europe have a stronger representation concerning trade and merchants than other regions. Agriculture has a strong presence for all countries including the most industrialised, through to the nineteenth century. Contributions for Italy, in particular, range widely, with trade, banking, industrial and policy themes being prominent — but little directly upon agriculture. For Western European countries the balance swings strongly towards industry and policy matters from the seventeenth century forwards. Industrialisation themes are also prominent in the coverage of Central and Eastern European regions, including proto-industrial development in the early modern period.

All the distributions covered above, whether documented in detail or noted, concern the total contents of the first 20 volumes of the *Journal* considered as an aggregate stock, with that total cumulative stock divided up according to the different historical periods, different European areas and different topics. Such a static analysis of total stock does not give information about the flow of entries in the *Journal* over time. Over the 20 volumes under analysis have certain periods, or countries or topics changed their relative popularity? Can anything significant be said from this about the dynamics of the *Journal* itself? It is difficult to discern any major trends: only groups with a major presence would have statistical significance and changes in their degree of representation are not obvious. Economic theory and methodology, for example, seem to maintain their popularity as themes. Within this category discussions focusing on the 'new economic history' and counterfactuals are heavily concentrated in Volumes II to IV (1973-75) reflecting the controversy which 'cliome-

trics' had occasioned in the late 1960's (S. Fenoaltea, *Debates,* Vol. II, No. 3, 1973, pp. 729-746; D.J. Loschly, *Debates,* Vol. II, No. 2, 1973, pp. 421-438; Vol. III, No. 1, 1974, pp. 164-188; Vol. IV, No. 2, 1975, pp. 481-486; A. Fishlow, *Debates,* Vol. III, No. 2, 1974, pp. 453-468; E.H. Tuma, *Debates,* Vol. III, No. 1, 1974, pp. 169-188; C.M. White, *Debates,* Vol. IV, No. 1, 1975, pp. 187-196; A.W. Coats, *Debates,* Vol. IX, No.1 1980, pp. 185-208)). Although R.W. Fogel did not go into print himself in the *Journal* on the subject (as A. Fishlow did) nevertheless it was Fogel's contribution to the new methodology, particularly (in the *Journal's* case) concerning the concept and measurement of social savings relating to railways which provoked most of this discussion. One would have supposed that trends in the subject would have been most apparent with methodological issues but themes embodying major new research methods — such as proto-industrialisation and historical demography remain current throughout the 20 volumes of the *Journal.*