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EDITORIAL

The new look LPS

We must start this editorial by apologising to our readers for the delayed appearance of this and, in particular, the previous issue of LPS. We hope that the new desk-top publishing techniques described in the last issue will give us more control of the production process and so present prevent similar delays in future. We are also pleased to announce that the price of LPS will be held at the present level for at least a further two issues.

One consequence of the new publishing techniques used in this issue of LPS which we hope is immediately striking is the new type face. Any comments on this new look will be appreciated. If you like or dislike the new style please let us know. Any ideas or suggestions about how we can make further improvements would also be most welcome.

The Civil Registration White Paper

As reported in LPS 39 and 40, we have been given to understand that the publication of a white paper embodying the recommendations contained in the Report of the Working Group on the Registration Service is imminent. More information and comment will be provided when it is forthcoming.

Microfilm copies of the Registration Indexes

In the mean time we turn again to the issue of the provision of microfilm copies of the much used indexes of births, marriages and deaths, currently housed at the General Register Office, St Catherine's House, London. Those readers of LPS who have not already seen them may be interested in two items of correspondence which appeared in The Times newspaper last month. The first, entitled 'Family matters', appeared on October 11th and drew attention to the overcrowding of the search room at St Catherine's House. This generated a response from Gillian Banks, the Registrar General, which was printed in the issue for October 15th. Both letters are reproduced below, with the kind permission of the authors.

Sir,

For some years I have been visiting the General Register Office at St Catherine's House, Kingsway, London (and previously at Somerset House, Strand) to undertake research into my family. The conditions there have become increasingly uncomfortable almost throughout the entire day. The facilities have indeed become inadequate since the study of family history is now, I understand, the biggest growth "hobby" in Britain. I was astonished recently to arrive at St Catherine's House at the same time as a busload of people from the Midlands, who had come to do similar research. I believe this part of the General Register Office must be profitable, with a steady queue of people spending money on birth, marriage and death certificate copies. It is not high time that the Government duplicated or triplicated the facilities for searches at centres outside London? The Mormon International
Genealogical Index is available in numerous large public libraries. Cannot something now be done about making the General Register Office volumes available in duplicate in a similar manner?

And I am, yours faithfully,
Leslie Jerman
Rushbrooke, Coppice Row,
Theydon Bois, Epping, Essex.

Sir,

Mr Leslie Jerman’s letter draws attention to the growing pressure in the public search room which we maintain for birth, death and marriage records. We are very much aware of the problem, and are taking what steps we can to remedy it.

A part of the answer must lie in making the best use of the space available in London, which we have recently been able to expand. But it is also important, as Mr Jerman rightly says, to make it possible for people to order and obtain the documents they want without coming to London. To that end, we offer for sale microfilm copies of the indexes which need to be consulted before a particular registration record can be identified and referenced.

The indexes have been filmed by quarter and by event, and cover the period from 1837 up to 1980. Complete or partial sets of the indexes have been purchased by individuals and by organisations in various parts of the country: these include public libraries and record offices in, for example, Redbridge (close to Mr Jerman’s home) as well as Birmingham, Bristol, Portsmouth and Leeds and smaller centres such as Morpeth, Preston and Truro.

After the relevant entry has been identified in the index a certified copy of the register entry can be ordered by post, and the charge we make when the index reference is given is less than for postal applications in general.

I should add that the handling of postal requests for certificates is itself a part of out operations which we now conduct outside London. The address to write to is CAS Section, Smedley Hydro, Southport, PR8 2HH.

Yours faithfully,

G. T. Banks,
Director, Office of Population Censuses and Surveys,
and Registrar General for England and Wales,
St Catherine’s House, 10 Kingsway, London, WC2.

Tom Arkell
Christopher Charlton
Terry Gwynne
May Pickles
Roger Schofield
Kevin Schurer
Malcolm Smith
Geoffrey Stevenson

November 1988
The Health of the Schoolchild in the Twentieth Century

Local historians interested in the demographic and social history of their communities during the twentieth century face considerably greater difficulties than do historians who study the era of the parish register or census enumerators' books. Certain sources are either closed to inspection, like the census schedules, to protect the individuals recorded therein from prying eyes, or, like the parish registers, cover only an unrepresentative and variable proportion of the population. Many other documents that provide details of particular individuals have been thoroughly weeded because of their bulk or destroyed altogether on the grounds that there was little information of historical interest within them. For example, Jay Winter's survey of primary sources on infant health and infant mortality in Britain between 1900 and 1930 listed many official reports ranging from Select Committees of the House of Commons to the Annual Reports of local Medical Officers, and volumes of committee minutes, yet found almost none of the detailed records which must have been kept on individuals.¹

Nevertheless even reports and minutes contain material to interest the social historian. The roles of certain committees ranged far wider than might be expected from their formal title. To cite one particular example, in the middle of the First World War the Children's Care Sub-Committee of the London County Council authorised an enquiry into how many mothers with school age children in nine London boroughs were working outside the home and of those how many were employed in munitions, were working on account of the war, or had been working prior to the war. The same committee also collected information on the employment of school age children and pondered whether separation allowances were encouraging the wives of absent soldiers to consume too much alcohol.²

Committee papers, however, are not the most manageable of sources. Reports on very disparate subjects lie adjacent to each other, while cases on particular topics, families and individuals, have to be traced from meeting to meeting. Easier to analyse and containing much detail on the health and well-being of schoolchildren are the reports of the School Medical Officers. Local Education Authorities in England and Wales had been empowered by the Education Administrative Provisions Act of 1907 to provide for the medical inspection and treatment of children. Some authorities had already made some limited arrangements for the medical supervision of children in their charge in advance of the Act,³ but after 1907 the monitoring of children's health became much more extensive and systematic. By 1910 the School Medical Officer of the City of Cardiff was routinely examining boys and girls in three age groups: entrants, intermediate (aged 6-9) and leavers (12-15). Medical conditions noted included diseases of the nose and throat, ear, heart, lungs, nervous systems, eyes, chronic disorders, rickets, various forms of tuberculosis and deafness.
Table 1. Nutritional standard of London school children, 1913-1919

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage with excellent nutrition</th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage with subnormal nutrition</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrants* (aged 4-6)</td>
<td>Intermediate (aged 8)</td>
<td>Leavers (aged 12)</td>
<td>Entrants* (aged 4-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys (%)</td>
<td>Girls (%)</td>
<td>Boys (%)</td>
<td>Girls (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Report of the School Medical Officer for the years can be found in London County Council, Annual Report of Council 1915-19, vol. III, Public Health

* = Third term only in 1917.

Table 2. Nutritional standard of Manchester school children, 1909-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutritional standard</th>
<th>Entrants (aged 5)</th>
<th>Leavers (aged 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys (%)</td>
<td>Girls (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well nourished</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor or bad</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Manchester Central Library, Fifth Annual Report of School Medical Officer 1913, pp. 28ff.
Other conditions listed were the number of children with decayed teeth, distinguishing those who had four or more decayed, the incidence of head lice and dirty bodies or heads, the nutritional status of children in three broad classes ('good', 'normal' and 'below normal') and even the state of the children's clothing and footwear. Children in single years of age between three and eight and aged thirteen, were also weighed and measured.  

Such information can be put to a variety of purposes. The incidence of disease at particular ages can be measured. The health of boys can be compared with the health of girls. In London, the nutrition of the girls appears to have been somewhat better than that of the boys as table 1 makes clear. This was not always the case, as for example in Manchester where girls entering school before the First World War were recorded as less well nourished than the boys (table 2). There are, however, certain problems with such assessments of nutritional standards. Some School Medical Officers held that they represented the subjective views of the examining Medical Officer and when there were attempts to define standards, different definitions could be adopted. In general, because standards were measured against what was considered 'normal' for the community in question, comparisons between nutritional standards in different communities are probably more suspect than the measurement of annual variations in nutritional standards within a particular community and the relative nutritional standards of boys and girls, particularly when there was a consistency of medical personnel and in the definitions applied.

Nevertheless, whenever possible, assessments of nutrition need to be considered alongside evidence on average height and weight. These too, of course, pose their own problems of interpretation. First, it must be emphasised that mean height and weight reflect the general health of a population as much as nutrition in itself. Secondly, the mean height and weight have to be measured against a standard schedule of height and weight. The standard selected for the purposes of this study is that of the London school child population of 1966. Judged from this perspective, the average Manchester child of 1927 was, depending on age, between 7 and 11 per cent shorter than the average London child of 1966 and, again, depending on age, between 16 and 32 per cent lighter. Girls were usually further down the 1966 averages for weight than were boys, but with less marked differences as regards average heights (see table 3). Similar results too were obtained from the London school child population in 1909. The implication is that in both populations boys enjoyed a better standard of nutrition than did girls, the opposite of what was suggested for London by the nutritional assessment (see table 1).

Great care is also needed in comparing the numbers of children with serious diseases since a certain number of children are liable to have been identified as seriously ill prior to the routine inspection and removed to special schools or clinics. In any event children seen routinely need to be distinguished from those seen on a special occasion since the reason for their selection was likely to have been the suspicion of a nurse, teacher or Medical Officer that the child concerned had a particular medical problem. Unfortunately, not all reports by School Medical Officers consistently distinguished between routine and special
inspections but as a quick rule of thumb if the number of children examined is substantially lower than the numbers examined on entry or on leaving, then the results for these age groups should be treated with caution.

Table 3.  Mean height and weight of Manchester school children in 1927 and London school child population in 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Manchester 1927</th>
<th>Manchester 1927 Index*</th>
<th>London 1966</th>
<th>London 1966 Index*</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Weight(kg) Manchester 1927</th>
<th>Weight(kg) London 1966</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Weight(kg) Manchester 1927 Index*</th>
<th>Weight(kg) London 1966 Index*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>117.2</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>139.5</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>156.6</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>110.5</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>116.5</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>121.9</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>133.8</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>156.8</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Manchester Central Library, Report of School Medical Officer for City of Manchester 1929, p. 85, citing Report of Chief Medical Officer of Board of Education 1927; Cameron, pp. 514-15.

* = Mean height/weight in 1927 as a percentage of mean height/weight in 1966.

Some of the most interesting data collected by the School Medical Officers are the medical histories of the children. Nottinghamshire was doing this as early as 1909 and this seems to have been a regular feature of school medical work in Belfast. By the age of twelve, more than eight in ten children in Nottinghamshire and more than nine in ten in Belfast had experienced measles. More than one third in Nottinghamshire but nearer two thirds in Belfast had experienced whooping cough. Smaller proportions had suffered chicken pox, scarlet fever and diphtheria (see table 4). In general, regardless of the nature of the disease, higher infection rates were reported for girls than for boys, but whether because the actual incidence was greater or because parents were more willing to acknowledge girls had been ill, or were more aware of illness in a girl, is unclear.

Outside of London, the routine monitoring of children was abandoned in the third year of the First World War and was not restored in its full form. By the 1920s the focus appeared to have shifted from observation to treatment as the school medical service grew in size and status. However, only a handful of School Medical Officers’ reports have been examined and the Cambridge Group would like to encourage the readers of LPS to undertake similar analyses to those outlined above. Few record offices or libraries may be fortunate enough to possess an unbroken series of reports but there should be a wealth of material to examine.
Table 4. Experience of illness in childhood by age 12

(Percentage of all children having experience of given illness)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illness</th>
<th>1909 Males</th>
<th>1909 Females</th>
<th>1934* Males</th>
<th>1934* Females</th>
<th>1945* Males</th>
<th>1945* Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measles</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whooping cough</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken pox</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarlet fever</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphtheria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumps</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak chest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonsilitis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See note 9.

* = Percentages of numbers examined whose parents returned forms (95% of all parents) in 1934, percentages of numbers examined in 1945.

NOTES


5. Belfast Central Library, Report of Senior Medical Officer for the year 1946, p. 66. ‘There is no definite scale whereby an assessment can be made of the nutritive state of any child. It depends on the impression made upon the individual medical office’.


8. Calculated from Cameron.

NEWS FROM THE LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES SOCIETY

Conferences

As a matter of policy we are trying to establish a new phase of planning in which we have firm plans for conferences up to a year ahead, and a provisional programme still further into the future. By advertising these arrangements well in advance - here in LPS and in the LPSS Bulletin - we hope to give members an overview of the Society's thinking and, most important, to encourage a response from you; please remember that we welcome suggestions for conference venues and themes. If you think we are neglecting any region of Britain or a topic, let us know: write to Paul Hair, Malcolm Smith or Grace Wyatt.

Forthcoming Conferences

14th-16th April 1989. Residential conference at St Mary's College, University of Durham. Friday evening through to Sunday lunch. Approximate cost is £60, including conference fee and residence with full board. The topic is 'Population in Northern England', with lectures, workshops, exhibitions and discussion as well as a chance to explore Durham's beautiful cathedral city setting. Day and half-day registrations are also available. Conference includes LPSS General Meeting.

1st or 8th July, 1989. Day conference at Loughborough University on the topic of 'Parish Records', focussing on Loughborough’s computerised database of parish registers.

November, 1989. Day conference with regional emphasis, probably to be held in either Cardiff or Bristol. Venue to be arranged.

30th March - 1st April, 1990. Residential conference at Bishop Grosseteste College, Lincoln. The theme will be Victorian population and the nineteenth century censuses.

7th or 14th July, 1990. Day conference, Sussex or London.


Surname Survey

The research project on surname distributions (LPS 37 & LPS 39) is beginning to reach the size where we can obtain good comparative data on inbreeding rates around the country. Many thanks to the volunteers currently working on some twenty parishes; several members have already returned their transcripts for computerisation. Still more volunteers from all areas are needed - is there anyone out there working on Norfolk? - but we have sufficient information
already to put on a sizeable exhibition of the results so far at the Durham conference. For further details of the project contact Malcolm Smith, Department of Anthropology, 43 Old Elvet, Durham, DH1 3HN.

LPSS Bulletin

During the summer (and during the mail strike) we launched the first issue of the LPSS Bulletin. This is intended to provide a forum for the news and views of our members, and to promote contact and interaction between the organising committee and the membership. Our plan is that the Bulletin should appear twice a year, alternating with issues of LPS. Initial responses have been favourable, but the success of the Bulletin will ultimately be judged by the extent to which it really does bring members into contact, by informing each other of our enthusiasms and our hobby-horses, our research interests and achievements. Contributions, please, to: Paul Hair, Department of History, University of Liverpool, P.O. Box 147, Liverpool, L69 3BX.

An LPS Suplement

POPULATION STUDIES
FROM PARISH REGISTERS

A Selection of Readings from Local Population Studies
with an introduction by Michael Drake

A selection of contributions from LPS compiled around a series of topics: Marriage, Baptism, Burial, Migration and Area Studies. It brings together some of the most valuable items to have appeared in LPS during the last sixteen years.

Michael Drake’s introduction outlines some of the basic procedures of parish register analysis and identifies the pitfalls and difficulties which can so easily trap the unwary.

252 pages including an index. Soft cover. ISBN 0 9503951 7X

Population Studies from Parish Registers can be obtained from booksellers or direct from Mrs M. Ballington, Tawney House, Matlock, Derbyshire DE4 3BT. Price £6.00 (plus 70p postage and packing).

Paid-up members of the Local Population Studies Society can purchase Population Studies from Parish Registers at the special price of £5.00 (plus 70p postage and packing).
COMBINING ESTATE RECORDS WITH CENSUS ENUMERATORS' BOOKS TO STUDY NINETEENTH CENTURY COMMUNITIES: THE CASE OF THE TANKERSLEY IRONSTONE MINERS C. 1850

Melvyn Jones

Melvyn Jones teaches at Sheffield City Polytechnic. His main historical interests are spatial demography and landscape history. He is the author (with W F Hornby) of An introduction to Population Geography (CUP, 1980) and the editor of The Hallamshire Historian

Introduction

Readers of LPS will be thoroughly familiar with the contents and usefulness of the census enumerators' books of the 1841-81 censuses, but, with the notable exception of the house repopulation technique, their use in conjunction with other contemporary sources, particularly when they are in a supporting role, has been less widely reported.¹ This article is concerned with demonstrating some of the ways in which census enumerators' books can be used alongside the records of a landed estate to shed light on certain aspects of the social and economic structure of industrial communities in a semi-rural setting.

The estate in question was, in the mid-nineteenth century, the south Yorkshire property of the fifth Earl Fitzwilliam (1786-1857). It occupied an extensive area between the towns of Barnsley and Rotherham, with outlying parts in Sheffield. Altogether it covered more than 17,000 acres. The main estate, which extended over large parts of the extensive Wath and Rotherham parishes and one third of the parish of Tankersley, was centred on Wentworth Woodhouse, a large Palladian mansion in Wentworth township in the parish of Wath (fig. 1).

Outcropping within the estate were several important coal and ironstone seams which were worked from at least the mid-eighteenth century. The most important of these were the Barnsley coal seam, which was nine feet thick in this area, and the Tankersley ironstone seam. The Tankersley ironstone seam, as shown in figure 1, outcrops to the west of Tankersley Park, a medieval deer park, and then swings eastwards through Wentworth township to the south of Wentworth Woodhouse and its park. The seam dips away beneath Tankersley parish and Wentworth township, towards the north-east. Obviously minerals are first exploited at their outcrop where they can be reached without undue difficulty, but later deeper pits have to be sunk to reach the dipping seams. In the case of the Tankersley ironstone, mining first took place on the western and south-western edges of the park, then moved to the north of the park, then into its central and eastern parts and finally beyond the park to a deep pit in Hoyland Nether township. From the early nineteenth century until c.1880 the ironstone supplied the Elsecar and Milton ironworks in Hoyland Nether township.
A casual browser among the Wentworth Woodhouse Muniments in Sheffield City Libraries could be forgiven for believing that ironstone mining on Earl Fitzwilliam’s estate in south Yorkshire in the mid-nineteenth century was a very small industry indeed. The 1853 wage books, for example, list only about forty men and boys at the ironstone grounds. For the most part, the persons named in the wage books were members of a small staff, headed by a mineral agent, who maintained the pits by pumping out water from the workings, laying and repairing wagonways, erecting and dismantling headgear at the small pits and tending the steam engines at the deep shafts. Absent from the 1853 wage books, because they were technically self-employed, were the nearly 300 men and boys who actually mined the ironstone.

The mining was organised on an ‘undertaker’ basis, a type of organisation widespread in the British Isles in coal mining and lead mining as well as ironstone mining. In this system, undertakers or contractors were appointed who then undertook to ‘get’ the ironstone and ‘hurry’ or ‘tram’ it to the bottom of the shaft in the case of deep pits, and to the surface in the case of small, shallow pits. Each undertaker was paid an all-in price per ton or dozen (about forty-two cwt) for the ironstone he got and out of this he had to pay the workers he employed. Although no written contracts for the period under discussion appear to have survived, a number prepared about fifty years earlier by Newton Chambers and Company, who were mining coal and ironstone about a mile to the south, have survived in transcript. For example:

5 July 1805 John Shelton and John Parkin.

To work 2 pits in the Black Ironstone Mine at Thorncliffe and get all the Ironstone 31 yds more or less up on the end from the level to the Bassett in both pits, to be got, hurried, hung on and Drawn on to the pit hill, to be set up 22” high, 18’ x 3’ and shall be reckoned one Doz to be led away in carts and D/D C ft 81 and paid at the rate of 22/- per Dozen, and to allow to L(ongden) C(hambers) N(ewton) & Co 6/- per Dozen for all the levels new driven by instalments of 1/- per dozen of the stone. To find their own tools, except Ropes, corves and Gin, also to employ sufficient hands to get 12 Dozens per fortnight and to work for no one else during Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>John Hollings</th>
<th>John Shelton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/-</td>
<td>Ernest</td>
<td>John Parkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the organisation of the industry, its rural setting and its location in a largely unpopulated part of the Wentworth estate away from established settlements, a number of interesting questions spring to mind: did the ironstone miners live in isolation or were they drawn from the established villages and hamlets in the area? How far and from which directions did the miners commute to work? Did kinship play an important role in recruitment into undertakers’ teams? To what extent did incomers find employment in the small, tightly-knit work units?

Two lists of estate employees in the Wentworth Woodhouse Muniments, when used in conjunction with the enumerators’ books of the 1851 census, enable us to address these questions in some detail and with some confidence.
The nature of the estate records

The first list is an enumeration of the one hundred men and boys who were employed at the ironstone grounds in September 1849. The workforce is divided into fourteen undertakers’ teams, twelve working in small bell pits and two at a deep pit, with the undertakers (ten) or partnerships of undertakers (four) clearly indicated at the head of each team. For each miner the full name and place of residence are given and, in the case of those under twenty years of age, their ages.

In 1849 only one of the two ironworks in Hoyland Nether was in blast, but two months later both works were leased to a Staffordshire ironmaster and the demand for ironstone grew quickly and the number of ironstone miners increased accordingly. The relatively small and fluctuating numbers of ironstone miners in the 1840s and the rapid expansion in the early 1850s were recorded with great accuracy in detailed lists compiled by the various heads of department on the Fitzwilliam South Yorkshire estate for the purpose of distributing the St Thomas’ Day charity donation on 21 December each year and the Collop Monday charity in March each year. It is not clear when these two charities began or when they ceased and this is the subject of further research. Detailed lists have been located for 1768, 1811-28 and 1841-56. The charities are mentioned in the account books for other years but no other detailed lists appear to have survived. At the back of the 1849 list there is a ‘Rule of Admissibility’ to a claim for the St Thomas’ Day donation: ‘Any person regularly employed in the Service of Earl Fitzwilliam and employed at that time. Persons employed at that time at a merely occasional job are not entitled’. The note also instructed each head of department to attend ‘to identify his men’. A quantity of meat and a sum of money were given on St Thomas’ Day and meat only on Collop Monday.

It is the St Thomas’ Day list for 1850 that has been analysed for the purposes of this study. The complete list names 1,242 persons grouped according to occupation and in some cases, principally miners, by place of work. The list included 606 men and boys employed at collieries, 271 men and boys employed at the ironstone pits, seventy-seven employees at the estate workshops and on a railway, forty-one farm workers at the home farm, twenty-eight carpenters, twenty-six woodmen, sixteen grooms and sundry gatekeepers, masons, slaters, quarrymen, bricklayers, painters and glaziers, millers, saddlers, smiths and former employees and widows of former employees in almshouses. A few names among the lists of male workers were of women, denoting widows on estate pensions.

The 1850 St Thomas’ Day list was compiled on 16 December, just three and a half months before the 1851 census (which was conducted on the night of 30/31 March) and then adjusted for the Collop Monday charity three weeks before the census (Collop Monday was on 10 March in 1851). Seventy-nine of the one hundred ironstone miners named in the 1849 list, and 251 of the 271 named in the 1850 list, have been identified in the 1851 census.
Figure 2  Distribution of the places of residence of Elsecar coal miners and Tankersley ironstone miners, December, 1850.
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Notes:  Map A shows the places of residence of miners employed at Elsecar High Colliery, the location of which is shown by the black square.  
Map B shows the places of residence of miners at Elsecar Mid Colliery which had two pits, one at Elsecar and another at Jump.  
Map C shows the places of residence of miners at Elsecar Low Colliery.  
Map D shows the places of residence of ironstone miners. By 1850 the two shafts in Tankersley parish were used for drainage and ventilation only. The shaft in Hoyland is the engine pit referred to in the estate records. Three ironstone miners lived beyond the area shown on the map.

Ironstone miners' places of residence and extent of residential segregation

Figure 2 shows the distribution of the places of residence of the 251 ironstone miners who were identified from the December 1850 St Thomas' Day list (2D), compared with the distribution of the places of residence of coal miners working in three collieries in the same area also owned by Earl Fitzwilliam (2A, 2B and 2C). In the December 1850 St Thomas' Day list there were eighty-seven men and boys employed at Elsecar High Colliery, 121 at Elsecar Mid-Colliery and eighty-eight at the recently opened Elsecar Low Colliery. Of these, eighty-three employed at Elsecar High, 115 at Elsecar Mid and eighty-two at Elsecar Low have been located in the 1851 census returns. The search in the census returns for both the ironstone and coal miners covered all those townships and/or parishes named in figure 2A together with Wortley township to the west of Tankersley. What needs to be emphasised is that in Hoyland and the surrounding townships and parishes there were miners of coal and ironstone who were employed in collieries and ironstone pits other than those owned by Earl Fitzwilliam. The combined use of the charity list and the enumerators' returns results in the identification of miners working at specific places rather than coal miners and ironstone miners in general.

In one sense, figure 2 contains few surprises in that, as expected, there is generally a close relationship between place of work and place of residence, but a close inspection of the maps reveals some interesting minor spatial patterns. The existence of an estate-built mining village at Elsecar explains the concentration of coal miners in the eastern corner of Hoyland township in close proximity to two of the collieries. Outside Elsecar there are some interesting variations over short distances. For example, the village of Hoyland Nether at the centre of Hoyland township, with three exceptions, only housed miners at the nearby Elsecar High Colliery. On the other hand, miners living in Jump, just across the Hoyland township boundary in Wombwell township, worked in almost equal numbers at all three collieries. Another interesting feature is the fact that only one coal miner employed at Earl Fitzwilliam's collieries lived in the rapidly growing village of Hoyland Common on the extreme western edge of Hoyland township, though other coal miners, employed at other collieries in the district, did live there.

Turning to figure 2D, the two most obvious characteristics are that, first, there is a remarkable degree of segregation between the ironstone and coal miners and, secondly, the residences of the ironstone miners are much more widely dispersed than those of the coal miners, with only a small proportion of the workforce living in close proximity to their place of work. The ironstone miners lived in substantial numbers at Pilley in Tankersley parish, Birdwell in
Worsbrough township, Hoyland Common in Hoyland township and Thorpe Hesley in Kimberworth township, with a fairly dense secondary scatter throughout Tankersley parish and Hoyland and Wentworth townships. The small number of ironstone miners in the northern part of Ecclesfield parish close to Tankersley Park is explained by the fact that Newton Chambers and Company provided an important alternative source of employment for iron workers, coal miners and ironstone miners at their Thorncliffe works in that area.

The wide dispersal of the homes of ironstone miners is partly explained by the fact that the bell pits and gin pits (advanced types of bell pit) and two of the three shafts were in the former Tankersley Park where, apart from one or two cottages and the farm attached to the ruined hall in the centre of the park, there were no settlements. The pattern also reflects, to some extent, the historical development of ironstone mining in the area and in particular, as mentioned earlier, its retreat during the previous half century from areas to the south and south-east and to the north of the areas indicated in figure 2D. In that period the pits, working the Tankersley seam near its outcrop, were much nearer Thorpe Hesley in Kimberworth township, Pilley in the north of Tankersley parish and Birdwell in the south of the Worsbrough township, all of which were important locations of the homes of ironstone miners in December 1850. As the working had retreated towards the middle of Tankersley Park and to Skiers Spring (the deep shaft mine in Hoyland township in fig 2D) so the workforce had lengthened its journey to work so that villages such as Birdwell, Pilley and Thorpe Hesley retained their importance as centres where Tankersley ironstone miners lived, even though journeys to work had doubled during the first half of the nineteenth century. Of those coal and ironstone miners whose places of residence have been located in figure 2, only 4 per cent of the coal miners lived more than two kilometres from their place of work, the vast majority living no more than a few minutes’ walk from the colliery at which they worked. By contrast, over 45 per cent of the ironstone miners walked between three and four kilometres to work, with as many as 95 per cent walking at least one kilometre.

Although largely segregated from other miners employed on the Fitzwilliam estate this does not necessarily mean that the ironstone miners lived in complete residential segregation from other miners and from families engaged in other occupations. Table 1, summarising the occupations of employed males in 1851 in the main settlement centres in which the ironstone miners lived, shows that although these settlements, with the exception of Wentworth whose estate village function is very clear, could be described as mining villages, they did not contain a residentially segregated ironstone mining population. Indeed, only the hamlet of Harley and the village of Hoyland Common had more than a third of their employed male population engaged in ironstone mining.

**Kinship and Teamwork**

Though not segregated residentially from other miners, agricultural workers, self-employed metalworkers and workers in iron manufacturing, there was, nevertheless, a certain closeness among the ironstone miners. Every working
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Birdwell no</th>
<th>Birdwell %</th>
<th>Pilley no</th>
<th>Pilley %</th>
<th>Hoyland Common no</th>
<th>Hoyland Common %</th>
<th>Harley no</th>
<th>Harley %</th>
<th>Wentworth no</th>
<th>Wentworth %</th>
<th>Thorpe Hesley no</th>
<th>Thorpe Hesley %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining (Ironstone mining)*</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(23.7)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(18.4)</td>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>(45.7)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(51.2)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(27.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial service</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service and professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owning and independent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
* = Employment in ironstone mining is expressed as a sub-total of the main category of Mining. The classification adopted here is that of Charles Booth (1886) modified and described by W.A. Armstrong in, E.A. Wrigley (ed), *Nineteenth Century Society*, 1972, pp.226-310.
day, unlike most of their neighbours, they left their villages to walk a fair
distance to their workplace, often in another parish, and when they arrived
they spent their day working in isolation in a close-knit team under an
undertaker. On the other hand, the overwhelming majority of local coal miners
worked in their home village, in bigger teams and, because of the larger scale
of operation, in greater isolation from others. Moreover, the boys who worked
in the coal pits as trappers and horseboys were employed and controlled by the
pit manager rather than by an undertaker.

In putting together his team an undertaker would try to ensure the greatest
efficiency and therefore the greatest profit. This meant having a getter or getters
to mine the ironstone, hurriers or trammers to take it in corves (wagons) from
the working place to the pit bottom and, in the case of the small, shallow pits,
coupling the corves onto ropes or chains (called hanging-on) to be wound up
the shaft by a gin boy who operated a pulley system by leading a horse or
pony round a circle at the pit top. It was then taken away from the pithead to
be banked prior to being taken to the furnaces. Getting was normally done by
experienced miners in their prime. According to the evidence collected in south
Yorkshire by the sub-commissioners of the Children’s Employment Commission
(Mines) in 1842\textsuperscript{10} some getters were as young as seventeen or eighteen, but
typically they were in their twenties, thirties and forties. Older men helped to
fill the corves and were employed as hangers-on and banksmen. Teenagers
were used as hurriers and the youngest of all - including nine year olds in 1851
were employed as gin boys.

The ironstone miners would obviously go through an occupational life-cycle,
starting as gin boys, progressing to be hurriers, becoming getters in their prime,
and then, as their health and strength declined, taking on the less arduous roles
of hangers-on or banksmen. Figure 3 shows the structure of the Tankersley
ironstone mining labour force in 1850-1 arrived at by combining the names
given in the December 1850 St Thomas’ Day list with the ages and occupations
stated in the March 1851 census returns.

Teams were likely to be made up on the basis of a number of criteria: skill,
work rate, reliability, availability, sentiment and profit would all have played a
part. Because of the heavy nature of the work and the ageing process, teams
must have been constantly changing as miners fell ill, died or moved into other
teams as lighter or heavier work became available, or moved into other
occupations. The appointment of new undertakers from the mining population
would also have caused the disintegration of existing teams as would the
formation of their new companies of workmen.

In a deep pit there was less need for young boys than in a small pit. Corves
here were trammed over larger distances but only to the bottom of the shaft, so
that gin boys were not required. Nor were boys employed as trappers, to open
and close airtight doors, as they were in the deep coal pits where gaseous
explosions were a constant threat. There were more opportunities in the small
pits for youths and boys. In such pits, teams were small, consisting of between
four and eight members, and as many as half of them were young boys
employed as trammers and gin boys.
There were certain advantages for undertakers in employing members of their own families. The main advantage was that earnings were kept within the family. If they were young they could also be more easily controlled and directed than other employees; they could possibly also be worked harder at no extra, or even less, expense. Evidence in government enquiries at the time suggests considerable abuse in situations where undertakers employed their own children, with an insistence on very long hours and unrealistic output targets. The mineral agent at Thorncliffe only a mile or so from Tankersley told the sub-commissioner of the Children's Employment Commission (Mines) in 1842 that:

'Those [undertakers] who have got their own children at work with them use them worse than the others. I am quite sure of this. Where the lads are hired by the undertaker, they will stick up for themselves and will not work more than the time agreed on, but where the undertakers employ their own children, they can make them do as they like'.

Notes: Undertakers and their teams only; members of the maintenance staff at the ironstone grounds are excluded.
In the same report, a boy of seventeen, who worked for his undertaker father as a getter, the most demanding job in a pit, said:

'I get and have been getting for two years. I find it very hard work indeed; it tires me very much; I can hardly get washed of a night till 9 o'clock, I am so tired. My father always tells me what to get. I and another boy have to get 35 corves a day; each corve holds nearly 4 cwt ... we work from five in the morning till nearly five in the evening and have about ten minutes for dinner'.

Whether an enlightened manager and caring father or a bullying tyrant, an undertaker's ability to recruit family members varied according to personal circumstance. Obviously undertakers in their forties or fifties with large families, and perhaps a large number of nephews, were in a much better position to introduce their kin into their work teams than relatively young undertakers whose brothers were probably already established in other teams or occupations and whose own children were too young to be recruited.

Table 2. Selected structural characteristics of the undertakers' teams working at the Tankersley ironstone grounds in September 1849.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Size of team</th>
<th>Age of undertaker</th>
<th>Make-up of team</th>
<th>Number related to undertaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell pits/gin pits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42.44*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit 7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit 8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit 9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit 11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.23*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit 12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine pit (deep shaft pit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.30*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** * = two undertakers in partnership; in these cases the figure in the last column shows those persons related to one or the other or both of the undertakers.

Attention may now be turned to the undertakers' teams working at the Tankersley ironstone grounds in September 1849. Selected characteristics of the teams are summarised in table 2. Bearing in mind what has already been said about the differences in the undertakers' responsibilities between the deep pits
and the small pits, it is interesting to note the virtual absence of boys (under fifteen years old) from the two undertakers' teams at the deep pit. Indeed, there were only five miners under twenty-one in team one and only one under twenty-one in team two at that pit. In the case of team two, where four of the eight team members were related, they were a father of fifty-six (the undertaker) and his grown up sons aged thirty-five, twenty-eight and twenty-six.

It is clear from the table that in the small bell pits and gin pits there was a relationship between the age of an undertaker and the number of kin in his team. In three of the four instances where there were no relatives of the undertaker in a team, the undertakers were aged thirty or under. Conversely, in all four cases where between two and five subordinate team-members were relatives, the undertakers were in their forties and fifties.

Table 3 gives further details of a representative sample of five of the twelve teams operating in September 1849. The team in pit one was the only one in which all members were related. The team was headed by two brothers-in-law. The son of one (William Smith) was the gin boy; James Burgon, the other undertaker, was childless according to the census of 1851. The other members of the team were the brother of one of the undertakers and his son.

In pit two the middle-aged undertaker was accompanied by his two young sons, the elder of the two probably hurrying and the younger acting as gin boy. The other two members of the team were another middle-aged getter and a teenager, George Smith, who probably acted as his hurrier. George Smith was a near neighbour of the undertaker.

William Bennett, the undertaker who headed the team in pit six, was also accompanied by his sons, but in this case two were in their twenties and undoubtedly getters. The structure of the undertakers' family in 1849 (he then had four sons aged twenty-seven, twenty-four, twenty-one and nineteen and a daughter aged sixteen) meant that he had to look outside his immediate family for two hurriers and a gin boy. William Bennett Junior, the undertaker in pit three and the eldest known son of William Bennett of pit six, was only twenty-seven years old, unmarried and still living with his father. He almost certainly learned his trade as a member of his father's team and only left it relatively recently. None of the other three members of his team who have been located in the census were his relatives.

The team in pit ten also comprised unrelated members. Although thirty-seven years old, William Jubb, the undertaker, still had a very young family (his five children were aged nine, six, four, two and one) and the eldest two were girls. In Jubb's case he made up his team by employing two near neighbours, William Hunter and John Senior, and sixteen-year-old Charles Smith, who could not be accommodated in the team in which his father worked. His father was Thomas Smith in pit one, and the place Charles might have filled was already taken by his cousin Ezra Smith whose father was one of the undertakers in that pit.
Table 3. Examples of undertakers’ teams in the bell pits and gin pits at Tankersley in September 1849.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Assumed role</th>
<th>Known relationship to undertaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - Pit 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Burgon (undertaker)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>getter</td>
<td>brother-in-law of WS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Smith (undertaker)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>getter</td>
<td>brother-in-law of JB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Smith</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>banksman</td>
<td>brother of WS; brother-in-law of JB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra Smith</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>hurrier</td>
<td>WS’s son; JB’s nephew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Smith</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>gin boy</td>
<td>TS’s son; JB’s and WS’s nephew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - Pit 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Trippett (undertaker)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>getter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Sylvester</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>getter</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Smith</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>hurrier</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Trippett</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>hurrier</td>
<td>son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Trippett</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>gin boy</td>
<td>son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - Pit 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Bennett (undertaker)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>getter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Bennett</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>getter</td>
<td>son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Bennett</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>getter</td>
<td>son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bennett</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>getter</td>
<td>son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Smith</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>hurrier</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Bell</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>hurrier</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Platts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>gin boy</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - Pit 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Bennett Jnr (undertaker)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>getter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Wroe</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>getter</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Holden</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>hurrier</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Ward</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>hurrier</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Ward</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>gin boy</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - Pit 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jubb (undertaker)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>getter</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Hunter</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>getter</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Smith</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>hurrier</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Senior</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>gin boy</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  * = individual not located in 1851 census returns.

Birthplaces of Ironstone Miners

In a recent article in this journal\textsuperscript{13} concerned with the social structure of Ivinghoe, a straw plaiting community in Buckinghamshire, in the nineteenth-century, the authors drew a distinction between Ivinghoe on the one hand and ‘its manufacturing counterparts in the north and midlands’ on the other in that Ivinghoe’s labour force was overwhelmingly home grown while, the authors imply, those of industrial communities in the north and midlands were not.
Figure 4, showing the birthplaces of ironstone miners working at Tankersley in December 1850, suggests that such a general statement may be quite misleading. Local patterns of migration are likely to be related to the balance between demand for, and supply of, labour, rather than some inherently regional characteristic of the centre of in-migration. The Tankersley ironstone miners were overwhelmingly locally born, a not surprising circumstance in view of what has already been revealed about the organisation of the industry. More than 97 per cent of the 251 men and boys employed at the ironstone grounds in December 1850 and who have been located in the 1851 census were born in the West Riding, of whom 236 (94 per cent) were born in south Yorkshire within fifteen kilometres of the ironstone grounds, and 195 (78 per cent) were born in Tankersley parish and the adjacent townships of Worsbrough, Hoyland Nether, Wentworth and Kimberworth within six kilometres of the ironstone grounds. All sixteen (out of eighteen) of the undertakers leading teams at the ironstone grounds in September 1849 who
have been found in the 1851 census enumerators’ returns were born in the same narrow area. Of the seven ironstone miners born outside the West Riding of Yorkshire, six had originated less than fifty-five kilometres from Tankersley. Two of these, from Nottinghamshire, were young nephews of undertakers who may have been specially brought to south Yorkshire to fill gaps in teams. They were aged eleven and thirteen, were probably gin boys, and worked in teams headed by young undertakers with no boys of their own of those ages.

Conclusion

Brief, selective and, in places, speculative as this analysis has been, it shows the potential of the combined use of census enumerators’ returns and estate and other local records. The evidence presented here shows that this approach may throw light on such matters as labour recruitment, family allegiance to particular occupations, the structure of labour forces, labour migration and residential segregation by occupation.

NOTES

2. Wentworth Woodhouse Muniments in Sheffield City Libraries. Referred to hereafter as WWM/SCL.
3. WWM/SCL A1557.
4. Miscellaneous Documents in Sheffield City Libraries, MD/SCL 3590(d). Comparison with other agreements show that the abbreviation D/D means delivered, and C ft 81 means 81 cubic feet.
5. WWM/SCL G-45.
6. In the supplement to his Sheffield Glossary 1891, Sidney Oldall Addy, stated that on Collop Monday, the day before Shrove Tuesday, ‘poor people go to their richer neighbours to beg a collop or slice of bacon, to supply the fat in which pancakes are baked on the following day.’ p. 13.
7. WWM/SCL R2A-42; WWM/SCL A1543; WWM/SCL A1412-A1414.
8. WWM/SCL A1412.
9. WWM/SCL A1419.
11. Ibid., witness no 60, p. 237.
12. Ibid., witness no 67, p. 240.
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The movement of rural labour and the workings of the rural labour market
have all too often been neglected by social historians in favour of the study of
the effect of industrialisation on urban society.¹ Yet the condition of the
southern agricultural labourer, and in particular his reluctance to move to the
manufacturing areas of the north, were subjects for frequent comment in the
nineteenth-century:

‘.... though of all classes .... agricultural labourers are under the
greatest necessity to leave their birthplaces, and have the greatest
inducement to do so, no class is so hard to move away.’²

For example, the workforce in the Weald of Kent was discussed in this context,
the Weald being an area virtually devoid of industrial employment and noted
for the presence of ‘surplus’ labour. T. L. Hodges reported to the Select
Committee of the House of Commons on Emigration that:

‘... there is in almost every parish, and has for several years past
been, a considerably larger number of people than the agricultural
demands require... the parishes are in considerable distress...’³

It was also an area with a high expenditure on poor relief. In the years 1841-71,
Poor Law Unions in north/north-eastern Kent tended to have the lowest
expenditure levels, while Unions with the highest levels were in the Weald. For
e.g., in the periods 1841-71, and 1865-71, Gravesend Union had a per
capita real expenditure level of 3s. 11d., and 2s. 4d., while Hollingbourne
Union had expenditure of 13s. 8d., and 10s. 2d respectively.⁴

Migration studies at county and national level preclude a range of questions
which together constitute a more detailed probe into labour mobility. From a
county study we cannot, for example, confirm or deny the observations of those
writers who, on the one hand, hold that agricultural labourers were in fact
particularly immobile, or, on the other hand, the contrary view that they were
very mobile, pulled by the attractions of industrial work and urban life. In
order to discover whether or not this was the case a closer examination of the
composition of the ‘movers’ is essential. The task can be fulfilled most
effectively by the study and linkage of the manuscript census, an arduous task even for the student of one parish. Brenchley, a parish lying in the heart of the Weald of Kent was found to be representative of the area and selected for a study which would illuminate some factors influencing population mobility in a mid-nineteenth century agricultural settlement in this region.5

Brenchley was a parish whose population in mid-century numbered 2,704 people, and which continued to grow by as much as 17.3 per cent in the decade 1861-71.6 The majority of its workforce was engaged in agriculture, nearly half of the adult males declaring themselves to be agricultural labourers (47.0, 46.6, and 46.8 per cent at the three censuses of 1841, 1851, and 1861).7 At that time when the absolute numbers of agricultural labourers were increasing, (if we take workforce at the censuses of 1841, 1851, and 1861 and 1871, the figures are 308, 392, 383, and 451 respectively), the numbers of small (20-100 acre) farmers were decreasing, in fact they fell from 53 to 41 per cent of all landholders in the years 1851-71.8 The principal type of farming as given in the Tithe Award was that of arable, including the growing of hops. The reliance on corn meant that the district was likely to be much depressed in times of low corn prices, with resultant unemployment. In times of crisis, the labourers had little alternative means of support as the percentage of household heads who held no land was high and increasing (between 1851 and 1871 the figure rose from 87.5 per cent to 93.8 per cent). As living-in was declining, the agricultural worker no longer had the security provided by this system of employment; in bad times he would now have to face the effects of increased food prices.9 However, as living-in was usually a life-cycle phenomenon ending upon marriage, labourers always had to contend with making this adjustment. Furthermore there was little alternative employment in an agricultural parish such as Brenchley, even the coming of the railway in the 1840s brought a minimal expansion in jobs.10

The narrowness of opportunity is confirmed by a comparison of the occupational similarities/differences between fathers and sons; in 1851 and 1871 96 per cent and 95 per cent of sons with labouring fathers followed their father’s occupations.11 The sons who were least likely to follow in their father’s footsteps were farmer’s sons. In the two censal years of 1851 and 1871 respectively, 50 and 92 per cent of those who left farming attained lower occupational status. Particularly striking is the fact that the fathers of these apparently downwardly mobile youths (as observed in the census of 1851) all had holdings of under seventy-five acres.

However, it would be misleading to depict Brenchley as a pauperised parish. While agricultural labourers lacked any means of self-support or betterment, other than these jobs, their average wage of 12s a week was on par with that for the county as a whole, and Kent was not considered to be a low-wage county. In fact real wages did not diverge markedly either in level or trend from those for the county or nation; in the early 1850s there was a rise in real wages, sustained, though not as great as that which came about after 1870.12 We can also infer the existence of unemployment from an examination of expenditure on poor relief. Local information is hard to gather but from a few surviving Relief Ledgers and Journals there is evidence to suggest that the early 1830s were very bad years indeed. At the time approximately a quarter of Brenchley’s household heads were claiming relief. Indeed, the Parish Overseer
in 1832 was obliged to pressurise farmers into employing more labour. Brenchley's expenditure on poor relief was permanently above average for its Union, the county, and England. However, after the mid-1850s, expenditure fell and the discussion of bad winters, bad harvests, and large-scale unemployment disappear from the Poor Law authorities' correspondence. E. L. Jones, when examining the agricultural labour market in England as a whole, presented a similar pattern of unemployment. He saw the 1840s as the turning point in labour demand, a time after which there were continuous shortages of hands in the 1850s and 1860s. Indeed, he argued that the growth of Arch's Union in the 1870s was a response to a check in the upward course of the standard of living, as opposed to a desperate response to appalling conditions.13

Reference was made at the beginning of this article to the census being an important source for the study of population mobility. There are two methods which can be adopted: firstly, an analysis of birthplace statistics, and secondly, the linking of successive censuses. Birthplace statistics, or any single year analysis, present a generally static picture of the workforce or population. While such statistics identify the origins of the population at a specific moment in time, they do not indicate the subsequent persistence/mobility of the 'outsiders' or of the Brenchley-born, and it is not so much the origin as the transiency of the workforce which is the measure of its response to socio-economic change. Single year analysis therefore disguises the rather brisk turnover of the population. The movement of labour is most effectively studied by the linking of successive censuses. This allows a fuller picture to be drawn of the rates of turnover and persistence (despite the fact that census linkage does not capture inter-censal change). These rates of turnover and persistence can in turn be related to contemporary environmental and economic stimuli.

The 1841 census did not record birthplace in detail; respondents were only asked whether or not they were born in the county of enumeration. Some 90 per cent of all 16-70 year olds in Brenchley replied 'yes', the remainder replied 'no'. Successive censuses which specify the precise place of birth of each individual, reveal how the Kentish-born, and those from neighbouring counties, consistently formed the largest grouping in the parish. The almost exclusively local nature of Brenchley's catchment area within Kent, and some nearby Sussex parishes, is confirmed by the statistics referring to the parish of birth of the workforce. Approximately half of the 16-70 year olds had been born in Brenchley, the others originating from a distance of only a few miles. The percentage of Brenchley-born declined from 51.8 per cent to 43.8 per cent during the course of twenty years (1851-71), though they continued by far to be the largest contingent.

Three sets of census linkage were undertaken: from the 1851 to the 1861 census, the 1861 to the 1871, and finally the 1851 to the 1861 to the 1871 census. Tables 1 and 2 display the results of the 1851 to 1861, and 1861 to 1871 linkage.

In the three-way link, 927 persons had already been linked from 1851 to 1861. When these pairs were then linked to the 1871 census, 349 persons could be identified as having lived in Brenchley from 1851 to 1871. To summarise, in the decade 1851-61, 38 per cent of the 'truly linkable population' persisted; by 1861-
71, the percentage had fallen to 31, and when the three-way link was conducted, 14 per cent of the truly linkable population were found to have remained in Brenchley for the twenty year period.14 This considerable rate of turnover in Brenchley was not unexpected and had long been a feature of English rural life. In seventeenth-century Clayworth and Cogenhoe, Laslett and Harrison found that of the 401 persons present in 1676, after the subtraction of ninety-one deaths, 50.8 per cent persisted to 1688.15 In a recent study of a nineteenth-century Essex village, taking into consideration non-persistence through death and the subtraction of temporary residents, Robin found that 64.5 per cent of the population of Elmendon stayed in the decade 1851-61, a considerably higher persistency level compared to that of Brenchley.16

Table 1. Linkage of the 1851 to the 1861 census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons available for linking (from both censuses)</th>
<th>5,572</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-censal deaths (from parish registers)</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-censal births (from parish registers)</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons who could not be linked, the ‘migrants’</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of these, numbers leaving after the 1851 census</td>
<td>3,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons arriving in the inter-censal period</td>
<td>1,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total of persisters divided by 2 (as there were two census entries per person) | 927   |

TOTAL OF MATCHED PAIRS, ‘PERSISTERS’ 927

Table 2. Linkage of the 1861 to the 1871 census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons available for linking (from both censuses)</th>
<th>6,233</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-censal deaths (from parish registers)</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-censal births (from parish registers)</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons who could not be linked, the ‘migrants’</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of these, numbers leaving after the 1861 census</td>
<td>3,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons arriving in the inter-censal period</td>
<td>1,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total of persisters divided by 2 (as there were two census entries per person) | 866   |

TOTAL OF MATCHED PAIRS, ‘PERSISTERS’ 866

When the census information concerning each individual was first coded, twenty separate pieces of information were recorded, including: birthplace; age; sex; marital condition; type of family; relationship to the head of household;
number of offspring; number of kin; occupation; area of land occupied by farmers. Each of the variables was analysed to see whether independently, or in combination with each other, it or they exercised any discernible influence on people's persistence.

The birthplace statistics for Brenchley's workforce had shown the very local nature of Brenchley's catchment area. When the mobility of these persons was reviewed with reference to the county of birth, it was again evident that very few persons came from distant counties, and the few that did were unlikely to be in Brenchley on the occasion of the next census. The parish of birth data also demonstrated that the more distant the individual's birthplace was from Brenchley, the more likely it was that they would not be present at the time of the next census. Two hundred and eighty-three Brenchley-born, or 36.2 per cent of the 1851 workforce, persisted from 1851-61, in comparison to 235 or 31.4 per cent, in the next decade. Fifty-four persons born in neighbouring parishes or those up to six miles away (or 23.6 per cent of the 1851 workforce) were still in Brenchley a decade later, the comparative figures for 1861-71 being fifty, or 21.8 per cent. It is evident that mobility was increasing, not only amongst the Brenchley-born but amongst the workforce as a whole: 70.3 to 75.1 per cent. While persistency rates showed a positive relationship with birthplace, it is nevertheless likely that birthplace itself exerted no independent influence on persistency and further features of the persisters need to be explored.

The lack of either horizontal or vertical social mobility discussed earlier could have driven out the younger and more ambitious members of Brenchley's workforce. There was also a slight surplus of males in 1851 which may have been primarily related to migration. Obviously age is a useful variable for the study of migration. We know that for most persons marriage would have occurred in their early twenties, and that child rearing would have continued until the forties. In general terms, the responsibility and ties of individuals would increase with age, and we can hypothesise that these may have hindered mobility. This was found to be the case in Brenchley where persistency was found to increase with age, with the exception of those aged 51 and over in 1851-61, and those aged 16-20 and 51+ in 1851-71, when this pattern was reversed. However, even the most persistent of groups increased their mobility in the decade 1861-71, the one surprising exception being the very slight increase of 1.3 per cent in persistency amongst the 16-20 year olds. The mobility of those aged 56+ may at first appear surprising, yet it was no doubt due to a greater likelihood of the break-up of the home involved in widowhood. The marginal increase in persistency amongst 16-25 year olds was attributable to the increased persistency of young agricultural labourers.

Overall, women and men had very similar persistency rates, although, as we shall discuss shortly, these rates differed markedly with age. A surplus of males in 1851 (the sex composition of Brenchley was 54 per cent male to 46 per cent female) would suggest a higher persistency rate amongst men in the previous decade. By 1871 the male 'surplus' was lower, due perhaps to males being slightly less persistent.

Given that persistency was affected by age, the mobility of Brenchley's eldest
inhabitants could be related to their marital status. A breakdown of the marital condition of both migrants and persisters supports the suggestion that responsibility hinders mobility, for married persons were the least mobile. Indeed, of all workforce members described as married in the 1851 census, as many as 38.7 per cent were still present in Brenchley ten years later. Additionally, the widowed were very mobile. Thus unattached people, whether young or old, were liable to be mobile. The importance of the fact of being 'unattached' becomes evident when we compare the mobility of married and widowed older persons - the married revealed higher persistency rates. For the years 1851-61 and 1861-71, the unmarried exhibited persistency rates of 17.7 and 16.8 per cent, the married 38.7 and 30.0 per cent, and the widowed 15.2 and 17.1 per cent respectively. Further analysis of migrant persons who were both old and widowed in 1851 showed that 'women with no stated occupation' to have been the dominant group (21.9 per cent), followed by the unemployed (18.8 per cent) and agricultural labourers (17.2 per cent). Perhaps these persons, affected by unemployment, retirement, sickness or poverty were obliged to return to their parish of settlement, enter the workhouse, or go and live with family or friends.

In our examination of life-cycle and labour mobility, we need also to examine the behaviour of different members of the family unit. As the majority of Brenchleyites lived in 'simple' households, it is not surprising that the greatest number of relatives were sons, daughters, wives and heads of households themselves.20 Outside these immediate relatives the only other substantial groups were lodgers and servants (including assistants and governesses).

If lack of opportunities served to encourage the out-migration of the young, we would expect adult co-resident sons and daughters to be less persistent than their parents. In fact, while persistency amongst the former remained stable, persistent heads and their wives declined. Daughters were less persistent than sons, perhaps because they left home to marry or enter into service. Furthermore evidence supplied by the twenty year linkage showed that the wives, followed by the husbands, were the most persistent (16.5 per cent and 12.3 per cent respectively), their children less so (sons 9.4 per cent, daughters 6.7 per cent), while no servants and only three (5.2 per cent) of the assistants of 1851 could be found in Brenchley in 1871. Meanwhile closer scrutiny of the sons revealed that of those who persisted either from 1851 to 1861, or from 1861 to 1871, 55 per cent and 75 per cent respectively were agricultural labourers. Once more members of the agricultural labouring class showed the strong influence of occupation on their mobility.

The effect of offspring on the mobility of family heads was for persistency to increase with the number of resident offspring. However, the numbers of heads of household with more than seven children were very small, and so too the numbers of persistent heads of household with such a number of children were small and therefore their persistency needs to be treated with caution. In fact over the twenty year period there were no such heads of family persistent in Brenchley. Meanwhile the childless family type, the 'solitary', had a high level of migration, only 15.9 per cent persisted from 1851 to 1861. While childless family units had a tendency to be young, and so the additional factor of the
effect of age on mobility has to be borne in mind, nevertheless it is clear that the presence of dependent offspring affected mobility. Yet the persistency rates between 1851 and 1861 of persons heading ‘simple’, ‘extended’ and ‘multiple’ household types were 37.2, 29.9 and 12.5 per cent respectively. If heads of ‘solitary’ and ‘multiple’ family types had similar persistency levels, the relationship between mobility and household type is clearly not a straightforward one.

As persons of the ‘no family’ or ‘extended’ family types had kin residing with them, the relationship between the number of kin and mobility was examined. In fact, less than a fifth of all households had any resident kin, and of those only a quarter had more than one relative. The number of kin was thus too limited to enable us to establish whether or not it exercised an impact on mobility.

From a study of the persistency of differing occupational groups, it is evident that persistency was consistently highest amongst agricultural workers, farmers and tradesmen, and lowest amongst professional, domestic and commercial persons. 32.1 per cent of Brenchley’s agricultural labourers persisted from 1851-61, and 33.2 per cent from 1861-71. The respective figures for farmers were 35.4 and 30.9 per cent, for craftsmen/tradesmen, 31.9 and 23.9 per cent, for professional persons 22.2 and 6.1 per cent, for domestics 9.2 and 7.9 per cent, and finally for persons involved in commerce 14.7 and 8.3 per cent.

While we must not forget that persistency was low for all occupational groups, the reasons for the low rate of persistency amongst professional persons, as opposed to the rate itself, are open to speculation; perhaps professionals such as clergymen and solicitors could not further their ambitions by remaining in an isolated place such as Brenchley, or perhaps they had short-term assignments.

Those engaged in commercial pursuits, such as railway servants and coachmen, were mobile by the very nature of their occupations, while those in service were well aware of the demand for servants in towns such as Tunbridge Wells. Meanwhile craftsmen and any tradesmen were more likely to be tied by their businesses to Brenchley. Indeed, the nature of craftsmen’s and tradesmen’s businesses encouraged persistency, as familiarity with the local inhabitants stimulated trade. It is interesting to note that master craftsmen exhibited high rates of persistency: of all master craftsmen present in Brenchley in 1851, 46.2 per cent were still resident in 1861, while the comparative figure for grocers, millers and butchers was 43 per cent. It is unlikely that the few craftsmen resident in Brenchley felt any great need to leave the parish. Indeed, the high degree of occupational inheritance may have been a result of the fact that the sons were offered a secure livelihood. In contrast, journeymen craftsmen were mobile: of those resident in Brenchley in 1851, 37.5 per cent were present ten years later, while no journeymen tradesmen could be identified. Perhaps, having some work experience behind them, they sought greater opportunities in London. Apprentices on the other hand, were supposed (in theory) to stay to complete their terms of apprenticeship and obtain some work experience. They were therefore more likely to be traced from one census
to the next over a ten year interval than journeymen, indeed, 37.5 per cent of apprentice craftsmen persisted for the ten year period 1851-61, though no apprentice tradesmen remained.

Like tradesmen and craftsmen, farmers, both owners and tenants, by nature of their business may have been more tied to the parish, or more specifically, the land, and consequently were not a very mobile occupational group. Furthermore, persistency levels were clearly associated with the acreage of land occupied. Persistency increased with the size of holding occupied. Yet, in conformity with the general pattern, persistency declined in the decade 1861-71, especially amongst the very small (under twenty acres) farmers, eight of whom were present in the 1861 census and none in the 1871 census. Although the numbers involved were very small, from the 1851-71 linkage we learn that of the twelve heads of household who held land in 1851, none holding under twenty acres persisted to 1871. The consolidation of land was squeezing out the small farmer, though there was a revival of the twenty to sixty acre holder in the decade 1861-71. As cited earlier, agricultural labourers were regarded by contemporaries as the least mobile of all occupational groups. Clifford's view was somewhat exaggerated, taking little account of the extent to which labourers were prepared to move locally, from one parish to another. Nevertheless they must be counted among the less mobile social groups. When supposedly better working conditions in other parts of the country were brought to their attention, either by the authorities or as a result of their increased literacy, they were reluctant to leave their locality. Indeed, even when the Poor Law Commissioners financed the move, few applied, and of those who went, many returned. No Brenchleyites were found in these lists of assisted migrants. The cost of any such move may have been prohibitive, especially as only a move to a northern agricultural area or town would appear to entail financial benefits. The constant threat of removal should they become chargeable may also have acted as a disincentive. Clearly these options had limited appeal. Agricultural workers may also have been reluctant to relinquish cottages received from their employers.

Summary of findings

Persons from long-distance birthplaces were more likely to make a further move than persons from short-distance birthplaces. Professional persons had higher rates of mobility than labourers, farmers or tradespeople. When the relationship between the two variables 'birthplace' and 'occupation' was explored it emerged that the majority of professional persons had been born outside Kent (55.2 per cent in 1851), while almost all agricultural labourers (89.3 per cent in 1851), were living in their county of birth. In order to evaluate the comparative influence of distance and occupation we examined the behaviour of the least mobile group, agricultural labourers, and the most mobile group, professionals, originating from Kent. It was found that even when born in the same place, professionals were more mobile than labourers: 23 per cent persisted to 1861, in comparison to 37 per cent of agricultural labourers.

What becomes evident then is a clear geographical demarcation line for the respective labour markets. Labourers, farmers and tradesmen originated from
and moved very locally, while professionals originated from and moved from further afield. The mobility of professionals could have been the product of a variety of factors, such as knowledge of opportunities elsewhere gained in transit, and the ultimate lack of opportunity for professional persons in Brenchley.

In this article we sought to identify the movement of Brenchley’s workforce in response to the continuing change in Brenchley’s social relations and the labour market. The response focused on persistence/migration as indicators of the flows of labour, using the census as our source material. Other sources, such as Poor Law records, marriage registers and poll books were used in the original study and the findings based on these sources complemented that of the census; however, their discussion is outside the scope of this article.

From the birthplace statistics we discovered that, in general, Brenchley drew upon very local sources of labour, the majority of residents originating from the parish or its environs. There was a greater degree of turnover than expected, with the most mobile adults coming from distant places. Not only was there a clear division between migrants and non-migrants in terms of origin, but divisions also emerged along occupational lines. The migrants who originated from longer distances, and who displayed little tendency to remain in Brenchley, were overwhelmingly professional, commercial and domestic persons, while those from closer to Brenchley, who showed a greater reluctance to move were labourers, farmers and tradesmen. It therefore became apparent that several distinctive labour markets were in operation. Even increased literacy did not produce a significant change in the labourer’s behaviour. Indeed, while there was an overall increase in migration in the period studied, the labourers were one occupational group to (fractionally) increase their persistence.

The reasons for the reluctance of the agricultural labourers to move have already been suggested. Their increased persistency in the decade 1861-71 should not be exaggerated, though it is nevertheless of interest, especially since it was most pronounced amongst the younger members of the occupational group. Conditions in Brenchley underwent no sudden change in the 1860s, and there are no data to indicate that the 1860s were worse than the 1850s and that therefore the ‘push’ factors on labourers were stronger. Indeed, perhaps out-migration in earlier decades had resulted in improved conditions for those left behind, though agricultural labourers as a percentage of the workforce were steady throughout the period 1841-71. However, it is not the numbers per se but the condition of the labourers which is of most importance.

An alternative explanation for their marginally changed behaviour in the decades 1851-61 and 1861-71 lies in the decrease of ‘pull’ factors. Perhaps there was a reduction in the pulling power of the towns which now supplied much of their workforce by natural increase. Indeed, immigration from the south-eastern counties to London fell in the 1860s, and Brenchley itself started gaining population from net migration, though the turnover of population was greater than in the previous decade. However, neither the ‘push’ nor the ‘pull’ factors showed any substantial change in the 1860s, and since the increase in
persistence on the part of labourers was only fractional, what is of greater importance is the comparative persistency levels of the different occupational groups. Bearing this in mind, although we have no evidence for worsening conditions in the 1860s, it seems that the high persistency levels of agricultural labourers were at once a reflection and a cause of their low standing and disadvantage within rural society.

Appendix

In order to determine whether or not a pair of records were ‘truly linked’, the following conditions had to be met (and written in the form of a Fortran programme):

Stage 1. Essential conditions for a Match

(1) Source must be different on the two records being matched (i.e. 2 different censuses);
(2) Sex must be identical on both records;
(3) Age must be one, two or three categories higher on the second record (each category consisted of five years);
(4) Marital condition must only change from single to married, married to widowed, or widowed to married;
(5) Name (surname compressed by Soundex and initial of first name)* must be identical on both records;
(6) County of birth must be identical on both records.

Potentially matched pairs having successfully passed the first stage were then tested further. They were tested using four variations which were not essential in order for a pair to be deemed truly matched. The only requirement was that a potential match must achieve a certain score on the basis of these variables to be truly a match.

Stage 2. Non-essential conditions for a Match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Place of residence in parish on both records:</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Adults' trade on both records:</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Persons aged 15 and under, trade on records:</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Parish of birth on both records:</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Union of birth on both records:</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A score of +2 had to be obtained on the non-essential variables for a pair of records to be deemed ‘truly linked’.
An instruction was also written into the linkage programme which ensured that women who changed their name through marriage would not be counted as 'migrants' but as 'persisters' if they remained in Brenchley. The 927 was multiplied by 2 as each person had two census entries. Therefore

\[(1,854 + 4,938) \times 100 = 37.5 \text{ per cent}\]

*For a detailed discussion of the Soundex method see M. B. Katz, The People of Hamilton, Canada West. Harvard University Press, Mass., 1975. Katz found that surnames compressed by Soundex method matched exactly for 91.9 per cent of his truly linked pairs, while the initial matched exactly for 89.1 per cent. The surnames of all Brenchleyites had been coded using Soundex, to which a code was added to represent the initial of the first name. The reliability of the initial was never in doubt as the enumerators always wrote out the first name of any individual in full. The only pitfall lay in the possibility of individuals reporting their first name differently from census to census, for example, William John could well become John William.

NOTES


3. Evidence of T. L. Hodges Before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Emigration, April 27th, 1826, Parliamentary Papers, 1826, IV, p. 133.

4. 'Real' expenditure was calculated using the Rousseaux Price indices, 1800-1913, cited in B. R. Mitchell & P. Deane, Abstracts of British Historical Statistics. Cambridge, 1961, pp. 471-72. The formula used to calculate real relief was: real relief = expenditure on relief (shillings & pence) + agricultural price index. See Poor Law Commissioners, Poor Law Board and Local Government Board Annual Reports, 1841-71, for expenditure on relief.

5. The representativeness of Brenchley was gauged by a detailed study of its occupational and demographic characteristics, namely, sex and age composition, and birth, death, marriage and population growth rates, and the subsequent comparison of those figures to those calculated for all the Wealden Union.


7. Adult is defined as synonymous with the workforce. A study of the census data for Brenchley revealed that those aged under 16 and over 70 represented an insignificant proportion of those gainfully employed. Consequently the age group 16-70 has been used to denote the adult population, or the workforce.


9. Traditionally, a substantial proportion of farm servants (the bailiff, housekeeper, carter, ploughman, cowman, shepherd, dairy and kitchen maids) lived and ate with the farmer in the farm house. They thus had more security than labourers who lived outside the farm, as they
were unlikely to be dismissed and turned out of the farm house in times of depression. There was the possibility that the farmer would not only continue to provide them with lodgings but also board in times of unemployment. Upon marriage, the farm servant left his employer's home and became a labourer. However, this is not to imply that all those working in agriculture had once 'lived-in'. This was not the case, though as late as 1851, in Brenchley, 48.5 per cent of the farmers had employees living-in, a figure which dropped to 16.4 per cent by 1871. Tradesmen, though fewer in number, also practised this form of employment, and here the drop was from 23.1 to 8.8 per cent respectively. See also A. Kussmaul, Servants in Husbandry in early modern England, Cambridge, 1981, for a discussion of the decrease of the custom of 'living-in' from the late eighteenth-century onwards.

10. C. Tufnell, the assistant Poor Law Commissioner for Kent, 1835-42, estimated that nine-tenths of all railway employees in Kent were from outside the county. The South-Eastern Railway had a branch linking Brenchley parish (or more specifically the hamlet of Paddock Wood) with London built in 1842, but the Brenchley census shows that the percentage of the adult male labour force employed by the railway only grew from 1.6 per cent of the workforce in 1851 to 2.9 per cent in 1871.

11. The extent to which sons pursued their fathers' callings is in part a reflection of the restricted opportunities available for the younger generation. However, the study of inter-generational occupational change as an indicator of the rigidity of the social structure is undertaken with the following reservations: we can only trace co-resident fathers and sons, and not sons residing elsewhere. Unless we know the pursuits of all the sons, we cannot establish the precise degree of occupational inheritance. Furthermore, a non-resident son could be working as a labourer for another employer, and yet in some later stage in his life-cycle, succeed to his father's holding. See Wojciechowska-Kibble, op. cit., pp. 250-2.

12. There is no unbroken series of statistics for the cost of living which would enable us to establish real wages in Brenchley during this period. Nevertheless, inferences can be drawn about the level and trend of wages in Brenchley from movements in the cost of living and real wages at the national and county levels, and they being nothing in the Brenchley data to suggest that this would be inappropriate. The levels and trends in real wages were calculated using the Rousseau Price indices (op. cit., footnote 4), and Bowley's agricultural wages: Real wages = Bowley's agricultural earnings - agricultural prices. If the value of real wages in the period 1830-35 (=64) is taken to equal 100 then the trend in real wages was: 1835-40 = 97, 1850-54 = 117, and 1870-74 = 141. See B. R. Mitchell and P. Deane, op. cit., pp. 349-50 and 471-2.


14. By 'truly linkable' is meant the population remaining after those who were registered in the parish registers as having been born or died between the two censuses are subtracted from the population, as the inclusion of such persons in the linking would artificially inflate the number of migrants.


16. J. Robin, Elmdon: Continuity and Change in a north-west Essex Village 1861-1964, Cambridge, 1980, p. 190. In fact that gap between Elmdon and Brenchley was even greater since Robin's migration figures are inflated by the inclusion amongst her migrants of women who could not be traced to the 1861 census as a result of name change through marriage.

17. The information recorded was: surname, first name, age, parish of birth, union of birth, county of birth, sex, occupation, marital condition, place of residence in the parish, area of land occupied, type of household (see footnote 20 below), relation to head of household, the number of offspring, kin, staff, visitors, lodgers and boarders in the household. Surname, first name, and the number of visitors were not used, since the name variable would tell us nothing about the reasons for persistence/migration, visitors were only temporary residents, and 'class' at this time as defined by the Registrar General was too general a category to be used. For example, Class 6, 'Undefined occupations', contained wide ranging occupations such as 'scholar', 'independent', or 'unemployed'.

18. Looking at the Brenchley workforce, of those born in Brenchley, 36.2 per cent persisted from 1851-61, in comparison to 23.6 per cent from neighbouring and parishes up to 6 miles away, and 20 per cent from parishes of 6-12 miles distance.

19. Agricultural labourers aged 16-25 increased their persistence from 27.7 per cent in the period 1851-61 to 31.4 per cent between 1861-71. Also the persistence of those aged 25-35 increased from 39.2 per cent to 45.3 per cent between 1851-61 and 1861-71.

21. Evidence for the whereabouts of Brenchley's out-migrants is hard to obtain. A search of the census for neighbouring parishes and the town of Tunbridge Wells revealed these places to be popular destinations, in keeping with the belief that most migration was over short distances. An alternative source of information are the Poor Law Union records, namely, those pertaining to the non-resident poor. A study of these revealed that 29.4 per cent of the heads of household who were recipients of relief were resident in Kentish Unions, 41.2 per cent in Sussex Unions, 14.7 per cent in London and 14.7 per cent elsewhere in the years 1845-66.

22. Evidence of literacy is to be found in the parish's marriage registers which show the signatures of couples being married and therefore enable us to calculate the percentage signing with an 'x'. In the years 1841-6 and 1867-71 respectively, 50 and 18 per cent of the couples both signed with an 'x', 33 and 26 per cent had one partner signing with an 'x', and 17 and 57 per cent had neither partner signing with an 'x'.

23. Public Record Office. MH. 32. 71, records of E. Tufnell, the assistant Poor Law Commissioner for Kent, 1st March, 1842.


25. See H. A. Shannon, 'Migration and the growth on London, 1841-71', *Economic History Review*, V, 1935, pp. 79-86. In terms of net migration, Brenchley was at first a loser of population, in the decades 1841-51 and 1851-61 its net loss by migration was 78 and 256, but then it experienced a net gain of 58 persons in the decade 1861-71.
FAMILY MIGRATION IN VICTORIAN BRITAIN: THE CASE OF GRANTHAM AND SCUNTHORPE

Martin B. White
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While many scholars have noted the presence of single people, married couples and families among migrants, little or no systematic attempt has been made to assess the relative importance of these various groups within any particular migration stream. It seems to be generally assumed that most migrants were young and presumably single.¹ Yet, from a rather different perspective, much recent work, including that on Victorian Britain, has stressed the need to place migration within the wider context of the family.² This would seem to imply that, at least in certain places, the movement of families may have been of considerable importance. Studies of the more detailed Swedish evidence have reached contradictory conclusions over this question. Ohgren found that 80 per cent of incomers to the central Swedish town of Eskilstuna in the later nineteenth century were ‘lone’ migrants who arrived without any family.³ However, Akerman’s study of other nineteenth century Swedish material has led him to conclude that family migration was more important than has hitherto been realised.⁴ This article attempts to cast some light on this issue by exploring the components of the migrant streams into the two Lincolnshire destinations of Grantham and Scunthorpe using the manuscript census of 1881.

Until the middle of the nineteenth century Grantham was but a typical market town, largely untouched by the industrial revolution, possessing a wide range of traditional crafts and functioning as a service centre within a mainly agrarian economy. From then on, however, the town became one of the foremost industrial centres of Lincolnshire. This transformation was the result of two developments: the coming of the Great Northern Railway and the rise of the agricultural engineering industry. From the 1850s the town grew rapidly in size and by 1881 the population had reached almost 17,000.⁵ This population has been sampled using the census enumerators' books.⁶ Scunthorpe was a very different kind of place in 1881. Indeed, it could hardly be called a town at all, but was, rather, a newly-formed and growing urban area based upon just one industry, iron, and depending heavily upon newcomers for its initial growth. At this time the five townships which later merged to form the town of Scunthorpe were still geographically separate. Until recently they had all been remote agricultural villages, but the discovery and subsequent exploitation of extensive iron ore deposits since the 1860s had transformed them into a thriving centre of the iron industry.⁷ Migration into four of these five townships is explored here using the 1881 census books.⁸
Table 1. Marital status of migrant males, 1881

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grantham</th>
<th>Scunthorpe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (100%)</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>1116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Migrant category of married migrant males with co-resident wives, 1881

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grantham</th>
<th>Scunthorpe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native wife (i.e. husband assumed to have arrived alone)</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Intermediate' (migrant wife with no co-resident migrant children)</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Family mover' (migrant wife, migrant co-resident children)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known (children's birthplace unclear; could be 'intermediate' or 'family mover')</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (100%)</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census enumerators' books (for both tables)

The census is a crude instrument with which to establish the familial components of migration. Broadly speaking, there are four related technical shortcomings. First, in many cases the information given is simply insufficient. For example, a migrant couple with co-resident migrant children most probably moved in as a family unit. But take away the children and the picture becomes unclear: did they arrive together or as single migrants who subsequently met and married? Second, the census may have been taken some considerable time after in-migration occurred and may no longer accurately reflect an individual's familial position at the time of his or her arrival. For example, all co-resident migrant offspring may have since left home, placing a truly migrant couple in an ambiguous category. Third, the census only shows those who moved in and have remained. Thus while there may have been a greater inwards movement of single migrants than of whole families in preceding years, many of the single people may have subsequently departed in similarly greater numbers. The census would only capture the net effect of this turnover, understateing single in-migration. Lastly, there is no guarantee that all members of a family unit actually moved at the same time. For example, a father may have been joined by the other members of his family at a later date.
Yet despite all these problems the census can be made to yield crude estimates of the relative size of two components within the migrant stream. The intention here is to obtain a rough indication of how many individuals arrived:

- as ‘single’ migrants without a spouse and family, or;
- as ‘family’ migrants who did possess a spouse and family.

Tables 1 and 2 contain the raw census information from which we will obtain estimates of the size of these two groups. Table 1 gives the marital status of all migrant males in the two study locations, excluding those enumerated as dependent children. The ‘married’ category is broken down into various components in table 2 using information on the birthplace of co-resident spouses and children (where present). If we ignore widowers; men who originally moved in as dependent children; and married men who arrived unaccompanied by their wives and/or dependent children, then the male migrants could have arrived in one of three possible states: as single men, as married men with a spouse but no children, or as married men with accompanying children. We need to estimate the size of these three groups using the data in the two tables. There are two problems here:

1) The ‘Intermediate’ category in table 2 contains those married couples where both partners were migrants but which either had no co-resident children or where all such children were born in the study area. This class includes, therefore, those who moved in as:

- childless married couples
- couples with children but whose migrant offspring had all since left home
- unmarried migrants (arriving either independently or with their parent(s)) who had subsequently married another migrant.

There is no way these three strands can be delineated, and so this category has been excluded from the following analysis. This seems especially wise given the additional interpretative problem of whether the migration of childless married couples is best conceptualised as ‘single’ or ‘family’ movement.

2) Many migrants recorded as ‘single’ or as ‘married to native females’ may have originally moved in as dependent children and either since left home or been orphaned. These two groups must accordingly be reduced by an appropriate amount in order to obtain a more accurate estimate of the number of independent single in-migrants. The calculation of this amount can be illustrated using Grantham males as an example. The relevant figures are shown in table 3.

The method assumes that dependent migrant children were as likely to leave home, or to be left behind by their out-migrating parents, as were their native counterparts. This assumption is made to facilitate the calculation of the appropriate adjustment ratios. Unfortunately, little information is available on the migratory behaviour of natives versus non-native. Of the turnover studies that have contrasted the migratory experiences of natives in relation to non-
Table 3. Worked example of the calculation of estimated ‘single’ migration, Grantham males 1881

A. Unmarried males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Migrant males with native wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=30</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
- a - Single natives living with parent(s)  
- b - Single natives not living with parent(s)  
- c - Single migrants living with parent(s)  
- d - ‘False’ independent single migrants (b/a x c)  
- e - Single migrants not living with parent(s)  
- f - Corrected estimate of single migrants (e - d)  
- g - Married male migrants with native wives  
- h - ‘False’ independent single migrants (d/e x g)  
- i - Corrected estimate of single migrants (g - h)  

Source: Census enumerators’ books

natives, Lawton and Pooley suggest that in the case of mid-nineteenth century Liverpool, non-natives were less persistent than native born residents. This feature is also displayed in the rural parish of Brenchley, Kent. However, despite the fact that non-natives appear more migratory than the native born population, it is doubtful if birthplace alone serves as an independent influence upon migration, additional characteristics of the non-native population such as age and socio-economic status also influencing their migratory behaviour. The first step is to calculate the ratio of those who were not living with either parent to those who were so living for unmarried natives in each age group. For example, taking natives aged 20-24 in table 3, there were eleven single men not living with either parent and forty-seven who were so co-residing (columns a and b). Applying the same ratio to the thirty-one migrants living with either parent (column c) suggests there were seven men aged 20-24 in the town who had originally in-migrated as dependents but who had since left or lost their parental home (column d). This amount is subtracted from the fifty-four enumerated migrants not living with their parents (column e) to arrive at an estimate of the ‘true’ extent of independent single in-migration among those aged 20-24, namely forty-seven (column f). Repeating the exercise for the other
age-groups results in an overall estimate of 184 such migrants. Of course, this procedure only has any major impact among younger persons. There is no way of estimating how many older migrants had originally moved in as dependent children. Most older natives had left their parental home, thus denying us any real 'correction factor' to apply to the older single migrants. For this reason only those age groups under thirty are 'corrected' in this way. This is probably not so very harmful, as (all else being equal) older 'single' migrants would anyway be less likely to have originally moved in with their parents than would their younger counterparts. This probably applies to the Scunthorpe district cases rather more than the Grantham ones, given the recency of the former area's expansion.

Attention now turns to those married migrants with native spouses. The proportionate reduction already made to the single migrants in each age group is now applied to the corresponding age-group in this population. For example, we made a reduction in the 20-24 age-group from fifty-four to forty-seven. Applying an equivalent reduction to the eight cases aged 20-24 in the second part of table 3 results in a revised figure of seven cases. This is done for the other age groups and finally the sub-total in each part of the table is summed to give an overall approximation of the total number of single men who arrived independently of their parents (184+101=285).

Finally, having obtained an estimate of the number of migrants who arrived in an independent, unmarried state, this can be compared with the numbers who moved in with their spouse and offspring. The former I have termed 'single' migrants, the latter 'family' migrants. The relative importance of these two types of movement among males and females is expressed in percentage form in table 4. While male migration into Grantham largely followed an 'expected' pattern, the single movement predominant, the male stream into the Scunthorpe area was skewed quite markedly in the other direction, with family movement predominant. This difference was even more apparent when the whole exercise was repeated for females (table 4 again).

| Table 4. Relative size of the estimated 'single' and 'family' migrant groups, 1881 |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
|                                 | Grantham | Scunthorpe |
|                                 | %       | %            |
| Males:                          |         |              |
| 'Single' migrants                | 62.8    | 45.5         |
| 'Family' migrants                | 37.2    | 54.5         |
| Total (100%)                    | 454     | 622          |
| Females:                        |         |              |
| 'Single' migrants                | 68.5    | 31.2         |
| 'Family' migrants                | 31.5    | 68.8         |
| Total (100%)                    | 537     | 493          |

Source: Census enumerators' books
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The key to this difference probably lies in the economic structure of the two locations. This is evident from the age-structure of the ‘single migrant’ stream. Excluding those who had subsequently married native spouses, 35.9 per cent of Grantham’s (‘corrected’) single migrant males were aged under twenty, compared with only 17.6 per cent of the Scunthorpe district cases. The figures for females were 49.0 per cent and 38.2 per cent respectively. Boys in their teens moved in to Grantham to take up apprenticeships, or for a position with a tradesman or at one of the many coaching inns. For girls, domestic service was the main attraction. A whole host of opportunities existed for young, single migrants. In comparison the Scunthorpe district had few such openings. Jobs in domestic service and trade and craft assistantships were scarce. The iron industry traditionally favoured the employment of strong, mature men, and no system of apprenticeship existed.

The existence of such employment can, however, be seen from another perspective. Work on the family economy has shown that the movement of families to a particular destination is often encouraged by opportunities for wives and children to contribute to the household budget. Such a phenomenon has been clearly observed among certain groups of textile workers in the nineteenth century. Yet this does not seem to apply here. According to my estimates, the destination with the least to offer in terms of family employment nevertheless experienced the most family migration. In Grantham, 29.9 per cent of females aged ten and above worked; in Scunthorpe only 13.5 per cent did so. The economic activity rate among co-resident children was also higher in Grantham (Table 5). These two case studies suggest, then, that job opportunities for those in their teens worked to encourage single in-migration more than it did the movement of families within any ‘family economy’ framework. In part this surely reflects the introduction of compulsory schooling in the 1870s, together with other legislation which took younger children out of the labour market. It may also reflect the absence of any major domestic industry in either location in which younger children could be employed at home.

Table 5. Labour force participation rates of young people, 1881

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grantham %</th>
<th>Scunthorpe %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aged 10 - 14:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males: A</td>
<td>20.5 (234)</td>
<td>10.0 (260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26.3 (19)</td>
<td>47.1 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females: A</td>
<td>4.1 (246)</td>
<td>2.0 (245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>33.9 (56)</td>
<td>41.4 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 15 - 19:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males: A</td>
<td>89.9 (169)</td>
<td>70.5 (112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>88.8 (75)</td>
<td>94.7 (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females: A</td>
<td>52.6 (133)</td>
<td>38.3 (81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>76.3 (156)</td>
<td>65.2 (66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: A - Co-resident with parent(s)
       B - Not co-resident with parent(s)
       (Totals in brackets)

Source: Census enumerators’ books
Table 6 breaks down the Scunthorpe area data into selected occupational groups. The skew towards ‘family’ migration is more evident among those engaged in the iron industry than among those in other occupations.

Several factors may have worked to encourage a high level of ‘family’ movement among the Scunthorpe iron workers. For one thing, in these early years of the north Lincolnshire iron industry, the demand for labour far outstripped the local supply. The iron companies had to venture far beyond the immediate countryside to fill even their least skilled vacancies. The growing port of Grimsby to the east and industrial south Yorkshire to the west were both competing destinations for the young single men of the north Lincolnshire countryside. So, too, was nearby Gainsborough with its expanding engineering works. The relative importance of families within local migration streams may partly reflect a deficient pool of single men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Iron industry %</th>
<th>Non-iron industry %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Single’ migrants</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Family’ migrants</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (100%)</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census enumerators’ books

Turning to those from longer distances, and in particular those from other centres of the iron industry, other factors may have prevailed. First, the movement of families is sometimes taken to indicate a less favourable economic climate in the place of origin than that which attends single migration. Thus J. T. Jackson has observed of the early Victorian glass industry:

‘The overall movement pattern between 1830 and 1851 was very much a one-way flow of glass makers of all ages from declining to new, expanding regions of glass-making: so-called established, stable areas of production did not exist to provide a surplus pool of skilled unmarried men who might move in search of better job opportunities, as appears to be the case in the iron-making and coal industries’.

Whether the iron industry had previously operated in this manner is debatable. What is clear, however, is that by the 1870s such ‘stable areas of production’ were less widespread. The shift of the main centres of the industry to Cleveland and north Lancashire was accompanied by a decline elsewhere. The Black Country, in particular, experienced a period of contraction at this time. There is some evidence to suggest that ‘family’ migration was relatively more common from the Black Country than it was from other longer-distance sources. Of the male migrants to Scunthorpe born in the counties of Staffordshire and Worcestershire, 65.5 per cent were ‘family’ migrants. This
compares with a figure of 52.8 per cent for male migrants from other long-distance (fifty kilometres or more) locations.\textsuperscript{19}

Secondly, mobility was almost a cultural trait among many iron workers in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{20} For many men in the industry, family mobility was probably regarded with less disfavour than among other groups of workers. Indeed, the absence of employment opportunities for females and children in most areas of heavy industry\textsuperscript{21} may well have made such movement more easy. The family was not having to surrender two, three or even more sources of income in the hope of a better deal elsewhere. Within the confines of the family budget, the only economic consideration was the relative employment prospects of the breadwinner in his present situation compared with those somewhere else. The very absence of any broadly-based family economy in many of these sending districts, then, may well have been as much a spur to family migration as its presence seems to have been in other places.

Thirdly, a low age at marriage was a national characteristic of iron workers.\textsuperscript{22} This means the pool of potential migrants in an iron district probably contained proportionately more families and correspondingly fewer single adults than did other areas. From a different perspective, the tendency to earlier marriage reflects the important role played by the wives of iron workers. The nature of the work was such that domestic duties were even more arduous than in some other working class households. The job was extremely dirty: wash day would be harder work than in other households; the long, unsociable shifts worked by the men enhanced the importance of a good domestic manager in the home. On the one hand, this meant that iron workers would be keen to find a good wife as soon as possible while, for their part, marriage was the easiest means available to most girls in iron working families of achieving some degree of independence from home. On the other hand, the high fertility of heavy industrial workers (in part a result of the low marriage age) meant that many families would experience a succession of older sons taking up employment in the industry. Although these sons contributed to the family coffers, the domestic strain must nevertheless have become immense. Within the space of a few years, the work-load of many wives and mothers suddenly increased markedly, just as they themselves were ageing. The daily routine was even more irksome if father and sons did not all share the same shift. Given such pressures, it would not be surprising if many young men were obliged and expected to relieve their mother by finding a wife as soon as possible. A report from early this century commented that:

This young man of the iron-working class usually has no misgivings about embarking upon matrimony early and without a sufficient income. He marries very young, often because he wants a home of his own. Either he is in his parents' home, where he is of course not the principal person to be considered, and is set on one side perhaps and has to undergo the discomfort and crowding entailed by being one of a family living in a small cottage; or he is a lodger, under much the same conditions'.\textsuperscript{23}

The importance of having a wife (and thus usually a family) was, perhaps,
enough to outweigh the hindrance to mobility which dependents might have presented. Indeed, many iron workers might well have been reluctant to move very far without one. 24

More generally, the movement of families over long distances may well have been more prevalent within the context of Redford’s ‘special industrial migration’. 25 All else being equal, the links between areas sharing a common form of industrial activity were likely to be stronger than those between other areas. The network of information which serviced migration was probably better developed; the body of knowledge concerning the conditions at a certain destination all that more comprehensive. A man with a family would be less keen to uproot on the basis of mere hearsay.

The evidence presented here suggests that the composition of migrant streams could differ quite considerably between one destination and another, and that in certain circumstances married couples with children may well have outnumbered independent single migrants. Furthermore, the extent of family migration could be high even into those areas with poor employment prospects for wives and children, in sum, it would seem that the movement of families was indeed of major significance in some areas of nineteenth century Britain, but, also, that this was not always a function of the ‘family economy’ conceived in the narrow sense of the employment of family members beyond the head.

NOTES

3. B. Ohngren, Folk lore ise ... (People on the move: social development, migration patterns and popular movements in Eskilstuna, 1870-1900), 1974, p. 376.
6. A one-in-three systematic sample was taken of households in Grantham Municipal Borough in the 1881 census.
8. Ashby, Brumby, Frodingham and Scunthorpe townships. The fifth township, Crosby, saw little development until the turn of the century.
9. The problem of separating ever-married migrant males who were resident in the census with their spouse from those who were not is greater in Grantham where 7.2 per cent of migrant males were widowed compared with just 4.0 per cent in Scunthorpe. Of those migrant males who were resident with their spouse, since the census is a static cross-sectional document, it is impossible to tell how many moved to the town as a child in their parents’ family, or alternatively, moved unaccompanied by their wife and children.
10. Excluding married persons in the ‘Intermediate’ category of table 2 and ever-married persons without a resident spouse results in a much reduced number of migrants upon which the subsequent calculations are based. In the case of males the pool of migrants is reduced by 41
per cent in the case of Grantham and 38 per cent in the case of Scunthorpe. Unfortunately, it is impossible to suggest whether the excluded migrants exhibited significantly different migratory behaviour to those included in the analysis.


13. However, a figure of some 20 per cent for working females aged ten and over is calculated for the parish of Frodingham in 1851 by P. M. Tillott and G. Stevenson, *Northwest Lindsey in 1851*, University of Sheffield, 1970. Frodingham is the ancient parish within which the townships of Scunthorpe were situated.

14. This table has been constructed in the same manner as was table 4. The raw number of 'single' migrants within the two occupational groups are 'corrected' using the ratios obtained from the total native population. Using the terminology of Table 3, columns (a) and (b) remain the same in every case (differing only by sex and location) but the figures in columns (c), (e) and (g) are replaced by those pertaining to the particular population sub-group being examined. The calculation then proceeds as explained in the example given earlier.

15. Wright, ch. 10.

16. This crude distance distinction is admittedly arbitrary but is a useful means of organising this description of possible forces at work.


19. However, this difference is not statistically significant: chi-square=1.59 with one degree of freedom.


21. Lady Bell, *At the works*, 1907.

22. This is shown from ecological data in M. Anderson, 'Marriage patterns in Victorian Britain: an analysis based on registration district data for England and Wales, 1861', *Journal of Family History*, 1, 1976, pp. 55-79. See also Bell, pp. 178-9.


24. A high incidence of lodging among married couples in the Scunthorpe district suggests a spouse was more valued than a house.

THE FRANKPLEDGE POPULATION OF SHREWSBURY, 1500-1720

W. A. Champion

William Champion obtained a degree in history at Oxford University, and has researched the social and economic history of Shrewsbury between 1400 and 1660.

Frankpledge was a system, originally evolved in the tenth and eleventh centuries, for policing local communities, in which typically the male population of the townships were grouped into ‘tithings’ and made responsible for their good behaviour. Individuals incorporated within the system were obliged to attend the ‘views of frankpledge’, originally associated with the biannual Sheriff’s Tourn (special sessions of the hundred courts), but later more normally with the private leet jurisdiction of the manorial courts. In practice the system did not apply uniformly over the whole country, and the north in particular possessed a different peace-keeping organization. The duties of the tithings included those of mutual surety, the collective pursuit of malefactors, and the provision of ‘chief pledges’ who comprised the juries which attended the leet courts and presented communal offenders. During the later middle ages, however, some functions such as surety lost their importance, while others were modified - the obligations of collective pursuit, for example, were concentrated on local constables. By 1500 the system was less widespread and more restricted in scope, but tithing lists drawn up for the views of frankpledge could still prove useful, both for empanelling local juries, and for providing a handy indication of males inhabiting the jurisdiction. Further details of the frankpledge system can be found elsewhere and need not be elaborated here. My purpose is rather to analyse the frankpledge listings which have survived for the town of Shrewsbury between 1500 and 1720 as a means of gauging changes in population size. To achieve this I shall first outline the nature of frankpledge in Shrewsbury - which differed somewhat from that found in other communities - and then describe the fluctuations in the size of the town’s frankpledge population during this period.

Frankpledge in Shrewsbury

Attendance at views of frankpledge was normally confined to males aged twelve and over. In Shrewsbury, however, this was not the case - at least from the early sixteenth century when the first extant lists appear. We can see this, for example, by comparing the view of frankpledge taken on 9 November 1525 with the locally surviving returns for the lay subsidy of the same year, which were composed according to craft affiliation, citing masters and servants, as well as the ‘out of craft’, i.e. adult labourers, doctors, gentlemen etc., who were not members of a craft fellowship. This comparison, supplemented by the use of other contemporary records, shows that of the 448 males listed in the view of frankpledge 309 were craft masters, 61 were ‘out of craft’, and 14 were
servants, including 4 identifiable journeymen. Of the remaining 64 individuals, 15 were otherwise listed in the view with an occupation. These figures imply that in Shrewsbury the frankpledge population was largely composed of adult males who had passed beyond servanthood and had become independent householders. This is supported by the fact that apprentices were never listed as a rule, while the view taken on 29 October 1517 was headed (in Latin) 'Names of the inhabitants and fathers of families in Shrewsbury and its liberties', a formula which also tends to support this interpretation.3

It may seem surprising that so few servants and especially journeymen attended the views, since census evidence from Coventry in the 1520s and from Cambridge in the early seventeenth century appears to indicate that very few journeymen were living-in servants and, so it has been suggested, must have lived out as separate householders.4 As such, one would expect them to have appeared in the Shrewsbury frankpledge lists. But this was not normally the case. Thus, while virtually all the sixty-eight master shermen (excluding two widows) assessed for the 1525 subsidy were also listed in the view, only four of their twenty-seven journeymen were likewise noted. Similarly, at a later date in 1613, of thirty journeymen described in a survey as working in Corvisors Row, only five appeared in the views of frankpledge of 1612-13.5 The survey in fact indicates why most journeymen were excluded. It is significant that the five listed journeymen were all married men, while of the remainder seventeen were lodged in other households (six with a parent), four boarded with their masters (including two brothers and a son), and four were also married men who cannot be traced. In other words, although a few journeymen did indeed appear at views of frankpledge, the majority did not since they were in fact lodgers whose status, at least for frankpledge purposes, was not regarded as constituting a separate household. In this respect a comparison between a muster of 1573 which listed 710 male ‘householders’ (595 excluding the Abbey Foregate suburb), and surviving craft listings, in particular another muster of 1569, also suggests that less than 10 per cent of these householders could have been journeymen, and this too explains their relative absence from the views.6 Thus the paucity of journeymen in-servants at Coventry and Cambridge was probably due both to the fact that the relevant evidence relates to poorer residential districts where servant keeping was in any case uncommon, and to the fact that most journeymen did indeed live outside their masters’ households, but as lodgers rather than householders themselves.

In Shrewsbury, therefore, frankpledge encompassed adult males who had set up as independent householders, although it is clear from alterations to the lists that an individual could be temporarily replaced by another member of his household if he had died or was incapacitated. Thus the dyer John Gardener of Frankwell suburb, who died in early 1539, appeared in the mutilated frankpledge lists of 1535-8, but in the last two of these views his son’s name was inserted alongside his own, apparently to represent the household as his father’s life approached its end. In the same lists, Leonard Leche of Mardol street was also crossed out after his death, and his servant’s name inscribed as a temporary replacement. The 1525 view contained the name of William Weale whose father, a mercer, had only recently died. Weale’s mother had taken over her husband’s stock and was assessed in the 1525 subsidy, but as a woman she
could not appear in the view of frankpledge. Her son was clearly listed as the surrogate head of that household, although he himself did not achieve master status until 1528-9.

Once listed, an individual was expected to attend the two views of frankpledge held in each civic year, one in October/November, the other in April/May. This involved appearing at the town hall before the two Shrewsbury bailiffs so that attendance could be registered in the paperbooks compiled for that purpose by the town clerk, although the names themselves were drawn up beforehand. Attendance markings were placed alongside each name, signifying whether an individual had presented himself at the view, or whether failure to attend had been due to illness, absence from town or because leave had been granted not to appear. Occasional annotations show that attendance could also be excused, at the discretion of the authorities, through poverty or extreme age. The markings were drawn up in columns with the earliest in date closest to the names. Thus, provided the columns are sufficiently regular, it is reasonably easy to deduce how many views were noted in each book, and when a name was first inserted or finally erased.

Although the paperbooks were headed with the names of the bailiffs serving in the year in which each book was first composed, it was common practice, especially in the sixteenth century, to extend the listings in one book over several years rather than starting afresh at the end of the bailiffs' term of office. This was done by simply erasing the names of those who had died or departed, and adding newcomers to the bottom of the list for each street. The frankpledge lists were then used to empanel the grand juries for the leet or 'Great Court', empowered to present communal offences, including failure to attend the views, for which fines were imposed.

The biannual appearance of, in theory, all male householders before the bailiffs represented a key occasion for public overview of this segment of society. It is, therefore, worth noting the steady decline of this system after c. 1560. Excluding those who were given leave of absence, we find that between 1050 and 1560 less than 10 per cent of the frankpledge population were normally fined for non-attendance. The figure then rose steadily, from about 14 per cent in 1570 to 18 per cent in 1580, 22 per cent in 1600, 34 per cent in 1620, 43 per cent in 1640, 65 per cent in 1660, and 80 per cent in 1680. Alternatively, the percentage of those listed who actually appeared at the views can also be noted. This figure fell from about 50 per cent in the mid-sixteenth century to 31 per cent in 1601, 18 per cent in 1620 and to less than 2 per cent by the late-seventeenth century. 'It may seem strange that the lists were still maintained even while the system was experiencing terminal decline, and this must clearly affect our appreciation of their reliability. Yet considerations noted below suggest that the relative changes in the size of the frankpledge population were accurate, at least before 1700, and the continued composition of the lists may be ascribed to two factors. First, a register of male householders remained necessary for empanelling juries; and secondly, the fines for non-attendance represented a small but welcome increment to civic income.
Figure 1. The Frankpledge population of Shrewsbury (excluding the Abbey Foregate), 1507-1715
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A good series of frankpledge listings clearly provides an opportunity to identify individuals and, through collation with legal and parochial records etc., to explore many sociological issues. Such information is particularly useful when, as in 1664-8 and in the early-eighteenth century, the occupations of all those listed was also given. These have recently been analysed by Angus McInnes, while the residential patterns of trade and status can be shown, not surprisingly, to have been similar to those described by James Hindson in LPS, 31, employing the Marriage Duty returns of the 1690s. In this study, however, our principal interest lies in considering the views as evidence for population movements, much as Poos has employed the tithing lists of medieval Essex to outline such changes before 1550. To this end I have excluded any consideration of the listings for the townships in Shrewsbury's rural liberties, as well as, for comparative purposes, the Abbey Foregate suburb which was not incorporated into Shrewsbury's frankpledge jurisdiction until 1586. Also omitted are a small group of residents, about eighteen in number, in Merivale who were listed in 1507 and 1510 at a time when both the town and the abbey claimed jurisdiction over that street - a dispute later settled in the abbey's favour.

The simplest way to count those listed is to enumerate those who appeared in the last views of each paperbook, i.e. whose names were not erased, although in practice updating of the lists often occurred even after the last recorded view. For greater coverage, however, the names in the first views in some of the paperbooks have also been counted - a relatively easy task, despite later erasures, because of the marking system described above. It should, therefore, be noted that the totals displayed in figure 1 do not in fact give a complete coverage of extant views of frankpledge.

Ignoring short-term fluctuations, the pattern revealed by figure 1 is reasonably clear. Between 1507 and 1563 the frankpledge population remained relatively stable, although a decline of some 14 per cent took place between 1525 and 1540, subsequently recouped by 1563. Thereafter this population grew rapidly, from 452 in October 1563 to 801 in the spring of 1587, 984 in 1613 and 1072 in 1634, an increase of 137 per cent over the whole period. The total in 1634 was almost the highest recorded in the seventeenth century and numbers remained roughly level until 1715 (958), although intermediate oscillations were quite marked. Listings also survive for 1722 (825), 1724 (907), 1728 (814), and for the years 1731-8. Some of these lists, however, do not seem to have been composed with as much care as previously. This, it seems, was partly due to the fact that by the late-seventeenth century the lists were beginning to underrecord the increasing numbers of urban gentry, in particular those who maintained their principal seat elsewhere. The degree of under-registration (perhaps 2-3 per cent of the frankpledge population by 1700) should be borne in mind when considering the later totals.

How do these changes correspond to independent estimates of Shrewsbury's population? Calculations indicate that the population, excluding the Abbey Foregate in each case, was approximately 2900 in 1525 (subsidy assessment),
2500+ in 1563 (diocesan survey), 4700 in 1587 (muster return), 6000+ in 1672 (Hearth tax), and 6300 in 1695 (mayor’s census and Marriage Duty returns, excluding outlying townships at Coton, Gravel Hill and Old Heath). These figures correspond reasonably well with what one would expect on the basis of the frankpledge evidence, with little sign of growth before 1560; a substantial increase thereafter; and a measure of stability during the second half of the seventeenth century. Much the same pattern appears if the town is taken in its entirety, i.e. including the Abbey Foregate. In this case the population was about 3100+ in 1563, 5500 in 1587, 7000 in 1672 and 7200 in 1695. In detail, however, the frankpledge lists show that the Abbey Foregate was less successful than the rest of the town in recovering from a dip in numbers during the mid-seventeenth century. Totals in that suburb rose from 125 in the spring of 1588 to 194 in 1634, and oscillated between 150 and 170 from 1647 (152) to 1715 (161). The latter totals in fact were similar to that recorded in spring 1587 (155), prior to an epidemic in that year (see below).

Recent surveys have indicated that English towns more than shared in the overall doubling of the national population between 1500 and 1700. According to Clark and Slack, however, the disproportionate growth of the urban sector was uneven. Most if not all of the larger established towns experienced some increase between about 1570 and 1620, but whereas some centres continued to grow until about the mid-seventeenth century, others did not. Accepting that the frankpledge lists give a reasonably accurate picture of population change, Shrewsbury’s experience would seem then to have been typical of the more successful provincial towns, although in detail the curve of growth was at its steepest in the early Elizabethan period, with over half the increase between 1563 and 1634 occurring before 1587. A marked deceleration took place within the next twenty years, and although the immediate rate of growth must have risen sharply after 1606, the increment between 1613 and 1634 was irregular and not as rapid as in the years before 1587. Nonetheless, Shrewsbury’s population continued to grow until about 1640 when, as elsewhere, further increase was halted, even momentarily reversed. Enumerations for the second half of the seventeenth century indicate the same stickiness of population change experienced by the national population as a whole, although growth appears to have continued in London, the greatest urban centres (often ports), and the emerging dockyard and industrial towns.

In examining the frankpledge totals in more detail, it is important to appreciate that the lists represented only a portion of the whole populace. Since they were composed of adult male householders, i.e. of individuals usually older than their early twenties, any increase due to natural causes must represent a lag of about twenty five years since its origin. This implies that the substantial rise in numbers after 1563 could have had its roots beforehand in the 1540s, and since incipient growth is visible from 1556, the level of dependents may already have begun to rise by the mid-1530s. However, the extent to which the inception of growth was due to prior natural increase is complicated by the unknown contribution of immigration. Moreover, owing to inadequate parochial registration, the details cannot be assessed before 1560, although thereafter the decadal totals of baptisms in two of the town’s five parishes, St Alkmund’s and St Julian’s (both mainly urban in character), recorded growth for much of the
late-sixteenth century, and a consistent surplus over burials.\textsuperscript{16}

These points have a bearing on the meaning of the 'rebuilding statutes' of 1536 and the early 1540s, empowering civic authorities to compel the repair of ruinous properties, which have been interpreted both as a sign of continued demographic attrition and of renewed urban growth.\textsuperscript{17} The Shrewsbury evidence is relevant here because the town council is known to have taken an interest in this matter in 1532, and lobbied for the 1536 bill in parliament.\textsuperscript{18} Although the population may have dipped after 1525, this was perhaps too recent to have prompted any marked deterioration of Shrewsbury’s housing. At the same time, significant growth could not have occurred before 1540, and a renewed demand for property did not indeed emerge until the 1560s - signalled, for instance, by inquests into encroachments in 1563, 1568 and 1570\textsuperscript{19} - as a likely prior increase in dependents was translated into a rise in the number of households. It seems more plausible, therefore, to interpret the statutes at face value as their preambles stated - simply as expressions of concern about the dangers posed by ruinous properties, anxieties which had fifteenth century antecedents.\textsuperscript{20}

The frankpledge lists also supply some evidence about the severity of the mortality crises in the late-1550s, which nationally reduced the population by some 5.5 per cent between 1556 and 1561.\textsuperscript{21} The incidence of local crises was never universal, and of fourteen towns examined for epidemic mortality between 1485 and 1610, Shrewsbury was one of only three for which no evidence exists for an epidemic between 1557 and 1559.\textsuperscript{22} The frankpledge enumerations tend to support the hypothesis that Shrewsbury escaped. Between the spring of 1556 and the spring of 1563 the population increased slightly from 418 to 437, while an incomplete list of autumn 1558 gave 269 males compared to 274 in the same streets in 1556. By contrast, later mortality crises observed from parish registers were often signalled by sharp falls in frankpledge totals, provided a sufficiently proximate series of listings exists. Thus an epidemic in 1587, probably typhus, was marked by a decline of 10.5 per cent in the number of male householders between the spring of 1587 and 1588 (Abbey Foregate included). Similarly, whereas between spring 1650 and autumn 1652 the frankpledge population in the rest of Shrewsbury barely changed, in the Welsh ward numbers fell by 8.4 per cent following the plague epidemic of 1650 which is known to have been confined to that district, coincident with the urban part of St Chad’s parish.\textsuperscript{23}

It is noticeable, however, how rapidly in the period of growth the effects of epidemic mortality could be overcome. Thus the losses of 1587 were retrieved by 1595, while the mortality caused by a plague epidemic in 1604 was recouped so quickly that scarcely any decline is visible in the frankpledge totals. Again, the frankpledge population fell by 10.5 per cent between 1622 (1032) and 1625 (924) in the wake of mortality crises in some parishes in 1623-4, while recruitment of craft masters, and thus of householders, was also hit by trade dislocation.\textsuperscript{24} Yet these losses had been more than made good by 1634. Such crises, however, may have had a deeper impact before the underlying disposition to grow appeared. Thus it is tempting to ascribe part of the decline in the frankpledge population between 1525 (448) and 1540 (385) to the plague
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outbreaks of 1526, 1532, 1536 and 1537-8, whose existence, if not their severity, was indicated by contemporary references.\textsuperscript{25}

It is interesting also to observe that the cessation of Shrewsbury’s population growth in c. 1640 occurred at about the same time as the pattern of parochial vital events also changed. The combined registers of St Alkmund’s and St Julian’s parishes show that the long ascent of baptismal totals was curtailed in 1640-9, and the natural surplus in that decade was the smallest since registration began. In St Chad’s, the most populous parish, where registration survives from 1617, a decline in baptisms did not occur until the 1650s, although the previous decade was the first to witness a surplus of burials over baptisms, a trend which persisted for most of the rest of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{26} As noted previously, however, the adult male population would not immediately be affected by changes in the level of dependents, so the contraction of the frankpledge population between 1634 (1072) and 1647 (950) must reflect some combination of increased mortality, reduced immigration and delayed entry into the frankpledge ranks. Significantly crisis mortality is known to have struck the town in 1642-3 and 1648, while economic problems also reduced the number of adult males coming forward to claim master status: recruitment to the Drapers’, Mercers’ Shermen’s and Weavers’ crafts in 1640-9 was lower than in any decade since 1600. Commercial difficulties were experienced by many towns in both the 1620s and 1640s, and Shrewsbury was no exception.\textsuperscript{27}

Comparisons and conclusion

As noted above, historians have suggested that despite the general context of growth from the second half of the sixteenth century, the demographic experience of English towns was not uniform. Frankpledge listings from other towns may serve to illustrate this point. Similar data, though not so plentiful, survive for Ludlow, Leominster and Hereford.\textsuperscript{28} Perhaps the most interesting contrast is supplied by the Hereford records, although in that city frankpledge was known by an alternative name, the judicial tourn. The subsidy returns of the 1520s suggest that before the era of growth the populations of Hereford and Shrewsbury (excluding the Abbey Foregate) were not too dissimilar, and this is supported by the frankpledge evidence. In 1561-2 some 430 men were listed at the Hereford tourn compared with 437 at Shrewsbury in the spring of 1563 (again excluding the Abbey Foregate, as is the case with all subsequent figures). By c. 1670, however, the size of the two communities had diverged markedly. For example, whereas 922 taxpayers in Shrewsbury were assessed for the Hearth tax of 1672, only 364 persons were taxed in Hereford in 1665, prompting Lobel to comment that ‘Hearth Tax returns of 1665 reveal a startling decline in the city’s position in respect of wealth and taxable population in relation to other towns’.\textsuperscript{29} Even allowing for variation in the comprehensiveness of the respective Hearth taxes, the difference is compatible with the frankpledge data. Thus in October 1664 989 men were listed for the Shrewsbury view of frankpledge, but only 424 for the Hereford judicial tourn.

In fact the evidence shows that after 1561-2 Hereford’s population did at first grow at a rate similar to that of Shrewsbury. By April 1572 the Hereford total
had risen by 27.4 per cent to 557 (Shrewsbury 574 in 1576), but then appears to have been checked, even reversed. The figure of listed males stood at about 546 in 1578-9, 538 in 1600-01, 426 in April 1638 and 500 in April 1661. Several incomplete lists survive for the intervening years, none of which indicate any further sustained growth in Hereford's population after c. 1580.

The utility of frankpledge listings in unravelling basic questions of population change is well demonstrated by this comparison. The extent to which similar evidence survives for other towns is uncertain although, in addition to the examples mentioned above, tithing lists have also been noted for Coventry, Maldon and Worcester.30 Such material enables one not only to examine those features described in this article, but also provides a foundation for tackling many other issues of population and social structure, including mobility, occupational patterns and participation in some local institutions, all of which deserve investigation.

NOTES


5. S. B. R. 2219, sessions records including a survey of inmates.


7. Fines are calculated from 'great court' records in the series S. B. R. 977-1381, and then compared with the nearest surviving frankpledge lists - see note 11.


10. Poos, 'The rural population'.

11. Sources: S. B. R. 996, 1023, 1052, 1054, 1076, 1083, 1089, 1117, 1119, 1342, 1842-3.

12. McInnes, pp. 61-3.

13. Briefly, these approximations are based on the following calculations. In 1525 some 496 male taxpayers were assessed for the lay subsidy although evasion was at least one third; S. B. R. 172 and W. A. Champion, 'The Shrewsbury Lay Subsidy of 1525', Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society, LXIV, 1985. It is assumed that the non-taxpayers aged under sixteen comprised 40 per cent of the population and that the sex-ratio in towns - though not in London at a later date - favoured males by, say, 10 per cent. (For this last point, see Phyhtian-Adams pp. 199-201; R. Finlay, Population and Metropolis, 1981, pp. 19, 140-2). The diocesan survey of 1563 listed approximately 550 households after rural parishioners are excluded; Brit. Lib. Harleian MSS, no. 594, fos. 160-1, 170. Frankpledge data, however, indicates that the survey totals may be slightly underestimates, particularly in St Julian's parish. A multiplier of 4.5 has been used. The muster of 1587, arranged principally by craft affiliation, listed 1291 males, although unlike normal muster designation, males aged above sixty were included; S. B. R. 2551. After adjustments for residents in the Abbey Foregate and substantial servant evasion, a figure of 1380 can be derived. It is then assumed that the proportion of the population aged less than sixteen was by now about 35 per cent (see J. Boulton, Neighbourhood and Society, 1987, p. 18), but that the sex-ratio still favoured females. The Hearth tax of 1672 listed 922 taxpayers excluding the Abbey Foregate, W. Watkins-Pitchford, Shropshire Hearth Tax Roll, 1672, 1949. To these
should be added those exempted by certificate and paupers, about 400-500 in total. A multiplier of 4.5 has again been used for this, the most comprehensive of the Hearth tax rolls for the town. This multiplier was in fact the mean 'houseful' size (i.e. including lodgers) calculated from the best surviving Marriage Duty returns between 1695 and 1698. S. B. R. 275-8. These census lists undoubtedly provided the basis for the Mayor’s count of 1695; T. Phillips, The History and Antiquities of Shrewsbury, 1779, p. 68.


15. Clark and Slack, Ibid.

16. Based on aggregate totals held on file by the Cambridge Group.


19. S. B. R. 76, fos. 66v, 114v, 125v.


26. See note 16.

27. Clark and Slack, pp. 103-4.


RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

A NOTE ON MOBILITY IN AN ESSEX PARISH IN THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY

Claire Davey

In a short article in LPS 18, 1977, E. A. Wrigley gave details of the baptism register for Colyton which provides direct evidence about the mother’s place of origin. Although the register only covered the period 1765-77, it contained some interesting features. Wrigley found, for example, that while almost 10 per cent of the entries in the baptism register concerned a child whose parents lived outside the parish of Colyton, almost all mothers came from places within a twenty-five mile radius of the parish. Most interesting of all, the 1851 Enumerators’ Books revealed that the life-time mobility of married women had changed little over the eighty intervening years.

With this in mind, it may be instructive to look briefly at the information contained in the registers relating to the Essex parish of Moreton between 1796 and 1812, which, like those of Colyton, are rich in additional information. A typical entry in the baptism register for 1798 reads:

‘James Hancock son of Wm Hancock, Tailor of Moreton End, son of Wm Hancock of Chipping Ongar Innkeeper, by Sarah his wife, daughter of Houchen of Chipping Ongar, Carpenter by Sarah his wife, daughter of George White of Moreton End, Carpenter, by Mary his wife, daughter of George Nicholls of Bovinger, Farmer, born Monday April 16th, baptised Sunday May 20th’.

Here we have evidence not only of the parish of origin of the mother, but also of the father of the infant, and of both sets of grandparents. Occupations are stated for male relatives, and the length of time elapsing between birth and baptism is generally given. If a person came from Moreton itself, his or her actual abode within the parish was also given.

The rector responsible for these detailed entries was William Wilson, who had come to Moreton from the curacy of St Pauls, Sheffield. He continued to organise the registers in this highly desirable way until 1812, when printed books were introduced following the Act of Parliament 52 Geo. III (28 July 1812) for regulating and preserving parish registers.

The registers are comprehensive and clearly written, and are interspersed with incidental notes on such topics as cohabitation. In 1806, for example, the Reverend Wilson remarked that the mother of one infant ‘now lives with Samuel Carter of Fyfield, butcher. It is acknowledged that they are not married’. The marriage and burial registers are also detailed, and contain especially interesting information on ‘causes’ of death.
Figure 1 The place of origin of the grandparents of those baptised in the parish of Moreton, 1796-1812.

Notes: Each dot represents one grandparent. The parishes mentioned in the text and located on the map are as follows. CO = Chipping Ongar, Br = Brentwood, HE = High Easter, HBO = Hatfield Broad Oak, Fy = Fyfield, Ch = Cheimsford, Ha = Harlow, SW = South Weald, HL = High Laver, LL = Little Laver, ML = Magdalen Laver, Bo = Bobbingworth, AR = Abbess Roding, BR = Beauchamp Roding, BeR = Berners Roding, AyR = Aythorpe Roding, HR = High Roding, MR = Margaret Roding, WR = White Roding.
Mobility

Moreton is a small parish in west-central Essex of some 1,670 acres, with a population of 431 in 1831, lying seventeen miles north of London, and within reach of the large towns of Chelmsford and Harlow. Moreton had neither been touched by the great cloth industries of Essex, nor by market gardening, which came to characterise so many areas on the outskirts of London. The area, in fact, remained predominantly agricultural well into the twentieth century.

There were 201 baptisms in the sixteen years that the register covers, relating to ninety-one different marriages. In this study, remarriages have been ignored, and each marriage is used only once, no matter how many children it may have 'contributed' to the register; therefore, although we are unfortunately dealing with rather small numbers, we should have some guide to the relative importance of different parishes when we examine the pattern of migration into Moreton.

The abode of the father was given in all cases, apart from the ten 'base-born' children. In only seven cases was the abode outside the parish. Two fathers resided in London, one in South Weald (some eight miles distant), while the others lived in the neighbouring parishes of Fyfield, High Laver and Beauchamp Roding.¹

Table 1. Distance of stated place of residence of grandparents from Moreton (cumulative percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miles from Moreton</th>
<th>Paternal grand father %</th>
<th>Paternal grand mother %</th>
<th>Maternal grand father %</th>
<th>Maternal grand mother %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In parish</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Number      | 100                     | 100                     | 100                     | 100                     |
|                  | (76)                    | (51)                    | (87)                    | (60)                    |

Grandparents of the infants, however, showed evidence of a rather wider residential pattern. Although nearly one third were said to come from Moreton, fifty-six other places were mentioned. Figure 1 shows the distribution of grandparents for stated place of abode for areas within a fifteen mile radius of
Moreton. If a circle were drawn representing a five mile radius centering on Moreton, it would enclose 76 per cent of all grandparents; if the area were to be extended to a ten mile radius, 90 per cent of all grandparents would be captured. Only 7 per cent came from further afield than fifteen miles.

The most favoured places were small, nearby villages - Bobbingworth, the Lavers, and the Rodings - or the larger market villages, such as Hatfield Broad Oak and High Easter. There is a distinct pattern according to the sex of grandparent within this overall pattern. The place of residence of the maternal and paternal grandfathers was given in 97 per cent and 95 per cent of cases respectively, and for both sets of grandmothers in 77 per cent of cases. On average, 39 per cent of grandfathers came from the parish of Moreton itself, although only 18 per cent of grandmothers did. From the information in table 1, it can be seen that while around one half of the maternal grandfathers came from within a mile of Moreton, the 50 per cent mark for paternal grandmothers was not reached until the area is extended to four miles from Moreton. Maternal grandmothers showed the most adventurous tendencies of all - although three quarters came from within six miles of Moreton, 15 per cent lived more than twelve miles away, and included in their number women from places as far afield as the Isle of Wight, Newcastle Upon Tyne, Oxford and Huntingdon.

However, all in all, a rather static pattern is revealed, especially when compared with the similar Colyton evidence. Ninety-one per cent of the fathers of baptised infants lived in Moreton, while 96 per cent of their own fathers and mothers came from within a distance of only twelve miles from the parish. Although 60 per cent of grandfathers chose brides randomly from neighbouring areas, the rest married women from, almost literally, on their own doorstep.

**Occupation**

Occupations were listed for 329 different people in the baptism register. Although 44 per cent were merely called labourers, and an additional 19 per cent were farmers, twenty-nine other occupations were named. Most of the occupations are what might be expected from an agricultural area at the end of the eighteenth century. Fathers of the baptised infants included in their number six carpenters, seven bricklayers, and four butchers, in addition to a gardener, a tailor, an ostler and a thatcher. Fathers with more exotic occupations tended to come from further afield - a tinker and a printer came from London, a wheelwright from South Weald. Occupations occurring only once among grandparents include a captain of an East Indiaman from Brentwood, a flax dresser from Newcastle, a haberdasher from the Isle of Wight, and a barber from Epping.

**The 1851 Census Enumerators’ Books**

The first fifty years of the nineteenth century were characterised by rapid improvements in transport in Essex. The London-Chelmsford railway line opened in 1840, and the Braintree-Maldon line was finished in 1847. There seems to have been little change, however, in the Moreton area. Kelly's
Directory of 1845 has little to say about Moreton itself, but reveals that a coach left Chipping Ongar (three and a half miles away) for London each morning, along with a carrier twice a week, and a coach three times a week to Chelmsford. This is essentially the same picture as that given by the Univeral British Dictionary in 1793.

The 1851 Census also provides us with information on sixty-one married couples where the wife was aged forty-five or under. This information is thus comparable with the earlier baptism register in which, by definition, only couples of childbearing age were noted.

Table 2. Birthplaces of husbands and wives from the 1851 census enumerators' books (cumulative percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miles from Moreton</th>
<th>Husband %</th>
<th>Wife %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In parish</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 mile</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 miles</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 10 miles</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The birthplace information for these couples in the 1851 census is broken down into distance groupings and presented in table 2. The percentages in this table are roughly comparable with the figures for the paternal and maternal grandfathers of 1796-1812 given in table 1, on the assumption that it is likely for a person to be born at the habitual abode of his or her parents. We see that although slightly fewer were actually born in Moreton, over half came from a mile or less away. One couple came from Ireland, one wife from Gloucester, and one from Oxford. Yet all of the others came from less than twenty miles away, with the exception of one man from Hedingham Castle (twenty-four miles distant).

Conclusion

In short, both Moreton's remarkable parish registers of 1796-1812 and the later mid-nineteenth century census returns show the population to have a high degree of stability, with no evidence of change over the intervening period, at least as far as migration into the parish was concerned. Indeed, if anything, the marrying population migrated into Moreton from shorter distances in 1851 than half a century earlier.
However, it must be stressed that the numbers we are dealing with are small, and it would be unwise to attempt to make any generalisations with such limited evidence at our disposal. This short paper has therefore been restricted to a simple examination of the records, and an analysis of wider issues has not been attempted. It should be clear, however, that a register for a larger parish, or for a set of parishes, containing comparable information, would be a useful find indeed. 

NOTES

2. The register is housed at the Essex Record Office in Chelmsford, reference D/P 72/1/1-4.
3. This is not quite true, as a bride was never considered independently of her father. Thus the occupation and residence of the person we will here, for the sake of brevity, call ‘paternal grandmother’, is really the occupation and residence of her father (ie: the father of the paternal grandmother). ‘Maternal grandmother’ is likewise really the father of the maternal grandmother.
4. It is not clear in the registers whether the place given is the birthplace of the subject, or the place where he or she is currently living, or, in the case of some grandparents, was living at the time of death. Following Wrigley, (LPS 18) any place name is taken to be place of habitual abode.
5. The probable existence of such registers was noted in E. A. Wrigley, ibid, p. 29, footnote 4.
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The expanding Prideaux population

Dear Sir

Readers of my article in LPS 36, 1986, may like to know how my attempts at estimating the Prideaux population turned out. To some extent they illustrate beginner's luck, for at some vital dates I obtained the right result for the wrong reasons.

While my count of telephone subscribers in England proved a useful guide, I was greatly misled by not having made a more systematic survey of those living overseas. To my surprise there are more than 200 Prideauxs listed in the USA, more than 150 in Australia, and about 40 in Canada, New Zealand and South Africa.

I drew attention to more than 20 spelling variants, but there are more than 40 now recorded. Of these the early version of PRIDDIS has survived, so that more than 50 members of the clan (including a few PRIDDICES) are listed in that form in directories in 1988. They are mostly, I think, descended from the east Devon branch of which one family obstinately refused to conform to the EAUX convention in the early nineteenth century at a time when all others did so. As a result of this oversight on my part, together with my ignorance of the number living outside this country, I based my back-projections on a figure of a thousand population derived from a supposed list of 300. There is now a global total of over 700 people listed, and it is unlikely that the clan numbers much less than 2,200. Using this as a base I should have estimated a population of about 150 in the year 1550, and expected to find a score of households.

There were in fact 18 or 19 households by the end of Elizabeth's reign, not 12 or 13 as I had thought. There were nearly twice as many by the eve of the Civil War, but by 1705 not more than 38 families can be found whose children are born in the eighteenth century. Far from the gentry families being more prolific in the seventeenth century, the civil unrest took such toll of their numbers that their expansion was arrested. As a result there were only 49 households visible by 1805, very close to my guesstimate, made on false premises, that there would
be some fifty collateral family units! They probably represent 350-400
individuals, to whom must be added childless couples and unmarried adults.
The increasing mobility which can be noticed from 1790 onwards, to be
followed by emigration overseas after 1840, made the tracing of pedigrees
increasingly difficult; but the rapid expansion of population is clearly visible,
more marked overseas than in the home country. I did not attempt to carry my
study beyond 1880.

Yours faithfully
Roy Prideaux

‘Orcheton’, West End, Northleach, Cheltenham GL54 3HG


A family affair

Dear Sir

Whilst carrying out research at the Essex Record Office in Chelmsford I came
across the following entry in the Epping Union Board of Guardians Minute
Book for the 5th June 1840 (ref G/EM 3). This concerns the governor of the
union workhouse and his wife, also the matron, who had been newly
appointed to their respective positions at the end of April 1840. The entry
reads:

Also it was resolved that it be communicated to the [Poor Law] Commissioners that since
the appointment of Benj Goode Miller & wife to the Office of Govenor & Matron of the
Union Workhouse, it has been ascertained that his said Wife was the Widow of his own
Nephew who was the son of his late Sister - And Consequently the Marriage is void ab
initio - and to obtain their Opinion as to the Course proper for the Guardians to pursue.

A second minute dated a week later directs the Clerk to write to the Poor Law
Commissioner. Their reply must have been received within a week for the
minutes of the following weeks meeting (19/6/1840) record that the
appointments were withdrawn. The matter did not rest there since the minutes
of June 26 and July 7 note the Board’s refusal to allow Benjamin Miller any
remuneration.

This issue clearly illustrates that marriage within the prohibited degrees was
not just a matter of concern to the ecclesiastical authorities. For those who may
wish to follow-up the matter more closely a further account of Mr Miller and
(said) wife should appear in the Poor Law Commissioners in-letter books
housed at Kew (PRO MH12/3479).

Yours faithfully
Elizabeth Sellers

1, Chignal Road, Chelmsford, Essex CM1 2JA
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A GLOSSARY FOR LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES

A revised and enlarged edition containing articles on demographic terms and
methods, on simple statistics and on sources for local population studies. A
bibliography and a list of useful addresses are included.
£1.80 (postage and packing 24p) (1979)

THE PLAGUE RECONSIDERED - a new look at its origins
and effects in 16th and 17th century England

The book sets out for the historian and for the general reader the medical and
epidemiological facts essential for the understanding of plague and its effects
and exposes the areas of controversy still remaining. It illustrates them by
case studies of plague at Bristol, Colyton and Eyam.
£3.65 (postage and packing 43p) (1977)
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Guides for the historian, historical demographer and genealogist to the
whereabouts of deposited parish registers in England and Wales, giving
details of the place of deposit and of the dates of the registers deposited.
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Studies, Tawney House, Matlock, Derbyshire DE4 3BT.
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