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EDITORIAL

Amendments to the Parochial Registers and Records Measure 1978

New legislation which seeks to amend the Parochial Registers and Records Measure 1978 is on its way through Synod. It bears the title Church of England (Service Chaplaincies and Miscellaneous Provisions) Measure and would not warrant a second glance from the average LPS subscriber (or editorial board member for that matter) if it were not for the contents of Part II, clause 7 and Part III, schedules 1 and 2. Tucked away amongst clauses concerned with matters such as Service Chaplaincies, Sequestration, the Conduct of Funeral Services and the Rights of Burial of Cremated Remains, are a series of proposals which taken together will substantially alter the administrative procedures laid down in the 1978 Measure. There is much to commend these amendments. They have arisen from an analysis of the operation of the present system by a group of archivists and church administrators who have drawn from ten years' experience of the present Measure to forge a new code which is eminently practical. Indeed, if it were not for one clause which radically alters users' rights of access to parish registers, the new legislation would have our unqualified support.

Let us consider first the main thrust of the new proposals. They originated as recommendations from a Review Group under the chairmanship of the Venerable Bazil Marsh, Archdeacon of Northampton, which consisted of Victor Gray, Essex County Archivist; Dr Brenda Hough, General Synod Archivist; Nigel Yates, Kent County Archivist and three assessors, one of whom was Lionel Wadeson, Synod's Assistant Secretary-General, who played a significant part in drafting the 1978 measure. Without question this was an immensely experienced team though it lacked any representation from records users. At the heart of the new Measure there lies the conviction that the inspection of parochial records should coincide with the relevant quinquennial inspection of the church's fabric, and as this procedure is essentially the responsibility of the archdeacon, he should also take control of register and record inspection. So in the future it will be the archdeacon rather than the bishop who ensures that inspections take place and that this is done every five years, rather than the six laid down in 1978. He will also appoint an appropriate person in consultation with the chief officer of the diocesan record office to carry out the inspection, and the archdeacon will receive the report which should follow such an inspection. The new Measure also tackles the question of cost, an issue which has rankled with Local Authorities since they began to recognise the scale of the commitment they had entered into in the euphoria which followed the 1978 settlement. Then provision was made for the expense of carrying out a parish inspection to be passed to the parochial church council but in practice the costs have been borne almost entirely by Local Authorities. Now the financial burden is to be placed squarely on the parish.
It seems to us that this is all good common sense and we would be the first to admit that there is much to commend the Review Group's other major proposal which stems from a concern for the safety of the original registers. With the growth of interest in genealogical studies, many registers are now in almost daily use and as a result have begun to deteriorate. Clearly it is desirable that whenever possible readers should use photographic copies. It is unfortunate, however, that in seeking to secure this objective the new Measure extinguishes the public right of access to the original registers at least in those circumstances in which the custodian of the registers chooses to use such powers. According to the notes which accompanied the draft Measure when it was presented to Synod it was the Registrar General who planted this idea in the minds of the Review Group, stating that "public access to most original registers and records could be restricted by an Amending Measure".

Whether the Registrar General helped draft the clause of the new Measure which embodies this advice we cannot say. But as readers will appreciate, it is quite unacceptable in its present form, which is as follows:

'(2A) Where a search is made under sub-section (1) or (2) above the person having custody of the register book or the chief officer may require the search to be made in an authenticated photographic copy of the register book; and for the purposes of this sub-section the copy shall be regarded as authenticated if it bears a certificate signed by the person who was the chief officer, as the case may be, at the time the copy was made to the effect that it is a true copy of the register book.'

This clause has been brought to the attention of a number of groups of potential records users including the Genealogical Records Users' Groups and the Council of the British Association for Local History and from these discussions a number of difficulties have emerged. In the first place it would appear to have been drafted in such a way as to make it unworkable in many record offices. The clause states that the chief officer at the time the copy was made must certify its accuracy. But of course many offices have held photographic copies for years and the officers who first received them are no longer on hand.

However, our fundamental objection to the proposal is not with the working of this clause, which can easily be amended to express the meaning its authors intended, but with the intention which is to eradicate the users' right of access to the original registers at the discretion of the custodian. We have made clear already that we recognise the need to encourage the use of photographic copies of registers, and we would even accept the concept of authenticated and certificated copies, but only if the users' residual right to consult the original registers is preserved. This could be achieved by the addition of a further sentence to the clause embodying a right of appeal to the custodian of the register or the officer in charge of the record office by any reader who having made use of the photographic copies can demonstrate reasonable grounds for believing that the photographic copy is defective in quality or incomplete.
Any reader who has used photographic copies of registers will be aware of the problems which can arise with them. Sometimes pages are omitted and frequently parts of a page in the photographic copy are less legible than they are in the original. We would also point out how tedious and time-consuming the process of authentication - page by page - will be. Several archivists have expressed doubts as to whether present staffing levels would ever permit such a procedure to be undertaken in their record offices. But of course there is no reason why new legislation should constrain the better-staffed record offices from adopting good practices for no better reason than that they may set a lead which will not be followed universally. We have made our views known to the Archdeacon of Northampton and to Lionel Wadeson and pointed out that records users were not consulted when the Measure was drafted. We are fortunate that the Measure was not high enough on the agenda of Synod’s February meeting to receive final approval. Had the planned timetable been followed it could now have been on its way to Parliament and so beyond amendment. We hope that consultation will secure appropriate amendments before Synod meets again in the summer and we would like to think there will be enough common ground between the parties - archivists, administrators and records users - to achieve a workmanlike compromise.

The Measure at work

One legacy of the Measure Review Group which has received no more publicity than their new Measure is the report in which they describe the questionnaire which they circulated to all archdeacons to establish the extent to which the Measure had been implemented. This was despatched in October 1986. At the same time the Association of County Archivists sent a second questionnaire to Diocesan Record Offices. The replies from these two enquiries provide an interesting insight into the extent of the Measure’s effectiveness.

The archdeacons proved more obedient respondents achieving a response rate of 82.57 per cent from thirty-nine dioceses against the archivists’ paltry 52.8 per cent. However, there were extensive areas of silence even amongst the archdeacons, no replies being received from the Dioceses of Birmingham or Liverpool. The Dioceses of London, Europe, and Sodor and Man were omitted from the survey.

The Review Group concluded, diplomatically, that the enquiry revealed how the Measure had served "to accelerate a process already underway", at the same time expressing concern at the large number of inspections outstanding in certain dioceses. In thirty-six archdeaconaries inspection was complete but in no less than fifty-four, involving a total of 1,907 parishes, inspection had not taken place. Furthermore, only four dioceses had begun the second round of inspection and no less than sixteen confessed to having no arrangements for such further inspection. The Review Group was in no doubt that the reason this essential element in the system the 1978 Measure had sought to establish had been so neglected was largely the result of the general shortage of resources. They urged Diocesan Boards of Finance to consider what help they could give diocesan record offices towards the implementation of the Measure. However,
the problem is not exclusively financial. There is evidence in the archdeacons’ replies of a general lack of will to grant the Measure a high enough priority. In only seven dioceses had a Books and Documents Committee been appointed though four others were considering the matter; and only ten had produced Guidelines on what records should be kept or thrown away. The enquiry also revealed the extent of the difficulties which had been encountered from parishes reluctant to co-operate with the Measure. Three had refused to allow inspection to take place; 107 had failed to deposit documents when requested to do so; and 81 had failed to comply with the standards for keeping records in the parish.

Readers who remember the debate which surrounded the introduction of the Measure in 1978 will recall the speculation there was about the number of parishes which would seek to retain their records. This enquiry produced evidence of only 159 parishes making such a request of which 87 had received approval and 13 had been refused. The remainder, at the time of the enquiry, were awaiting decision. The Review Group did not feel moved by the statistics to relax the stringent conditions set out in the Measure for records maintained in parochial custody. Consequently the new Measure does no more than update Schedule 2 (in regard to temperature and humidity) though it does make provision for a parish to use a muniment room as an alternative to a storage cupboard.

The County Archivists’ questionnaire complements the picture revealed by the Church enquiry. Sixty per cent of respondents had completed their initial survey. Among 32 per cent a significant amount of work remained to be done though in only 20 per cent of the record offices involved was the work outstanding described as substantial; 64 per cent had not begun the second round of inspections though 12 per cent had completed them. The amount of time devoted to the Measure by diocesan record offices is indicated by the estimate that the average office had committed one whole person-year to surveying the records and three whole person-years for listing them.

On the question of the storage of records, 60 per cent of the archivists reported that their Bishops had laid down standards for the storage of records less than a hundred years old, but 76 per cent of respondents were aware of parishes which had failed to comply with these directions. Parishes had also been found to be at fault in keeping older records. In 25 returns, 148 parishes were recorded as keeping their records, but of those 148, only 10 had received permission! The report noted "there is a small but significant proportion of clergy/PCCs who prevent implementation by conscious/unconscious prevarication and bloody mindedness."

Against such defaulters the Measure provided the Bishop with powers of enforcement, yet none of the respondents reported formal disciplinary action and without such assistance there is little diocesan record officers can do. However, 52 per cent reported that their Bishops had removed parish records from unauthorised custodians.
The report also describes a number of special cases. The 1978 Measure does not apply to the Channel Islands, nor to the Isle of Man, though in each case it could be adopted by appropriate local legislation. The report informs us that in the Isle of Man such an initiative may be imminent. The Review Group also considered how far the principles of the Measure could be applied to the Diocese of Europe and depending on the results of a questionnaire, further consideration is to be undertaken by the diocese and its advisers.

It is a shock to discover that the report includes the Diocese of London amongst these special cases. At the time the enquiry was made, the London Diocese had neither a diocesan record officer nor a diocesan books and documents committee. This was because the Greater London Record Office had been unwilling to accept additional parish register material and would not allow its archivist to be designated. The Southwark Diocese had also been affected by this decision though an attempt had been made to resolve the problem by appointing the Surrey County Archivist as a diocesan records officer. The Review Group was informed that as a result of their questionnaire, negotiations with the Greater London Record Office had been renewed and an agreement had been reached. In future the Greater London Record office, the Guildhall Library and the Archives Department of Westminster City Libraries will be recognised as designated diocesan record offices for the Diocese of London; and the Greater London Record Office, the Surrey Record Office and the Archives Department of the London Borough of Lewisham will act for the Diocese of Southwark. The Report notes, somewhat dryly, "there [is] a lot of ground to be made up if the implementation of the Measure [is] to keep pace with progress elsewhere".

If the Review Group were to achieve nothing else it would deserve respect and gratitude of records users everywhere for having brought the Dioceses of London and Southwark within the law of the land.

Registration: Proposals for Change

The White Paper Registration: Proposals for Change was published on 31 January. We approached it without enthusiasm expecting to find all the imperfections heralded in the Green Paper, unleavened by second thought or consultation, and now settled in a leaden administrative framework. We had formed these views from the correspondence we had seen between government spokesmen - including ministers - and members of the public who had questioned the system for access to registration records described in the Green Paper. We had seen the government defend its absurd accreditation scheme, pour scorn on the benefits of simple photocopies over certificates, and extol its hard-line freemarket policy. We had not realised that, despite defensive posturing, somewhere in the system genuine consultation was taking place.

In fact the government has preserved the basic framework which was set out in the Green Paper, yet at the same time made important concessions to records users. Registration records are to be divided between "historic" and "recent"; the present "pot-luck" individual entry system of access to the recent registers is to
be retained; centrally there is to be a reading room and possibly a search room, while the day-to-day business of St Catherine’s House is to be moved to Southport. At a local level authorities will provide basic access facilities and may offer a wider service if they so choose.

The White Paper identifies the age at which the division of registration records between historic and recent should take place, as one of the questions which aroused considerable public interest. More than 200 responses were received. A thirty year limit found little support. We are told a minority favoured varying limits for birth, marriage and death registers and this included the Association of Metropolitan Authorities and a number of local authorities. Between one hundred years or seventy-five years there was a divergence of view. The society of Registration Officers who were concerned to protect privacy, advocated a hundred year division, while the genealogists and family historians felt seventy-five years would be a fair compromise. In fact a majority favoured the seventy-five years option and it is this proposal the government will adopt with the additional possibility that the age may be lowered at some time in the future if this appears to be justified.

For the first time since the early years of the century readers will have direct access to the registers albeit only to the older registers and via microfiche copies. They will now be able to order photocopies rather than certificates if they so wish and it is assumed (though no guarantee is offered on this point) that such copies will be cheaper than certificates.

For the recent records something like the existing system will be retained with access to the registers confined to the purchase of copies of specified items identified from the indexes. But here again there has been progress. The government has scrapped the Green Paper’s accreditation scheme and abandoned its insistence that certificates were the only type of copy it would permit.

The accreditation scheme found little support. It was feared that it would be expensive and cumbersome to administer. Users believed it would be divisive in that it would favour established researchers and commercial firms.

The argument in favour of simple photocopies allied to more elaborately controlled certificates was one we believed we had lost. The government had seemed transfixed by the notion that making certificates hard to obtain would solve its security problems and that the production of simple non-certificated copies would undermine this system. In fact, as so many correspondents pointed out, so much of the information contained in the register entries could be obtained elsewhere from sources which are publicly available that the system advocated in the Green Paper could not be justified on security grounds. Instead we have the pleasure of seeing the government adopt the remedy so many of us prescribed. It has decided to make available copies which are non-certificated - in effect simple photocopies - while at the same time introducing more comprehensive application forms for those requiring certificated copies. These will be similar to passport applications and will require applicants to identify themselves, state their relationship to the subject
of the required certificate and the purpose for which it is required. Thus, the government argues, the need of both security services and the genealogical user can be satisfied.

The White Paper appears to support the retention of a Public Search Room, if not at St Catherine's House then somewhere else in central London. The search room will service the needs of users of both the historic and the recent registers but a fee will be charged for entry. The White Paper acknowledges that this proposal in the Green Paper drew much comment and opposition from records users. But the government believes such a charge is justified. It is determined to recover the cost of the service and argues that at present almost a third of visitors to the Public Search Room leave without purchasing certificates. Such people, it is said, should pay their share of the financial burden now borne exclusively by the tax-payer and purchasers of certificates. The fee the government has in mind is a modest one and according to the White Paper has been set only after extensive enquiries had been made among potential users. It is suggested that the fee should be £1 or £2 with a system of season tickets for regular visitors.

In addition to the Public Search Room the Green Paper raised the question of a central library or reading room where users would find microfilm or microfiche copies of the historic registers, and the proposal carried the recommendation that there should be private sector involvement in the funding and management of such a library. The White Paper recognises the strength of feeling amongst records users that this facility should be government funded, but the government remains convinced that this should be a non-governmental initiative. It proposes to offer a contract to a charitable trust or commercial concern to provide a central library which would be overseen by OPCS who would, on receipt of an annual royalty, supply a copy of all the historic records. The precise division of responsibilities and function between the Public Search Room and the proposed free-enterprise library is not entirely clear.

On the question of local access the White Paper adopts a more muted tone than its green predecessor. Local authorities were not enthusiastic about the role offered them in the Green Paper and as the White Paper admits "there is little indication of which course - display in a county archive or public library, purchase of OPCS film or fiche, or some other approach - the majority of them may choose to adopt". What is absolutely clear is the government’s refusal to direct local authorities to provide a certain service and so achieve a uniform standard. The government insists it must be a matter of local opinion and demand.

The White Paper also contains a reference to intended legislation which will permit the church authorities to make authorised copies of their registers which can then be used for research purposes instead of the original ones. This would seem to be a reference to the Church of England (service chaplaincies and miscellaneous provisions) Measure to which we have already drawn attention.

The White Paper summarises the access provision the government envisages. These provisions are set out in the table below. There are important issues that
remain to be clarified particularly with regard to the proposed central library, the fees it would be expected to charge users and the royalties it would pay OPCS. Similar questions would arise in cases where local authorities purchased microfilm from OPCS with the intention of making copies from this material available to the public. Would there be complete freedom to make unlimited copies, or would the purchaser of a register or index microfilm or fiche find that OPCS in fact intended to operate a system of royalty payments? These matters are important. It is on such points of detail that the extent to which the new legislation succeeds in unlocking the massive new archive which the registration records represent will be determined. Access is the key; if a national pattern of access points emerges where readers can consult these records effectively and inexpensively, we shall see the study of civil registration records take their place alongside the census enumerators' returns. If access remains essentially a central metropolitan facility, registration studies will continue to be the preserve of demographers and genealogists; a wider public will have been excluded and an important opportunity will have been lost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPCS</th>
<th>Local authorities</th>
<th>Non-governmental agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recent records (under 75 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified copies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unofficial copies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic records (75 years or more)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified copies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unofficial copies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records for sale on film (or fiche)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browsing facility</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion how do we regard the White Paper? There is much that we find distasteful. We do not believe that charges however small should be made for access to records; nor are we convinced of the need to divide the registers into historic and recent and to restrict access on grounds of confidentiality. We
stand by the principles which guided the progenitors of the registration system. Registration is a public statement and so it should remain. We also regret the government's failure in this legislation to establish a uniform (or at least a minimum) national standard. These are all points we were not alone in presenting to the government when the Green Paper was published. Now the time for consultation on broad principles has passed. We could continue to advertise our belief in a quite different system but this would be to marginalise LPS in the present debate. The political realities are contained in the White Paper; it is the new proposals that must be addressed. Imperfect as they are they remain preferable to what went before. And on this basis we have no hesitation in welcoming the White Paper. We understand that OPCS has invited consultation and we hope records users will take up the matters which require clarification.

The calculation of days of the week

In the last issue of LPS an editorial note promised that an article detailing the problems associated with using calendars in the past and calculating the day of the week for specific dates would be published in this issue of the journal. Although such a piece has now been written, due to the complexities associated with this subject, the finished article has turned out to be rather longer than originally intended. Consequently, shortage of space in this issue of LPS has determined that the promised article be held over until LPS 45. We hope that our readers will be able to persevere until the autumn.

Tom Arkell
Christopher Charlton
Terry Gwynne
May Pickles
Roger Schofield
Kevin Schurer
Malcolm Smith
Geoffrey Stevenson
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NEWS FROM THE CAMBRIDGE GROUP FOR THE HISTORY OF POPULATION AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

An Historical Data Archive for the UK: a feasibility study

Few people undertaking historical research, whether amateur or professional, local or general, can have failed to notice the growing impact of computer techniques for collection, storage and investigation of historical information. Like it or not, the computer is rapidly becoming an important element in the historian’s bag of research aids. Yet although few can deny the advantages the use of a computer may bring, it also creates a set of potential problems, certainly for the future if not for now. Partly because of the novelty and youthfulness of applying computer techniques to historical research, much of this type of work has been and is being carried out in relative isolation, with few researchers knowing what other computer using-historians are doing, how they are doing it, and how it may reflect upon, help or benefit their own work. The formation of the Association for History and Computing* in 1986 is beginning to alleviate this problem, yet it still remains the case that the bulk of machine-readable historical data files that have been and are being created are inaccessible to other researchers. Indeed many data files, no doubt, have already been lost to the research community as data are erased at the termination of a research project, or lie forgotten in the recesses of the University computing service. Unfortunately, unless something is done now the gravity of the situation will only increase as time goes on, with present technologies and methodologies becoming obsolete and superseded by others.

If the vast body of machine-readable data files which have been generated over the past twenty years is to be preserved for future use by the academic community and other interested parties, the only practical solution is for them to be stored in an appropriate central data archive, catering not only for their preservation, but also their full documentation, cataloguing and dissemination. A central data archive is appropriate and beneficial for a number of reasons. Firstly, it will help to prevent duplication of effort in generating further data files, making it possible for researchers to consult work already completed in their field quickly and efficiently. Secondly, the archive will act as a common resource for both research and teaching purposes, providing up-to-date information on available data sets and a central point for data requests and dissemination. Furthermore, it is hoped that the archive will serve as a centre for the exchange of information for researchers in the field, providing practical help and expertise in the handling of historical data using computerised techniques. However, before such an archive can be established it is appropriate to undertake an in-depth investigation of the current stock of machine-readable historical data files.

Fortunately, the British Academy has generously granted a Major Research Award to fund this initial investigation. Consequently, an historical data
archive project has been set up at the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure, headed by Dr Kevin Schurer and co-ordinated by Ms Sheila Anderson. The primary purpose of the project is to investigate the existing stock of historical data files in the United Kingdom, with some indication of their nature, structure, content and potential for secondary analyses by historians and other social scientists. This work will require consultation with historians and other social scientists, librarians, family history groups and other creators of machine-readable historical data files. To this end, it is intended to distribute a questionnaire to all history departments and others who may have created, be in the process of creating, or who store or house historical data files in machine-readable form, in order to gather as much information as possible on the existing stock of computerised data. A copy of the questionnaire is enclosed with this issue of the journal and further copies can be obtained from the address below.

The body of information collected will be used to construct a database of existing historical files held in machine-readable form, detailing their use to date, content, coverage and accessibility, together with a section on work currently in progress. From this a bibliographic guide to historical data files will be produced at the end of the project, together with an on-line search facility for those with access to the Joint Academic Network (JANET). Undoubtedly, the database will be of great benefit to the research community, providing, of course, that it has the depth and variety of information necessary to be of meaningful value. In this respect the project can only be successful in achieving its aims if it receives the full cooperation from those who are creating, or who have created machine-readable historical data sets. Therefore, if you wish the project to succeed please co-operate in completing and returning to us the questionnaire set out below. We would also be most interested in hearing from those people who, although they may not have created or be creating their own machine-readable historical data files, would nevertheless be interested in using the facilities of an historical data archive. Some indication of the type of service which would prove most useful would also be appreciated.

Further details on the project and additional copies of the questionnaire are available from:

Sheila Anderson  
Historical Archive Project  
Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure,  
27 Trumpington Street, Cambridge, CB2 1QA. Tel: Cambridge (0223) 333194

* The Association for History and Computing is an international organization which aims to promote and develop interest in the use of computers in all types of historical study, at every level, in both teaching and research. It publishes (three times a year) its own journal, History and Computing. Further details of the Association are available by writing to the Membership Secretary, Dr Veronica Lawrence, 3 Crown Terrace, Stadhampton, Oxon, OX9 7TY.
NEWS FROM THE LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES SOCIETY

Conference report

The day-conference held at Nottingham Polytechnic, Clifton Campus, on the 1st July 1989, organized by Dr Dennis Mills and attended by about forty-five delegates, dealt with the perennial subject of Parish Registers and their employment in local studies. Dr Tony Wrigley (All Souls College, Oxford) discussed burial registers and pointed out that these were more comprehensive than baptism registers. Aggregative analysis could indicate both seasonality of mortality and years of crisis mortality, and therefore point to seasonal or irregular onsets of specific disorders and diseases. It could also, in certain segments of registers, be applied to occupations, to indicate the economic context. Family reconstitution, which required the linking of all categories of register, could however be specifically applied to linking, in the case of infants, burials and baptisms, to determine infant mortality - a most important feature of past mortality. The obvious difficulty with this exercise is that the burial registers unfortunately omitted a proportion of infants because they died unbaptised. Nevertheless the difficulty can be circumvented by using the Bourgeois-Pichat test which, by graphing known infant burials, and by making certain assumptions about endogenous and exogenous infant mortality, enables estimates to be made of the under-registration of infant deaths and hence of total infant mortality. In his workshop Dr Wrigley demonstrated from parish registers how this procedure could be applied and tested.

Turning to baptism and marriage registers, Professor Paul Hair (Liverpool University) drew attention to the variation of the registers over time, in the range of data they provided, so that some were suitable for particular analyses, others for different analyses. Technical snags in the registers (such as the calendar year and the repetition of names among siblings ) were noted, as was the varying extent to which, at different times and in different circumstances, the registers failed to represent all births or all marital unions. While age at marriage was fundamental to demographic enquiry, it was not easy to extract from the registers: marriage horizons were easy to extract but some caution was called for in interpreting the results. Seasonality of marriage also provided a simple exercise, but the contributory factors, such as local economic opportunity and local courtship custom, were not always obvious. In general, statistical analysis of parish registers became more meaningful when set within the context of the total social dimension. This was very much the case with the final exercise recommended to local history groups, the calculation of bridal pregnancy rates (by bringing together marriage and baptism registers). A satisfying example of mass social behaviour, it was quite easy to demonstrate, but what do the commonly high (and increasing) rates of earlier centuries tell us? Analysis by marriage baptism durations shows relatively few shotgun marriages, but many illegitimate mothers must have been 'thwarted pregnant brides'. Could we distinguish between courtship-led pregnancy and marriage-
led pregnancy? In the subsequent workshop, a series of simple exercises in the analysis of local baptism and marriage entries was tackled with some zest: almost complete silence for an hour, broken only by distressed calls for assistance when the normal abnormalities of every parish register came to light.

Forthcoming conferences

**Nineteenth Century Population and Community History**, a weekend conference to be held at Bishop Grosseteste College, Lincoln, 6-8 April 1990. Speakers include Dennis Mills on Victorian Lincoln, John Beckett on Rural Population Studies, Carol Pearce on the Bibliography of Nineteenth Century Census Studies and Richard Wall on Family and Household Patterns in Mid-Nineteenth Century England. This conference will include a programme of Workshops and Discussions on topics integrated with the Lectures.

**Historical Migration**, a one-day conference to be held at the University of Lancaster, Saturday, 30th June, 1990. Speakers include Colin Pooley on Approaches to the Study of Population Migration in Mid-Victorian Britain, Ian Whyte on Parallels and Contrasts in Patterns of Migration in Early-Modern Scotland and England, and Robert Woods on Geographical Perspectives on Historical Migration. Workshops will include Malcolm Smith on Surnames, May Pickles on Early Nineteenth Century Occupations, and Grace Wyatt on Maternal Mortality.

**Disease and Death in the Modern Period**, a one-day conference to be held at the Institute of Historical Research, Senate House, University of London on Saturday 3rd November, 1990. More details in next LPSS Newsletter.

Further details of conferences can be obtained from the LPSS Conference Secretary, Grace Wyatt, at the address given in the next item below.

Research project on maternal mortality

Maternal mortality can be inferred from parish burial registers, even when the cause of death is not given. A maternal death is a death which occurs in pregnancy, labour, or during the immediate post-natal period. It is unlikely that we can by any direct method trace the first of these, but even they in certain cases can be inferred by estimating the difference in death rates between women (or better, married women) of child-bearing years and men of similar age.Deaths in labour are usually indicated in the parish register by the mother of a newly-born child being buried within a few days of the baptism of a child born to her. The burial may be before or after the baptism, according to whether the baptism is delayed or not. The length of the relevant post-natal period is normally defined as six weeks after delivery. A mother buried within six weeks of having a child baptised can be considered as having died through puerperal causes.

The aim of this project is to estimate the extent of maternal mortality from about 1600-1850, with a view to finding agreement or disagreement with Schofield’s data from Sweden. A very few parish registers may give cause of
death at varying times through this period, but the majority will not. Thus it is apparent that most of the maternal mortality will be inferred by linking the burial of the mother to the baptism of the infant. If additionally the age of death of the mother is given, collection of these data will aid the identification of maternal mortality.

Volunteers wishing to be involved in this project for one or more parishes should write to Mrs G.M. Wyatt, 302 Prescot Road, Aughton, Ormskirk, Lancs. L39 6RR stating the parish of their interest, or asking for suggestions for a parish to research. Volunteers will receive progress reports twice a year, and a presentation of results will be in LPS or LPSS Newsletter.

NOTES

3. R. Schofield, 'Did the mothers really die? Three centuries of maternal mortality in the world we have lost'. in L. S. Bonfield, R. S. Smith and K. Wrightson, The world we have gained: histories of population and social structure, Oxford, 1986.

Parish Register Occupational Project

Regular readers of LPS will hopefully be fully aware of the project launched by Tony Wrigley of the Cambridge Group to undertake an investigation of occupation structure in the early nineteenth century based on a national sample of parish registers. Details of this project have been given in a previous issue (see LPS 38, pp.6-7) and findings from a pilot survey undertaken by the Mid-Wharfdale Local History Group, Yorkshire have also been published (see LPS 38, p.68; LPS 39, p.72; LPS 40, pp.61-2). However, some LPSS members may have been confused as a result of receiving a letter from the Society's chairman, Paul Hair, inviting them to take part in a similar project organized by LPSS. Do not fear, the two projects are in fact one and the same, with all the results being returned to Dr Wrigley. We apologize for any confusion that may have been caused.

Mary Turner

It is with sadness that we record the death on 28th September 1989 of Mary Turner. She will be remembered warmly by many of our members as a loyal, lively and enthusiastic contributor to conferences, and as a champion of local history in schools and adult education. A memorial fund has been established in order, in the first instance, to provide proper binding and storage of the extensive collection of local history material that Mary bequeathed to the Local History Department of Manchester Central Reference Library. Donations should be sent to: Mary Turner Memorial Fund, c/o Working Class Movement Library, 51, The Crescent, Salford, M5 4WX.
CRAFT OCCUPATIONS IN THE LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY:
SOME LOCAL CONSIDERATIONS

Christine Hallas

Dr Hallas is Head of Studies in History at Trinity and All Saints' College, Leeds. She has recently completed research into the economic and social change in nineteenth century Wensleydale and Swaledale for her Ph.D. thesis.

Introduction

One of the distinctive features of traditional English rural society is the diversity of occupations to be found within the community. The primary activity of agriculture, sometimes in association with extractive industry, required the support of a wide range of crafts and services. The country craftsmen included both those, such as blacksmith and wheelwright, who serviced the primary industries of the countryside and those, such as tailor and shoemaker, who supplied the rural population with their basic needs. The rural craftsman was, therefore, integrally associated with the relatively self-sufficient rural economy which persisted in England and Wales well into the nineteenth century. Continuing rural population growth to the mid-nineteenth century stimulated demand for the products and services of the rural craftsman in both local and regional markets. Further, the concentration of specialist crafts in some places influenced the local population trends. The number and prosperity of rural craftsmen, therefore, increased broadly in line with the growth of rural population. It has been observed that total numbers employed in virtually all crafts dropped consistently from either 1861 or 1871 and that in many areas employment in country crafts per thousand of population fell from 1851. The causes of this decline have been the subject of much debate. The link with declining rural population is inescapable, but of comparable importance was the impact of industrialization and the competition from factory made goods which improved transport facilitated. Contemporaries noted the connection between the decline of rural crafts and industrialization and commented that it was a period of rapid change. However, as this paper demonstrates, industrialization did not cause a uniform decline in rural crafts either in terms of spatial distribution or within specific crafts. Also, albeit to a limited extent, many country craftsmen were able to adapt and take advantage of some of the changes brought about by industrialization. Recent research has shown that the contraction of the rural craft industry was generally gradual and even at the end of the nineteenth century the rural craftsman remained an important figure in the life of the countryside.
A Yorkshire Case Study

Wensleydale and Swaledale provide a useful case study for an analysis of the craft industry in the late nineteenth century. They are two of the most northerly of the Yorkshire dales and are situated in a relatively remote upland region which lies between the industrial towns of the West Riding and Lancashire to the south and the estuaries of the Tees, Wear and Tyne to the north east (see figure 1). Upper Wensleydale (81,000 acres) includes all the townships in that dale from Carperby westwards; lower Wensleydale (18,000 acres includes all the townships from Leyburn westwards to West Witton; Swaledale (74,500 acres) includes all the townships in that dale from Marrick westwards (see figure 2).

Figure 1 The regional setting of the study area
The economy of Wensleydale and Swaledale in the nineteenth century was based on the primary industries of agriculture and lead, supported by crafts and services. The agriculture of the area was largely pastoral. However, while all elements of livestock farming remained important, towards the end of the century in Wensleydale emphasis was placed increasingly on dairy farming. Although there was some lead mining in Wensleydale, the industry was predominantly in Swaledale. Lead mining in the area probably enjoyed its heyday in the early 1800s but there were other buoyant periods during the nineteenth century. It was only after the 1870s that the lead mining industry entered its final decline. Despite the adjacent position of the two dales and their apparent geographical unity, close examination reveals that there were three distinct economic areas; (Upper Wensleydale, i.e. Aysgarth Rural District; lower Wensleydale, i.e part of Leyburn Rural District; and Swaledale, i.e. Reeth Rural District), which exhibited marked differences in the development of both primary and secondary industries. A detailed analysis of selected crafts in the three areas provides an indication of the extent to which the rural craft industry survived in the late nineteenth century and illustrates the degree to which the fortunes of the industry varied even within a small area. This paper, in highlighting the diversity of experience within the two dales, demonstrates the importance of testing at local level generalizations concerning the development and decline of the craft industry in the nineteenth century.
Table 1  Occupational structure of upper and lower Wensleydale and Swaledale, 1841-81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number and percentage of occupied population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Wensleydale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraction</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total occupied*</td>
<td>2055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>5725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Lower Wensleydale |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Agricultural      | 365  | 40.9 | 323  | 27.0 | 259  | 21.3 | 258  | 22.0 | 304  | 26.7 |
| Extraction        | 58   | 6.5  | 207  | 17.3 | 239  | 19.7 | 128  | 10.9 | 103  | 9.0  |
| Craft             | 181  | 20.3 | 246  | 20.6 | 252  | 20.8 | 257  | 21.9 | 222  | 19.5 |
| Others            | 290  | 32.5 | 441  | 36.9 | 496  | 40.9 | 567  | 48.3 | 554  | 48.6 |
| Total occupied*   | 892  | 195  | 1214 | 173  | 140  |      |      |      |      |      |
| Total Population  | 2463 | 2655 | 2999 | 2703 | 2722 |

| Swaledale |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Agricultural | 429  | 19.5 | 531  | 19.5 | 669  | 25.3 | 762  | 32.8 | 795  | 38.4 |
| Extraction   | 1052 | 47.7 | 1343 | 49.4 | 1203 | 45.6 | 959  | 41.3 | 671  | 32.4 |
| Craft        | 238  | 10.8 | 263  | 9.7  | 277  | 10.5 | 204  | 8.8  | 201  | 9.7  |
| Others       | 489  | 22.2 | 676  | 24.9 | 629  | 23.8 | 602  | 25.9 | 554  | 26.8 |
| Total occupied* | 205  | 718  | 641  | 323  | 688  |      |      |      |      |
| Total Population | 6758 | 6820 | 6196 | 5370 | 4717 |

Notes: *=In the count of total occupied dual occupations have been assigned to both categories, consequently the total number of occupations is greater than the total occupied population. Since the percentage figures in this table relate the number in each occupation group to the total occupied, due to the double-counting caused by dual occupations the percentage columns will not total to 100 per cent, the discrepancy being proportional to the number of dual occupations recorded in a particular year. Agricultural = Workers in agriculture including adult members of the farmer's family, farmer's children where they are returned as working on the farm but excluding the farmer's wife. Extraction = Workers in the lead, coal and quarrying industries. Craft = Workers in the craft industries. Others = Workers in the textile and service industries, professional people, manufacturers and managers, workers in miscellaneous occupations including servants, non-agricultural and unspecified labourers, clerical workers, railway employees and jockeys. The proportion of occupied population to total population over the period varied from 32.6 per cent in Swaledale in 1841 to 47.9 per cent in upper Wensleydale in 1871. Where children (fourteen years and under) were returned as working they have been included in the relevant category. Women are included in the table but they did not constitute a high percentage of craft workers and their work was usually in dressmaking or related crafts. For example, in 1861 in upper and lower Wensleydale and Swaledale women constituted 26.3 per cent, 22.1 per cent, and 32.8 per cent respectively of the total employed in craft work.

Crafts and the Dales' Economy

The place of crafts in the economic structure of a nineteenth-century rural society provides a useful guide to the degree of self-sufficiency and vitality of the community. Table 1 shows, in simplified form, the occupational structure of upper and lower Wensleydale and Swaledale in the period 1841-81. The occupational structure of upper Wensleydale was that of an area with a broadly typical rural economy, that is of agriculture being closely supported by crafts and services. In contrast, a much lower proportion of the occupied population of lower Wensleydale was employed in agriculture, and a much higher proportion was employed in the extractive industries and in crafts. In Swaledale nearly half the workforce was employed in extractive industry in 1851. This proportion declined progressively to a little under a third in 1881, by which date agriculture had become the principal employer. The proportion of craft employment in Swaledale was consistently lower than in Wensleydale with its agricultural predominance and two important market towns.

Predictably, craft employment was most highly developed in the relatively diverse economy of lower Wensleydale. Expressed as a proportion of the economically-active population, it was substantially more important than in primarily agricultural upper Wensleydale and twice as important as in Swaledale, which was dominated by the lead mining industry. In all three areas the peaking of craft employment accords with the national pattern and closely follows the population peaks. What the statistics disguise is the extent to which the three areas were interdependent. The population of upper Swaledale made use of craftsmen in upper Wensleydale. For example, there were several carrier routes connecting the two dales. The Garth family who lived in upper Swaledale record frequently using the facilities of Wensleydale. Further, particularly in the second half of the nineteenth century, the population of upper Wensleydale made use of craftsmen in lower Wensleydale. So, although crafts provided an important support to agriculture and the rural population, this did not necessarily result in an even distribution throughout the area and some communities enjoyed a greater concentration of crafts than others.

The Timing of Decline

Employment in the different crafts did not necessarily follow the same trend, as table 2 shows by reference to the three specific craft groups of blacksmiths, stonemasons and shoemakers. These three craft groups have been selected as representative of the craft types found in the countryside, that is, those dealing with animals and transport, those concentrating on stone and building, and those providing footwear and clothing for the local population.

Although nationally there was not an absolute decrease in the number of blacksmiths until the end of the century, both in the North Riding of Yorkshire, where numbers peaked in 1851, and in the two dales there was a decrease in numbers from the mid-nineteenth century. Numbers of shoemakers also declined as the local population fell and as mass produced articles became more widely available. Stonemasons, however, although suffering a decrease in
Table 2  Numbers employed in selected crafts in upper and lower Wensleydale and Swaledale, 1841 and 1881

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper Wensleydale</th>
<th>Lower Wensleydale</th>
<th>Swaledale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Masons</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>5725</td>
<td>5482</td>
<td>2463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Includes masters, journeymen and apprentices.

Table 3  Blacksmiths and shoemakers per thousand total population in upper and lower Wensleydale and Swaledale, 1841 and 1881

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper Wensleydale</th>
<th>Lower Wensleydale</th>
<th>Swaledale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See table 2.

Swaledale, enjoyed an increase in Wensleydale. This reflects the changing needs of the population in each dale and the facility in Wensleydale to export stone.

The significance of the figures in table 2 can be more fully understood when the number of workers in selected crafts per thousand population are identified (see table 3). In upper Wensleydale and lower Wensleydale the number of blacksmiths per thousand population declined between 1841 and 1881 but in Swaledale, which lost almost one-third of its blacksmiths over this period, there was a small increase in numbers per thousand. This small increase was probably the result of Swaledale reverting to a predominantly agricultural economy which required the support of blacksmiths. As with crafts generally, the more diverse economy of lower Wensleydale is reflected in the fact that it had the highest number of blacksmiths per thousand. The proportion of blacksmiths in all three areas was consistently lower than in the North Riding. The 1881 North Riding figure of 6.2 compares with rates of 3.6 to 5.1 in the three areas. The incidence of shoemakers follows a similar pattern. The number of shoemakers per thousand population fell in both upper and lower Wensleydale between 1841 and 1881 whereas in Swaledale, although numbers
declined, there was an increase in numbers per thousand. The number of shoemakers per thousand in the North Riding exceeded numbers in the three areas until 1881 when at a rate of 6.4 to 7.8 the local level overtook the North Riding figure of 6.3. The comparatively high proportion of shoemakers per thousand in the two dales in 1881 was due to the relative isolation of the area and, consequently, its greater reliance on local craftsmen even after the coming of the railway.

In contrast to the trend with blacksmiths and shoemakers, as both tables 2 and 3 demonstrate, the numbers of stonemasons, although declining in Swaledale, increased in both upper and lower Wensleydale between 1841 and 1881. While the increase in the number of stonemasons may conceal some incorrect recording of quarrymen, the growing export of dressed stone from several large quarries and a rise in building activity within Wensleydale account for most of the increase. For example, eight of the fifteen stonemasons recorded in Hawes in 1851 were born in Gilling, near Richmond. They may have been employed by a firm building the new Parish Church in 1850 or the new Independent Church which was completed in 1851.

An indication of the incidence of different craft businesses, as distinct from numbers of employers and employees, may be obtained from the local trade directories. The numbers of blacksmiths', stonemasons' and shoemakers' businesses per thousand population are set out in table 4. The number of blacksmiths' businesses per thousand was highest in lower Wensleydale, reflecting the importance of crafts in the area's mixed economy. The lower numbers of blacksmiths per thousand recorded in upper Wensleydale may point to the increasing reliance placed on the lower dale facilities, particularly in the latter part of the century. In Swaledale the directory information for 1893 would seem to corroborate the evidence presented earlier in table 3 and to imply an increasing demand for blacksmiths as dependence on agriculture superseded reliance on the lead industry. The number of shoemakers' businesses per thousand in Swaledale was consistently lower than in either of the two Wensleydale areas, possibly reflecting differences in standard of living and also the reliance of parts of Swaledale on Wensleydale craftsmen. As with blacksmiths and shoemakers, the number of stonemasons' businesses per thousand was highest in lower Wensleydale for most of the period, but in 1872 and 1893 lower Wensleydale was second to upper Wensleydale and Swaledale respectively.

Some indication of the size of blacksmiths' and shoemakers' businesses may be obtained by combining elements of tables 3 and 4, as shown in table 5. Between 1841 and 1881 the size of blacksmiths' and shoemakers' businesses in upper and lower Wensleydale fell, matching the fall in the number of blacksmiths and shoemakers per thousand of population. In Swaledale, although the number of blacksmiths per thousand increased slightly, the size of blacksmiths' businesses fell marginally whereas a marked increase in the number of shoemakers per thousand was translated into a significant increase in the size of shoemakers' businesses.
Table 4  Selected craft businesses per thousand population in upper and lower Wensleydale and Swaledale, 1823-1893

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper Wensleydale</th>
<th>Lower Wensleydale</th>
<th>Swaledale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonemasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 5  Size of blacksmith and shoemaker businesses in upper and lower Wensleydale and Swaledale, 1841 and 1881

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of employers and businesses per thousand population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Wensleydale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmiths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  The 1881 figure for businesses is derived from an average of 1872 and 1893, see table 4. Emp = Employees, Bus = Businesses, Emp/Bus = Number of employees divided by number of businesses.

Source:  See tables 2 and 4.

The general pattern which emerges is one of the size of craft businesses falling in line with the fall in population. The increase in the size of shoemakers' businesses in Swaledale is an unexpected deviation from this pattern.
Table 6  Threshold of population at which shoemakers appear in Aysgarth, and upper and lower Wensleydale and Swaledale, 1841,1871,1881

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aysgarth</th>
<th>Population per shoemaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Wensleydale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Wensleydale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census Enumerators’ Books, 1841,1871,1881, upper and lower Wensleydale and Swaledale. PRO HO 107/1245-6, 1252-4, RG 10/4868-73.

The Emergence of Shoemakers

The spatial distribution of shoemakers illustrates the concentration of some craft occupations in specific townships. Both Aysgarth and, to a lesser extent, Thoralby specialized in shoemaking. In Thoralby the craft declined from four shoemakers in 1823 to three in 1840 and to one in 1893.20 The number of shoemakers in Aysgarth declined also, from nine in 1841 to six in 1871 and to four in 1881. In Aysgarth, as table 6 shows, the population threshold for shoemakers was much lower than in the three areas generally, indicating the extent of specialization in this craft in Aysgarth.

An Aysgarth shoemaker’s account book for the years 1857 to 1873 provides an indication of the amount of business undertaken and confirms that local shoemakers served a wider area than their immediate village.21 As with many other craftsmen, the shoemaker, Francis Thompson, followed more than one occupation and was returned as ‘farmer and shoemaker’ in a contemporary directory.22 He does not appear to have been an employer of outside labour but ran his business alone. The account book indicates that Thompson made all types of footwear. The business covered most of Wensleydale and substantial orders were taken from adjacent Coverdale and nearby Richmond. Occasional orders came from Wharfedale to the south and from places further afield.

In 1861 Thompson achieved a peak of 237 orders and received payments of £296.11.6d. The following year his receipts of £308.14.2d. from 231 orders were the highest of the period. In this year fifty orders came from Aysgarth, 137 from elsewhere in Wensleydale, thirty-three from Coverdale (about six miles distant), two from Swaledale (about ten miles away), three from dales to the south (about nine miles away) and six from Richmond (about fifteen miles away). This shoemaker, therefore, was serving an area of up to twenty miles radius from his home. The mileage, however, does not give an indication of the difficult terrain which needed to be traversed to reach all the places outside Wensleydale. The shoemaker received some of his payment in kind, which suggests the continuing existence of a partial barter economy. Several of the individual accounts in each year were for sums in excess of five pounds, indicating that some of Thompson’s customers were people of substance.
The business of another shoemaker, Robert Hunter of Askrigg, was neither as large nor covered such an extensive area as that of Francis Thompson. Hunter’s business rose to a peak in the mid-nineteenth century when in 1852 he took orders worth £103.11.10d. from 128 people. The business quickly declined and throughout the 1860s and 1870s he made shoes for less than ten people per annum. In 1883 business revived slightly to a peak of thirteen people but then declined and after 1884 he had fewer than ten customers a year. As with Thompson and in common with craftsmen and tradesmen elsewhere, Hunter also took some of his payments in kind. Most of Hunter’s customers were local but a significant proportion were from Swaledale. Of 128 customers in 1852, at least twenty-four were from Swaledale, one lived in Northallerton, thirty miles away, and one came from Catterick Bridge, twenty miles away. All the others were from upper Wensleydale. Hunter made large quantities of clogs and, like Thompson, his main market was the local working man. Apart from the relatively buoyant 1850s, unlike Thompson, his customers rarely placed orders amounting to more than one pound.

The rise and fall in the fortunes of the local shoemakers was predictable. Although the footwear industry in Britain was developing into a large wholesale industry in specific locations from the early nineteenth century, concentration was not pronounced before the middle of the century. The increase in output was due to the expansion of the home market, to export demand, and to the requirements of the military for men fighting in the Crimea. Even in 1851 only six per cent of the master manufacturers of footwear employed more than ten men, so the industry remained mainly in the hands of craftsmen. However, an increasing population, coupled with the rise in the standard of living and the influence of fashion, led to a growing demand for footwear and encouraged the adoption of technical innovations. This quickened the move into mass production which eventually led to the demise of the craft shoemaker. Hunter and Thomson reached their peak of output in the 1850s and 1860s, and although their decline may have been influenced by personal factors, it coincided with the mass production of footwear and the arrival of the local railway, first to Leyburn in 1856 and then throughout the dale in 1878. Perhaps the inevitable demise of the local craft industry was foreseen by the shoemaker who placed the following advertisement in a local paper in 1866:

‘to be disposed of, the old established business of a clog and shoemaker in a lead mining district which has been carried on with success by one family for fifty years, at present in full operation employing an average of four men.’

Conclusion

The census returns and the directories indicate that craft employment in Wensleydale and Swaledale followed the same broad trend that was evident regionally and nationally. Although craft employment may have delayed the consequences of industrialization and urbanization for much of rural England, it is widely accepted that by 1900 country crafts were everywhere in decline.
This was the case in Wensleydale and Swaledale, although overall decline appears to have been deferred until the last quarter of the nineteenth century, somewhat later than in the country as a whole. Lawton ascribed the rural exodus in the second half of the nineteenth century to the loss of rural industry, much of it in crafts, due to the impact of mechanization. A general exodus from crafts in the two dales in the second half of the nineteenth century is not discernible and, although in decline, craft employment remained an integral and important element in the economy throughout the century. As a rule, if a craft was in evidence in a township in 1823, it was likely to be present in 1872 and, most probably, still there in 1893, although in decreased numbers. As Saville so appositely comments:

'So long as village and parish populations did not fall markedly, and while the local and regional markets were still intact and under no serious pressure from national competition, the outlook for the rural craftsman was a secure one.'

In addition to the impact of mechanization, improved transport has been regarded generally as one of the principal causal factors in the decline of rural crafts. In Wensleydale and Swaledale this relationship is inconclusive. The isolation of the area, and the consequent high cost of importing factory products, enabled craftsmen in the two dales to continue in business long after their counterparts in more accessible parts of the countryside had succumbed to competition from mass-produced goods. It is worth noting that the number of craftsmen in lower Wensleydale increased, both absolutely and per thousand of population, after the arrival of the railway at Leyburn in 1856. However, the fact that the railway was not opened beyond Leyburn until 1878 and failed to penetrate Swaledale beyond Richmond, may account, in some measure, for the relatively later decline of crafts in the two dales. Even after the arrival of the railway it would appear that the potential for receiving large quantities of mass-produced goods was not realized immediately and the rural craftsman was able to survive in the dales into the twentieth century.

NOTES


16. PRO, HO 101/2380, Census Enumerators' Books (CEB), 1851, Hawes.
18. Directories usually record only the name of the owner/manager of the business concerned and not names of employees.
19. Stonemasons have not been included in this table since some of those enumerated in the census returns as stonemasons may have been quarry men.
27. Ibid, pp.26-42. Church notes that technical innovation was also encouraged by a short supply of skilled labour in the localities which specialized in footwear manufacture, ibid, pp.29-30.
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The Heralds' Visitations

Studies of migrant populations in England before the nineteenth century are rare and generally limited in scope. Until the institution of the national census, appropriate data for research into migration and persistence must be looked for among such manuscript sources as settlement records, apprenticeship registers, ecclesiastical deposition books and occasional local listings. These sources have survived only in small quantities, in particular places and for random samples of population classes.

In the heralds' visitation returns of English counties between 1530 and 1688, preserved at the College of Arms, we have a considerable body of source material on the English gentry in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries which has hardly been explored in such a context. By their nature the visitations provide us with a useful method of assessing the number of the gentry class at this period. Better still, they give us information from which we can learn their places of origin and calculate, with a fair degree of precision, the date of migration into, or their persistence within, the county of current settlement.

In 1530, Henry VIII gave Thomas Benold, Clarenceux King of Arms, a commission to travel the counties within his heraldic jurisdiction (south of the river Trent) 'to visit the arms and cognizances of gentry and to reform the same if it were necessary'. Such authority had been given before, but had not been used with the systematic energy and expertise which generally characterized the heralds' visitations over the next 150 years. The Kings of Arms' commissions were renewed by every succeeding monarch up to and including James II, after which they lapsed and have never since been re-issued. Between 1530 and 1688 nearly every English county was visited once, most of them three times and some four or five times.

At first the inspecting herald called on each gentleman in his own house; later the High Sheriff of the county was requested to prepare a list of the gentry, hundred by hundred, and to require them to wait upon the herald, usually in the chief inn of the district on a certain day, and to bring such documents or provide such information as would satisfy the officer that he was entitled to the status to which he pretended. Those who failed in this were required to 'disclaim', that is to say, they were forbidden to make use of the title and privileges of their rank, either for ever or until they had corrected their
situation and the county authorities were informed accordingly. These methods appear to have been extraordinarily effective, at least for the first century or so of their application.

A leading heraldic scholar has written: 'Visitations ... are not always comprehensive. While heralds endeavoured to include all the gentry of a county, arriving themselves beforehand with lists obtained locally and, on occasion, pursuing those who ignored their summons ... almost every visitation has what appear ... to be glaring omissions. this is particularly marked in the later visitations'. These omissions, however, can often be rectified, and by checking other contemporary sources and matching subsequent visitations every attempt has been made to do so in this study. The same writer goes on to say: 'It is somewhat remarkable that in an age when the officers of arms were prepared to provide their private clients with pedigrees of inordinate length and incredible splendour, they should have displayed such rectitude when engaged in their official duties on behalf of the Crown'. As far as visitations were concerned, Sir Edward Coke was justified when he wrote that the heralds' 'learning and faithful dealing in descents and pedigrees upon just proof may be a mean to quiet many controversies ...'. When all due allowance has been made for human frailty, visitation pedigrees fully justify Sir Anthony Wagner's description of them as 'a unique and immensely valuable corpus of genealogical record'.

Correcting the abuse of arms by persons not entitled to them - those who were not 'gentlemen' - was only a part of the heralds' brief. They were concerned just as much, if not more, with finding those who were entitled to them but were not using them, and supplying the deficiency. This was, after all, how they obtained the greater part of their fees. Before they could confirm a gentleman's status they had to be able to recognize it, and it would seem that in the seventeenth century it was sometimes just as difficult to do so as it is today, since then, as now, it hung upon the definition of the word 'gentleman'.

There were, of course, certain indisputable qualifications, such as the sovereign's commission, a call to the Bar or a university degree, but for those who lived simply in the country or achieved prosperity in the town, the detection of gentility called for an objective judgment. The acquisition of personal merit or proof of distinguished ancestry might help, but the overriding attribute was the ability to live in the manner of a gentleman and be so reputed. It must also be remembered that most families changed their status over a period of time, either rising or falling in the social scale. Often, where the head of a large family was a landowning gentleman, other members would be in professions or trade, while some would claim no more than yeoman or even husbandman status, so that if the senior lines expired, the family no longer appeared in the visitation returns.

Each gentleman interviewed gave the herald information which enabled him to make a rough drawing of his armorial bearings in his work-book and accompany it with a pedigree, usually of some three or four generations. The place of residence is nearly always stated in each generation, and by using a time-scale of twenty-five to thirty years per generation approximate dates of
movement can be calculated.

Previous studies of pre-industrial migration have invariably been limited to small cohorts of a particular class in one place (e.g. apprentices in East Anglia and the poor in Birmingham) or are the fortuitous results of rare and unusual listings, such as surviving ecclesiastical deposition books and exceptionally informative parish registers. From the pedigrees in the Visitation Books we can gain information as to the origins of each gentleman in almost any county and his place of settlement there. Where the pedigree includes three, four or more generations we can discover the stages of internal migration of the head of the family and of the junior branches. Although few dates are given, we can arrive at an approximation by using the generation scale mentioned above, taking into account seniority within the family. Moreover, since most counties were subjected to at least two visitations within the period 1530-1688, in many cases turnover and persistence rates can be calculated. The continuous nature of the pedigrees and the ability to analyse from a single volume the gentry population of a whole county are advantages which compensate for the long intervals between visitations.

Gentry settlement in Huntingdonshire

While research into the mobility and persistence of the gentry could be carried out using the visitation returns for almost any English county, Huntingdonshire has been chosen firstly, because it is one of the smallest of the (historic) counties, and can therefore be adequately surveyed within the compass of a short exercise. Secondly, it received three visitations from the Kings of Arms - in 1564, 1613 and 1684, thus providing two intervals of forty-nine and seventy-one years respectively. There are likely to be fewer 'lost' families than if the intervals had been longer. Lastly we have reason to believe that, at least in the first half of the visitation period (1530-1688), Huntingdonshire was exceptional among English counties in having an unusually low persistence rate. In an early study of the English counties and their gentry populations, the Reverend Thomas Fuller wrote: 'this seemeth a probable cause why many new families (... more in proportion than elsewhere ...) are seated therein, because Huntingdonshire being generally Abbey land, after the dissolution many new purchasers planted themselves therein'.

The Valor Ecclesiasticus, compiled by Thomas Cromwell's commissioners, is the primary source for the value and extent of lands in the possession of the Church a few years before the Dissolution of the Monasteries. It would show that the greater part of Huntingdonshire had been 'Abbey land' until 1539, when it was taken into the hands of the Crown and gradually made available for sale or by gift to lay gentry from other parts of the country as well as those within Huntingdonshire itself. It is, however, a monumental work, and for this study a secondary source. The volumes on Hunts, in the Victoria County History, have been used to compile figure 1, which illustrates the extent of ecclesiastical property in Huntingdonshire in 1539. The Victoria County History includes a breakdown, parish by parish, of the occupation and descent of every manor in the county so far as this could be ascertained. Notwithstanding the
Figure 1  Ecclesiastical property in Huntingdonshire, 1539

KEY:
- Ramsey Abbey
- Sawtry Abbey
- Bishop of Ely
- Thorney Abbey
- Bishop of Lincoln
- Others

NOTE: The category others includes
- St Mary's Priory, Huntingdon; Stonely Priory;
- St Neot's Priory; Bushmead Priory, Beds.;
- Merton Priory, Surrey; Westminster Abbey;
- Knights Hospitallers of St John

Boundaries are approximate since manor boundaries
do not always coincide with parishes
confused and involved nature of manorial tenures, they can also confirm, in many cases, the approximate time spent by gentry families in those parts of the country in which they moved.

In order to test the truth of Fuller’s statement, we shall compare the persistence rate in the period 1564-1613 with that of 1613-1684, to discover whether there is any substance in the explanation he gave for the short tenures of Huntingdonshire gentry in the period before he wrote; namely that the majority of them had taken advantage of the seizure and sale of ecclesiastical property in and after 1539 by purchasing and settling in former Church lands. That such land formed the greater part of the county is demonstrated by figure 1. Consequently, if Fuller was correct, the further away in time we go from 1539 the more settled the Huntingdonshire families ought to be. Let this then be the hypothesis upon which we shall proceed: the persistence rate of the Huntingdonshire gentry in the period 1613-1684 is significantly higher than that of 1564-1613.

The hypothesis is tested in two ways: firstly, by mapping each occurrence of a gentry family for each visitation year; secondly, by arranging the observations extracted from the data to compare the length of time each family was settled in Huntingdonshire at each visitation.

The gentry of Huntingdonshire were fortunate in their Visitations; all three of them were conducted by experienced and reputable officers. Nevertheless, our study of the Hunts. returns has shown that in each case a number of gentle families slipped through the net. The results of the 1684 Visitation were by far the least satisfactory. Many of the ‘wrong’ people were summoned and some of the ‘right’ people failed or refused, to appear. No such difficulty seems to have been encountered on the previous occasions, even in 1564 when the Tudor influx of ‘new men’, accelerated by the booming market in old monastery land, was at its height.

Before commencing the study of the office books a number of sheets were prepared to receive the extracted observations from each Visitation, divided into columns with the following headings:

1. Name of family
2. Place of origin
3. First place and date of settlement in Huntingdonshire
4. Senior branch: place and date of internal migration
5. Junior branch: place and date of internal migration

The 1564 Visitation

The narrative pedigrees made this visitation more difficult to analyse than the two later books, partly because they had not in every case been correctly set down. No dates at all are given, even for the first arrival in the county, so it was necessary to estimate the age of the current head of the family and work backwards using a generation scale adjusted to the number of children in each generation (an approximation made even wider by the knowledge that not all
members of the family are included in the pedigree, in particular the non-surviving children).

Nevertheless, it was apparent that a number of families had entered Huntingdonshire within a year or two of the Dissolution and a few had been there a considerable time before. The number of gentry families in the survey - only nineteen in all - was suspiciously small. Examination of the next visitation (1613) revealed that several families, for whatever reason, had been omitted in 1564. As a result, a further eight names were added to the nineteen families included by Hervy.

One important omission was the Wingfield family of Kimbolton, the most eminent in the county. It is likely that Sir Edward Wingfield, one of the Queen’s Generals, was away on royal service and so could not be interviewed. At least two other omissions, and probably more, were of men who received grants of arms after 1564; perhaps they were reckoned as yeomen at the time, but they were certainly present.

There are no explanations or amplifying remarks in the text, and the documents used in the preparation for this visitation and the subsequent fieldwork have not survived. There appear to have been no ‘disclaimers’ and all the pedigrees save one were accompanied by coats of arms.¹²

The 1613 Visitation

There were few problems with this extremely well-conducted survey. The tabular pedigrees are a great improvement on those of 1564. Few intermediate dates are given in the pedigrees, but almost invariably the age of the heir to the head of the family is stated, which made it easier to calculate length of settlement using generation intervals. Many of the pedigrees have explanatory notes and some of the preparatory documentation, correspondence and fieldwork are bound up with the Visitation returns.

The old county of Huntingdonshire comprised ninety-eight county parishes grouped into four hundreds, together with the four parishes of the borough of Huntingdon. In 1613 Charles listed sixty families of gentry living in forty-eight parishes. More than half the parishes contained no gentry at all; most of the others held one or two families, while four parishes, including the town of Godmanchester, held three. Only one gentleman was found in Huntingdon itself. Of the heads of these families, two were peers,¹³ two baronets¹⁴ and three knights; the rest were esquires or gentlemen. Of these, ten either had no arms or could make insufficient proof of those they claimed; in all but one of these cases, Lancaster was apparently prepared to make good this deficiency, subject to his principal’s approval. Robert Castle of Glatton who had twice failed to respond to his summons, first to appear before Lancaster at Stilton, then to keep a second appointment at Huntingdon, was made to ‘disclaim’.

A count of the gentry population in Huntingdonshire in 1613 showed that some forty of the families had sprung from other places within the past fifty years,
many from the neighbouring counties of Bedfordshire, Northamptonshire and Cambridgeshire but a number from as far away as Lancashire, Yorkshire and Dorset. Several had their origins in Wales, including Sir Oliver Cromwell, alias Williams, the owner of Hinchinbrooke and uncle of the man who was to become Lord Protector of the Commonwealth. Ten owed their position in the county to the business or legal acumen of their fathers or grandfathers in London. A good deal of the internal ‘step’ migration was due to the purchase or inheritance of properties in other parishes by younger sons.

The sixty families on Charles’ return have been made up, in this study, to sixty-one. Mason of St Ives was accorded gentle status in the 1684 Visitation and the family was certainly living there in 1613, but were probably yeomen. A Mason was included among the common soldiery at the ‘Armada’ muster of 1588.\textsuperscript{15}

The 1684 Visitation

This visitation seems to have been less successful than the earlier ones and may partly explain why visitations ceased altogether within a few years. All the ancillary papers are bound up in a separate volume, from the announcement of the visitation in the ‘London Gazette’ to the lists of those interviewed, with Clarenceux’s observations on them. The hundred-bailiffs had supplied Clarenceux with very full lists of those persons presumed to be gentlemen, culled from the Hearth Tax Returns. A numeral representing ‘chimneys’ was entered against their names; all those living in houses with five chimneys or more seem to have been summoned. Many of them did not answer the summons, perhaps because they did not consider themselves eligible or because they did not want the trouble of making the journey. They may have saved themselves an indignity, since of those who did present themselves no less than thirty-five were obliged to disclaim. Against some of the names Sir Henry’s clerk has entered such remarks as ‘an innkeeper’, ‘a baker’, ‘very smalle estate’, ‘he disowns his family and says he has no use for armes’, and ‘say’d peremptorily he wd. not come’.

Of the fifty-three who were accepted as gentlemen and whose pedigrees were recorded, twenty-two either had no arms or could produce no satisfactory proof of entitlement to those they were using.

To this total has been added the names of two more Huntingdonshire families whose claim to arms was undoubted. The Montagu family, whose two branches headed by the Earls of Manchester and Sandwich were seated at Kimbolton Castle and Hinchinbrooke House respectively, were not, as peers, required to present themselves before Clarenceux King of Arms. The Bedell family had been represented in both previous visitations; the senior male line became extinct in 1643, but a junior branch was still seated at Catworth. William Bedell was summoned but did not appear; against his name is a note: ‘Mr Bedell of Catworth went to Bedford, if he could not return in time he sayd he would come to London before Mich’as terme’.

36
Locations of gentry families

Once the data had been collected, it was possible to enter the locations of each family on a map (figure 2), and from these several observations can be made. Comparing the 'Abbey lands' map (figures 1 and 2a), with that of 1564, we note that of the nine pre-1539 settlements all but two are on 'lay' land. The two exceptions were both tenants of the clergy. Releasing the Crown lands for sale was a gradual process. After twenty-five years only another eighteen gentlemen were in residence, and some of these may have been former copyholders who bought their own estates.

By 1613 many more had settled (figure 2b). The best land was in the south and west of the county, an area of fertile undulating ground through which two or three good tributary brooks flowed into the Ouse near St Neots, and the northern strip in the valley of the Nene adjoining the Soke of Peterborough. The 'wet lands' of Ramsey fen, stretching across the county from Cambridgeshire, were almost uninhabitable; the projected fen drainage schemes had not yet got under way. It is not easy to discern 'betterment' migration at this stage, although a small number of townsmen, probably merchants, from Huntingdon and St Neots moved to country seats, presumably after successful business careers.

Figure 2c illustrates that by 1684 the gentry population of the county had declined in number, even in the desirable south-west. No doubt there were many reasons for this but one of them must surely be the failure of the fen drainage enterprise. Despite interruption by the Civil War this had been resumed, apparently with great success at first; but the drying out of the peat had resulted in shrinkage and lowering of the surface level, and by the last quarter of the century much newly-reclaimed land had been re-inundated.

On the other hand, since the war Huntingdon had developed as a business and administrative centre and the gentry now residing there were generally wealthy merchants and past mayors or bailiffs of the borough.

Persistence of gentry families

At first it was envisaged that a simple count of 'old gentry' (those present at more than one visitation) as against 'new gentry' (those only appearing in a single visitation) might be sufficient to validate the hypothesis. As the material was extracted however, a trial count showed that this was not the case; not only would the test be too crude but the result would tend towards the opposite conclusion to that which would logically be expected. A much more careful alignment of the observations was required, and this could only be done by using such information as could be gathered from a thorough study of each pedigree contained in the herald's office books. This can be better explained by a description of the data as they presented themselves on closer examination.

With so few dates provided in the pedigrees, we must be content with approximations and decide upon the best units of time with which to work. We
Table 1  Number of gentry families, by categories, in each year of assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Settlement</th>
<th>1539</th>
<th>1564</th>
<th>1613</th>
<th>1684</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (0-25 yrs)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (26-50 yrs)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (51-75 yrs)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (76-100 yrs)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (101-125 yrs)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (126-150 yrs)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G (151 yrs &amp; over)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

note that the period from the Dissolution to the first Visitation is exactly twenty-five years; from 1564 to 1613 is almost fifty years, and from 1613 to 1684 is not far short of seventy-five years. A generation can be assumed to be twenty-five to thirty years. Let us then work in units of twenty-five years and derive an 'index of persistence' as is shown in table 1. From this table we can see that the gentry population rose significantly from the middle of the sixteenth century to the latter half of the seventeenth, and to a lesser extent that the persistence of some families increased; thus proving, by inversion, the correctness of the Reverend Thomas Fuller's dictum about the small number of ancient families of Huntingdonshire.

Our hypothesis, that the further we proceed in time from 1539 the more settled Huntingdonshire gentry families should be, requires us to compare the situation in 1613 with that in 1684, when there was apparently a decrease in gentry population (or rather, a decrease of those accepted and recognized as gentry by the heralds). This is by no means as obvious, and in order to assure ourselves that by 1684 significantly more families stayed in Huntingdonshire for a longer period than in the early period, a chi-squared test of the two right-hand columns must be carried out. The results of this test confirm our hypothesis at the ninety-nine per cent probability level.\(^{16}\)

The heralds' visitations were instituted for the correction of heraldic abuses, but their true purpose was to reinforce the contemporary social structure - the 'natural order' of things. To the heralds themselves they presented a legitimate means of supplementing their incomes. They have for centuries provided genealogists with a mine of evidence acceptable at English law. This paper has attempted to show that they can also be of some value to the historical social scientist.
NOTES

2. Coke, Sir Edward, Fourth Institute, 126.
4. 'He who ... can live idly and without manual labour and will bear the port, charge and countenance of a gentleman, he shall be called Master' - Doderidge, St., in the Abergavenny Peerage case, 1588, cit. in G.D. Squibb, The High Court of Chivalry, 1959, p.172.
5. J. Patten, 'Patterns of migration and movement of labour to three pre-industrial East Anglian towns', Journal of Historical Geography, 2, 1976, pp.111-29.
9. The principal data sources are the office books of these visitations, namely; Northants and Hunts, 1564, by William Hervy, Clarenceux (abbreviated 'H.4' at the College of Arms), Huntingdonshire, 1613, by Nicholas Charles, Lancaster Herald, deputizing for William Camden, Clarenceux ('C.3'), and Cambs and Hunts, 1684, by Sir Henry St George, Clarenceux, ('K.7'). The 1613 visitation has been published by the Camden Society and is an almost exact transcript of the original, see Sir Henry Ellis KH, (ed) The Visitation of the County of Huntingdonshire, 1613, Camden Society, 1848. H.4 and K.7 are unpublished and are held at the College of Arms. The three books together contain 132 pedigrees.
11. The location of manors on the map is approximate, as manor boundaries do not always coincide with parishes and the information given in the VCH for Huntingdonshire is less detailed than that in the Valor Ecclesiasticus.
12. The exception was Castle of Glattton, whose descendant was forced to disclaim at the next Visitation. Since he had clearly been accorded gentle status for a long time, the family has been included in the counts of both Visitations.
13. Lord St John of Bletso, who succeeded his brother in 1596 but retained his seat at King's Rippon, Hunts, and Lord Clifton of Leighton Bromswold, whose grandfather had been custosius of the City of London.
14. Including Sir Robert Cotton, the famous antiquary.
16. Since more than twenty per cent of the observations in the table are smaller than five, the chi-squared test will be invalid unless the units of persistence in column 1 are altered. This can be done by combining the categories A & B, C & D and E & F & G for the years 1613 and 1684, and setting out a contingency table thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-50</th>
<th>51-100</th>
<th>101-151+</th>
<th>Row Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1684</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column totals</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

I have recently completed a ‘total reconstitution’ of the parish of Colyton in Devon.\(^1\) Colyton is likely to be familiar to readers since the parish registers were used for the first family reconstitution undertaken by Tony Wrigley. My project aimed to enhance the database about the population in Colyton by adding other sources of documentary information to the demographic details given on the FRFs (Family Reconstitution Forms). This produced a ‘total reconstitution’ along the lines described by Alan Macfarlane for his study of Earls Colne in Essex.\(^2\) One of the reasons for this was that it is theoretically possible to divide the population by class in order to analyse any differences in demographic profile according to social status.

Several aspects of this methodology will be considered in this article. I will describe my version of the method of ‘total reconstitution’ and discuss the method’s applicability for class-specific study. I will then go on to examine some of the results of the class-specific analysis which emerged for Colyton’s nuptiality pattern. One of the major discoveries made in the analysis of the original reconstitution was significant changes in female age at marriage over time. Women married in the second half of the seventeenth century at over two years later than those who married in the 1550-99 cohort. After the 1650-99 ‘high’ there was a steady fall in marital age, so that by the early nineteenth century women married a full five years earlier than their seventeenth century counterparts.

Nuptiality trends are an indicator which can be readily examined in present day populations. Yet, at present in social history projects, class-specific categorisation tends to be an ambiguous process. Historical demographic research could do with the analytical possibilities used in other social science studies. But there is a school of thought which would consider it anachronistic to define ‘class’ differences in a pre-nineteenth century population. While the English population was undoubtedly stratified by wealth and cultural affinity this may be better described by a dichotomous division of the population into ‘low orders’ and ‘better-off sort’. Unfortunately, these are not suitable categories for comparative analysis.

Apart from some recent exceptions,\(^3\) present work often related the demographic behaviour of an entire community to economic factors which
probably only affected a section of that community. Hopefully, the results presented here take us one stage towards providing a picture for past society which is comparable with contemporary research, as well as highlighting the pitfalls along the way. In the last resort, what I have aimed to produce for this parish, is an accurate description of the population according to local economic and social conditions.

**A socio-economic classification**

In the case of Colyton, a four part social division seems to reflect the local circumstances in the period 1538 to 1837 which was covered by this project. This three hundred year period saw no major social upheaval which called for any re-ordering of the hierarchy. At the top of the social scale was a group of local nobles, wealthy yeomen and self-made wool manufacturers and merchants. They owned the larger farms and town properties, held the reins of local government and maintained a staunch loyalty to the Anglican church. Further down the scale were the middling orders, generally town-based craftsmen of reasonable means. Some of them were political and religious radicals who formed a Presbyterian community in opposition to the Anglican church in the seventeenth century. This group joined ‘Monmouth’s rebels’ at Sedgemoor in 1685. The labouring population consisted of farm and textile workers. Due to the prevalence of pastoral agriculture and lacemaking for much of this period, this group contained a preponderance of females. As a result of their low waged and spasmodic work pattern, these labouring women shaded into the poor group. Additionally, a group of widows, elderly people, ill people and orphaned children formed a self-evident group of ‘poor’ who were maintained by the generous relief structures in Colyton. In contrast to those who have written that Colyton consisted of a largely ‘peasant’ population, of owner-occupiers who lived off smallholdings, I would suggest that along with the craftsmen who maintained family businesses, there was a broad band of landless proletarian workers.

The economic picture was not quite as straightforward. There were major economic changes over this three hundred year period which have not so far been given detailed analysis in connection with demographic changes in Colyton. Farm leases and parochial records suggest that the early seventeenth century saw a switch from a wool and wheat based farm economy to one based on dairy production. While wool finishing and arable agriculture used a mixed or a somewhat male orientated labour force, from the onset of pastoralism, waged work was increasingly for women. This was reinforced by patterns in the lace industry, a domestic trade which mainly employed women. Lacemaking appeared in Colyton in the early seventeenth century, and employed some twenty per cent of the entire population in 1698 (and by definition therefore, almost all of the adult females). The trade seems to have gone into decline in the second half of the eighteenth century, not to be revived until the 1840s when Queen Victoria’s wedding dress was commissioned to be made of Honiton lace. While female employment prospects dwindled in the second half of the eighteenth century, there was another change in agriculture. Farmers turned over to arable again, and the result was a revival in men’s work.
The result of these economic patterns was sex-specific migration when the work opportunities were not there. There is evidence, in settlement examinations and poor relief documents, that young men left Colyton to work elsewhere in the second half of the seventeenth century and early eighteenth century. An underlying problem with the total reconstitution is already apparent, because the reconstitution is based on family units, and offers little information on people who did not marry. Yet in the case of Colyton the behaviour of the young (and sometimes not so young) unmarried people is all-important. This adds an extra twist to the results of the class-specific analysis of demographic behaviour, for any present day study would be in a better position to tailor its questions to the given society, instead of trying to piece together the jigsaw of that society first, and then analyse it by inflexible criteria.

Towards a total reconstitution

The total reconstitution process involved four stages. The first was collation and assessment of sources for their quality and usefulness. Sources which did not mention any names could be excluded immediately. Eighty documents, or sets of documents, were included in the Colyton project. Priority was given to documents which mentioned occupations and wealth levels. Tax assessments for example, were an ideal source. Wills and inventories are excellent to use in total reconstitution, but none of these for Colyton survived the bombing of Devon Record Office in 1942. No record apart from the parish register spanned the entire three hundred year period. Overall, the balance of the records did change over time. The gentry were much better recorded in the first century of the 1538-1837 period, whereas by the last century the poor and labouring classes are better recorded than the gentry. There is a shortage of craft and labourer designations in the period 1650 to 1749.

Secondly, the information from the documents was put onto index cards. These were sorted according to surname sets into rough cohort groupings. In the cases where several people had the same name, they were put into chronological order. Thirdly, the index cards were linked to their respective FRF and surnames were standardised to the form they took on the FRF to avoid further confusion. The cards of two people who had the same name and lived at the same time, such as fathers and sons could now be sorted out. Family index cards were grouped together as they appeared on the FRF At this point cards were collected into final cohort groups according to the FRF date which is either the date of marriage, or in the case of ‘dummy’ FRFs, the date of first child’s baptism.

Lastly the FRF/card conjunctions were put into ‘status’ groupings. The population was divided into the following groups;

- Gentry and landed wealth
- Craftspeople and middling wealth
- Labourers
- Poor
- Status and occupation not known
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Preferably the group chosen was based on a wealth indication, but where this was not available, occupation attributes were used. After that the definition of group could depend on more tentative indications. The preferred defining characteristics were: an indication of amount of land owned or leased, a list of possessions such as would be found in an inventory, a comment on wages received, a note of the amount of tax paid, or an entry that the person in question received poor relief or their children were made pauper apprentices. Failing these an assumption of social grouping would be made from a source where occupation was mentioned. At the last resort more subjective indicators, such as a description of a person as a ‘poor man’, would have to be considered.

Clearly the choice of the class-specific groupings embraced a welter of methodological problems. There is no precedent for this type of analysis, and any division runs a risk of oversimplification. The underlying problem, of course, is that while people can be socially mobile during their lives, this analysis is static. The point at which the social classification was frozen here, was at marriage. While for some people a status categorisation had to be based on a single incidence in the records, others had several entries. If there was a conflict in the information, for example, between a man who is recorded as a ‘craftsman’ on marriage but as a ‘labourer’ later, the attribute nearest to his marriage defined his grouping since the behaviour of the young adult age group were seen as most crucial in this study. This requires qualification however, since a young couple were likely to enter a period of lifecycle poverty in the few years after marriage. This happened when the couple had children who were below the age when they could start to contribute to family resources. Lifecycle poverty is certainly evident in hearth tax records and has been delineated as a special case which would not, on its own, cause an FRF to be deemed poor.

A typical example of a card is presented here. They contain extra information which, while not concerning the individual’s status grouping directly, was considered to be useful for some part of the study.

**ISSAC DROWER**
1663 Feoffees Bailiff’s Accounts ‘pd for mending of ye plantchent in Joseph Mayett’s own chamber’
1674 Hearth Tax ‘Pauper’
1678 Bailiff’s Accounts Apr. 13th ‘pd for stocking parish musketts 2d’
Aug. 10th ‘pd for making ye shoolhouse court and mending others as of his bill 6. 5d’
1681 July 26th ‘pd for his work and his boy 3 days to mend parish chamber 6s 6d’
1682/83 Poor Account. Contributed 3s.
Feoffee document 18/1 (40 ‘Issac Drower’s Bill; works at 18d per day together with Zarkey’

Issac Drower was a carpenter and he was literate because he wrote and signed his own bill. ‘Zarkey’ we find from the attached card is likely to be his son, Zachariah, a joiner, and a rebel at Sedgemoor in 1685. The Hearth Tax
Table 1  Number and percentage of Family Reconstitution Forms with status designation  
1538-1837

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Total number of FRFs</th>
<th>Number with status designation</th>
<th>% with status designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1538-49</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550-99</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-49</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650-99</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-49</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750-99</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-37</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2  Distribution of Family Reconstitution Forms with status by cohort 1538-1837

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Gentry</th>
<th></th>
<th>Crafts</th>
<th></th>
<th>Labour</th>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1538-49</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550-99</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-49</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650-99</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-49</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750-99</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-37</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attribution of 'Pauper' probably reflects a temporary stage of lifecycle poverty and it would seem to be fairly safe to put Issac Drower into the craftsperson category. Turning to the FRF number 10683, there is something of a shortage of demographic information about Issac. No baptism is recorded for him or his wife Mary and they did not marry in Colyton. But Issac appears in a marriage bond of September 1663. He was a joiner born in Topsham who married Mary Trawle, a spinster from Colyton. They had three children, baptised from 1664, and Zachariah married in Seaton in 1691 at the age of twenty six.

It was generally difficult to give women a status attribute since they are rarely given occupational labels and the social and legal system effectively precluded them from appearing in many of the documents which indicate land holding. It was regrettably necessary then in the classification for demographic analysis, to give women their father's status group until marriage and their husband's group at marriage and thereafter. If a woman was recorded as a wool spinner, or lacemaker for example, or if she appeared in the records as a pauper, this
was entered on to computer indexes of the female population and used in analysis of factors outside the scope of the reconstitution such as illegitimacy patterns.

Going beyond this, the number of individuals who could not be given a status or occupational group of any type is large. Table 1 shows the number of FRFs in each category which could be given a status group. As might be anticipated, in general the proportion follows an upward trend over time. Table 2 shows the distribution of all the FRFs which can be given a status grouping.

Problems of linkage

All Colyton records were linked by hand with the aid of computer produced indexes of the FRFs. The reconstitution was punched into a computer some twenty years ago. Since the technology available then was less sophisticated than today, only certain aspects of the FRFs were entered. However, alphabetical indexes of husbands, wives and children by surname were used in this project. Total reconstitution of historical records cannot yet be accurately effected by computer methods. The process is clumsy and costly by machine and the diverse spelling of names is a particular problem. The Russell SOUNDEX code has been the most promising method of nominal linkage by machine. SOUNDEX is appreciably quicker than hand methods. Katz and Tiller found it took only a tenth of the time it had taken to link the 1861 Hamilton, Ontario census by hand. However, the code is not satisfactory for the linkage of names further back in the past. When tested on Colyton by hand methods, Schofield identified 986 spellings comprising 244 different christian names in the Colyton register over the period 1538-1640. SOUNDEX failed to assign fourteen per cent of the spellings and erroneously conflated thirty-five per cent of names. This was obviously found to be ‘an entirely unacceptable error rate’.

However, name problems still exist when documents are linked by hand. Spellings are even more diverse than in the parish registers in seventeenth century parish documents like poor law accounts. To help overcome this, a system of phonetic linkage was used in this part of the Colyton project. This aimed to take the linguistic development of the west country dialect into account and certain idiosyncratic patterns could be identified. From this some name ‘rules’ could be drawn up and applied loosely.

For instance, surname shortening is a frequently encountered name change in the Colyton data. Thus over time, ‘Batstone’, a very common Colyton surname became Battey, then Batt. Presumably there was an element of sheer laziness in this but the variations on this name served to distinguish different family branches. Other examples of the ‘y’ shortening are Clotworthie becoming Clittery, Goulsworthy becoming Gollsey, Husway or Hussey becoming simply Hooy and Killander becoming Kelly. Some names are just shortened. For example, Hooper became Hoop and Quinton became Quint. Some permutations certainly reflect local dialect, Cauley and Cawley are the same as Calie and Calley as are Lowde and Lewd. Other names could change completely. While Ticken, Tigon and Tirken are recognisable as species of the same names: the links between Turle, Tirrel, Tyall and Turvell are perhaps not so obvious.
Similarly Salway or Zalway became Samwayes or Zamwayes and eventually just Samis.

Changes in the first letter of the surname provide much confusion in linking. Not surprisingly aitches may or may not appear, thus Alston, Halson and Halstone are all the same name. Similarly 'C' and 'K' were interchangeable. Kerby could be Corby or even Corky. Abbreviation sometimes started from the beginning of the name, hence Spurway became Purway in some cases. In the nineteenth century the common name in Colyton of Restorick went to Restadick and then just Stadick. Some letters were often reversed, so Crocker and Corker were the same names. Another problem is 'alias' names, as in the case of 'Tucker alias Baker' or 'Kerby alias Pyper' either surname might be used without the other. The reason for these names is not clear. Some female christian names were interchangeable; for example Joan, Joanne and Jane; and also Hannah, Joanna and Susannah.

Nuptiality and social class

The analysis of demographic behaviour by social grouping carried out for the Colyton reconstitution shows that nuptiality behaviour was indeed variable according to 'class'. This is shown in tables 2 and 3. There are minor differences in the number of marriages considered from those analysed by Wrigley and Schofield (plus or minus 6) as a few marriages which took place in another parish, or which have been found in documents other than parish records, have been added, and a few cases were removed as it was discovered that a woman's baptism had been incorrectly linked to a marriage. The last cohort, 1800-37, is well short of cases and represents only a section of the FRFs for this period.

Although the sample was small it is clear from tables 2 and 3 that women in the higher social groups married at an earlier age than those who were less well off. The opposite situation prevailed for men, since poorer men were likely to marry earlier than gentry or 'middling' status men. This seems to have been the effect of the local economy, since the changeover from a predominantly wool and wheat based economy to one based on dairy production in the first half of the seventeenth century had a major effect on local labour supplies. The outcome of gender-specific labour demand was a skewed sex ratio so that the population was decidedly feminine from the 1620s. By the 1650s there were four women to every three men in Colyton, the opposite situation to that which prevailed in the 1550s when there were four men to every three women in the parish. The variation in marriage ages must then, to some extent reflect the availability of partners, as well as emphasising the economic constraints on marriage. There is a shortage of data on women's wages in the past, but it seems fairly certain that the level at which women were paid for a day's labour was well below the level which could be earned by men. As marriage in the past depended on the couple's ability to command a level of economic viability, in areas in which openings for male employment were limited it was a prospect confined to those partnerships where the potential husband was able to find local employment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort/Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Lower quartile</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Upper quartile</th>
<th>Tri-mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1550-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort/Group</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>Lower quartile</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Upper quartile</td>
<td>Tri-mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These results are, necessarily, tentative and therefore only suggestive in their scope. As has been explained there are particular problems with the sampling methods of the total reconstitution method. In a community which is of a manageable size for analytical purposes, the number of cases in each section are too small to bear the weight of an interpretation of any great significance. However, as far as they go, they confirm a close association between economic and demographic patterns. They reinforce at a local level, the association made by Wrigley and Schofield between the male real wage level and marriage ages. We are only left wondering how much more we could learn, if we could specify from the reconstitution details of those who did not marry.

Conclusion

The groundwork for the total reconstitution of Colyton, the linking together of disparate documentary sources to form a picture of the social grouping of every inhabitant, took eighteen months. I was fortunate because the basic family reconstitution was already complete. Although automated methods of family reconstitution are being developed, it seems unlikely that total reconstitution will ever be able to be carried out in a short period. At present the method is tedious and time-consuming. Ultimately, it is simply not cost-effective for the single researcher to undertake. The future lies either with the further exploitation of modified reconstitution projects, linking one or two good quality documents to a completed reconstitution, or alternatively, with total reconstitution projects being executed by an interested group of researchers, such as a local history group, who are able to use the finished product for genealogical purposes as well as furthering their knowledge of the past of their community.

NOTES

3. B. Derout, 'Une demographie differentielle: cles pour un systeme auto-regulateur des populations rurales d'Ancien Regime', Annales E.S.C., 35, 1, 1980, pp.3-41 analysed demographic behaviour in France by comparing better-off with poorer peasants. E. Jutikkala, Social differences in pre-industrial demography: a case study on a middle sized town, 1987 has used parish registers to differentiate the population of Turku in Finland by socio-economic class for the years 1826-44. He found no differences in fertility factors and some slight differences in mortality factors. J.E. Knodel, Demographic behavior in the past, Cambridge, 1988 used the Ortsippenbuch genealogies to produce reconstitution of fourteen different villages in diverse districts of Germany. He was then able to analyse demographic change by occupational groups.
4. I consider that D. Levine, Family formation in an age of nascent capitalism, London, 1977 is guilty of this in his study of the communities of Shepshed, Bottesford, Colyton and Terling.

9. Devon Record Office Box 1. Marriage bonds.
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THE USE OF MARRIAGE HORIZONS TO MEASURE MIGRATION:
SOME CONCLUSIONS FROM A STUDY OF POCKLINGTON,
EAST YORKSHIRE IN THE LATE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Contributed by Roger A. Bellingham

In the LPS 43, in an article on population change and stability in Nantwich, Grace Wyatt used the place of residence given in the registers for the parish as indicators of migratory movements.\(^1\) Indeed, this method of using the residence information for bride and groom given at the time of marriage, and recorded in the marriage register, has been taken as evidence of personal mobility and of the range of contact between communities, in a number of previous studies.\(^2\) However, contrary to this work the detailed analysis of 1174 marriage partners recorded in the registers of Stanhope, County Durham, by Pain and Smith has shown the potential limitations of such data.\(^3\)

The Stanhope study made use of data available for the years 1798 to 1812, enabling the residence of the bride and groom, as shown in the marriage register, to be compared with their place of birth, as given in the baptismal entries for their children. The form of the Stanhope registers stems from a request from Bishop Barrington who had ‘asked for baptismal registers to be annotated with the place of birth of the parents of a child baptized.’ \(^4\) It was some twenty years earlier, in 1777, that Archbishop Markham had ordered that the scheme developed by William Dade in York should be put into practice in the diocese of York. Some parishes never adopted the system, others followed it fully for only a few years, but the information in Yorkshire registers as to the residence and occupation of parents and grandparents has been used to throw considerable light on migration during this period.\(^5\)

Unfortunately those responsible for the Pocklington parish registers only persevered for the four years from 1779 to 1783 inclusive, but an analysis of ninety-one marriages at Pocklington between 1773 and 1782 and the baptismal entries during those four years, underlines the limitations of marriage horizons as an indication of migration and personal mobility. For a significant number of brides the residence, given as Pocklington at the time of their marriage in the parish church, is at odds with the extra parochial residence of the bride’s father as recorded at the baptism of a child or children baptized between 1779 and 1783.

At best the information available is considerable as shown by the following example from the Pocklington register of baptisms for 1779.\(^6\)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infant's Christian name</th>
<th>George Lyon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infant's surname</td>
<td>Weddall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's name, profession, descent and abode</td>
<td>John Weddall of Pocklington Gentleman son of Thos. Weddall of Bubwith merchant by Beatrix his wife dau. of Edward Barrett of Bubwith merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's name and descent</td>
<td>Mary Dau: of Robert Plummer of Whitby merchant by Sarah dau: of Richd Cross of Pocklington, merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born</td>
<td>On Wednesday the 10th Novr 1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptized</td>
<td>On Saturday the 20th Novr 1779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, the marriage entry for John Weddall and Mary Plummer in the Pocklington marriage register for 1774 reads:

No 148. John Weddall of the Parish of East Cottingwith and Mary Plummer of this Parish, spinster. Married in this Church by licence 17th February in the year 1774

Pain and Smith remark that in Durham Bishop Barrington asked that the baptism register should show the place of birth of the parents of the baptized child. In Yorkshire the directive of Archbishop Markham is less clear, but in Pocklington the register appears to record the residence of the grandparents at the time of the baptism (or at date of death, if the grandparent was no longer alive). Where the residence of the bride's father in the baptisms register differs from that of the bride in the relevant marriage entry, it could be that the bride's father had moved after the date of his daughter's marriage. However, it would seem more likely that the bride's family home was outside Pocklington and that she had moved to Pocklington before her marriage.

One must immediately record a note of caution. Pain and Smith were using registers for the fourteen years between 1798 and 1812 and analysed 587 couples who could be cross-referenced to the Stanhope marriage register. In contrast, this note is based on an analysis of forty-two brides who could be cross-referenced to the Pocklington baptism register, and in seven cases the wife's father's residence was not given.
Table 1  Residence of bridegrooms and brides as recorded in the Pocklington Marriage Register from 1 January 1761 to 31 December 1782

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Bridegrooms</th>
<th>Brides</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pocklington</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjoining parishes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parishes up to 5 miles</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 6 to 10 miles York</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York (13 miles)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parishes between (11 to 20 miles)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull (23 miles)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parishes 21 miles or over</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>207</strong></td>
<td><strong>207</strong></td>
<td><strong>414</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra parochial</strong></td>
<td><strong>29%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence beyond 10 miles</strong></td>
<td><strong>14%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2  Residence of Pocklington brides at the date of marriage and residence of their respective fathers at the baptism of her first correlated child from January 1773 to March 1782

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>All entries</th>
<th>Linked entries</th>
<th>Linked entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pocklington</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjoining parishes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parishes up to 5 miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 6 to 10 miles York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York (13 miles)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parishes between 11 to 20 miles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull (23 miles)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parishes 21 miles or over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra parochial</strong></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>57%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence beyond 10 miles</strong></td>
<td><strong>2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>31%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the twenty-one years between 1761 and 1782 the marriage registers for Pocklington show the percentage of spouses with a residence beyond ten miles at 8 per cent and, as one might expect, it was normally the man who was ex-parochial - sixty out of the seventy-two cases during that period. (Table 1), But
if one accepts the information in the baptism register, the percentage of correlated brides coming from Pocklington between 1773 and 1782 falls from 91 per cent to 43 per cent, and the percentage coming from beyond ten miles goes up from 6 per cent to 31 per cent (Table 2).

Pain and Smith's research showed an apparent understatement of extra parochial spouses of 16 per cent for both men and women. At Pocklington the residence of the groom at the time of the marriage was, in the sample that could be checked, in accord with that of his father as shown in the relevant baptismal entry with only two exceptions - and they cancel each other out!

One must, however, assume that many of the women married at Pocklington whose fathers resided elsewhere, had migrated to the town before their marriage. Indeed, the baptism entries in the four years from 1779 to 1783 show that 42 per cent of 69 wives of tradesmen whose children were baptized in that period had fathers residing more than ten miles from the town.

The township of Pocklington had a population of 943 in 1743 rising to 1502 in 1801 but the parish registers suggest that the period of rapid growth was from around 1769 to about 1784. Can one therefore postulate that when the population of a small market town such as Pocklington is increasing rapidly, especially when young women of marriageable age are in-migrating, marriage registers provide a particularly poor indication of mobility?

NOTES

2. See for example J. Millard, 'A new approach to the study of marriage horizons', Local Population Studies, 28, 1982, pp.10-31 and the references there cited. I am most grateful for the comments and criticisms of Dr David Neave upon an earlier draft of this note.
4. Ibid, p.44.
6. The parish registers for Pocklington are deposited at the Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, York.
NOTES AND QUERIES

COMPARING NUMBERS AND THE USE OF PERCENTAGES

A note contributed by Kevin Schurer

A letter published in this issue of LPS draws attention to some of the problems and misunderstandings that can arise from the apparently simple task of comparing two or more numbers. Of all statistics the percentage is by far the most widely used. This is probably due to the fact that most people can understand and interpret percentage figures without having to run for the nearest statistics textbook, while at the same time they are easy to calculate, even for those with little mathematical ability or confidence. Yet the simplicity and ease of use associated with the humble percentage does not come without a price. Popular and heavily used though it is, as a measure of relative values the percentage may sometimes result in unsatisfactory as well as ambiguous interpretations.

Consider, for example, the relative comparison of two simple values. For the purpose of illustration, let us say that in the year 1700 England had a population of 5 million, while France had a total population of 20 million. Clearly, one could argue that at this date the population size of England was one quarter or 25 per cent that of her continental neighbour. That is to say:

\[
\frac{5}{20} \times 100 = \text{percentage} \\
0.25 \times 100 = 25\%
\]

Conversely, by simply turning the calculation around, one could state that the population of England was 75 per cent less than that of France, as follows:

\[
\frac{20 - 5}{20} \times 100 = \text{percentage} \\
\frac{15}{20} \times 100 = \text{percentage} \\
0.75 \times 100 = 75\%
\]

However, using the same method, it is also possible to state that France’s population was 300 per cent more than England’s.

\[
\frac{20 - 5}{5} \times 100 = \text{percentage} \\
\frac{15}{5} \times 100 = \text{percentage} \\
3 \times 100 = 300\%
\]

From the simple example above, it is not difficult to see how the use of a straightforward percentage to express the relative difference between two or more numbers may cause inconsistent interpretations, and in turn lead to
misunderstandings and ambiguity. In the case of the example above, this problem is the result of the fact that the differences from which the relative percentages are calculated are assymmetric. That is to say that the denominator used in each case is different. The problem would not arise, for example, if the population of England in 1700 had been 10 rather than 5 million. If this had been the case then the relative difference between the populations of the two countries would be exactly the same, another words symmetrical, with the result that England’s population would be 100 per cent smaller than that of France, while equally France’s population would be 100 per cent larger than England’s.

A further problem associated with the comparison of percentage figures can be particularly troublesome for historians. Let us return to our example of the population size of England and assume that in 1750 the country numbered 6 million in total. Over the following twenty years the size of the population increased by 2 million, reaching 8 million in 1770, while over the next twenty year period a further increase of 2 million was witnessed, bringing the national total in 1790 to 10 million. Although the absolute increase in population over the two periods is exactly the same, being 2 million in both cases, the relative percentage increases of the population are 33.3 per cent over the period 1750 to 1770, and 25 per cent between 1770 and 1790. Equally, the overall population increase for the whole forty years works out at 66.6 per cent rather than 58.3 (33.3+25). The cause of this potentially confusing situation is that when straightforward percentage figures are calculated from a series of numbers they are not themselves additive across the series. Therefore, to return to our example, if England’s population had increased by 33.3 per cent in both successive time periods, the total reached by 1790 would have been 10.7 million (6+2+2.7) rather than 10 million, yielding in turn an overall increase between 1750 and 1790 of 78.3 per cent.

An elegant solution to the problems associated with the use of simple percentages as a measure of relative difference and change has been put forward elsewhere. This advocates the wider use and adoption of the log per cent as a means to overcome the ambiguities and misunderstandings arising from the use of the normal percentage function. As its name implies, the log per cent is calculated from the logarithmic value of the difference between two numbers, unlike a standard percentage calculation which uses the absolute difference. Since the division of numbers whose values are expressed in logarithmic form is achieved by simple subtraction, the problems outlined above arising from asymmetry and additivity are no longer applicable.

To return to the examples given above, in the case of the first, the log difference between the populations of England and France in 1700 can be calculated as follows:

\[
\log(20,000,000) - \log(5,000,000) = \log \text{ difference} \\
16.811 - 15.425 = 1.386
\]

The log difference between the total population sizes can then be converted into a log per cent simply by multiplying the figure by 100. Therefore, the relative
difference between the populations of the two countries can be expressed as being 138.6 log per cent (L%). Moreover, since the log difference between the two populations is identical regardless of the perspective adopted, it is the case that England's population was 138.6 L% less than that of France in 1700, while the French population was 138.6 L% more than England's.

By using log percentages the problem of additivity met when comparing the normal percentage change of values over one time period with those for a successive period also disappears. For example, the log percentage population increases in England from 1750 through 1770 to 1790 can be calculated as below:

a) 1750 - 1770

\[
(\log(8,000,000) - \log(6,000,000)) \times 100 = \log \text{ per cent}\\
(15.895 - 15.607) \times 100 = 28.8
\]

b) 1770 - 1790

\[
(\log(10,000,000) - \log(8,000,000)) \times 100 = \log \text{ per cent}\\
(16.118 - 15.895) \times 100 = 22.3
\]

Alternatively, calculating the increase over the forty year period as a whole gives a log per cent figure as follows:

\[
(\log(10,000,000) - \log(6,000,000)) \times 100 = \log \text{ per cent}\\
(16.118 - 15.607) \times 100 = 51.1
\]

This, of course, unlike the straightforward percentage figure, is the sum of the two twenty year periods when calculated separately (22.3+28.8=51.1). This additive function of log percentages is particularly useful to historical demographers when calculating, plotting and interpreting the growth rate of populations in the longer term. This point is illustrated vividly by the two distributions plotted in figure 1. Both of the plotted lines depict a hypothetical population numbering one thousand in 1600 and growing consistently at a rate of 10 per cent per decade until 1800. The bottom line plots the changing size of the population according to an absolute scale (left hand side), the result being a curve which despite the even growth rate gets sharper and sharper toward the end of the period of examination. The upper line plots exactly the same population but does so using a logarithmic scale. As a consequence of the consistent growth rate over the period the logarithmic scale on this graph produces a straight line. Therefore, by using a logarithmic scale of change rather than an absolute one, the researcher can immediately determine relative size and change in long term growth rates. Equally, although the examples in this short note have been confined to demography, the method outlined above is obviously applicable to many other avenues of historical enquiry. In short, any investigation that examines relative change over time or the relative difference between two or more values may benefit from the use of log percentages.
Despite various advantages, it would be naive to think that the log per cent will suddenly become used in favour of normal percentage figures. As was pointed out at the beginning of this article, the percentage has become the standard statistic of comparison due to its easy calculation and its apparent universal understanding. Yet it must be remembered that invariably standards are not the optimum form of communication, rather they are the lowest common denominator. There are many ways of exploring, interpreting and explaining historical data and we must be aware that the most obvious is not always the best.3

NOTES

NOTES AND QUERIES

A NOTE ON EARLY SCHOOL MEDICAL SERVICE STATISTICS

Contributed by David Hirst

The Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure have drawn attention to the information to be found in the reports of local School Medical Officers. Users of these reports should be aware that there are pitfalls in utilizing many of the statistical tables published in the early years of the School Medical Service for comparative or longitudinal studies. One reason is that before the First World War statistical concepts were unfamiliar to many local School Medical Officers, although a series on statistics was published in the Medical Officer in 1910-11. Basic methodological errors abound in some of the early reports. In 1913 Arthur Greenwood attempted to use data from the reports of local School Medical Officers in his study of The Health and Physique of School Children, but found

In certain cases the tables given in the reports were useless for the purpose, as, for example, where the average height and weight of all children under five, or between five and eight, are stated without any indication as to the average at each year of age; and also where boys and girls are not distinguished.

Further distortions arose from differences in inspection procedure. The usual practice was to take heights with the children's boots removed, and the weights in ordinary indoor clothing, but this was not invariably the case, and some doubtful cases had to be excluded from the tables in Greenwood's analysis.

Even where these elementary errors or inconsistencies are avoided, more subtle differences in statistical information can distort comparisons between areas. The Board of Education required 'entrants' and 'leavers' to be inspected. A selection of Annual Reports in 1912 defined entrants as those 'aged five'; 'aged five last birthday'; 'aged four to five and five to six'; 'five in 1912'; or 'children in their sixth and seventh years'. Some authorities defined entrants as all those entering a school within the authority for the first time during the year, a definition which allowed some eleven or twelve year olds to appear in the height and weight statistics of entrants.

The Cambridge Group note the difficulties of using subjective data. Even at this early stage some School Medical Officers were aware of the problems in discussing nutritional standards, or the presence of 'slight anaemia'. An indication of the possible range of variation comes in the comparison of the analyses of the four medical inspectors in Staffordshire below. A similar range of variation occurs in comparisons between other authorities.
Table 1  Staffordshire: variation in defects reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspector</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number examined</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verminous heads</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringworm</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defective sight</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound dentures [sic]</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart functional disease</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaemia [slight]</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouth breathers</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2  Defects reported in school children on medical inspection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defects Reported</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily deformity</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defective nutrition</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclean head/body</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decayed teeth</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlarged tonsils</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adenoids</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lancet, i, 1909, p.1851.

Part of this variation is due to differences of definition between areas. In some cases all children with bad teeth were recorded as having defective dentition. Elsewhere children were recorded as having bad teeth only if four or more teeth showed signs of caries, while in Devonshire Teeth: 10 per cent were defective. About 80 or 90 per cent had disease of the teeth, but only those cases were included as defective when the teeth were causing harm either by indigestion or blood poisoning.

Not until November 1913, in his Annual Report for 1912, did George Newman, the Board of Education's Chief Medical Officer, try to tackle the problem by issuing a set of standard tables. Yet even these 'standards' would have amounted to very little unless they were consistently enforced. Previously the Board of Education declined to publish national tabulations as they were considered too inaccurate. The onset of the War left many areas unable to
perform the routine medical examinations,\textsuperscript{11} so consistency remained an unfulfilled goal. After the war following an Act which ordered the virtual abandonment of monitoring, emphasis in the reports shifts to treatment.

Despite the presence of methodological flaws, the reports are documents with considerable social and historical value, but comparisons between authorities, or over time, should proceed with cautious analysis of the quality of the methodology.

NOTES

2. See Medical Officer, 4 and 5, 1910-11.
3. Arthur Greenwood, \textit{The health and physique of school children}, London, 1913, p.5. One School Medical Officer whose Annual Reports made good use of statistical methods was James Kerr, who was responsible for school health in the London area under the London County Council and its predecessor, the London School Board. Kerr, however, was undoubtedly atypical in being a Howard Medallist of the Royal Statistical Society.
5. Taken from the Annual Reports for 1912 of the School Medical Officers for Edmonton, Tottenham, Ilford, Kent and York respectively. Note also the different ages given in tables 1 and 2 of the article by the Cambridge Group cited in note 1 above.
11. About 100 authorities were unable to conduct routine inspections during 1917. Board of Education, \textit{Annual Reports of the School Medical Officer for 1917}, C.9206, p.2. BPP 1918, ix.
SOME RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Notes on articles compiled by Terry Gwynne, book reviews by Kevin Schurer

Elaine Clark

This article investigates attitudes towards marriage in pre-industrial England at a village level, putting the issue in the context of social control. The author discusses the pressures that economic need and social or tenurial relationships imposed upon the decision to marry and investigates how peasants defended their personal interest against the intrusion of lordship and custom. The evidence is drawn mainly from manorial courts.

Gillian Clark

The author makes use of parish registers to investigate 'nurse children' as indicated by register entries between 1540-1750. Issues such as defective data and sampling are addressed, and the need to see collected data in the context of time and place is emphasised.

Mildred Collins

The author makes use of the census enumerators' books, 1851-81, to construct a picture of Pikeheelve Street, on the north-west outskirts of West Bromwich in the West Midlands.

The August 1989 volume of Continuity and Change, (vol.4, part 2) is devoted to the Child in History and therefore might be of general interest to LPS readers, although the articles do not draw upon the usual source materials dealt with in LPS. In particular, Natasha Burchardt shows how a quota sample of life-story interviews might be used to discuss the issue of step-families in 'Structure and relationships in step-families in early twentieth century Britain' (pp.293-322).

Mary Dobson

Dr Dobson investigates the demographic decline during the period 1650-1750 within a regional context. She seeks to highlight geographical variation in relation to more general demographic findings used to describe population trends at a national level. The raw data are collected from over 1000 individual parishes in south-east England. In such a study as this she points out that the techniques of family reconstitution, aggregative analysis and back projection are
less appropriate. A wide range of source material is used to provide data which are then handled along a hierarchical scale of analysis (this methodology is briefly summarized pp.397-9). Among the conclusions drawn is a significant emphasis upon the influence of a changing epidemiological cycle (investigated pp.417-22).

Chris Durston

The author examines puritan attempts to regulate marriage during the 1650s. Although the intention of the article is to investigate changes in marriage regulations in the context of the mid seventeenth-century revolutionary crisis, LPS readers may be interested in the light it sheds upon what Professor Stone has described as the bewildering variety of ways an engagement could be undertaken in the early modern period.

Martin Ecclestone

The author attempts to go beyond static descriptions of distribution patterns of selected surnames and examine more closely the actual process of diffusion. An appendix offers a mathematical approach to the diffusion process. The procedure is applied to four surnames and findings are presented in map form (figs 2-6).

P J P Goldberg
'Mortality and economic change in the diocese of York, 1390-1514', *Northern History*, XXIV, 1988, pp.38-55.

Using mainly probate evidence from the diocesan Exchequer Court of York set alongside chronicle sources, the author investigates levels of mortality from the late fourteenth century to the early sixteenth century. The difficulties of using medieval probate evidence as a source for mortality are discussed. Finally, possible links between regional population movements and economic change are considered. This article could usefully be read as part of a sequence of work by Dr Goldberg which includes: 'Female labour service and marriage in the late medieval urban North', *Northern History*, XXII, 1986, pp.18-38; 'Marriage, migration, servanthood and life cycle in Yorkshire towns in the later middle ages', *Continuity and Change*, 1, 1986, pp.141-69.

A. Hassell-Smith

The first part of a two-part article examines the work-patterns and life-styles in north Norfolk in the late sixteenth century. It is based upon wages-books and other accounting records of those who employed labouring people. LPS readers will be particularly interested in the methodology which involves a two stage process: extraction of the data, and subsequent classification and analysis. The
method seeks to avoid the dangers of analyzing nominal data without the appropriate background information relating to those named in the sources. Categories identified for discussion include Resident Farm Servants, Specialist Day Labourers, and Labouring Women. Part II continues in Continuity and Change, 4, 3, 1989, pp.367-94. It considers how the families discussed in Part I adapted their life style in the face of the serious economic crisis of the 1590s. A number of issues of current debate are investigated, e.g. the role of women in pre-industrial society.

Edward Higgs
'The definition of the 'house' in the census of 1841', Local Historian, 19, 2, 1989, pp.56-7.

In response to June Sheppard's article (see below) in the Local Historian Dr Higgs provides a warning that the use of the modern convention by which a house can be defined as 'all the space within the external and party walls of a building' can be documented from only 1851 onwards and cannot therefore be confidently applied to the 1841 census.

Edward Higgs

Dr Higgs investigates the notion that statistical series are human creations which reflect underlying definitions of terms in the context of occupational breakdowns in the nineteenth-century censuses. The basis of this study is provided by the tables in the census reports in parliamentary papers. The conclusion offers a timely warning that such occupational information as can be derived from the manuscript census enumerators' books must be treated cautiously, and that the published census reports require even greater caution.

Bridget Hill

The author examines the conclusions reached on the mean age of marriage and its relation to fertility as part of the debate on the rise in population in the eighteenth century. It refers, among others, to the work of Wrigley and Schofield, Levine, Houston, Snell, Anderson, Kussmaul, Laslett and Oosterveen, so LPS readers should feel at home. The conclusion would seem to be relatively moderate: that the 'present obsession with the mean age at marriage ... reduces a central human experience of rich cultural and subjective diversity to an abstract statistic'.

D. A. Kent

David Kent provides further addition to the work on servants in pre-industrial English society. This study is based upon settlement examinations for the
Westminster parish of St Martin-in-the-Fields, 1750-60, and focuses upon women recorded as 'yearly hired servants'.

Richard Lomas

Dr Lomas provides a local study of the initial impact of the Black Death which offers comparisons with other parts of England, and goes on to consider the length of time over which plague continued to have an adverse effect on the level of population. For the twenty-eight townships for which Dr Lomas has evidence a death rate of slightly over 50 per cent is calculated, although this conceals variations from 21 per cent to 78 per cent. In so far as the evidence allows, it is argued that the Durham experience was nearer to the recovery model which is dated from after 1450 rather than earlier in 1430 or even 1400.

Alan Nash

Since Domesday Book must remain one of the key points in any history of English population it will be of interest to many LPS readers to note this regional approach to the Domesday population. The article in effect presents a revised method of seeking an estimate for the Domesday population of southern England, and in so doing discusses many problems familiar to LPS readers from work in later periods: the relationship between family and household size, the appropriateness of multipliers in the context of differing time scales, and the difficulty of matching divisions from one period with another. The author argues that the only satisfactory way of dealing with the problem of the multiplier is the use of differential multipliers in order to reflect more sensitively the number and distribution of population. The calculated totals for southern England from an average and from differential multipliers differ by only about 27,000: i.e. between 512,000 from an average multiplier and about 485,000 from differential multipliers. The author sees the actual difference as far less important than the highlighting of relative spatial differences in southern England's constituent communities.

Elizabeth Routledge

The survival of an early fourteenth century tithing roll from the leet of Nedham and Mancroft, one of the four leets of Norwich, allows Elizabeth Routledge to study the total adult male population of one quarter of a medieval town. She compares the tithing population with more usual urban sources such as deeds and subsidy assessments. The existence of Norwich survey plans which reconstruct the pattern of property ownership at Norwich from deeds enrolled on the court rolls, 1285-1340, provides the study with an added dimension. The author calculates a population for Norwich of around 25,000, which she points out exceeds previous estimates.
June Sheppard

The author examines housing data as provided by the decennial censuses, 1801-51, which she sees as a useful addition to the mainly descriptive accounts generally used hitherto to investigate housing. Edward Higgs (see above) has responded to this article with a warning about the definition of the ‘house’.

Barry Stapleton

Barry Stapleton seeks to show that the experience of Odiham reflects an emergent model of high levels of migration in which the majority of migrants moved relatively short distances and indicates that it was the 13-30 group which was the most mobile element in society. Much of the study is based upon the parish registers of Odiham and on family reconstitution, but a very interesting range of additional sources is utilised including non-conformist material, ecclesiastical courts, parish apprenticeship indentures and settlement papers, the 1851 census, and, most interestingly of all, civil registers. These sources allow the author to obtain a measure of accuracy for the Anglican registers. Barry Stapleton’s long association with LPSS ensures that many of the issues of both sources and their interpretation which constantly concern LPS readers are well aired in the course of this article.

Kathryn Thompson

Dr Thompson analyses the information provided by a Leicester apprenticeship register from November 1844 up to 1927. The 476 entries record the name of the apprentice, date of the apprenticeship, sex, age, parent’s names, residence, parish, name of master, his trade, residence, term of the apprenticeship and the premium paid. This amount of information allows a close investigation of this urban union in the latter part of the nineteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth century.

Adrian Wilson

In addition to parish registers the author draws upon the records of the London Foundling Hospital and Bills of Mortality to investigate illegitimacy in London in the mid eighteenth century. Conclusions are drawn as to the level of London illegitimacy and the effects of economic conditions. A general model of courtship patterns is constructed and London is presented as the pacesetter for changes in styles of courtship.
Charles C. Withers

Dr Withers presents a general view of migration which uses some unusual sources such as the Glasgow Register of Police held by the Strathclyde Regional Archives and therefore shows what can be done when such opportunities present themselves.

Susan Wright
"Holding up half the sky": women and their occupations in eighteenth-century Ludlow, Midland History, XIV, 1989, pp.53-74.

This is a further contribution to the study of the role of women in pre-industrial society in which the author focuses upon women’s employment in Ludlow in the eighteenth century as revealed by a series of Easter Books, 1720-1835. LPS readers will be interested to read this extended local study in the context of Sue Wright’s articles in LPS 42 (pp.18-31) and LPS 43 (pp.13-27) which examined the nature of this particular source.

Book Reviews

S. D. Amussen

Despite its rather grand title, this book focuses on the social life of five sixteenth and seventeenth century Norfolk parishes: Cawson, Winfarthing, Shelfanger, Stow Bardolph and Wimbotsham. The choice of these parishes reflects the basic threefold agricultural divisions of the county: the first of the parishes being situated in the sheep-corn area; the last two are neighbouring parishes on the fen edge; the remaining two parishes being in the wood-pasture region located to the north of the Little Ouse/Waveney River, which separates Norfolk from Suffolk. Using local based sources – churchwarden’s accounts, court records and in particular wills – the author traces the changing patterns of social relationships within and between the selected parishes. Against the backdrop of a transformation in the prevailing system of agricultural production and economic development, social conflicts within the various village communities are investigated principally in terms of social class, while conflicts of gender are examined within the context of family and household. In conclusion it is argued that early modern England witnessed a transformation in the social order as a result of a variety of different pressures and tensions. A basic change occurred in the social structure in which power and authority shifted from a status based elite to an income based elite, at the same time the family becoming a more private, inward-looking institution. Not all readers may be convinced by this argument; however, this does not change the fact that the book is both an interesting and stimulating read.
Peter Clark, Kathy Gaskin and Adrian Wilson

This work, the first publication of the Small Towns Project (see LPS nos.34 and 41), traces through three centuries the population of 644 small towns and a further 218 communities of marginally urban status. It makes it possible for the first time to compare on a wide scale the indicated populations (using standard multipliers) from the 1563 and 1603 diocesan surveys, 1641/2 Protestations Returns, Compton Census and Hearth Tax, and to collate these with Census data (1811 and 1851). Sometimes the results suggest a clear picture of growth or decline for a particular community; in other cases the juxtaposition of the data casts doubt on one or more of the sources. Local population historians will be interested both in its substantive results and in its implications for the sources. The volume is available from the Secretary, Centre for Urban History, University of Leicester, Leicester LE1 7RH (price £9.50; Centre members £8.00).

D. Mills and C. Pearce

Many readers of LPS will know this publication in another guise. For the last five years or so the bibliographic section of this booklet has been available in computer printout form from the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure. This part of the publication provides a most useful and complete guide to work that has been carried out using the census enumerators’ books of the nineteenth century (as opposed to the published census reports). For each publication its content in terms of subject matter and use made of the census data is briefly sketched out. In addition, each work is indexed by author and geographical area covered, usually parish. Unlike the computer printouts mentioned previously, this booklet also contains an introductory text by Dennis Mills. This is a short but excellent overview of the census returns and how they have been used by researchers. Clearly, this booklet is a must for all those using nineteenth century census data or about to embark on census based research.

Gwyneth Nair

This study of the Shropshire parish of Highley provides much interesting reading for the local demographic historian. Indeed, demographic sources provide a central part of the research presented in this book. Parish registers, census enumerators’ books and other related materials are all analyzed thoroughly and carefully. Changes in, and patterns of, mortality, fertility, nuptiality, illegitimacy and household structure are discussed with clarity and understanding. Of particular interest is the central theme of the book in which
the author argues that the inhabitants of pre-enclosure Highley (the parish was enclosed during the early seventeenth century) had more in common, in terms of social homogeneity, with the parish community of the nineteenth century than the population living during the period 1650 to 1800, during which time the administration of the parish was controlled by a small but powerful oligarchy of local tenant farmers. This serves to remind us all that as historians we must never take continuities in the past for granted!

R. M. Prideaux

P. Sanders

It is always pleasing to see the many hours spent in tracking down a family history rewarded in the publication of a book. The appearance of the two reviewed here gives particular pleasure. Both works, like many family histories, are full of detail, and fascinating insights to the everyday lives of the ancestors of the respective authors. Yet despite the common root shared by the two books, in terms of content they are quite different from each other. In part, this is a function of the fact that the two groups of families that are studied are themselves very different. The west country Prideaux's include in their list of forebears John Prideaux, Rector of Exeter College, Oxford in the early sixteenth century; Edmund Prideaux of Forde Abbey who was accused of aiding the Duke of Monmouth in his rebellion against James II, released from the tower after a payment of £14,500 to Judge Jeffries; and his father, also Edmund, the second son of Sir Edmund Prideaux, first baronet of Netherton, who served as Attorney General to Cromwell. In comparison, the Sanders family appear rather humble. They lived mainly as carpenters or landless labourers in Essex until the family moved to the east end of London, to Stratford and later to Bethnal Green, at the end of the nineteenth century. Although it must be said that the the Prideaux clan also had its share of miners and naval dockworkers, the basic social difference between the two ancestries is reflected to a certain degree in the writing of the respective authors. Prideaux provides much informative background narrative on the events that shaped the world in which his ancestors lived, while Sanders gives the reader a rich picture of the everyday lives of his family: their work, their entertainment, their pleasures and sadness. In this, the fact that much of the book by Sanders relates to the twentieth century enables him to enrich his text with interesting oral evidence. Both books stand as testimony to the growing interest in, and enhanced reputation of, family history. I hope we can look forward to many more publications like these.

S. Rappaport

Despite its central position in the country's economic and social life, London has long been an under-researched topic of historical study. In recent years this
situation has thankfully improved and this book stands as testimony to the current interest in the history of the nation's capital. It is usually argued that urban life in the sixteenth century was very much in disarray. The combination of demographic pressure, economic uncertainties, rising prices, falling living standards and unemployment resulted in widespread social unrest and the virtual collapse of administrative control in the urban centres of Tudor England. Indeed, many historians have wondered how the towns and cities of England escaped from the general political and social upheaval which swept across many continental cities during this period. With this paradox very much in mind, Rappaport challenges the conventional view which portrays urban society in this period being typified by instability. This is done on two levels: firstly the author argues that in the past the forces toward instability - demographic growth, inflation, economic decline - have tended to be over-emphasised, while at the second level Rappaport claims that the mechanisms for enforcing and ensuring stability - the economic and administrative institutions of the City - have been under-emphasised. Most of the analyses presented in the book, and upon which Rappaport’s argument is largely based, is centred on a sample of one thousand adult working men, comprising 530 'entrants' serving apprenticeships in the various livery companies of the City - that is to say the guild institutions into which the craft and trade associations were organised - and 470 'masters', those who kept and trained apprentices, mostly master craftsmen, retailers and merchants who kept their own shop. Obviously, despite Rappaport’s claims of representativeness, critics of the book will no doubt point to the possible bias in the social mix of his 'sample' population. Although Rappaport is probably correct in pointing out that the numbers of the wage-labouring and masterless-men population in the capital have previously been over-stated, other problems still remain. For example, the concentration on inhabitants within the walls of the City, ignoring those without; the general lack of any age-specific information; the representativeness of the cohort selected for the study of the sixteenth century as a whole: these are all issues that need to be addressed. Yet these words of caution should not overshadow the fact that the book provides a detailed and valuable corrective insight on the operation and organisation of urban society in Tudor England.

J. Walter and R. S. Schofield (editors)

This volume of essays is dedicated to the memory of Andrew Appleby who before his sudden death in 1980 pioneered work on the study of famine in pre-industrial societies. In the first chapter the book's editors provide an informative overview of the occurrence of crisis mortality, harvest failure and the changing structure of mortality in the pre-industrial period. In particular, they point out that one must not overlook the potential role of human intervention in 'natural' disasters and conclude that social organisation and intervention were also important factors which helped to shape the incidence and structure of mortality in the past. The role of social intervention is also an important feature of the contributions by John Walter and Paul Slack. In the first of these chapters Walter examines the relationship between periods of harvest failure, increased mortality, social unrest and popular protest, emphasis
being placed on the part played by the various institutions of administrative control at the local level. The local environment and administration systems are also central to the chapter by Slack, which investigates the response to plague in early modern England, concentrating on the actions taken by civic authorities to combat the further spread of plague and arrest public alarm. The previous chapter by Wrightson and Levine falls entirely into the category of a local study, examining the changing structure of mortality in the parish of Wickham, Co. Durham. Interestingly, this study emphasises the concept of death at the level of the individual, investigating the actual experience of death and differing individual perceptions of mortality. The book also contains two chapters based predominantly on French material. The first of these by Jacques Dupâquier examines the inter-relationship between mortality crises and the price of grain, while the second by David Weir takes as its theme the development and operation of the main grain markets of France in relation to trends in regional mortality levels. The book closes with two chapters, one by Tony Wrigley, the other by Roger Schofield. In the first of these Wrigley raises a number of speculative questions concerning the relationship between the quantity of grain produced in a harvest year and the price for which it is sold in the market. Various issues surrounding this most basic of exchanges, argues Wrigley, need to be addressed more fully if we are to understand the operation of pre-industrial economic systems. In the final chapter, Schofield stresses that the basic way in which society is organized, in terms of its family and household structures, can have an important influence on the ability to organize and develop modes of agricultural production and food distribution, which in turn can determine the rôle of mortality intervention on demographic growth. All in all, the book will be invaluable to anyone researching the nature of mortality in pre-industrial societies.

W. F. Webster

The bulk of this work consists of a reproduction of the surviving Hearth Tax documents of 1664 and 1674 for the county of Nottinghamshire. These are printed in order of Hundred and faithfully set out as in the original returns. The lists are also fully indexed by place and the names of the individuals recorded. Of particular interest is the sixty page introduction contributed by John Beckett. This is a very scholarly discussion not only of the administrative background to the hearth tax, but also of some of its problems and its potential for use. Beckett concludes his introduction in the following way: ‘It is to be hoped that this introduction has provided not merely information on the administration of the tax in Nottinghamshire, but has also pointed to ways in which the material can be used to increase our knowledge of the county, and of the individual settlements within its borders’ (p.xlii). In this it clearly succeeds, but in addition, it provides a useful guide to those using similar materials for other counties.
CORRESPONDENCE

Letters intended for publication in LPS should be sent to Kevin Schurer, 27 Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1QA

Editors’ note

LPS readers are reminded that the editorial board is always prepared to offer advice on subjects within the scope of LPS. Sometimes queries which have been raised are discussed in print in this section of the journal but there are many others which are not published, so if you think we can help do not hesitate to contact us.

An issue of quality: two views

Dear Sir

You asked readers for more letters. Perhaps you will not entirely welcome this one.

Gratifying though it is that the LPS calendar now after many years appears to be synchronised with that of the rest of the world, the effort to keep pace with the present seems to have had a deleterious effect on the quality of one of the most prized and long running items: News from the Cambridge Group.

The gist of the news was certainly exciting: at last some hard demographic data about the twentieth century. The manner of its telling left something to be desired: in presentation, in what was included and in what was omitted.

The typographical error count appeared to be higher in this part of the issue than in any other. Could it be that the spelling of "Bethnal Green" is due to an insufficiency in the "availability of relevant" proof readers? (I have used double quotes as LPS technology seems incapable of distinguishing between single quotes and apostrophes.)

I cannot help feeling that this contribution, frustratingly fascinating though it is, has not been scrutinised with the same editorial care as other contributions to the issue. Perhaps, to be charitable, the "hard slog" of the "very time consuming and laborious process" has so enervated the sloggers that they had no energy left to describe their work in the way one would expect from a long-established and well respected research department. I can only hope that the next announcement (sic) of results will come with a more helpful commentary and analysis.
In case you were wondering, I found the rest of the issue well up to the usual high standards and as informative and interesting as ever!

Yours faithfully
Derek Turner

29 Beech Road, Thame, Oxfordshire OX9 2AN.

Editors’ note – We do, in fact, welcome this letter, after all it does not harm to be reminded of our failings from time to time. Derek Turner is right to point out the typing mistakes in the various news items of LPS 43, and is correct in thinking that these were the result of rushing final copy to the printer without the provision of sufficient proof reading. We are very much aware of the problem of keeping to schedules and are doing our best to solve it. Concerning the project on twentieth century household data described in the News from the Cambridge Group of LPS 43, since this project utilizes census data post-dating 1881, it is covered by both the Confidentiality Act and the Official Secrets Act. As a consequence of this, although the Cambridge Group can and will publish research findings from the data, they are not at liberty to discuss the creation or preparation of the data files.

Dear Sir

I am inspired to write in response to your recent call for letters (LPS Autumn 1989). As one of your overseas readers, I am sometimes concerned that LPS may be too narrowly viewed as, literally, "local population studies". The articles carried are excellent pieces on the detective work required to understand local population change. However, the studies are more than that: they are often the building blocks for understanding national population movements.

For my work, the studies have other uses in teaching and speeches (yes, even in North America!). Often LPS articles are exactly what the doctor ordered, i.e., concrete, specific examples of demographic-social change and, perhaps, documenting the range of human demographic behaviour. Portrayals of fertility, marriage, and family behaviour (and its marvellous variation) over the centuries come alive in the issues of LPS.

The "grass roots" nature of LPS and the Society has created a treasure of local history that some of us in other countries can only view with envy and admiration.

Yours faithfully
Edward T. Pryor

Director General, Census and Demographic Statistics Branch, Statistics Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A OT6.
Literacy in France

Dear Sir

In Michael Heffernan’s introduction to his article in LPS 42, he states that, ‘males were 10 to 20 per cent more literate than their female contemporaries’ (p.32). This, surely, is misleading since he is really comparing the number who were literate, not degrees of literacy. Consequently, the statement should read as follows: ‘when comparing men and women, 10 to 20 per cent more men than women were literate.’ However, the percentage calculated are also given to misinterpretation. For example, Table 1 of the article (p.33) states that in the period 1816-20 54 per cent of males were literate, compared to 34 per cent of females. This difference could be expressed as twenty percentage points, but less ambiguously 59 per cent more men were literate than women (ie. 54+34 x100 = 159).

Yours faithfully
Brian Sheldrake

26 Bowood Road, Swindon, Wiltshire SN1 4LP.

Editors’ note – General problems relating to the use of percentage calculations are discussed in a separate note in this issue of LPS.

A Query about Chapelries

Dear Sir

With reference to Professor Hair’s query about chapelries (LPS 42 Spring 1989, p.58), I have recently been looking at the registers of Kirkby Stephen. Kirkby Stephen is a large parish of 3,522 acres consisting of eight townships and two chapelties. The registers begin in 1647. Mallerstang is an ancient chapelry, the chapel being rebuilt by Anne, Countess of Pembroke in 1663. The registers begin in 1713. The first book from 1713 to 1813 only contains baptisms. The second book from 1813 to 1882 contains baptisms, marriages and burials. Of the 740 entries in the first book, 39 are illegible as the book has suffered from damp. Of the remaining 710 entries, 461 or 65 per cent also appear in the Kirkby Stephen registers, only 249 or 35 per cent are new entries. The distribution of new entries varies over time. From 1713 to 1728 there are 103 entries of which only 6 are also in the Kirkby Stephen registers. From 1729 to 1761 there are 200 entries, half of which are new and half duplicates. From 1762 to 1813 there are 407 entries, of which 52 or 12 per cent are new. Thus the proportion of entries which only appear in the Mallerstang registers falls drastically over time. The position is further complicated as there are some entries in the Kirkby Stephen registers relating to Mallerstang which do not appear in the Mallerstang registers.

With the second register a change takes place. The baptisms and burials which appear in the Mallerstang registers do not appear in the Kirkby Stephen registers, although there are still a few entries in the Kirkby Stephen registers
relating to Mallerstang which do not appear in the Mallerstang registers. It is different with the marriages. There are forty-one entries from 1831 to 1851, which is as far as I have gone and, except for six these are all in the Kirkby Stephen registers. In these six cases it is stated that one of the marriage partners came from another parish. It may be that the Mallerstang chapel was not authorised to solemnise marriages and that the incumbent recorded the marriages he knew of where ever they took place.

It follows from the Mallerstang registers that it is not safe to do a family reconstruction from a chapel register or from the registers of the mother church alone. Neither would it be correct to count the registers and add the totals together. How far the Mallerstang registers are typical of early chapel registers remains to be discovered.

Yours faithfully
Arthur Duxbury

Firbank, 48 High Street, Kirkby Stephen, Cumbria CA17 4SH.

An LPS Supplement

**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).
HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY RESEARCH GROUP

RESEARCH PAPER SERIES

Number 23

PEOPLE AND PLACES IN THE VICTORIAN CENSUS

A review and bibliography of publications based substantially on the manuscript Census Enumerators' Books, 1841 - 1911

prepared by

Dennis Mills, The Open University (Project Director)
Carol Pearce, The Open University (Annotations)
Rosalind Davies, Jo Bird and Carol Lee, Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure (Computing)

PEOPLE AND PLACES IN THE VICTORIAN CENSUS brings together in one listing all the known publications for the British Isles which draw on the manuscript Census Enumerators' Books. A comprehensive introduction to the CEBs and their use is followed by an annotated listing alphabetically by author, and then by a matrix of publications relating to each geographical county.

150pp approx. Price £7.95 (incl. p&p)

Available from Dr. Charles W.J. Withers, Hon. Co-Editor, H.G.R.G. Research Paper Series, Department of Geography, The College of St. Paul and St. Mary, Cheltenham, Glos. GL50 2RH, from whom further information on the Series can also be sought.

Cheques should be made payable to 'Historical Geography Research Group'
Women and children picking hops