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Introduction

The current debate on the topic of 'cultural provinces'\(^1\) raises the question of whether, in some areas, they were not composed of a myriad of mini-cultures. A powerful image that comes to mind in this connection is the much-quoted story of the Elizabethan Sir Christopher Metcalfe, of Nappa Hall in upper Wensleydale, who rode to York Assizes accompanied by 300 mounted followers of his name or kin. It is not necessary to accept the story in its entirety to wonder how it was possible for such a legend to arise. A generation or two earlier, though Metcalfe was by far the most common surname among those mustered by Sir James Metcalfe on Middleham Moor in 1535, they numbered only 12 individuals.\(^2\) Do we write off the story as hopelessly exaggerated, or is it possible that the Metcalfes had prospered mightily in the circumstances of the mid-sixteenth century?

This was a time when certain surnames proliferated and came to dominate particular parts of the dales, and in most cases those names are still present – though in much smaller numbers than formerly. The trend was certainly not confined to Wensleydale, and the present work is centred on nearby Nidderdale, but the crucial question is how it came about that so many people in regions of sparse population bore the same name and saw kinship as the linch-pin of their society. Intuitively, it may seem inevitable, given the restriction of narrow valleys bounded by mountains to ensure insularity and consequent inbreeding, but was this really the explanation? The assumption should at least be tested since relationships noted in wills and probate inventories suggest that social contacts across the watershed were more frequent than we might expect. This article reports the research conducted by a joint WEA – Leeds University extra-mural evening class held in Nidderdale, where the early modern population was even more thin on the ground than in Wensleydale, and was mainly dispersed. The class was concerned with the period 1500-1750 throughout Nidderdale and the adjacent Washburn valley.

Even a limited acquaintance with Tudor and Stuart sources for Nidderdale makes it clear that, in certain parts of the dale, some surnames were extremely common. Near the dale head one could not escape the Baynes and the Horners, just as the adjoining dale head of the Washburn was the province of the Gills. In central Nidderdale the Hardcastles – still commemorated by the former
Quaker settlement of Hardcastle Garth – held sway, but where the dales gave way to the lowlands there was a much greater range of surnames, none of them being outstandingly prevalent. Insistent questions come to mind. Was this a temporary phenomenon or a traditional state of affairs? How many of these surnames (if any) arose in the dale and when did others arrive? Why did the pattern eventually disappear? There are questions of methodology too; such as the best sources to use, and how best to calculate the prevalence of surnames.

Some of the names, notably Beckwith, Clint, Farnell, Hardisty, and Thackwray, appear in the local Poll Tax return for 1379, and may well have originated in the dale. Others, such as Askwith, Craven, Kettlewell and Coverdale, clearly did not, since they refer to places some distance away. Although the names which later became dominant were by no means all present in the late fourteenth century (when most surnames had become hereditary), there was no sudden influx at any particular time. It is likely that generally-applicable names like Gill or Grange, Smith or Waite, came into widespread use after originating in a number of different ways. There were certainly no outstandingly common names among the taxpayers of 1379, so the objective was to show how and when dominance was achieved by particular surnames.

**Lay Subsidy of 1546**

The earliest comprehensive lists of tenants do not appear locally until the sixteenth century. A rental of 1526 for Knaresborough Forest (which included a large part of lower Nidderdale) revealed six branches of the Skaife family in the small township of Birstwith, and six branches of the Beckwiths in Killinghall. For Nidderdale as a whole though, there is no single source until the Lay Subsidy of 1546. Even then, it listed only the better-off, taxpayers being very thin on the ground in the upper reaches of the dale.

It is, nevertheless, the most complete list available for this period, and has the advantage of revealing the surnames present when monastic estates in the upper dale were being broken up – an event which might have been expected to make it easier for new settlers to get a foothold. As it happens the whole of Nidderdale, together with nearly all the Washburn valley, was held by just a handful of landlords until 1540. The crown lands of Knaresborough Forest occupied much of the southern and western part of the dale, but since monastic property in the Forest was confined to a few properties in Hampsthwaite, belonging to Saint Robert’s priory at Knaresborough, the Dissolution made only a minimal impact here. There was a rather larger effect in Bishop Thornton and Bishopside north of the river, which were held by the Archbishop of York as part of his Lordship of Ripon until its confiscation in 1647, since it included some monastic farms. The biggest change of ownership though, was of estates in the upper dale, held by Fountains and Byland abbeys until the Dissolution.

The names of taxpayers in the Lay Subsidy of 1546, when listed by townships (see Figure 1), show no particular pattern on comparing one group of surnames with the rest. Moreover, if townships are collected together into lordships there is no perceptible tendency for particular surnames to be confined by manorial boundaries. But there is a trend towards different groups of surnames emerging
in each parish, even when the lordships extended over several parishes or, more surprisingly, when a parish was divided between two lordships. The term ‘parish’ is being used here in a very general sense, for most northern parishes were very large and groups of surnames tended to be associated with each chapel-of-ease, both in this preliminary study and later. Each such constituent parochial chapelry typically contained several townships. A link between surnames and places of worship suggests, perhaps, that important social contacts were made in this way, though it will emerge that other factors came into it as well.

Pateley chapelry (in Ripon parish), for example, had a common pool of surnames even though two of its townships had been in monastic hands and a third had been part of the Archbishop of York’s estates. The surnames Collyer, Gill, Hardcastle and Smith between them accounted for 40 per cent of all taxpayers here, yet these names were virtually unrepresented in the adjoining chapelry of Middlesmoor (in the parish of Kirkby Malzeard), where the Bayne family alone comprised 30 per cent of taxpayers. A strong hint relative to the early association of surnames with chapels-of-ease appears in the fact that, when Middlesmoor chapel was built in 1484, the names of the founders were given as Ralph Bayne, John Bayne, Miles Bayne and Ralph Bayne junior, ‘with the rest of the inhabitants of the Vale of Middlesmoor’. Parochial solidarity is shown in 1608, too, in a Star Chamber complaint of incitement to riot. It was made in Kirkby Malzeard parish church, resulting in 400 parishioners destroying a recent enclosure of 220 acres at Skelding. Even allowing for much exaggeration, a high proportion of parishioners was evidently involved.6

Parish registers

Conclusions drawn on the basis of the Lay Subsidy of 1546, though necessary to demonstrate the situation at an early date, are open to the objection that they feature only relatively prosperous families. To establish more firmly the connection between families sharing a limited group of surnames and their chapelries, for the whole community rather than taxpayers alone, it is necessary to use parish registers. In this area, that means delaying a full analysis until the seventeenth century. Watson, in his study of surname distribution in Cambridgeshire parishes, contrasted the absence of unusually common surnames there with the situation in the parish of Colne, Lancashire.7 He showed that, in the latter case, the ten most common surnames comprised no less than 34 per cent of the whole, one surname alone contributing 9.9 per cent. His analysis was based on an index of entries in the published parish register for Colne, 1599-1653, but because baptisms, burials and marriages were all included, it was impossible to distinguish between single people and heads of families.

Since only two of the parish registers used had been published, and the rest had to be transcribed, it appeared to be little extra work to count family heads (defined here as those men or women having children baptized or buried within a period of ten years). Though clearly incomplete, the numbers will be comparable, and have the advantage of excluding those single adults appearing in the burial register who, in this area, were quite often casual industrial
workers. Like the in-servants and farm labourers found in such numbers in lowland England, they were likely to be the most mobile element of the population.\(^8\) When family heads were counted for Hampsthwaite, Ripley, and Pateley during three well-spaced decades between 1615 and 1745, it turned out that the ten most common surnames comprised at least 20 per cent of all names in each chapelry until after 1700, except in fast-growing Pateley. Pateley chapelry acquired a group of new surnames in the late seventeenth century, largely as a result of an increase in lead mining activity on Greenhow Hill. Miners were attracted from other areas, such as Derbyshire, bringing with them unfamiliar names – many of which disappeared again c.1730 when the mines became less profitable.\(^9\) Table 1 certainly under-estimates the effect of this temporary boom, since many mining families must have attended the flourishing Presbyterian church on Greenhow Hill, and some failed to have their children baptized in the Church of England.

No doubt this happened in other parts of the dale as well, but here the growth of rural industry did not attract incomers. On the contrary, the dual economy encouraged the employment and subsequent settlement of children from poorer local families.\(^10\) Production of textiles, linen in particular, had grown rapidly as flax became available from the Baltic, via Hull, and local markets began to deal in linen cloth on an increasing scale. The frequency with which looms were mentioned in probate inventories escalated in lower Nidderdale,\(^11\) and weaver-testators not uncommonly bequeathed a loom to each of several sons.\(^12\) There can be no doubt that this aided the importance of long-established families until after 1700, when the lower dale became more open to outside influences. In Hampsthwaite parish, the dominance of the major families declined fairly rapidly after this date, but they held out much longer in Ripley, as Table 1 shows.

The formerly monastic upper dale, which had even more persistent surnames, unfortunately has no surviving register until 1700. But probate sources suggest that the key to the persistence and abundance of certain surnames in particular locations lay in opportunities for sons (rather than daughters) to settle in the area where they grew up. Though the upper dale was too remote from markets

### Table 1  Changing proportion of family heads with the ten most common early seventeenth century surnames, over the next century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Early 17th century</th>
<th>Mid to late-17th c.</th>
<th>Early 18th century</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hampsthwaite parish (%)</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family heads (n)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripley parish (%)</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family heads (n)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pateley chapelry (%)</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family heads (n)</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: F. Collins ed., Hampsthwaite parish register. YPRS. Volume 13 (1902) and Pateley and Ripley parish registers (untranscribed), North Yorkshire County Record Office, nos.567-9 and 791.
for the dual economy to operate, there was ample land, and the inheritance custom (nominally primogeniture) was easily circumvented. Other opportunities arose on account of the Dissolution of the Monasteries which, surprisingly, attracted very few incomers, but the opportunities were not confined to those parts of the dale which had been in monastic hands. It seems that a climate of change was fostered and spread rapidly, not only there but also in the Archbishop of York’s estates and in Knaresborough Forest. The Forest experienced particularly extensive encroachment by cottagers on its vast unenclosed commons. Yet, as in the upper dale, there is very little evidence of incomers settling there, for it has been shown that most encroachment was intended to provide for members of existing families, whether younger sons, widows, spinsters, or retired family heads.

Hearth Tax returns

For these reasons, each part of the dale had its own group of surnames during the period 1550-1700. Confirmation of the fact is obtainable from the names given in the Hearth Tax return for Lady Day 1672, though it is not an ideal source on several counts. Family reconstitution for the five townships which comprised Hampsthwaite parish showed that as many as 35 per cent of adult males resident at that time failed to appear in the return, either as taxpayers or as exemptions. Many of the missing individuals do appear, however, as landless cottagers (or cottage-encroachers) on lists of those fined for illegal encroachment on the commons in April 1671. Though not liable for the tax, they were omitted from all surviving local returns (that is, those of 1664, 1666, and 1672) in spite of a specific order that they should be listed. The recording of some landlords’ names rather than those of the occupiers, together with shared occupancy, may be responsible for the omission of the remainder. Fortunately, cottagers’ surnames were often the same as those of their tax-paying neighbours, so that the value of the tax return as a source of surnames becomes less dubious.

As it happens, a transcript of the return for Claro Wapentake (of which Nidderdale formed part) has recently been made from the copy at the Public Record Office. It does suffer from the disadvantage that it is a contemporary copy from a local return now at Wakefield, by a scribe who was not conversant with local names. As a result he made errors, as well as omissions, which had to be corrected before analysis was begun. Fortunately, family reconstitutions provided a check-list of names which made it clear the local copy was both accurate and more complete. On account of the large number of names available from the Hearth Tax return, it is permissible to use an established statistical technique for examining the data. It involves matching the surnames from each parish with its neighbours, and calculating a so-called ‘coefficient of relationship by isonymy’ Ri, expressing the degree of sharing of surnames. For Nidderdale, where parishes were much too large to be useful units, our chosen source made use of their constituent townships, a total of 24 being taken into consideration. Their locations are shown in Figure 1.

The first finding was a confirmation that the highest values of the coefficient Ri came from pairs of townships which shared a chapel-of-ease, while much lower
Table 2  Representative values of the coefficient Ri, expressing the degree of sharing of surnames between townships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjoining townships within a chapelry</th>
<th>Ri per 100,000</th>
<th>Adjoining townships across chapelry boundaries</th>
<th>Ri per 100,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fountains Earth and Stonebeck Up</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>Fountains Earth and Bishopside</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bewerley and Bishopside</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>Bewerley and Stonebeck Down</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birstwith and Fellisciffe</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>Birstwith and Clint</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampsthwaite and Birstwith</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>Hampsthwaite and Ripley</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killinghall and Ripley</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>Killinghall and Pannal</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood and Fewston</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>Norwood and Pannal</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** As defined by Souden and Lasker, Ri is a coefficient of relationship by isonymy. Isonymy means 'having the same surname', so that Ri is a measure of the frequency with which surnames are repeated in different places – in this case the lists of Hearth taxpayers, by townships.


values characterized adjoining townships which crossed such boundaries, as shown in Table 2. What this means in practice is that fairly small groups of names were found to be associated with each chapelry, Fountains Earth having more than twice as many surnames shared with Stonebeck Up as with Bishopside, for example. This tendency persisted even to the extent of distinguishing chapelry from chapelry within a parish. In Thornthwaite chapelry (part of Hampsthwaite parish) the surnames were quite distinct, not only from adjoining townships inateley chapelry, but even from the rest of its own parish. To take an extreme instance, one third of the seventeenth century taxpayers in Thruscross chapelry were named Gill, yet the name does not even feature among the four most common in adjoining Fewston parish, of which Thruscross formed part. Perversely, we find Thornthwaite and Thruscross sharing surnames across the intervening watershed – but they had a lot in common including, in the seventeenth century, a shared curate.

Further down the dale, Ripley parish, which never had a chapel-of-ease, contained a quite different group of names from those of Hampsthwaite parish on one side, or Pannal parish on the other. The presence of the river could possibly have been a factor here. So far from Nidderdale being a cultural whole, it seems there were no more shared surnames from place to place along the dale than there were across its watershed, in keeping with the pattern of
Figure 2  Surnames comprising 6 per cent or more of Hearth Tax payers' surnames in 1672

Notes:  The area shown as 'Brimham' on the map became the parish of Hartwith in 1750. It was not officially a parish in 1672, and to call it Hartwith would be misleading. But it was recommended for parochial status in 1647, communion being held and children baptised there throughout the later seventeenth century. It therefore functioned as a chapel in 1672, as it had before the Reformation, and for the purpose of this map its old title has been reinstated.
medieval roads. Relationships across watersheds, facilitated by such roads, have been demonstrated for Wharfedale, by Maltby, on the evidence of marriage partners rather than surnames.\textsuperscript{19}

**Dominant surnames**

Figure 2 shows, in addition to chapelry boundaries differentiating the surname groups, the dominant names appearing in each as a percentage of all taxpayer's surnames, where the mean number of names was 124 per chapelry (ranging from 50 in Bishop Thornton to 231 in Pateley). The highest proportion is found, unsurprisingly, at the remote dale heads of Thornthwaite beck, the Washburn, and the Nidd. It would be easy to dismiss the outstanding numbers of Horners and Cravens, Holmes and Gills, as due to isolation and consequent inbreeding, but the evidence proves otherwise. For the bequests made by dale-head folk in their wills show that their marriage partners had often come over the watershed from Wharfedale or Coverdale – as did farm servants. It is quite remarkable that there was so little contact (in terms of shared surnames at least) with adjoining chapelries down the dale, but it is worth noting that even early turnpike roads avoided this valley bottom.

Two families look like the exceptions required to prove the rule. The Hardcastles formed 17 per cent of taxpayers in Bramham 'chapel' but also 8 per cent of those in the adjoining chapelry of Pateley, while the Waites formed 14 per cent and 7 per cent of Thornthwaite and Hampsthwaite respectively. In fact both families were exceptionally localized, being confined to a few hamlets near the chapelry boundaries. Family reconstitution shows no less than eleven branches of the Waites in Padsde, Menwith, Swarcliffe and Felliscliffe in the 1670s, within an area of perhaps ten square kilometres, while the Hardcastles were confined almost exclusively to just two hamlets.

Hardcastle Garth, in Hartwith, speaks for itself, and comprised five taxpayers of that name living in close proximity, while a further four paying branches of the family were either at Dacre or at Dacre Banks. Neither of these hamlets was more than three kilometres from Hardcastle Garth and the chapelry boundary separating them was of no significance, because most of the Hardcastles had transferred by this time to the Quaker faith. It could therefore be argued that their tendency to live unusually close to their kin was a direct result of religious persecution. The presence of former Quaker burial grounds associated with each settlement is a pointer in this direction. But this explanation is flatly contradicted by the Waites, who seem always to have adhered to the Church of England, yet whose horizons were almost as limited within the period we are examining as those of the Hardcastles. The apparent dispersion of Hardcastles and Waites across chapelry boundaries in 1672 is therefore an anomaly which serves to strengthen, if anything, the general rule that family names were limited until c.1700 to small areas of the dale.

The other aspect of shared surnames revealed by the map is that, though certain small groups of surnames dominated the more remote chapelries, those nearer the mouth of the dale – while still differing in their surnames from neighbouring chapelries – had none that was outstandingly common. This is
quite evident in Bishop Thornton, in Pannal, and in Ripley. The only surname relating to as many as 6 per cent of taxpayers in Ripley parish, for example, was Reynold(s) or its alternative form Reynard. At first sight this contradicts the evidence in Table 1 that Ripley maintained the level of its ten most common surnames longer than other places in the dale. In fact, though, the two sources relate to rather different groups in the community: a difference much more evident in Ripley than elsewhere.

Diverse experiences

What is highlighted in Ripley parish is the differing experience of two status groups. The first consisted of long-established families bearing the most common surnames, headed by the Ingilbys of Ripley castle, a county family with extensive estates. Together they were able to maintain their little group of surnames at the level of 20 per cent of all surnames until long after 1700. But it was the other 80 per cent which dominated the lists of Hearth Taxpayers, and in Ripley this group was much more diverse in respect of its surnames than comparable groups in other parts of the dale. No doubt this was partly due to the Ingilbys themselves, who inadvertently introduced many new surnames, whether employees or farm tenants. A secondary factor was Ripley’s situation at the crossing of major north-south and east-west roads, which not only made it easier for new blood to be introduced, but also encouraged youngsters to leave the district. This encouragement was exceptionally strong during the civil war, for the period 1641-1660 witnessed a fall of more than 10 per cent in parish population.

Neither of these factors was present in the adjoining parish of Hampsthwaite, where the population rose due to natural growth during the same period, and yielded five different surnames in competition in 1672 (as shown in Figure 2), none of which became outstandingly prominent. Their proportions were small compared to the chapelries of the upper dale, and were kept that way by a high degree of short-range mobility. Nevertheless, nearly 60 per cent of all Hampsthwaite surnames present during the period 1621-1635 were still there during 1651-1665, compared to the much lower level (just over 40 per cent) which survived over the same period in Ripley parish. Hampsthwaite parish register does feature some new surnames from outside the parish but they were usually transient, appearing among the marriages when bridegrooms from elsewhere married local girls, who then settled in the husband’s home parishes and raised families there.

It is now possible to conclude that, apart from Bishop Thornton, Pannal, and Ripley, the explanation for both the high proportion of certain surnames in the upper dales, and the moderate levels lower down, seems to stem from circumstances which allowed new settlement by sons other than the eldest in places where there was land to spare. This has been shown to give rise to family groups within chapelries, becoming more pronounced as time went by from 1546 to 1672, but there are hints, too, of even higher concentrations in certain hamlets. Nor were they confined to the Hardcastles and the Waites, for while the Horners formed 28 per cent of taxpayers in Middlemoor chapelry as a whole, there was a tightly-knit group of 12 Horner families on the former
Byland granges near the source of the Nidd. The Horners, in fact, took over from the Bainens on many of these farms between 1546 and 1672.

The former Byland estates seem to have nurtured such families more successfully than did the Fountains granges. Tenants of Bylands Earth claimed to hold by Tenant Right, where inheritance had been almost guaranteed on favourable terms (and sub-division of farms was clearly permitted) in exchange for a customary duty of defending the Scottish border. Tenants of Fountains Earth, however, on account of the close control exerted by the nearby abbey and because monastic stock was still kept there, suffered some erosion of Tenant Right. As a result, there was a general move towards leasehold tenancies (incomplete by the time of the Dissolution), which sometimes allowed subdivision, but especially forbade subletting. The Fountains lodges therefore tended to remain large, and were worked with the assistance of unmarried youngsters who rarely had the opportunity of acquiring farms of their own in the upper dale – in contrast to the situation in Bylands Earth.

After the Dissolution of the Monasteries the new landlords, who were agreed on the need for more tenants to enhance their rents, differed in their approach to this end. Former Byland estates were strictly controlled by a resident lord of the manor, whereas the Fountains lands were developed in piecemeal fashion, but both methods allowed population density to increase by 1672 to more than twice the level present before 1540. The consequence in terms of surnames was that the successors of Byland tenants were able to establish their names ever more firmly, while those on former Fountains estates were more likely to change or disappear.

Conclusions

Further research would of course be necessary to determine the reasons for the occurrence of dominant surnames in other areas of the Yorkshire Dales. Clearly, a surplus of land and favourable tenurial conditions often played a part (as did the availability of by-employment in some places), in ensuring that several sons from a single family could settle in the locality where they grew up. Kinship ties within each chapelry were therefore as likely to be economic as social in origin. The period of dominance by established families reached a peak after the Dissolution (though never confined to former monastic lands). It continued for as long as conditions were favourable but suffered a severe setback after the Restoration, when family size declined and the national population growth rate fell to zero. Under these circumstances as many as 40 per cent of fathers had no son to succeed them, and their surnames disappeared. There were local differences nevertheless, dominant surnames persisting longest in the upper dale, but even there they came to an end by the mid-eighteenth century.

As to the assumed insularity of the dale heads, it now appears that even watersheds as high as those of Nidderdale (averaging 600 metres in its upper reaches) proved no barrier to the people who lived there – however daunting they may have seemed to strangers. The dale head communities, having little contact with the lower dales, may have joined with each other to form a different kind of 'frontier zone' to that envisaged in recent work at Leicester,
united, rather than divided, by difficulties of access. They maintained contact (using the network of routes across the watersheds), with families in distant parts, with whom they intermarried, yet the same group of relatively well-to-do families which existed in 1546 was still there in 1672 (and even later). The fortunes of individual family names inevitably waxed and waned, Baines declining in numbers as Horners prospered, for example. But the key to the overall influence of such families lay not in marriages within the dale, but in the union of their sons with the daughters of families of similar status elsewhere. Their subsequent settlement near the husband’s birthplace could almost be taken for granted.
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