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EDITORIAL

A new LPS supplement on the census

Readers will be aware that from time to time LPS publishes supplements to accompany the journal. The last supplement was Surveying the People, published in 1992 with the assistance of a Marc Fitch Award. This autumn a new supplement volume will be published, also with support from the Marc Fitch Fund. Unlike Surveying the People which explored four key document sources – the Compton Census, the Marriage Duty Act assessments, the Poll taxes and the Hearth tax – the new supplement concentrates on the nineteenth-century censuses. The volume, edited by D. R. Mills and K. Schürer, is entitled Local communities in the Victorian census enumerators’ books. It contains 25 articles reproduced from the pages of LPS, arranged into 6 thematic parts. The articles have been revised especially for this volume, some have been substantially extended, many incorporating additional illustrative material. Seven entirely new chapters have been written by the volume’s editors. These introduce each of the six themes of the volume, providing an overview of previous research work and the approaches taken, written especially with the local community historian in view. In so doing, they not only point to some of the analytical pitfalls, but also discuss problems of interpretation. Above all, the introductory chapters are intended to provide a practical aid to all those using the CEBs in their studies or research. The full contents of the new supplement, by chapter, is as follows:


PART I The enumeration process
2. The enumeration process – D. R. Mills and K. Schürer
3. The tabulation of occupations in the nineteenth-century census, with special reference to domestic servants – Edward Higgs
4. Identifying the census enumerators: Cornwall in 1851 – Tom Arkell
5. Liverpool’s institutional and quasi-institutional populations in 1841 and 1851 – Iain C. Taylor
6. A floating population: vessel enumeration returns, 1851–1921 – Valerie Burton
7. Visitors to Margate in the 1841 census: an attempt to look at the age and social structure of Victorian holidaymaking – John Whyman

PART II – Population and demography
9. Age reporting by the elderly and the nineteenth-century census – David Thomson
10. How accurate is the Methley baptismal registration? – Minoru Yasumoto
12. Age checkability and accuracy in the censuses of six Kentish parishes, 1851–1881 – Audrey Perkyns

PART III – Employment and occupations
15. Craft occupations in the late nineteenth century: some local considerations – Christine Hallas
16. Who worked when: lifetime profiles of labour-force participation in Cardington and Corfe Castle in the late eighteenth and mid-nineteenth centuries – Osamu Saito
17. Combining estate records with census enumerators' books to study nineteenth-century communities: the case of the Tankersley ironstone miners, c. 1850 – Melvyn Jones

PART IV – Migration and population turnover
18. Migration and population turnover – D. R. Mills and K. Schürer
19. Birthplace accuracy in the censuses of six Kentish parishes, 1851–1881 – Audrey Perkyns
20. Patterns of migration of textile workers into Accrington in the early nineteenth century – William Turner
22. Family migration in Victorian Britain: the case of Grantham and Scunthorpe – Martin B. White

PART V – Family and household structure
23. Family and household structure – K. Schürer and D. R. Mills
24. Family and household in a nineteenth-century Devonshire village – Neil M. Howlett
25. The child populations of Ladywood and Edgbaston in 1851 – Jenny Dyer
27. Depopulation and changing household structure in the mining communities of west Cornwall, 1851–1871 – Mark Brayshay

PART VI – Residential patterns
29. House repopulation from the CEBs of 1841 and 1851 – Adrian Henstock
30. The structure of the Whitby jet industry in 1871 – Noreen Vickers
31. An early Victorian suburban élite: heads of household at home – John B. Redfern
32. Village type and employment structure: an analysis in the nineteenth-century Lincolnshire Wolds – Charles Rawding

Accumulative Bibliography
Supplementary Bibliography
Index
The book is due to be published by Leopard’s Head Press, Oxford, this November, priced £12.50 – a remarkable bargain given the volume exceeds 400 pages in length, let alone the quality! The book can be ordered from any good book shop. Alternatively, readers may wish to order the book directly from LPS. This can be done simply by writing to: LPS (Census volume), Department of History, University of Essex, Colchester, CO4 3SQ. Please enclose the name and address to which the book is to be sent, the number of copies required, and a cheque (made payable to ‘Local Population Studies’) for £15.00 (£12.50, plus £2.50 p&p.).

The full bibliographic reference for the new supplement is:

LPS General Office moves to Colchester

For much of the journal’s history, the LPS General Office has been located in Matlock. Indeed, judging from the occasional items of stray mail, some of our readers are still under the illusion that the Office is still situated there! More recently, as a result of administrative changes in Derbyshire, the General Office had to be relocated to Cambridge. Now it is on the move again. Over the course of the summer all of the LPS material has been transferred to its new home at the University of Essex, Colchester. This upheaval has caused some temporary administrative problems, especially our inability to deal with requests for back issues of the journal as the LPS stock has remained packed away in inaccessible boxes! Things are now just about back to normal.

One consequence of the move of the General Office is that Ruth Bridgen, the librarian of the Cambridge Group, will be handing over the job of assistant to the journal to a new helper at the University of Essex. Ruth has assisted with the production and administration of the journal for the past eight years, and we are grateful for all of the work she has done. We are pleased that she will not be leaving LPS altogether, but rather taking on a new rôle assisting with special projects on an ad hoc basis. The work of journal assistant, handling all new submissions to the journal, subscriptions, membership enquires and sales, will be undertaken by Amanda Flather. Amanda will work at the new office situated at the University of Essex, and it is to this address that all enquires concerning the journal should now be sent. From this October the address for the LPS General Office will be:

Local Population Studies,
Department of History,
University of Essex,
COLCHESTER,
CO4 3SQ

Telephone: 01206 872190
FAX: 01206 87   E-mail: lps@essex.ac.uk
Honours for local history

In our previous editorial (LPS 57) reporting the Knighthood conferred upon Professor E. A. Wrigley, co-founder of the Cambridge Group, we asked the question whether anybody other than W. G. Hoskins had been cited in the honours' lists for 'services to local history'. In answer, the editorial board has been contacted by Dr Joan Thirsk who informs us that the citation for her CBE, awarded in 1994, was for services to 'agrarian and local history'. Thanks are due to Dr Thirsk for supplying us with this information.

Back numbers of LPS on sale

In part as a result of the transfer of the General Office (see notice above), we have decided to reduce the amount of stock that we currently hold by offering series of back numbers of the journal at hugely reduced prices. Any reader wishing to purchase sets of LPS can now do so at the following rates:

*LPS no. 21 to LPS no. 50 (inclusive, including Index) £17.50
*LPS no. 10 to LPS no. 20 (inclusive, including Index) £10.00

Both prices include postage and packing. Readers wishing to take advantage of this offer should write to the General Office (address above), enclosing a cheque made payable to 'Local Population Studies'. Do not delay. This is a limited offer: order now while stocks last!

Cambridge Group aggregate analysis data

*LPS is intending to make available the aggregate analysis material for the 404 parishes that formed the basis of Wrigley and Schofield's *The population history of England, 1541-1871: a reconstruction*. This is held, essentially, as a series of tables. For each of the 404 parishes, the data are divided into the three key types: baptisms, marriages and burials. For each of these, the data are then further subdivided into years and months. In total, this amounts to a considerable amount of data – some 5.8 million separate figures, not including additional summary tables! The sheer volume of data presents a secondary problem: how should we disseminate the material?

Initially we had considered micro-form or micro-fiche as media for publication and distribution. However, their use is, we believe, becoming less widespread, and also, it is doubtful if many readers have access to such facilities in their homes. Consequently, we are now considering the alternative of producing a CD-Rom which would include all of the material, plus an introductory text on the use of the data. One advantage of this electronic form of dissemination is that the data could be stored as `spreadsheets' which could be loaded in widely-used PC software packages such as Excel or Lotus 1-2-3. Costings for this are not yet finalised, but we would expect that the price of such a disc would be around the £15–20 mark. The obvious drawback is that to use the disc one must have access to a computer with a CD-Rom drive.
Another alternative would be to make the data available to readers on an *ad hoc* basis. It might prove possible to provide a service whereby those wanting only a small number of parishes were provided with the material on diskette, or as a paper copy of the appropriate tables. Obviously, prices would vary according to the amount of parishes requested, but we would hope to be able to produce the material at reasonable costs.

What is the point of publicising all of this when our plans are still unclear? The answer is simple. We would like to produce the material in a form that best matches our readers' needs and requirements. Consequently, if you are at all interested in receiving a set of the aggregate analysis data then please write and inform us what format would best suit your needs.

**A first for LPS**

Following on the heels of the previous issue which was the first to reproduce a photograph as an accompanying illustration to an article, this issue includes another first. With this issue we go into colour for the first time! In doing so, we hope that readers will agree that the maps depicting population change in Yorkshire, reproduced on the centre pages of the journal, help to clarify the geography of population change in this county a great deal.

October, 1996

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

New project on death and disease, 1250–1350

Since it began under the direction of Peter Laslett and Tony Wrigley in the mid-1960s, research on the demographic and social structural history of early modern England at the Cambridge Group has absorbed the bulk of resources provided in the form of grants from ESRC funds. During the late 1970s and early 1980s Richard Smith pursued work on medieval marriage but for most of the last decade primary research on medieval matters has been largely absent from the Group’s agenda. As part of a more focused concentration on matters to do with the long-term history of mortality from c.1250 the Group is devoting more of its resources, no longer so heavily based on ESRC, to the medieval period. As part of their major work on The Population History of England (1981) Tony Wrigley and Roger Schofield considered ‘crisis mortality’, in particular that associated with harvest failures and inflated grain prices in the early modern period, and revealed that England in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, notwithstanding falling real wages and recurrent harvest failures, with certain regional exceptions previously discussed by Andrew Appelby, was not distinguished by the ready appearance of famine-induced mortality surges. For an earlier phase of English history between c. 1270 and 1320 when national population totals reached levels akin to those of c. 1600 to 1650 some research suggests that, unlike the later phase of late Tudor and early Stuart history, death related mortality crises were a prominent and regionally widespread feature of the demographic landscape.

The assumption that peasants did starve in the decades either side of 1300, most particularly in the Great Famine years around 1316, is no more than an assumption, and is based upon a posited direct correlation between increases in deaths of manorial tenants and harvest failures. Although there is good evidence to encourage such a view, it is an hypothesis which needs closer examination. In particular, an assessment of the impact of disease following in the wake of dearth is much required. From 1 October 1996 Dr Phillipp Schofield joins the Cambridge Group as a Wellcome Trust-funded research fellow to work with Richard Smith on the subject of responses to dearth and disease in medieval village society 1250 to 1350. Dr Schofield had previously worked at the Oxford Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine where he had been employed as a research officer to collaborate with Richard Smith and Zvi Razi on the subject of famine in late thirteenth and early fourteenth-century England. He has already made important use of the records of manorial courts of a Suffolk manor (Hinderclay) to investigate economic, demographic and social responses to dearth prior to 1300. Phillipp Schofield will extend his research on Hinderclay and link it with that of other manors in a larger region of North Suffolk on which Richard Smith has also worked intensively. It is hoped that a full analysis of the
rich manorial documentation characteristic of this area of East Anglia will permit
detailed investigation of the response of the peasantry to recurrence of harvest
failure and, subsequently plague. The manorial records – surveys, account rolls
and court rolls are being analysed within a relational database. Additional
evidence will be extracted from the relevant Beveridge price data deposited at the
London School of Economics. In addition evidence bearing upon the frequency
of tenant deaths will be compared with that relating to the much more elevated
status group, the tenants-in-chief of the crown as recorded in the Inquisitiones
Post Mortem.

Discussion of causes of death amongst the peasantry will be based upon a
comparison of aristocratic and other elite group mortality at times of increased
peasant mortality, the assumption being that the aristocracy did not starve in this
period but may have contracted disease following in the wake of famine; deaths
of customary tenants recorded in the manorial court rolls will be used to offer a
crude index of the relationship between famine-related mortality and status and
to assess the relative impacts of food deficiency and disease. In terms of grain
supply, regional and national price data of the kind outlined above, and grain
yield and price material recorded in the account rolls of the local manors can be
used to identify crisis years; these data can then be related to other fluctuating
indicators such as land market activity and tenant deaths to highlight problem
years.

This project will aim in its results to expand upon the body of research into
maintenance contracts, frequently provided in the form of detailed dietary
provision to outgoing by incoming tenants of customary holdings and the
records of payments in kind to harvest workers in the manorial accounts;
research in this area will focus upon changes in quantity and type of food,
especially variation in the range of cereals offered, an aim being to relate these
changes to harvest fluctuations and to alternative demands upon resources, such
as taxation. It may also be possible to monitor the production of ale for sale,
through the fines paid for infractions of the Assize of Ale and recorded in the
manorial court. Important also in this regard is the frequent reference to grains
in contractual agreements and disputes between peasants; this information
allows discussion of the material resources of individual peasants within a
village community and the extent to which these could be redistributed during
poor harvest years.

Additional to direct discussion of diseases and mortality, the impact of famine in
terms of the village society and economy will also be considered. Within the
village community itself it will be possible to distinguish between the relatively
wealthy, those with a surplus, and the poor, those without. Early modern
historians, such as John Walter, have written in terms of the social devices
employed to retain cohesion during years of poor harvest; This is a theme which
has been given little, if any, attention by medievalists. Issues of entitlement
and allocation of available resources are of central importance here. Use of the
proceedings of the manorial court to consider the land market in terms of
responses to crises caused by harvest failure and related shocks, suggests that it
will be possible to discuss social tensions within the village community and
directly relate them to the availability of grains. In particular, plaints of trespass and debt c. 1300 are often extremely detailed and vivid and offer a valuable, but under-exploited insight into the tensions arising in a village community. In a forthcoming article (Agricultural History Review 45 1, 1997) Phillipp Schofield argues that the village economy of the late thirteenth century was not necessarily a 'social economy' and that little effort was made by the wealthier members of the community to support those who were poorer during the worst years of the 1290s. High levels of taxation most likely exacerbated these shortcomings.

It is clear that a great deal of the research in this project will depend on the detailed exploitation of the contents of manorial court rolls. Members of the Cambridge Group, its visiting fellows and former graduate students are among those who have contributed to a new work entitled The Manor Court and Medieval Society, edited by Zvi Razi and Richard Smith and published by Oxford University Press (September 1996). Among its contents of likely interest to readers of Local Population Studies are detailed discussion of this source category as evidence for research in the fields of population and family history.
NEWS FROM THE LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES SOCIETY

Conference Reports

Staffordshire University/LPSS joint Day Conference, 23 March 1996

The theme of the day was 'Vital Registration and the Nineteenth Century Censuses'. Dr David Gatley of Staffordshire University introduced the theme, explaining how a computerised database had been created from the abstract returns to the 1861 census, the annual returns of the Registrar General and the poor Law Commissioners. The 1851 Educational census had also been added. The abstract returns of the 1871 census were nearly ready and the 1851 returns had been started.

Participants had the opportunity to take part in two workshop sessions. Humphrey Southall and Ian Gregory of Queen Mary and Westfield College, using an impressive link-up with two computers in London, demonstrated a Geographical Information System capable of producing accurate maps of boundary changes to registration districts, local authority areas and Parliamentary constituencies for specific dates; the GIS also represented statistics spatially. In the workshop directed by Sheena Bateman of Staffordshire University, we had hands-on experience at the keyboard, manipulating data for Cheshire and Staffordshire to generate maps, graphs and charts in glorious technicolour. Even those not used to surfing the Internet found they could paddle in SECOS!

Edward Higgs, of the Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine in Oxford, spoke about the General Registry Office (1837-1914) arguing convincingly that the reasons it was set up and the reasons for the collection of census data were more to do with insurance and citizenship than with medicine. The final speaker was Jon Stobart of the university of Staffordshire, who showed how the database could be used in a study of the socio-economic structure of an area, providing the questions rather than the answers.

The workshop sessions were punctuated by an excellent buffet lunch in The Pavilion. Seventy-two square feet of bookstall also did a brisk trade, especially in documentation and discs relating to the conference. This was a stimulating day offering plenty of variety within a unifying theme. Participants went away with fresh ideas for studying infant mortality, education, migration, density of population, employment patterns, the location of hospitals and lunatic asylums, and much more.

London Day School 22 June 1996

It is becoming traditional to hold a day school in London at the Institute of Historical Research on a theme of special interest to Open University students
taking course DA301. This year the subject was ‘Getting away from Parochialism’. Three members of Open University Staff, Michael Drake, Ruth Finnegan and Paul Smith, and Peter Razzell from the Open Centre for Family and Community Study, took us through the stages of designing, preparing and writing up a research project. So much that is written about the past is narrowly focused on a discrete topic, in a limited sphere, with little or no reference to the wider world. The speakers demonstrated that to widen the perspective enhances the value of what we write about the past. They showed that getting away from parochialism involves the way questions are out, a search for other relevant studies, the use of a comparative perspective and the production of a non-parochial research report. Once again there were compliments on the catering arrangements from the participants – ‘very adequate amount’, ‘very attractive’, ‘nice to be offered fresh fruit instead of the usual cream cakes’. The collection of books in the British Local History Room is always popular and is the reason why we timetable such a long lunch break. This year it proved to be even more so, we had difficulty in getting one participant out by closing time! A new feature was that several people asked about membership of the Institute and access to the Library. They could be getting some postgraduate applicants once the participants have completed their Open University degrees. We hope to enjoy the fruits of their research at future conferences as former students are going to be invited to give presentations of their projects.


Glorious sunshine greeted delegates as we arrived at this year’s conference venue: St Martin’s (formerly Charlotte Mason) College, set in its picturesque, if somewhat hilly, campus. Over the next few days we were to be treated to the Lake District at its most inviting. The College staff gave us a warm welcome and the level of hospitality, the standard of catering and the cosiness of the accommodation ensured that our stay was a very pleasant one.

The more serious side of proceedings was opened on Friday evening by the society’s Chairman, Michael Drake. After extending a welcome to the delegates Professor Drake introduced Professor Michael Anderson from the University of Edinburgh whose presentation celebrated the silver jubilee of the publication of his well known book Family structure in nineteenth century Lancashire. Professor Anderson took the opportunity to revisit the data he had gathered a quarter of a century ago, and also made use of data available from his national sample of the 1851 census. His paper asked ‘What can the mid-Victorian censuses tell us about variations in married women’s employment?’ While Higgs, Humphries and Horrell, amongst others, claim that censuses generally were guilty of great underreporting of women’s employment, especially married women’s participation in the labour force, Prof. Anderson argued that in fact this was not the case. Historians using the census as a research tool should not be deflected from pursuing questions dealing with women’s occupations. He demonstrated that budget studies, used by Horrell and Humphries to argue for underreporting of married women’s paid employment in the census tended to be selective of
relatively young married working women with children, and that if the census data were analysed in such a way as to remove the effects of age and life cycle stage then equally high rates of married women’s work could be detected amongst equivalent groups. While older women were less likely to return an occupation their households were rather more likely to contain one or more lodgers; an aspect of women’s income earning strategies seldom mentioned in any census reports. Prof. Anderson drew his presentation to a conclusion by saying that he believed that, as the non-recording of female occupations was very widespread in the census, this accurately described reality: most urban married women contributed very little to their household economy in terms of income, they made their contribution in terms of other resources, about which few details, if any, were captured by the census.

From Lancashire textile workers, the first paper of the second day, by Dr Marguerite Dupree of the Welcome Unit, University of Glasgow shifted the focus to Women as wives and workers in the Staffordshire Potteries. Dr Dupree further endorsed the census as a tool for studying women’s paid work, and called for studies of family life to consider communities, not just occupations. Despite having a high proportion of their women in the work force the pottery towns, unlike the textile towns discussed by Prof. Anderson, displayed high fertility rates. The mid nineteenth century censuses showed, however, that most of the women working in the pot banks and finishing rooms were aged less than 30; only 14 per cent of married women worked in the potteries. The male population of the towns making up the ‘Potteries’ also encompassed a large proportion of miners and iron workers; both occupations renowned for their high fertility. Were there ‘occupational cultural groups’ with the only the wives and daughters of potters obtaining work in the same industry? In fact 23 per cent of children working in the pottery industry lived with their mothers only, and although the largest proportion of children working in the industry were the offspring of potters, miners children were more likely to be found working in the pot banks and workshops than the children of potters. There was in fact little difference in fertility between the occupational groups within the Potteries; all married early and had, on average, numerous children. The question then became how could those mothers who did work outside the home combine occupation and childcare? There were several answers. The pottery community had relatively low population turnover so there were usually plenty of alternative carers around; the costs of child care also appear to have been lower than in the textile areas. Also, compared to other groups within the local community the potters were relatively well off so could presumably more easily take advantage of any child care services on offer. Taking a community wide perspective thus allowed a fuller understanding of the competing opportunities and constraints operating on particular occupational groups.

The second of Saturday’s papers returned once more to Lancashire. Dr Elizabeth Roberts from the University of Lancaster brought with her a selection of tape recorded oral history interviews; her paper reviewing the ‘bad press’ women’s work in the textile industry had received in the literature, and then redressing the balance by allowing women who had worked in the industry at the turn of the present century to ‘speak for themselves’. Aided and abetted by a transcript of
the interviews the audience heard that life was hard; 'all bed and work', underpinned by a strong sense of the Victorian work ethic. The double burden of housework and paid employment was very often shared by husbands in the textile districts - just so long as this contribution was not put on display to the outside world! Despite the low fertility of textile workers leading contemporaries to believe that they 'must have known something' (and were therefore 'amoral') there was little evidence that this was so amongst Dr Roberts' respondents. Indeed there was sense of considerable ignorance of the workings of the reproductive system and an acceptance of 'having to take what God sent'. The interviewees did seem, on the other hand, to corroborate the allegations that families in textile districts resorted regularly to 'convenience foods', other meals being very costly in terms of time spent in shopping, preparation and cooking. Working women may have helped to raise the standard of living of their families, particularly when many employers appear to have assumed that wives would be working and men's wages were commensurably low. A final decision on this question was however very hard to reach, Dr. Roberts pointed out, because there were so many, often hidden, costs involved. One was the cost to the women themselves. As the final interviewee recalled: 'The women had their babies and worked like idiots. They died, they were old at forty.'

On Saturday afternoon the conference secretary had thoughtfully scheduled some free time for delegates to explore Ambleside and its environs. At least two booted figures were seen striding out for a nearby hill, others chose to pursue a little window shopping and a commendable number preferred to attend the Annual General Meeting!

On reconvening later in the afternoon we moved eastward across the Lancashire border for Prof. Pat Hudson's paper on Women workers in the eighteenth century textile industry of West Yorkshire. Her paper reported on part of a wider study, and concentrated on the communities of Sowerby and Calverly, one on either side of Yorkshire's woollen/worsted divide. In a predominantly pre-mechanised era female spinners were in great demand to furnish the predominantly male weavers with spun fibre. The necessary ratio between the two was such that the weavers requirements had to be met by labour beyond that available within the household. Agricultural changes in process are thought to have released women from the fields, but the opportunities for earning provided by spinning seems to have kept the textile population from moving to nearby towns. In Sowerby the demand for spinners' product meant that there was considerable turnover of young women between households. This was probably encouraged by such workers being paid by the week, not yearly as would have been true of their peers in husbandry. Prof. Hudson demonstrated that the demography of the two study communities was rather different. Calverly women married when in their early 20s across the eighteenth century, and the community experienced high marital fertility but low illegitimacy and pre-nuptial pregnancy. In Sowerby the female age of marriage fell across the second half of the century, and while legitimate fertility was lower than Calverly, illegitimacy and prenuptial pregnancy were noticeably higher. Both textile communities displayed traits quite different from those of the later nineteenth century by which time textile workers had become renowned for their late age at
marriage and low fertility within marriage. One has to assume that full scale industrialisation of the industry played some part in this shift, although it was not necessarily the only possible culprit.

Saturday evening saw the majority of conference delegates enjoying an illustrated talk by Miss Sheila Ricketts, a Cumbria Blue Badge Guide, on the life and work of local heroine Beatrix Potter. *From fantasy to farming: from the stories of Beatrix Potter to the farming of Mrs Heelis* took us from Beatrix’s very repressed Victorian childhood through the years which saw the creation of her well-loved animal characters to her marriage (at the age of 46) to lawyer Heelis. Having long been entranced by the Lake District Beatrix spent her latter years there as a respected breeder of rare sheep. By local account she seems to have been a pretty formidable character, with something of a reputation for scaring children! Miss Ricketts skilfully wove a wonderful tour around the sights and events of Cumbria into her narrative and her talk was very much enjoyed by all present.

The final morning of the conference saw us moving away from a predominantly northern perspective on the conference theme, but attention remained fixed on marriage patterns. Sharon Lauricella, a PhD student at the University of Cambridge presented a paper entitled *Wives of weavers, daughters of dealers: an analysis of marriage in 18th century Banbury*. She set the context of her study in the great growth in population in the late 18th century, to which, Wrigley & Schofield have argued, changes in nuptiality made a profound contribution. Because of the information which they contained concerning male occupations it was felt that the parish registers of Banbury could help contribute to this debate, and Ms Lauricella described how she had exploited this resource. Regretfully women could not be classified using their own occupations, as these were seldom given, but they could be shown to be the daughters and wives of men in particular occupational groups. Pre-1775 there was great variation amongst male occupations in the average age of their brides but over the closing decades of the 1700s there was a marked convergence in women’s age at marriage. By the end of the century men in most occupational groups were marrying wives of an average age of 24 years. The men themselves, however, were marrying increasingly later. The underlying demographic and economic intricacies of this scenario were, Ms Lauricella assured her audience, to be further explored in the course of completing her doctorate.

The final speaker at the conference was Dr Pam Sharpe from the University of Bristol who chose to consider women in agriculture in the early modern period within a comparative perspective. *What*, she wanted to know, did women actually do on farms, *when* did they do it and *where* did they do it? Sounding warning bells concerning the ‘bias’ of the historic record towards large farms keeping accounts as well as ‘closed’ villages and the conditions found there, Dr Sharpe argued that female agricultural workers were unlike their male counterparts in that the women’s wage rates did not vary much across the year, nor across regions: 6d per day seems to have been standard, although there were exceptions. Much greater regional variation was apparent in what women were called upon to do. The upland/lowland divide was particularly marked. Women
undertook a greater range of tasks in the North and West than in the South and East, for example.

This completed a very fine collection of extremely well presented papers. The society is most grateful to all the speakers who gave up their time to come and address the conference. We also owe many thanks to the Mrs Kath Teasdale and her team at St. Martin’s College for the high standard of accommodation and facilities offered but Conference Secretary, Christine Jones, deserves the special thanks of all who attended for the great deal of hard work she shouldered in putting together such an informative
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LIFE EXPECTATIONS OF THE WIDOWS AND ORPHANS OF FREEMEN IN LONDON 1375–1399

Barbara Megson

After graduating in History from Girton College, Cambridge, the author worked as a research assistant before entering a career in teaching. This was followed by a period, prior to retirement, as a member of HM Inspectorate of Schools. Barbara Megson has produced several publications, including, a study of the Worshipful Company of Bowyers, 1300–1600, entitled Such Goodly Company (Delworth Press, 1993).

Most exercises in medieval demography are either speculative or on a very small scale. The problems are obvious. No systematic records of baptisms, marriages or burials were kept in England before 1538. The historian therefore has to rely on very small samples, such as may turn up in manorial, company or city archives. An identifiable group of this kind is to be found in the entries of the Court of Orphans of the City of London.

They offer a rare opportunity to analyse the survival rates and destinations of widows and their young children in the late fourteenth century. This study sought to establish the number of orphans left, the proportion of boys to girls and how many lived to maturity, including the number of girls who married under the age of 21. In addition, an attempt was made to test the theory that most (London) families were dying out within two or three generations. It is known that many people, both men and women, remarried on the deaths of their spouses. Evidence was sought to establish how common it was to remarry more than once. Further, where widows took another partner, how commonly did they choose a man from their previous husband’s craft?

The prime source for data bearing on all these questions, the records of the Court of Orphans, is to be found in the London Letter Books. Some additional material is also available in the Calendars of Pleas and Memoranda, the Coroners’ Records for 1300–78 and the wills of the children’s parents where they exist.¹

The systematic administration of London developed early. The decisions and ordinances of the Mayor and Aldermen, acting in both their civil and judicial capacities, were noted in the ‘Letter Books’: so-called because each successive volume was designated by a letter of the alphabet, beginning with Letter Book A which covered c. 1275–98.

The Court of Orphans was, in effect, a sub-committee of the Court of Aldermen and dealt with the property and upbringing of the young children and widows of their freemen who had died. The Court enrolled the details, nominated a legal
guardian, together with two sureties, who held the orphan’s property until its owner reached the age of 21, or completed an apprenticeship, if this took longer. An orphan girl could marry and receive her portion early, but only with the consent of the Mayor and Aldermen.

Between 1375 and 1399, Letter Book H recorded the details of 152 bereaved families: the names of the children’s fathers, usually of their widowed mothers and of their new husbands when they remarried. Sometimes the orphans’ ages were given and the dates on which they claimed their inheritances also appear. Such data provide some hard, if minimal, evidence of the size of late fourteenth-century families, and the ratio of number of boys and girls and their survival rates. It also gives an indication of how many wives survived their husbands, the proportion who acted as their children’s’ guardians and whether or not they remarried.

Quantification based on such a small sample must inevitably offer a limited baseline. It can, however, afford an opportunity to test estimates drawn from longer periods and larger populations. It also gives an insight into quite a broad cross-section of the community. Sylvia Thrupp, quite reasonably, tended to concentrate on the wealthy merchants but many freemen were craftsmen, including some very humble trades.

By focusing on a limited period, and on a small but finite population, it is possible to use data which may serve as a probe to test broader studies, such as those of Sylvia Thrupp and Barbara Hanawalt. Before 1349 England was suffering from the difficulties characteristic of over-population: in the years after 1349, the reverse was the case. Since the plague of 1348/9 became endemic, moreover, these problems did not go away, but intensified and reappeared in a number of critical epidemics. The period under review is, therefore, likely to demonstrate the impact of very high mortality rates.

Sylvia Thrupp contended that few London families survived in the male line for more that three generations: London therefore depended on immigration from the outlying countryside for new citizens. An attempt was therefore made to trace the subsequent destinies of the widows ad orphans as well as the parents’ places of origin. Both the tracing of the widows and of the children led to extended searching, retrospectively in Letter Books F and G, and prospectively in Letter Books J and K.

**Method of procedure**

Straightforward listing provided the original database of the study. Each family was then analysed as a case study, wherever the material permitted. Four cadres of people emerged: fathers, mothers, their daughters and their sons. The last two categories were later supplemented with lists and details of the daughters’ husbands and their status. There was also an additional set of people arising from the remarriage of their mothers.
Table 1  Fathers and their widows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left widows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which, widows known to be second wives</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died as widowers*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes  * = Leaving 87 children without either parent.

Fathers

Inevitably, the information on the fathers was the most complete. There were 152 of them. The family of every case recorded in Letter Book H was included in the study. This involved a number which originated in earlier Letter Books, since some of these cases were very long-running: 36 of the men named had died earlier than 1375, some very much earlier, including one who had perished in 1349, presumably in the Black Death. How many of these men died as a result of epidemic disease can only be conjectured, in view of the fact that their children's goods were often not deposited at Guildhall until long after their father's death, commonly not until their mother's remarriage. Probate dates can be a good indication, however, of the date of decease. Of the 78 men whose wills are recorded, 27 of the testators appear to have died during an outbreak of plague. Of the original 152 fathers, 52 left 87 children without either parent (Table 1). The crafts or professions of 122 men in this sample are known and included one royal, and three city, officials, two MPs and two knights: 46 of the 49 crafts listed in 1381/2 were represented among them (Table 2).

Thanks to the City requirements that testators must leave their property in thirds it is sometimes possible to calculate the overall wealth of the testator, by multiplying the orphan's portion by three. Among the six wealthiest men, all former aldermen, it is no surprise to find a draper (a former mayor), two mercers, a vintner, a goldsmith and a grocer. All these men left estates worth over £1000 and one, William Knyghtcote, well over £3000. The value of real estate left cannot be quantified and some men undoubtedly resorted to legal devices to conceal their true worth. At the other end of the scale, however, there were carpenters, brewers, a butcher, an 'upholder' and a cordwainer who each left less than £20. A fruiterer had only 40s. with which to endow his 8 year old son: 17 fathers, however, died possessed of between £100 and £200, a substantial sum at the time, not only the competence of some merchants but of a number of prosperous craftsmen as well. Fourteen left between £200 and £900.

A number of these wealthier men, if ostensibly practising a hand-craft, were probably also exercising their right to invest money in wholesale trading enterprises. In contrast, there were some who, by their occupational standards, left very little. The estate of Richard Cavendish, whose family had been mercers for generations, finally totalled only £20. The explanation may lie in the fact that,
Table 2  Fathers’ crafts and trades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craft or trade</th>
<th>n.</th>
<th>Craft or trade</th>
<th>n.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spicers/Grocers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bowyers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drapers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockfishmongers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Commoners</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tapicers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skinners</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glasiers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmiths</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Paternosteres</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vintners</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shearmen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolmongers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cooks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordwainers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Painters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Marshalls</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gridiers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cheesemongers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weavers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glovers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apothecaries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Butchers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrivenors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Malemecaries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ironmongers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poulters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quiltmakers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurriers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plomers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pewterers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Marbers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Upholders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberdashers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fruiterers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Armourer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

before the orphan’s patrimony was declared, the estate had to be cleared of all outstanding debts. A merchant might easily leave his property encumbered with losses from speculative enterprises and bad debts in an adverse year. He might, however, have possessed real estate, already conveyed on trust to the next generation. The sharp discrepancies of wealth within the same company, for example the brewers and cordwainers, are also a reminder of the diversity of occupation involved in such trades: from the lowly artisan producer to the capitalist entrepreneur.

Wills, where they still exist, can provide considerable additional detail, notably about the man’s craft, place of residence, previous wives, other members of the family and of some real estate. It is clear however that testators only dealt with matters outstanding when the will was made. Where older children had already been ‘advanced’ and received their portion, they might not be mentioned at all. Real estate, as already shown, could be made subject to a legal ‘use’ and thus escape mention in the will. Only 96 wills are recorded for this cohort of fathers. They were made by 82 testators, 14 of whom made two, one relating to real estate and the other a personal testament. Of the 96 listed, the texts of only 64 wills have survived. The rest, mainly in the Court of the London Archdeaconry, appear only in the index. Five wills were proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury (PCC). The dates of death of these latter are significant, denoting as they do the rise of the PCC as a probate court for men of real wealth. The richest of them all, however, William Knyghtcote, who died in 1383, eluded its net. His wills were proved in the city’s own Court of Hustings and the London
Commissary court. A mercer, former sheriff and alderman, he left each of his three orphan daughters a dowry of £500. He is known to have had at least three sons, but he only refers to his ‘son and heir’, omitting to name him, as also in the case of ‘his children’. A number of testators used these generic terms, including some who referred merely to ‘my wife’, in the same way.

Given these limitations, it is often hazardous to try to establish the full size of the testator’s family, especially as the Court of Orphans was only concerned with the wealth and care of young children. Most men appear to have left only one or two such orphans, though there were six families with four, one with five and one of eight.

What these figures do not show, however, is how many older children were alive and ‘advanced’ at the time of their father’s death. It is thus impossible to be sure that in any particular case the record of a man’s family is complete. The names of a few more children have emerged from records of litigation. In this way, it has been possible to add 46 more descendants to the tally: 30 boys and 16 girls. Wills can also be used to throw light on the parents’ earlier homes. Many crafts relied for at least some of their apprentices on recruitment from country districts. Eighteen out of 64 testators referred to lands outside London and a number clearly originated in the shires: four from Norfolk, three others with connections in Northampton, four in Essex, two from Surrey and others from Kent, Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire and Lincolnshire. From their requests for prayers in the local church, for parents and families, it is often possible to pin-point their birthplaces with accuracy.

Such were the fathers of the families under review. Not all were wealthy, even though they all claimed the privileged status of freemen of London. There were undoubtedly many poorer freemen belonging to the same crafts as those under scrutiny. Only those who had something to leave, however small, appear in these lists, bearing out the contention of Elaine Clark that the Court of Orphans was chiefly concerned with the protection of property.

**Mothers**

Two thirds of the wives of the 152 men in this sample are known to have survived their husbands. Of these, as already indicated, 20 were not their spouse’s first wife. Though difficult to identify, some of these widows had also been married before. Many of the second wives would have been younger than their husbands. If girls could marry from the age of 14 onwards, and apprentices were forbidden to do so until the end of their term of service, most young men were at least 21 years of age, and often 24, before they could take a wife. The age of only one of the mothers in the sample is known. Idonea de Hatfelde was 14 when she married Richard Claverynge, as his second wife in 1363. When he died, in 1375, she was still only 26, with a son aged 9 years: she subsequently remarried twice. Likewise, Dame Margaret Phelipot must have been about the same age at the time of her first marriage in 1370, as she was still bearing children to her fourth husband whom she married in 1392.
Though doubtless as vulnerable to personal grief as anyone else, the widow of a London freeman could at least rely on the city to ensure that she received her share of her late husband’s property; which would enable her to survive with dignity herself and to care for her young children. As early as 1268, the city had ordained respect and protection for its widows and exemptions from certain tallages, redemptions and contributions. She could claim a life interest in one third of her former husband’s property, in the name of her dower, and also her ‘Chamber’ which entitled her to live in her former dwelling, ‘the hall, the principal chamber, the yard, so long as she remain unmarried’.

Only a few London husbands in this survey attempted to restrict their wives’ dower to their widowhood and three out of six women so restricted remarried notwithstanding. For the London widow was an attractive marriage proposition.

In addition to her dower and her Chamber, the widow was normally, by custom, given the guardianship of her underage children, together with control over their patrimony. Like other guardians she could charge, at a rate of 12d. a week for their upkeep. In this way she had the use of two thirds of her dead husband’s assets. Of the 100 widows in this study, 70 are known to have acted as the guardians of their children, 15 per cent more than Barbara Hanawalt’s figure over a much wider period. Only 23 mothers were specifically excluded by their husbands who had named an alternative guardian. The one ground for automatic prohibition was that of a personal interest in the orphan’s fate and fortune. Usually, where widows were superseded by designated guardians, the intervention arose because the children were those of a former wife: in such cases the step-mother was only allowed the care of her own children. Sometimes, undoubtedly, the husband had been aware that his will would be challenged: as when, in 1369 Lucy Bretforde, a second wife with no children, successfully claimed a half share of her husband’s estate, though there were orphans of his first marriage. The precedent was overturned, however, when, in 1394, Idonea Pynchon challenged the right of her step-son to a third of his father’s estate and lost her case. On a few occasions, the orphan’s inheritance was so large that it required an experienced man of affairs to administer it. In such cases the father would nominate a trusted friend or business associate or, as in the case of John Pynchon, the boy’s uncle.

It is thus clear that the London widow, unlike her despised counterparts in Florence, was likely to be in demand for remarriage. If she married again, as 48 of the guardians in the study clearly did, the new husband was automatically entitled to control of her dower. He frequently assumed the right of guardianship of the children as well, but had to appear at the Guildhall to seek permission before he could do so. This was often the first occasion on which the orphan’s patrimony was declared and was on such occasions entered in the Letter Book long after the father’s death. This means that, in many cases, it is now only possible to locate the date on which the widow remarried, and to whom, not the precise date on which her former husband died.

Of the 100 widows in this cohort, 50 are known to have remarried, of whom 6 married again, after a second widowhood, and one after a third. It is
Table 3  Widows known to have remarried into their former husband's craft or trade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Widows remarrying into same craft/trade</th>
<th>n.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmiths</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vintners</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockfishmongers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drapers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearmen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordwainers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaziers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Widows remarrying into allied craft/trade</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuller's widow &gt; Webber</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fletcher's widow &gt; Glover</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothier's widow &gt; Woolmonger</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Widows remarrying into different craft/trade</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number in sample                        | 100  

sometimes claimed that widows of this period remarried very shortly after their first husband’s death but the numbers in this group who did so do not give great support to this view. Only 6 are known to have remarried within 6 months of their widowhood and eight within 12 months. Most seem to have waited for at least 18 months to 2 years before pledging themselves again, even at a time of exceptionally high mortality. Nor does this study suggest that widows automatically married men of their former husband’s calling. It may be significant that four of the six who remarried within six months did so within the craft, perhaps to keep the business going. They comprised second marriages to one grocer, one goldsmith, a merchant and a shearmen. Of all the known remarriages, only 13 widows chose a man from their former husband’s trade (see Table 3).

There remain 44 widows who appear not to have remarried. One or two are known to have died soon after their husbands, leaving their orphans bereft. Some may have been older women when left who retired from the scene. At least two grandmothers acted as guardians. One widow was charged by her husband not to remarry in order to look after their ‘idiot’ daughter: a responsibility which she appears to have fulfilled. Others may have exercised their right, as widows of freemen, to carry on their husbands’ businesses, but there is little evidence of this. That the option existed was remarkable, however, since it was no longer available in sixteenth century London, by which time the increase in population had resulted in the marginalisation of women in the working world.
Six of these widows left wills, together with two wills drawn up by widows who had remarried but made them with their husband’s consent. One of the latter held enfeoffed property in her own right, to which her husband had no legal access unless she willed her rights to him. Another widow, who died in 1399, had outlived her first husband by 33 years when she made her will in 1409, and 9 years after the death of her second. Two died shortly after their husbands: one only a few months later and the second two years after. The remarkable Margaret Phelipot, made her will in 1431, 56 years after the decease of her first husband and 34 years after the death of her fourth spouse. It is of considerable interest that, on the death of the latter in 1397, she took a vow of celibacy. She did not retire from the world, however, and is to be found, as late as 1428, appearing in law suits alongside her son of her last marriage. 19

The stamina of these London women was remarkable. Resolute stoicism alone can have carried them through repeated pregnancies and childbirth, only to see their young swept from them, not only by the drama of the plague, but in the high rate of child mortality, from ordinary childhood complaints, for which there were then no remedies. It is hard to reconcile Ariès’ conclusion that children were not valued by Londoners with Wyclif’s chiding of mothers who grieved for their young children, instead of thanking God in his mercy for taking them out of this world. 20

The Orphans

Between 1375 and 1399 the London Court of Orphans had the care and oversight, at one time or another, of 301 children of freemen: 159 boys and 142 girls, an unexpected imbalance of sexes. 21 Sixty-seven of these children died before reaching the age of 21 and 62 more disappeared from the records. (See Table 2) The figures suggest a survival rate of 1.5 per family.

As already indicated, however, the available sources only mentioned those children not previously ‘advanced’. A number of fathers are known to have had other children, apprenticed, married or adult at the time of their deaths. Court cases, casual appearances in the city records and even entries in the records of the Privy Council have supplied the names and existence of a few additional children; 46 in all. Thirty men and sixteen women have turned up in this way, bringing the total of these London survivors to 280, making an average ratio of 1.84 per family. If so many became known on this haphazard basis, it is surely probable that a number more existed and that perhaps Londoners were just managing to replace themselves, even in these exceptional years of high mortality. The incidence of plague reduced from 1408 onwards and from then on there should have been a steady increase in survival rates.

It proved possible to trace the ultimate destinies of some of the orphans. but only to a limited extent. The records at this point are inadequate as evidence of anything but very tentative conclusions, though even these may serve as sound base-lines for further enquiries. It is possible to establish whether the children reached the age of 21, or, in the case of girls, married before that age, from their
Table 4  Orphan girls known to have married young and their patrimony

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Patrimony</th>
<th>Age at marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knyghtcote</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyle</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>£40+</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knyghtcote</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwendedone</td>
<td>40 mks</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursher</td>
<td>£106</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>£40+</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draper</td>
<td>£40+</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godyn</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Nortone</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

appearances in court, to claim their patrimonies from their guardians. Since the Court of Orphans controlled the right to marry underage and was a court of appeal for disputed apprenticeships, such major events in these young people’s lives are accessible up to the day on which they claimed their inheritance. Thereafter, unless they broke the law, brought a law suit, or otherwise attracted public attention, they are difficult to track, particularly as the average citizen, even today, probably never appears in a court of law. For those who were involved in litigation, the records of pleas and memoranda, made by the Court, provide a rich source to supplement the Letter Books. Sometimes the orphans, now adult, appeared making their own wills: some, in their turn, leaving young children to become wards of court.22

For the girls, their usual destiny was marriage, though nine girls in the sample did in fact embark on an apprenticeship. One of the latter had an unusual ‘escape’ clause in her indenture, enabling her to leave at any time for marriage, but this was unlikely to be true for others.23 This may partly account for the remaining girls who were still not married (54 per cent of those surviving). The ages at marriage can be calculated in 11 cases only (see Table 4). Marriage before the age of 14 was not normally permitted by the Court of Orphans, but it was customary among the landed gentry to marry wealthy heiresses when they were considerably younger. Of four girls who claimed their patrimony before they were 14, three had dowries of £500 each and one of £200. Two others, with sums of over £100, did not marry until they were 18, in one case and 17 in the other. Nine took husbands in their fathers’ trades and six married into allied trades: a comparatively small number of the whole. Socially, like married like, if only because the city fathers watched jealously lest any of their orphans be socially ‘disparaged’, by marrying beneath them. Within this framework the remaining 45 girls (73 per cent) crossed the frontiers of different trades and crafts freely in their choice of husbands.

Less is known about the boys’ marriages because, in general, they could not marry until 21; or older, if their apprenticeship lasted over that time. Most boys probably served an apprenticeship, but only 29 are recorded for this group. Two
Table 5  The orphans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died under age</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No further record</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survived</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were the victims of early marriages: arranged in one case by the ambitious father of a boy of six and the other manipulated by a ruthless guardian into marriage with his own daughter.24

For 62 children (26 boys and 36 girls) however, there is no further entry at all after their initial enrolment (see Table 5). What happened to them? No doubt, some died of plague and disease, but such deaths would normally have been reported and their money returned to their fathers’ executors’. Some may have vanished in the confusion left in a family where few survived, though only two families in this population are known to have been totally wiped out.25 Perhaps, in epidemics, some children were sent out to the country towns and villages whence their parents had come to be apprenticed in London. It is hard to believe, however, that a girl would marry without her dowry.

In their turn, a number of the orphans later drew up wills: 23 boys, 5 girls and 10 of their husbands. As in the case of their parents, these documents are often an incomplete record. They may, and sometimes do, give additional information about the number of their families, but they may also omit very important details. Before lamenting, with Sylvia Thrupp, the social decline of the city’s grandees, it should be noted that five of the wills of the girls’ husbands achieved PCC status and two of the orphan boys: a total of 7 for this generation: one more than for their fathers.26

That neither of the two male orphans concerned became aldermen may well reflect a change of aspiration rather than lack of ambition: and only one of the girls’ husbands followed this course.27 Two orphan boys had been given the means to go to the University of Oxford and John Brikles, in 1440, bequeathed money for a chantry, for five years, to be sung by a student at Cambridge. As both Barbara Hanawalt and Sylvia Thrupp suggest, the title the new generation coveted seems to have been that of ‘esquire’, denoting as it did, kinship with the knightly class of royal office. Four eventually did claim such status: of the girls of William Knyghtcote, one married an alderman, but the other two married into knightly families of Essex and Suffolk. Another heiress also married an Essex landowner. One wealthy girl, a bastard orphan, was notwithstanding married to ‘a valet of the Lord King’. These isolated cases do not support the theory, however, that there was a major exodus into the shires. Most of the orphan girls in this group appear to have married freemen of the city and clearly stayed there. At least five boys left widows with their own orphans.28 One daughter, following a family tradition, became a nun. Four of the boys became monks and one a
friar. On the death of her mother, the girl described as an ‘idiot’ was promptly sued by the rest of the family for her portion.

By 1436, the London Rate Assessment list only appears to carry the names of seven of the families in this enquiry. Search in the Letter Books and Calendars of Pleas and Memoranda, however, reveals 41 more families with the names of the fathers originally recorded. Given that the names of older children are often omitted in surviving records and the line of descent is now impossible to trace, particularly in the case of girls, it would seem reasonable to suggest that some of these surviving families were in fact the successors of the original ones. Even if some of the rich members of these families had withdrawn into the counties, yet they probably kept their connections with the city, since it is well known that the English gentry and aristocracy continued to keep roots in trade and sent their younger sons back into it, as apprentices in their turn.

Another factor in the ‘dynastic’ story is that some families with a long-established London connection were, in the natural course of events, coming to an end in the late fourteenth century: a process doubtless heavily accelerated by the repeated outbreaks of epidemics in the 50 years between 1349–99. The wonder must be that as many as 57 per cent of the orphans managed to survive, and this is to ignore the 62 children about whom nothing further is known. Further, if the older children culled from other sources are included, a survival rate of 1.84 per father emerges.

Conclusion

The size of surviving families has probably been under-estimated hitherto. The survival rate could therefore be somewhat higher than previously estimated, particularly after 1407, when outbreaks of plague became less frequent. More widows (77 per cent) acted as guardians in this period than Hanawalt’s estimate of 55 per cent for the years 1389–1428 suggests. The incidence of remarriage, for this generation, may be less, however. Third and fourth marriages were probably rarer than supposed.

A number of families survived into the next generation and beyond, even if only calculated on the basis of the male line. The names of many in this survey continued well into the fifteenth century. It would be dangerous to assume that none of these were lineally descended from the fathers originally listed and this would seem to suggest that more freemen’s families may have continued to live in London than in the case of the wealthy aldermen who were in the best position to purchase country estates for their descendants.

NOTES

5. Unless required to do so, by her husband's will, a widow could assume the right of guardianship without appearing at Guildhall for five years after his death. CLB K, 5 footnote.
7. One third to the widow, one third to be divided between the testator's young children, and the remainder, known as 'the testator's third', could be left in personal bequests, including gifts to the church for masses and charitable works.
8. For example, Adam Haket, Bowyer, left over £750 and John Gilbert, Painter, about £900.
9. If, however, known older children are added in, the figures become: 10 families with four living children, six with five, two with six and one with eight.
16. The widows who married a third time were: Maud Andrew/Vyne/Constantyn; Matilda atte Myln/ Wakelee/Dallyng; Dionisia Claverynge/Hatfelde/ Olney; Margaret Hothom/Sibille/Grace. One married four times: Margaret Berlyngam/Philpot/Fitznichol/Bamme.
17. Geoffrey Patrik, scrivener, in his will (Co. Hu. (ii) 147–8) made the dower of his widow, dependent on her not remarrying, perhaps to ensure the care of their 'idiot' daughter, Cecelia.
22. Richard Cok (d. 1397), CP&M 1381–1412 255, 268; William Lynne (d. 1421), PCC 52, 54 MARCHE; Thomas Herkestede (d. 1424), L.Com. 3 123v.; John Prynce (d. 1421), CLB I 255; William Wyght (d. 1409), CLB I 80.
23. Agnes Cok; her indenture recorded CP&M 1364–81 219 (Roll A21 Membr. 8).
24. John, son of John de Gartone (d. 1362), was aged nine years when his father died and had already been married with his father's consent; CLB H 52. John Costantyn was married to Philippa Peche, his guardian's daughter, during his minority and succeeded in obtaining an annulment when he came of age; CLB H 16, 102, 293.
25. The families of John Nedham (1391/2) and William Pursere (1390).
26. Orphans' Wills proved in PCC: John Godyn (1463) and William Lynne (1421). Husbands of the orphan girls with wills in PCC: William Doners (1439) married Johanna Leget; Richard Forster (1411) husband of Idonea Knyghtcote; John Sybille (1401) whose wife was Margaret Gylle; John Barley (1409) who had married Dionisia Sutton and John Longe (1460) whose widow has been Matilda Adam. See also Thrupp, The Merchant Class, chapter 5.
27. Thomas Aley, mercer and husband of Margery Knyghtcote.
28. See endnote 22, above.
29. William Clerk (Carmelite); John Frensshe (Merton Abbey); Thomas Goldyngham (Croxton Abbey, Leics.); William Hake (Augustinian); Henry Thomlyn (Monastery at Lewes); Matilda Toky (Kelbourne Priory).
30. CLB H 431.
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Introduction

Ever since the publication of E. A. Wrigley's and R. S. Schofield's volume *The Population history of England 1541–1871* an intriguing question concerning rural-urban migration in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has been posed. The authors' procedure known as 'back projection', confirmed what had long been suspected, that English populations experienced a period of unusually slow growth in the century after 1650. From 1650 to 1750 the population of England increased only marginally from 5.2 millions to 5.7 millions. This may be contrasted with a rise of 2.2 millions in the period 1550 to 1650 and approximately 11 millions between 1750 and 1850.

What is intriguing about these figures is that during this period of very slow growth London and the provincial towns were growing faster than ever before. London's population appears to have grown from about 400,000 in 1650 to 675,000 in 1750 but to counter-balance the burial surpluses and enable the City to grow net immigration must have been about 8,000 per annum. In the provinces, Nottingham's population for example increased from over 5,000 in 1674 to 10,720 in 1739. Since less than 300 of this came by natural increase of baptisms over burials we may infer a high immigration rate of over 90 per cent of the gross increase. From the above examples it would appear that during the second half of the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries large numbers of people were forsaking the countryside in order to find new forms of employment in the developing centres.

In recent years there has not been any shortage of papers describing the growth of urban communities in the early modern period. However, the corollary, rural depopulation, is still a largely unexplored field and only two examples may usefully be quoted here. In mid-Wharfedale in the Old West Riding some 3,000 souls are reported as having left the valley settlements in the 80 or so years between 1664 and 1743 (Figure 1). And from the East Riding, for roughly the same period, Susan Neave found substantial rural settlement contraction with particular reference to Harthill, Bainton Beacon division (Figure 1). From these, admittedly few, examples it seems not improbable that in the century after 1650
there occurred a significant shift in numbers from agricultural to non-agricultural forms of employment. In view of Professor Wrigley's current interest concerning a better understanding of the industrial revolution, the possibility of a substantial transfer of labour from village to town at a relatively early date is of very considerable interest.⁸ The purpose of the present study is to observe patterns of rural/urban migration from both sides as this occurred within the historic county of Yorkshire during the period c. 1670 to 1743.

The period selected for study is determined by the existence of two sources of evidence: several seventeenth-century hearth tax assessments chiefly dated to the 1670s and an Archiepiscopal Visitation of 1743. Each return provides information on population in terms either of numbers of households or families present within a parish at the appropriate date. Unless otherwise stated the word 'population' when used in the present paper means families and not individuals.

One well known procedure used to arrive at figures of net migration involves the use of two or more estimates together with aggregative figures of baptisms and burials from parish registers over the same period of time. Starting with the first estimate one adds the baptisms and subtracts the burials until the second estimate is reached, the resultant discrepancy being ascribed either to emigration or immigration as the case may be.⁹ Rewarding though this procedure certainly is, it is far too laborious when dealing with more than 2,000 townships or approximately 640 parishes and chapelries as in the present study, and some less demanding technique has to be found. Fortunately, there is not too much difficulty here.

It is a truism that at a time when the population of England was either stationary or growing but slowly a rise or fall in numbers at local level may be roughly equated with immigration or emigration. Or put in another way, urban growth in these circumstances is largely an index of net migration.¹⁰

In the present study the adopted procedure has been to compare the number of households recorded in the hearth tax assessment with the number of families noted in the Archiepiscopal Visitation some seventy years later. The calculated difference between the two totals is then attributed to emigration or immigration as appropriate. In order to provide some check on the reliability of the estimates, the longer and more detailed method involving aggregative totals from the registers was used in some 60 parishes, that is nearly 10 per cent of the total. Implicit in the use of these demographic sources is the concept of a 'migrant family' which is often false; more usually adolescents and young adults form a disproportionate number of most migrants.

The resulting picture suggests that population change in Yorkshire was extremely diverse in the period studied, migration being the outstanding characteristic (Figure 1). It was the principal factor in determining the rise or fall in local populations throughout the county. It would seem that decisions on whether to move or stay were influenced by the presence or otherwise of work opportunity in the non-agricultural sector within the parish. Although many agricultural parishes sustained a reasonable growth rate, overall numbers failed
to rise since many people born in the parish did not remain there all their lives. Although a number of country parishes where some form of non-agricultural employment existed grew modestly, for example a market town, such parishes seldom reached their full potential as many of the indigenous population moved out. By contrast, many urban and industrial parishes grew in excess of their natural increase – in some cases natural decrease – showing that large numbers of immigrants were regularly adding to the native population. In summary, there appears to be a clear correlation between the development of secondary and tertiary employment on the one hand and increased population on the other.

The sources

The hearth tax figures are taken from a publication prepared by J. D. Purdy, *Yorkshire hearth tax returns.* These returns are considered by Purdy to be the best available for each of the three Yorkshire Ridings. Factors determining their choice were first, the state of preservation and completeness of a document and secondly, the desirability of selecting assessments for all three Ridings which were as near as possible in date to each other. Accordingly, the East Riding assessment for Michaelmas 1672, the North Riding assessment for Michaelmas 1670 and the West Riding assessment for Lady Day 1672 were chosen. The 1672 East Riding assessment, however, does not include the town of Kingston upon Hull nor Hullshire, its surrounding area and so these figures were taken from the 1673 East Riding assessment. Similarly, as the Osgoldcross wapentake list in the 1672 West Riding assessment is badly damaged the 1674 West Riding assessment was substituted. The Michaelmas 1672 assessment was used for York City (not strictly in any Riding for it borders all three) and the 1665 assessment, the only one extant for the Ainsty of York.

The hearth tax assessments show that the East Riding was the least populous of the three with 16,069 recorded households, 12,400 of which were chargeable and 3,669 exempt both by reason of poverty and by certificate. The North Riding the second most populous and the largest in area, had a total of 24,070 households, 18,245 of which were chargeable and 5,825 exempt. The West Riding, undoubtedly the most prosperous and populous of the three had a total of 38,531 households of which 34,849 were charged and 3,682 exempt.

As is well known, listings of inhabitants drawn up for fiscal purposes are frequently deceptive. The 1672 West Riding return is a case in point. Although there are more names in this return than any other in the series it is nevertheless incomplete. The figure of 3,682 non-charged households or some 10 per cent of the total is substantially below that which might be expected. On the evidence of the two other Ridings, the East's 23 per cent and the North's 24 per cent and some other English counties it might be expected that the West Riding's total would be between 20 and 30 per cent of the total in most townships. According to Purdy the reason for this failure of evidence is that the West Riding collectors systematically noted only one category of pauper, namely those omitted by poverty because few full lists of those exempted by certificate were made.
Table 1  Charged and non-charged households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riding</th>
<th>charged</th>
<th>non-charged</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>non-charged as % of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>3,669</td>
<td>16,069</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>18,245</td>
<td>5,825</td>
<td>24,070</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>34,849</td>
<td>14,935*</td>
<td>49,784*</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>67,181</td>
<td>24,863</td>
<td>92,044</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
* = Figures adjusted by 30 per cent

For the purpose of attempting to establish a total population for the West Riding it was therefore decided to follow Purdy's suggestion and increase the region's exemptions from 10 per cent to 30 per cent. This would give a figure of 14,935 and a total of 49,784 (Table 1).

In the light of more recent work it might be argued that the Yorkshire figures generally are too low and that the true proportion of exempt households in all three Ridings could be as high as 30 per cent or more of the total number of households in the returns. If this were true it would have the effect of making rural depopulation in the Yorkshire parishes much greater than is shown and the rise of the towns and other developing centres correspondingly less. It would not of course overturn the results. Until firm evidence is produced, such as lost bundles of exemption certificates for the Yorkshire villages, there is no alternative but to use the existing material, as other scholars have done, and remind ourselves that the present study is not dealing in arithmetical exactitudes but aims to show the general trends and tendencies of the period.

Neither is the Archiepiscopal return of 1743 as complete as one might wish. In 1743 parts of Yorkshire lay outside the York Diocese. The Deaneries of Catterick and Richmond in the North Riding, Lonsdale (Yorkshire part) and Boroughbridge in the West Riding lay in the Archdeaconry of Richmond which belonged then to the Diocese of Chester. Also missing from the West Riding is Ripon, a peculiar of the Archbishop (Figure 1). Besides the omission of these parishes from our study there are 36 others (including some in York) where the incumbent in charge either refused to answer the Archbishop's questions or otherwise denied knowledge of the number of families residing within his parish. In order to make the two sets of figures compatible, the hearth tax equivalent of the missing 1743 parishes has been deducted from the hearth tax totals (Table 2).

In assessing the value of the Anglican returns it is recognised that some appear to be approximate especially for the larger parishes particularly those in the West Riding. Almondbury for instance had about 1,300 families (excluding
Table 2 Hearth tax totals less the equivalent of missing 1743 parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riding</th>
<th>hearth tax total</th>
<th>missing 1743 parishes</th>
<th>new total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>1,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>16,069</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>15,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>24,070</td>
<td>8,254</td>
<td>15,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>49,784*</td>
<td>7,414</td>
<td>42,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>92,044</td>
<td>16,917</td>
<td>75,127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * = figures inflated 30 per cent.

chapelries), Bradford above 2,000, Bingley about 600, Wakefield about 1,400 and Rotherham upwards of 950 (excluding chapelries). Such very approximate returns raise obvious questions concerning their reliability and contrast quite sharply with the much more careful counts for mainly smaller parishes and chapelries. These include in the West Riding, Bramley 171 families (chapel of Leeds), Ackworth 122, Featherstone about 137, Darfield about 257 (excluding chapelries) and Hemsworth 118 and many more which suggest that some returns can be trusted much more than others.

An inescapable problem encountered in the use of Anglican returns for the purpose of establishing a total population is the nature and extent of Dissent. According to the returns used here Dissenting interests of one kind or another appear in 437 out of the 640 parishes under consideration. Apart from the beginning of the Methodist revival the most significant factor in this part of the return is the wide prevalence of the Society of Friends in town and country in 1743 and that but for them there was little or no Dissent then in the country parishes. Neither is it without interest that the return's date, 1743, more or less coincides with the end of a general and remarkable decay in all the older forms of Dissent. John Wesley's conversion dated to 1738 heralded an evangelical revival but in 1743 this had hardly begun. The Romanist cause too was very far from flourishing and in many parts of the county a downward trend particularly among the gentry is reported to have started. A comparison of dissenting congregations in 1676 and 1743 confirms a declining trend in all forms of Dissent (Table 3). Some Yorkshire parishes are unfortunately missing from the Compton Census and care has been taken to include in Table 3 only those which appear in both returns. It is also true that many 1743 incumbents can be shown to have had an intimate knowledge of the presence and strength of dissenting congregations in their parishes, often giving not only the number of families but even individuals residing in the households of otherwise conforming families. In Stillingfleet the vicar reports, 'we have in our parish 101 families of which we have one family of Quakers, one master of a family, a Roman Catholic, and one Mistress of a family, a Quaker.' True, in some very large town parishes the clergy on their own admission had need to resort to intelligent guesswork as strict enumeration of dissenting families was quite out of the question. In Coley
Table 3 Numbers of dissenting congregations in 1676 and 1743

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riding</th>
<th>1676 n.</th>
<th>1743 n.</th>
<th>Losses &amp; Gains</th>
<th>1676 %</th>
<th>1743 n.</th>
<th>1743 losses &amp; gains</th>
<th>1743 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>-58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Chapelry the incumbent reports, 'We have in this Chapelry near eight hundred families; of these I think about a hundred and fifty are Presbyterians, and two or three Quakers. Bearing in mind the foregoing arguments it seems reasonable to believe that although the 1743 dissenting congregations perhaps may be 'on the lower side of accuracy' they are not damagingly so.

Confirmation that emigration was the determining factor in the decline of the agricultural parishes comes from two sizeable studies and a small random sample of isolated parishes. In the West Riding Deaneries of Craven and Old Ainsty nine Wharfedale parishes lying north of the Yorkshire coalfields (Figure 1) exhibit a combined baptismal surplus of 2,409 persons between 1664 and 1743. At the same time their combined estimated populations fell from 7,178 to 6,687. It would appear from the Wharfedale figures that some 2,900 (2,409 + 491) souls left the valley settlements in this period. Similarly, Susan Neave in her study of rural populations in the East Riding Deanery of Harthill (14 small adjacent parishes in Harthill wapentake) has shown that population in this area fell from a total of 3,771 persons in 1672 to 2,948 in 1743 (Figure 1). Yet according to the parish registers baptisms exceeded burials by 702. Neave concludes that some 1,525 people (702 + 823) permanently left the region during these years. And again the parish registers of fourteen depopulated parishes scattered across the county show a combined baptismal surplus of 1,782 persons. However according to the estimates their combined populations fell from 10,341 to 7,757 making a total loss of 4,366 (1,782 + 2,584).

Even allowing for the possibility that one series may be more deficient than the other there can be no doubt that losses of this order of magnitude in the absence of prolonged interludes of high mortality may reasonably be ascribed to emigration.

To complete the assessment of the reliability of the demographic sources used in the present study we need to consider the question of boundary correspondence. A comparative study of fiscal and ecclesiastical returns utilised for demographic purposes is only valid when the two areas represented by the returns are compatible. In Yorkshire this is a rare phenomenon as fiscal and ecclesiastical
interests seldom coincide. The hearth tax was collected by township, grouped according to wapentake or hundred and ultimately according to Riding. The Anglican Returns relate to parish or chapelry, may be grouped according to Deanery but the Riding, not being relevant to ecclesiastical interests, is not necessarily respected.

This lack of boundary correspondence is further exacerbated by the size of many Yorkshire parishes. More than half of Yorkshire's near 1,000 parishes contain 2 or more townships, sometimes many more and exceptionally at Halifax, 23. These multi-township parishes not infrequently transcend the boundaries of wapentakes and hundreds so that a population affiliated to one parish church, may, for taxation purposes, belong to two or more wapentakes or hundreds. One way to resolve the problem caused by an incompatibility of boundary is to re-order the hearth tax figures into parish groupings and use the Deanery as opposed to the wapentake or hundred for comparative purposes at regional level. This removes most of the obstacles encountered in attempting to ensure that the two sets of figures, fiscal and ecclesiastical are strictly comparable. However, it leaves one anomaly. Two Deaneries relative to the present study Dickering and Bulmer are unusual in that they transcend the boundary running between the East and North Ridings (Figure 1). In these two areas the boundary of the ecclesiastical parish which lies coincident with that of the Riding has been used to mark the Riding division. Where the Dickering and Bulmer Deaneries transcend the Riding boundary the parish figures on either side of the line have been separately totalled and allocated to the appropriate Riding. By adopting this somewhat laborious procedure Yorkshire populations are able to be compared at parish, regional and Riding level at two points in time.

Finally, there is the question of how to 'number the people'. In his work on the Warwickshire hearth tax assessments of 1662–1674. T. Arkell came to the firm conclusion that the hearth tax figures represent households or families which were synonymous in the seventeenth century, and not houses. This view accords well with the findings of the present writer on Yorkshire. The present writer's observations on the 1743 Visitation Return lead to a similar conclusion. The incumbent of Campsal (Doncaster Deanery) reports that 'there are about 238 distinct families in our parish but several of them small and some having but a single person in them.' And from Bishop Burton (Harthill Deanery), 'If those only are to be reckoned families, where more than one dwell together, I have then but eighty-two families; but if every single person who has a room or house to himself or herself, must be taken into that number, there are twelve such, which will then make ninety-four families in all.'

In the present study there is no attempt to convert households or families into individuals by applying a conversion factor deemed suitable to a particular location or period. To do so would only introduce a further element of uncertainty and as Arkell observes, 'since families or households were the basic unit of pre-industrial society in a way in which they are no longer, it should be a perfectly satisfactory method of recording the size and growth of communities.'
Table 4  Yorkshire populations in c. 1672 and 1743

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riding</th>
<th>1672</th>
<th>1743</th>
<th>increase n.</th>
<th>increase %</th>
<th>decrease n.</th>
<th>decrease %</th>
<th>total net increase n.</th>
<th>total net increase %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>2,303</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>15,152</td>
<td>12,622</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,891</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>15,816</td>
<td>16,716</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,891</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>42,370</td>
<td>58,377</td>
<td>16,007</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,891</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>75,127</td>
<td>90,018</td>
<td>17,421</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,891</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It remains only to emphasise that the study's results are intended to show an accurate demographic trend in the period; it makes no claim to arithmetical accuracy. It is possible that in the future the results may be refined or modified but it is unlikely that they will be dramatically over-turned.

Population change in Yorkshire c. 1672 to 1743

According to the estimates based on the hearth tax returns there were 92,044 families living in the historic county of Yorkshire in c. 1672. Of these 75,127 inhabited the area presently under review (Table 2). By 1743 according to the Visitation this number had increased to 90,018 that is by 20 per cent. Growth rates in the three Ridings varied markedly. In the East numbers actually declined from a total of 15,152 to 12,622 a drop of 16.7 per cent. In the North they slightly increased from 15,816 to 16,716 a gain of 5.7 per cent and in the West they increased from 42,370 to 58,377, a gain of 38 per cent. In York town families also increased from 1,789 to 2,303 or 29 per cent (Table 4). Growth rates achieved within the Ridings also varied considerably from one Deanery to another (Table 5).

The demographic changes identified in Tables 4 and 5 are graphically illustrated in four Yorkshire parish maps (Figs 1, 2, 3 and 4). The depopulated parishes are principally devoted to agriculture whether this be predominantly pastoral as in parts of the West and North Ridings or crop-growing as is widely found in the East Riding. Conversely, parishes characterised by growth are almost exclusively to be found in areas where non-farming activities predominate as in a county town, some minster and market towns, a few inland or coastal ports but above all the developing centres of the West Riding.

Bearing in mind the almost stationary nature of English population as a whole at this time it is reasonable to conclude that the demographic pattern that has emerged represents a general transition from farming to other forms of employment and one that occurs at a comparatively early date. Conclusive proof would require refining the figures to distinguish between on the one hand parish increase or decrease and on the other net immigration or emigration. This
Table 5 Yorkshire populations in c. 1672 and 1743 by Deanery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riding</th>
<th>Deanery</th>
<th>1672</th>
<th>1743</th>
<th>increase n.</th>
<th>increase %</th>
<th>decrease n.</th>
<th>decrease %</th>
<th>net change n.</th>
<th>net change %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Buckrose</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>-530</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulmer (lower)</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dickering (lower)</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>1,934</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harthill</td>
<td>7,614</td>
<td>6,413</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>-530</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holderness</td>
<td>3,014</td>
<td>2,513</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>15,152</td>
<td>12,622</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2,530</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Bulmer (upper)</td>
<td>4,463</td>
<td>3,584</td>
<td>-879</td>
<td>-19.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>6,143</td>
<td>7,319</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dickering (upper)</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rydall</td>
<td>4,030</td>
<td>3,918</td>
<td>-112</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>15,816</td>
<td>16,716</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td></td>
<td>991</td>
<td>+900</td>
<td>+5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Ainstie (New)</td>
<td>5,664</td>
<td>5,003</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ainstie (Old)</td>
<td>4,722</td>
<td>8,355</td>
<td>3,633</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craven</td>
<td>6,114</td>
<td>6,320</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>10,346</td>
<td>11,869</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pontefract</td>
<td>15,524</td>
<td>26,830</td>
<td>11,306</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>42,370</td>
<td>58,377</td>
<td>16,668</td>
<td></td>
<td>661</td>
<td>+16,007</td>
<td>+38.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

would require the counting of baptisms and burials recorded in the registers of every parish in the county. But as already said this is beyond the scope of the present author’s researches and until such an imaginative scheme is undertaken for the county as a whole, perhaps on a co-operative basis, the evidence of some 60 detailed studies (almost one tenth of the total) in different parts of the county will have to suffice.

**West Riding**

The precise destination of Yorkshire emigrants is not of course known for certain but it is not improbable that at least some would find their way into parishes in south and west Yorkshire in the West Riding. In this region the natural resources of coal, stone, iron and soft water, has affected the development of population centres and industry from the post-medieval period onwards. Numerous industries took root in the region but two textiles in the north and iron-making in the south – prevailed above all others. The textile and iron-making trades provided employment for many thousands of families both native-born and immigrant as the following examples demonstrate.

The West Riding Deanery of Old Ainsty increased its population by an estimated 3,633 families or 77.0 per cent in the period (Table 5). Most of the increase is traceable to parishes lying on the northern part of the Yorkshire coalfields.
Leeds for example, a woollen manufacturing town, increased from an estimated 1,594 to approximately 4,651 or by 192 per cent. The town's rapid growth is even more impressive once it is realised that throughout the period burials exceeded baptisms except briefly between 1700 and 1715, when the supremacy of baptisms is pronounced. Even in the short period up to 1700 burials were in excess of baptisms by some 3,023 or c. 703 families. The conclusion that in this period Leeds' spectacular growth is principally due to immigration is inescapable. Leeds chapelries also appear to have benefited from net immigration as they show a combined gain of 64 per cent (973/1,596).

To the south in Pontefract Deanery numbers increased by an estimated 11,306 families or 73 per cent. A substantial part of the increase is traceable to parishes on the western uplands where many families were employed in the making of woollen cloth. Almondbury rose from an estimated 964 to 1,740 (80 per cent), Huddersfield from an estimated 849 to 1,303 (53 per cent), Wakefield from an estimated 923 to 1,400 (52 per cent) and most dramatic of all Halifax grew from an estimated 3,343 to 10,537 (215 per cent) (Figure 2). It is obvious that gains such as these could only be possible if there were a strong element of immigration. Almondbury provides a good illustration. The parish register shows that 300 of the parish's estimated 776 gain is due to parish increase, from which an immigration figure of around 476 may be inferred (964 + 300 + 476 = 1,740).

In addition to these large textile parishes Pontefract Deanery had thirteen smaller towns and villages similarly engaged which were either situated between the larger towns or extended westwards along the Pennine valleys Aire, Calder and Colne. Their combined population estimates increased from 4,848 in 1672 to 8,124 in 1743 or by 68 per cent implying a considerable immigration factor.

Doncaster Deanery's modest growth of 1,523 families or 14.7 per cent is mainly attributable to the iron-working towns and villages in the west and south. In this region deposits of iron ore have influenced the development of metal-fashioning trades since at least the time of Elizabeth I. In the early modern period, cutlery, tool-making and wire-drawing for the woolcomb makers were the principal goods produced (Figure 2). Sheffield, an important cutlery town in the Deanery increased from an estimated 1,191 in 1672 to 2,000 in 1743 or by 68 per cent. Ecclesfield lying to the north increased from 940 to 1,108 or 18 per cent and Rotherham's population grew from an estimated 610 to 1,053 (72 per cent). There can be no doubt that urban growth on this scale occurring at a time when national populations were almost stationary is irrefutable evidence that large numbers of families were moving into the towns.

The industrial zone examined so far corresponds fairly well with the Pennine valleys' natural resources of coal, iron, grit and soft water. Eastwards from this zone an ever-increasing number of parishes took advantage of some of the finest farming country in the county, and, as might be expected, they remained agricultural. It would appear that farming even on these fertile soils was not sufficiently attractive to keep the work force and in consequence many parishes failed to grow (Figure 2).
The remaining two Deaneries in the West Riding, Craven and New Ainsty are substantially food-producing (Figure 2). Craven Deanery which partly occupies the limestone uplands and grits increased its numbers by an estimated 206 families or 3.3 per cent. This modest growth is attributable to 10 parishes, only two of which are agricultural out of a possible 29, listed in both returns. These are three market towns, Giggleswick 389/438, Kettlewell 106/121 and Long Preston 231/300; five industrial villages Keighley 359/450, Kildwick/Silsden 706/700, Bingley 391/600, Barnoldswick 131/200, Mitton/Waddington 314/415 and two agricultural parishes Marton 57/60 and Bolton by Bowland 106/146. Parish register information is available for 6 of these parishes but only one Mitton/Waddington suggests that net immigration may have contributed to the parish’s growth. Its natural increase is 57 as against an estimated increase of 101. Bingley with its 53 per cent gain (391/600) also looks a likely candidate for growth through immigration.

New Ainsty Deanery on lower lying ground further east declined by an estimated 661 families or 11.7 per cent (Figure 2). Out of its 38 parishes growth is apparent in just 11 of which 4 are agricultural. These are one market town Spofforth/Wetherby, 378/404, one urban centre Tadcaster, 143/250, four industrial villages Barwick 230/240, Aberford 61/104 Garforth 59/85 and Kippax 101/170, one inland port, Cawood 157/165 and four agricultural parishes totalling 121/148. Apart from Tadcaster (75 per cent gain) growth rates in these parishes appear to be innocent of net immigration. Kippax parish makes the point. Its estimated increase is 69, its natural increase, 70.

In summary, the greater the distance from the industrial heartland the less the chance that non-agricultural parishes would grow through a process of net immigration. It is also worthy of note that parishes lying in areas where the patterning of growth and decline is least clear-cut as for example east of the industrial zone, are most stable; fluctuations in many parishes vary by not more than 10 per cent either way.

East Riding

Outside the Old West Riding relatively few parishes show significant signs of growth and those that do are, in the main, urban or semi-urban in character. Evidence of industrial development in the East and North Ridings is extremely rare in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

York, historically the county town, embraces some 30 parishes within its bounds (Figure 3). Twenty-five of the 30 City parishes answered the Archbishop’s questions and these indicate that the population had increased from an estimated 1,789 in 1672 to 2,303 in 1743, a gain of 29 per cent. What proportion of the 514 increase is due to net immigration is not of course known. Parish register aggregations are available for eight parishes. These record a combined burial surplus of 2,020 people or c. 470 families between the specified dates. Yet the estimated population in 1672 is 746 rising to 921 in 1743 suggesting an immigration factor of 645, \((746 - 470 = 276 + 645 = 921)\). These figures show that
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in almost one third of the City's parishes the population increased as a direct consequence of net immigration.

The East Riding's decline from an estimated 15,152 families to 12,622 or 16.7 per cent is a trend observed in each of the Riding's five Deaneries (Table 5, Figure 3). Harthill Deanery occupying a central position in the Riding sustained a loss of 1,201 or 15.8 per cent. Out of the 62 parishes, some lying on wold and some on plain, only 9 are seen to have grown. Beverley, the county town and a prosperous commercial centre increased from an estimated 751 to 890 (19 per cent) in the period.36 Beverley's growth appears to have influenced nearby Bishop Burton 69/94 and Rowley 52/64. Other growth areas in Harthill include the market town of Pocklington 199/268 and Pocklington's immediate neighbours Wilberfoss 80/104 and Great Givendale 14/15; and three parishes situated on navigable rivers, Aughton 75/80, Hutton Cranswick 143/148 and Hessle 98/111.

To the west is Bulmer Deanery whose population declined by an estimated 315 families or 25.3 per cent in the period (Figure 3). Of the Deanery's nine parishes, all of which occupy an area of low-lying ground between two rivers, only two slightly increased, Hemingborough 283/c. 300 and Stilling-fleet 93/101. Both parishes are located on navigable rivers. Buckrose Deanery to the north east, one of the least prosperous areas in the Riding, lies almost entirely on the Wolds (Figure 3).37 Its population shrank from an estimated 1,045 to 834 or 20.2 per cent in the period. Out of a total of 24 parishes for which estimates are available at both dates, only one, Sherburn, experienced growth 57/60.

The population of the large Deanery of Holderness which covers most of the claylands on the plain in the south east of the Riding declined by an estimated 501 families or 16.6 per cent (Figure 3). Out of its total of 45 parishes named in both surveys only seven are seen to have grown. Roos and Hilston situated towards the south 62/72 and five others apparently centred on Sigglesthorne which together increased from an estimated 254 to 355. Some parishes in this group would certainly enjoy a variety of sea-faring trades but as to the rest no firm explanation offers itself as to why they too should have been growing.

South Dickering Deanery to the north occupies both wold and plain (Figure 3). Its population fell by an estimated 302 or 13.5 per cent in the period. The Deanery includes within its bounds some 27 parishes mentioned in both surveys, but only two, Bridlington 535/601 and Flamborough 101/120 show evidence of growth. Bridlington the only town in the Deanery, together with its neighbour Flamborough formed a natural harbour well known in historical literature. Surprisingly, neither parish appears to owe its growth to net immigration as the detailed figures for Bridlington confirm. Burial and baptism aggregations for Bridlington produce a baptismal surplus of 353 or c. 82 families whereas the estimated gain is only 66 families.
North Riding

Within the North Riding there appears to have been neither a great exodus as in the East Riding nor yet an influx as in the West (Figure 4). Instead, its modest gain of 900 families or 5.7 per cent suggests perhaps that many families from agricultural parishes were moving into others within the Riding where alternative forms of employment were available (Table 5).

The small Deanery of upper Dickering lying on the coastal plain increased its population by an estimated 715 families or 60.6 per cent (Figure 4). Out of the Deanery's six parishes only one, Scarborough, showed growth but this growth was considerable 562/1500 or 167 per cent. This suggests that Scarborough as a prosperous trading and fishing port, an early Spa and the largest town in the Riding, absorbed immigrants from other parts of the Riding and possibly beyond.

To the west lay Rydall Deanery whose population declined by an estimated 112 families or 2.8 per cent (Figure 4). The Deanery is one of high moors and dales which partly explains the long strip-like shapes of some parishes. Out of its 36 parishes noted in both returns only seven show signs of growth. Six are market towns, Pickering 420/568, Malton 284/440, Old Malton 118/120, Kirby Moorside 217/326, Hovingham 129/160 and Helmsley 447/503 and one agricultural parish, Oswaldkirk 53/55. It would appear from the figures that the market towns of Malton and Kirby Moorside may have benefited in some measure from net immigration.

To the north lay Cleveland Deanery whose population grew by an estimated 1176 families or 19.1 per cent (Figure 4). Sixteen of the Deanery's 39 parishes show evidence of growth. One is the industrial village of Danby 146/300, seven are either coastal or inland ports, Whitby 739/1522, Marske 113/160, Lythe 362/423, Loftus 72/120, Hinderwell/Roxby 108/166, Fylingdales 197/300, and, on the Tees upstream from the coast, Yarm 131/220. Together they make an estimated gain of 1,343 or 72 per cent suggesting a considerable element of immigration. For two parishes, Marske and Yarm this can be shown to be true. Marske's estimated gain is 47 yet its natural increase only 28; Yarm's estimated gain is 89 but its natural increase 52. Another growth area is in the vale further south where seven parishes cluster around Stokesley a large market town 301/321. They are Kirkby in Cleveland 104/111, Seamer 58/60, Rudby 157/164, Craythorne 39/49, West Rounton 21/26, Carlton 48/70 and one out-lie Kirkby Sigston 49/50. None of these parish figures suggests that net immigration had contributed to their growth and in the case of Stokesley this can be demonstrated. Stokesley's natural increase is 56 and its estimated increase 20 from which an emigration factor of 36 may be inferred. It may be that an above average number of farming families in the area chose to remain in their native place in close proximity to the benefits of a market town.

Finally, Bulmer Deanery occupying much of the southern part of the central plain and extending into the Howardian Hills in the north, declined by an estimated 879 families or 19.7 per cent (Figure 4). Out of its c. 40 parishes only
eight show signs of growth. Of these, four are market towns, Easingwold 176/240, Kilburn 70/124, Felixkirk 158/187 and Thirsk 324/500 and four agricultural, Brafferton 83/92, South Kilvington 68/82, Terrington 96/100 and Strensall 61/62. Immigration may have contributed to the growth of Kilburn and Thirsk but Easingwold, the only parish for which burial and baptism aggregations are available apparently did not. Easingwold’s estimated increase is 64 and its natural increase, 109.

The cast of the argument in the preceding pages has been to suggest that during a period of unprecedented personal mobility agricultural parishes lost and non-agricultural gained. While this is broadly true there is something to be put on the other side. For example Hull an important port located at the confluence of the rivers Hull and Humber, sustained an estimated loss of 360 families or 26 per cent. According to the parish register burials exceeded baptisms by 4,467 or c.1,039 families and an immigration factor of 679 families was insufficient to counter-balance the burial excess. Northallerton, the county town of the North Riding, also declined from an estimated 401 to 355 or 11.5 per cent. Similarly Selby (West Riding) an inland port and minster town with a market fell from an estimated 341 to 300 and a few other market towns could be quoted. Although a few parishes clearly ran counter to the general trend they are numerically negligible and completely fail to undermine the general thesis of the present paper.

Conclusion

The materials at our disposal have portrayed an industrialising society in process of transition. The period covered by the textual sources coincides more or less with the time of England’s greatness, now thought to have occurred at least a century before the conventional date of the industrial revolution.38 Perhaps the single most remarkable feature of the study is the implied rise in agricultural output per head. Agriculture released many thousands of families for employment in non-farming activities yet food supplies were never in jeopardy. Through sheer rise in numbers industrial output must have increased phenomenally though not, of course, output per head. That lay in the future. Yorkshire was probably ahead of other English counties in the process of industrialisation but similar studies from other regions would help to complete the picture of this momentous period in England’s historic past.
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NOTES

13. Purdy, *Yorkshire hearth tax*, 50, 69 and 95. My West Riding figures differ from Purdy’s which read, total 38,869, charged 35,137, non-charged 3,732. Calculations throughout the study are based on my figures as set out in the text.
15. Purdy, *Yorkshire hearth tax*, 123. The explanation is a little confused. Purdy says percentage of those exempt would have been between 20 and 30 per cent of those who actually paid. But comparison with the other two Ridings makes it clear that non-charged should be between 20 and 30 percent of total number of households recorded.
23. Pickles, Mid-Wharfedale’, 32.
26. G. Lawton, *Collections relative to churches and chapels within the Diocese of York*, (London, 1842). The present work could not have been attempted without recourse to this scholarly work. It reconstructs parishes and Deaneries as they were before nineteenth-century reorganisation.
30. Arkell, 'Multiplying factors', 56. Where, however figures of natural increase from parish registers are quoted these have been converted into families using a conversion factor of 4.3.
31. An agricultural parish for the purpose of the present study is deemed to be agricultural where at least 50 per cent of all adult males are likely to have been engaged on the land, see M. H. Long, 'Study of occupations in Yorkshire from parish registers in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries', forthcoming.
33. Yasumoto, 'Urbanization and population' 64.
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Introduction

Many readers of this journal will be aware of the Lancaster-based research project on the longitudinal study of individual residential histories. The aim of this project was to collect a large quantity of individual residential histories from family historians and genealogists, and to use these data to shed new light on the pattern and process of residential mobility in the past. Between December 1993 and September 1995 a total of 1,388 respondents provided useable information on 16,091 individuals born between 1750 and 1930 who had undertaken a total of 73,864 recorded residential moves during their lifetimes. These data have now been analysed and this article reports some of the key results of the project. In one short article it is not possible to examine all aspects of the study. The paper simply summarizes some of the key findings which challenge or refine existing knowledge on migration in the past. Full details are being published elsewhere.

There is no shortage of well-researched studies of migration in Britain in the past. However, most published research suffers from inevitable constraints of the data or methodologies used. Thus nineteenth-century census-based studies can provide only a snapshot of information on place of birth and place of residence on census night, missing out the pattern and process of intermediate moves, whilst other research tends to utilise sources which focus either on specific groups of the population and/or on particular reasons for movement. Thus whilst migration studies using sources such as poor law certificates, apprenticeship registers, trade union and judicial records can provide valuable information they cannot alone reveal a complete life history of movement for a cross-section of the population. Studies using diaries, life histories and oral evidence do allow a longitudinal perspective, although it is hard to assess the typicality of the small number of individuals involved, and there have been some attempts to create longitudinal data for larger populations by linking conventional census and registration sources in local studies. Such research has suggested that some common generalizations about migration in the past may be ill-founded, but due to the time-consuming nature of record linkage it has not been possible to extend these studies beyond the local level. In some European countries, where continuous population registers are available, there has been a more thorough reappraisal of migration patterns in the past, with particular
emphasis on the very high rates of short-distance mobility which seemed to exist in almost all areas and time periods.⁹

Data collected from family historians and genealogists do not totally avoid the problems associated with other studies. It should be stressed that this research has not discovered a new data source, but it has utilised a large labour force of family historians and genealogists who have been able to combine a wide range of conventional sources with family papers and oral evidence to piece together a more complete record of the residential histories of individuals (their ancestors) than is usually possible in studies that are confined to particular sources or localities. The data set has been used to focus on four main areas where current knowledge is limited. First, the high-quality longitudinal data can test existing assumptions about the links between migration, urbanization and industrialization. Much migration theory is still derived from the work of Ravenstein,¹⁰ but it has never been tested against data which measure migration over the whole life course of a large number of individuals. Second, good quality comparative information is needed to examine spatial variations in the pattern and process of migration within Britain, rather than relying on case studies from scattered communities. Third, comparable data is needed over a sufficiently long time period to enable assessment of changes in the migration process, and associated migration differentials, during the mobility transition which Zelinsky hypothesised in relation to the processes of urbanization and industrialization.¹¹ Fourth, we currently know very little about why people moved in the past and the extent to which reasons for migration varied over time and space.

In studies of developing countries, where documentary evidence on migration is scarce, there is some history of using biographical approaches to the study of contemporary migration: constructing complete life-time residential histories from in-depth interviews.¹² There has also been recent debate about the use of biographical approaches in contemporary migration studies in Britain.¹³ This research effectively adopts a biographical approach to migration in the past by using individual life-time residential histories constructed by family historians and genealogists. The research represents a pioneering collaboration between academics and family historians/genealogists.¹⁴ In addition to shedding new light on the migration process, it also demonstrates the potential benefits of such collaboration.

Assessing the representativeness of the data

As this is the first time that data provided by family historians and genealogists have been used in a major academic research project, it is important that biases within the data set are fully assessed. Data were collected by asking family historians and genealogists to respond to calls for information published in relevant journals. Respondents were sent detailed instructions and data entry forms on which to record the residential histories of their ancestors, together with associated information on why people moved, with whom they moved, employment and housing change, and other key life events. Information was thus provided by a self-selected group of family historians and genealogists who,
Table 1  Comparison of selected characteristics of sample population with census data (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% female</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% age &lt;20</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% age 20–39</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% age 40–59</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% age 60+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status and gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% unmarried males</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% unmarried females</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% married males</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% married females</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% widowed males</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% widowed females</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census region of residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Midland</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midland</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Midland</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population size of settlement of residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5,000</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000–9,999</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000–19,999</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000–39,999</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000–59,999</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000–79,999</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,000–99,999</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000+</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

themselves, chose which life histories to report. Statistically they formed an unknown sample of an indeterminate total population. However, it is possible to assess the representativeness of some aspects of the data provided by taking cross-sections of the characteristics of all those alive in selected census years and comparing them with published census evidence. This was done for 1801, 1851, 1891 and 1951 (Table 1). It should be noted that there are bound to be some discrepancies because of the cut-off points imposed by our own data collection procedures: we only collected information on people born between 1750 and 1930 so it was not possible for the sample to include anyone older than 51 in 1801 or younger than 21 in 1951.
### Table 1  Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1931 Sample</th>
<th>1931 Census</th>
<th>1951 Sample</th>
<th>1951 Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional and</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** The characteristics of data collected from family historians are affected by the year of birth stipulated for people to be included in the sample. Data were collected for people born 1750–1930 thus particularly affecting sample characteristics in 1801 and 1951. Only limited comparative data are available from the 1801 census of Great Britain.

**Source:** Calculated from 16,091 residential life histories provided by family historians; census of Great Britain 1801, 1851; census of England and Wales 1891, 1931, 1951; census of Scotland 1891, 1931, 1951.

Biases in the data set are likely to occur due to the aims and methods of family historians or genealogists, and because of problems inherent in the various sources used to reconstruct residential histories. The main biases that emerge from the data are an over-representation of males (especially before the twentieth century), and of those who eventually married and lived into old age. The gender bias is due both to the difficulty of identifying women in many historical sources (especially for the more distant past) and the fact that there is a tendency for family historians to follow surnames down the male line. However, around one third of life histories do refer to women, thus providing a larger sample of female migrants than in many studies. The biases in age and (to a large extent) marital status are due to the fact that most of the individuals for whom we received information survived into adulthood, and many into old age. Nineteenth-century Britain had a predominantly young age structure, but with very high rates of infant mortality. Because the very young appear in fewer sources, and because family historians are primarily interested in those who survived and produced a family line, we received little information on those who died in childhood. However, there is no reason to believe that (had they lived) those who died young would have had mobility patterns which were significantly different from their siblings who survived. Of more consequence is the fact that adults who never married are also under-represented in the sample.

The geographical distribution of individuals in the database is quite close to the distribution of the population between British census regions, as is the distribution between settlements of various sizes. The main discrepancy is an under-representation of people living in very large towns (especially London) in the earlier time periods. This may reflect problems of tracing individuals in the metropolis. There is also a predictable bias towards those in higher socio-economic groups. Although the sample contains some migrants from all classes and occupations, the very poor are under-represented due mainly to the fact that
affluent and literate individuals were more likely to leave an historical record. In the twentieth century the data set may be further biased by the predominantly professional and middle-class backgrounds of family historians.

In addition to biases that can be checked against census evidence, there are other potential problems to which attention should be drawn. The relative paucity of information for the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries compared to later periods almost certainly means that some less visible short-distance moves were never recorded for the more distant past, and many stated reasons for migration — especially in the period before oral evidence — must have been based on informed conjecture rather than conclusive evidence. However, respondents were asked to state the sources which they used to ascertain the information provided and, overall, only 19.1 per cent of migration reasons were deduced from a single source. In most cases multiple sources, often including family papers or diaries were used, and although it is impossible to know with certainty why most people moved in the past, the data provided by family historians do seem to be based on the best available evidence. Furthermore, although the total data set is large, when broken down by time period, locality and population characteristics some samples become quite small. The data are thus best suited to examining broad regional trends rather than migration characteristics in specific places.

It should be stressed that in highlighting these biases we are in no way criticising the quality of information provided by family historians and genealogists. Our overall impression is of data which has been meticulously researched, and the biases are inevitable outcomes of the sources available and the objectives of researchers. None of the biases invalidates the data set, but they do influence interpretation. It should be stressed that the data were never intended to represent a statistically valid sample of the British population, and the data are not being used for inferential purposes. The strengths of the data are in the evidence they provide on the characteristics of migrants, on migration differentials, on the ways in which migration relates to the life course, on spatial and temporal variations in such characteristics and on the reasons why people moved over long and short distances. In this context there are two important aspects of representativeness to be assessed and taken into account in interpretation. First, are the samples of particular sub-groups of the population large enough to make meaningful statements about migration characteristics and behaviour within those sub-groups and, second, do those excluded from the sample have migration characteristics which were significantly different from those included? Although we do not claim that the longitudinal data on migration are perfect, we do believe that they are about as good as it is possible to obtain. The biases that exist can be clearly demonstrated and taken into account in subsequent interpretation.

Migration patterns and processes

Analysis of all moves undertaken during an individual’s lifetime emphasises the significance of frequent short-distance mobility and places infrequent but often
Table 2  Distance (kms) moved by time period (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0–4.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0–9.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0–19.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0–49.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0–99.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0–199.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.0+</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean distance moved | 37.7 kms | 33.7 kms | 38.4 kms | 55.5 kms |
Sample size         | 8,202    | 19,670   | 20,944   | 17,878   |

Source: Calculated from 16,091 residential life histories provided by family historians. Data in the table only includes moves within Britain.

more visible moves over longer distances and to larger towns in a clearer perspective. Most movement undertaken in all time periods was short-distance and contained within regional migration systems, migrants to the major towns were drawn mainly from surrounding areas, and only London had a truly national migration field. This is demonstrated in Figures 1 and 2 which map moves to, from and within the census region of the West Midlands. Inevitably such maps over-emphasise longer-distance moves as very short-distance mobility within communities cannot be represented at this scale. This pattern was quite stable over time, but with well-known changes in the (relatively small) component of inter-regional migration as Midland and South-Eastern England attracted disproportionate numbers of migrants in the twentieth century. Mean migration distances were quite similar until 1880 (around 35 kms) but increased in the twentieth century to some 55kms (Table 2). However, it can be suggested that this increase was less than might be expected given parallel changes in communications and affluence. There is little evidence to support Zelinsky’s hypothesis of a mobility transition from low to high levels of mobility in the nineteenth century,¹⁷ and results are broadly consistent with recent evidence on the continuity of high levels of short-distance population mobility in continental Europe.¹⁸

Although previous studies based on life-time moves have examined inter-regional flows, longitudinal evidence emphasises the relative unimportance of long-distance moves in all time periods. For most people, for most of the time, migration was short-distance and contained within a well-defined regional migration system. Spatial analysis of the data also emphasises the degree to which all parts of Britain experienced essentially similar trends. The most distinctive British region was Highland Scotland, which experienced more long-distance in- and out-migration than other areas. However, elsewhere, despite obvious economic, social and cultural differences, all British regions were
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Figure 1.A Migration into the West Midland census region 1750–1879

Source: Lifetime residential histories provided by family historians.
Figure 1.8 Migration out of the West Midland census region 1750–1879

Source: Lifetime residential histories provided by family historians.
Figure 1.C Migration within the West Midland census region 1750–1879

Source: Lifetime residential histories provided by family historians.
Figure 2. A Migration into the West Midland census region after 1879

Source: Lifetime residential histories provided by family historians.
Figure 2.B  Migration out of the West Midland census region after 1879

Source: Lifetime residential histories provided by family historians.
Figure 2.C  Migration within the West Midland census region after 1879

Source: Lifetime residential histories provided by family historians.
experiencing essentially the same migration patterns and processes. The structure of migration shown in Figures 1 and 2 for the West Midlands is replicated for almost every other British region. These data also have implications for debates about the nature of British regions and the extent to which they were integrated into a national economic and social structure during the industrial revolution.\(^9\) Evidence drawn from the longitudinal migration data suggests that whilst there was a national London-based migration system, elsewhere most interaction was contained within regional economies.

It is usually assumed that the nineteenth-century migration system was dominated by rural to urban movement as people moved either to towns within their local region or, through a series of stepwise moves, progressed up the urban hierarchy.\(^{10}\) However, analyses that have demonstrated such patterns have been based mainly on cross-sectional information. Analysis of longitudinal data challenges these assumptions and highlights the relatively small role which movement up the urban hierarchy played in the total migration system. Moreover, there was also significant movement down the urban hierarchy throughout the period under study. Overall, only 17.8 per cent of all moves were to a larger settlement (using eight settlement size categories defined at four census dates), and almost as many moves were to smaller settlements. The vast majority of moves were either within one settlement or to other places of a similar size (Table 3). Before 1880 movement up the urban hierarchy exceeded migration to smaller places, and thus migration made some net contribution to urbanization, but throughout the twentieth century the reverse was true. This suggests that counterurbanizing trends have a much longer history than is usually assumed.

Most moves that did take migrants from small places up the urban hierarchy were either to settlements in the next size category (especially before 1880) or direct to large cities. There is only limited evidence of stepwise movement. This is emphasised if movement between settlements of different size is examined over the life course of individuals. Movement up the urban hierarchy was most likely to occur early in the life course with a tendency for movement to smaller places to take place later in life. Although particularly marked in the twentieth century with an increase in retirement migration, such trends also occurred in the previous century. Those that moved down the urban hierarchy consisted both of the urban-born and of previous rural to urban migrants, and mean distances moved down the urban hierarchy were similar to those for moves to larger settlements. In most cases movement down the urban hierarchy was to a free-standing settlement some distance away and not part of a process of suburbanization. These patterns were again consistent for all British regions, and shed important new light on the migration process. Rural to urban movement was not the most common migration experience for many people, but short-distance moves within and between similar settlements were dominant at all time periods. Moreover, some counterurbanization occurred from the mid-eighteenth century, and became at least as important as urbanization from the 1880s.
Table 3  Summary of all moves within Britain by type and time period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of move</th>
<th>1750–1839</th>
<th>1840–1879</th>
<th>1880–1919</th>
<th>1920–1994</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within same settlement*</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>8,863</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>10,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To new settlement in same size category**</td>
<td>4,084</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>5,099</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>3,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To settlement in larger size category</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3,210</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>3,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To settlement in smaller size category</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>3,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total moves</td>
<td>8,198</td>
<td>19,658</td>
<td>20,935</td>
<td>17,873</td>
<td>66,664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
* = For towns over 100,000 population, moves to contiguous suburbs have been classed as within-settlement moves.  
** = The following population size categories are used: <5,000; 5,000–9,999; 10,000–19,999; 20,000–39,999; 40,000–59,999; 60,000–79,999; 80,000–99,999; 100,000+. Settlement sizes were determined at four census dates: 1801, 1851, 1891, 1951.

Source:  
Calculated from 16,091 residential life histories provided by family historians.

It is usually assumed that migration in the past was dominated by young single migrants and that there were differences in the migration patterns of men and women. Analysis of the longitudinal data does not wholly support these assumptions and, again, emphasises the importance of studying migration within the context of the whole life course. For almost all categories of migration the most common experience was movement as a family grouping (Table 4), though younger single migrants (both male and female) were more likely to move over longer distances and up the urban hierarchy. The migration experiences of men and women were very similar with no significant differences in distances moved. Occupation and associated skills, education and income were more important factors affecting migration. Those employed in the professions and the armed services moved over the longest distances in all time periods, and some skilled workers and domestic servants (who mostly moved with their employers) also undertook more long-distance migration than other groups (Table 5). Farm workers and unskilled labourers moved over the shortest distances, and farmers were most likely to remain in the same house all their lives. Whereas cross-sectional data tend to over-emphasise particular types of movement, longitudinal analysis over the full life course places the migration experience in a broader perspective and emphasises the essential similarity of migration experiences for most people.
Table 4  Selected characteristics of migrants by time period (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20 years</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–39 years</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–59 years</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years+</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration companions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couple</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended family</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crises</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emigration</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military service</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/combined</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
* = Includes widowed, separated, divorced.  
The table should be read as follows: In the period 1750 to 1839, 27.2 per cent of all moves were undertaken by those aged under 20, 38.2 per cent of moves were made by unmarried migrants, 16.7 per cent of moves were undertaken alone and 47.9 per cent of moves were made primarily for employment reasons.

Source:  
Calculated from 16,091 residential life histories provided by family historians.

Reasons for migration, whether in the past or the present, are among the most difficult aspects of the migration process to understand. There have been no previous nationwide studies of the reasons for migration in the past, and data provided by family historians needs to be treated with due caution. In some cases reasons may have been inferred rather than based on direct evidence, and frequently movement is undertaken for a complex variety of reasons which cannot be adequately remembered or recorded. Not surprisingly, the most important reasons for moving in all time periods were employment and marriage (Table 4). However, the relative importance of these changed over time, and in the twentieth century migration for a much wider range of reasons, including housing change and family circumstances, increased in importance. Whilst this could, in part, reflect more accurate information for the more recent past, with short-distance moves for housing reasons being under-represented in
Table 5  Mean distances moved by time periods and selected migrant characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20 years</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–39 years</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–59 years</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years+</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Migration companions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couple</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended family</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selected occupational groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural labourers</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled non-manual</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled manual</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled manual</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled manual</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic servants</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed services</td>
<td>128.5</td>
<td>124.9</td>
<td>129.5</td>
<td>155.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calculated from 16,091 residential life histories provided by family historians.

The data set in earlier periods, it does also seem likely that changes in the housing market, ease of travel and the break-up of close-knit family groupings could have contributed to these trends. Men and women tended to move for slightly different reasons, with women more likely to move for marriage and less likely to move for employment before the twentieth century and, in all periods, female migrants were more likely than men to move for family reasons, usually reflecting the caring role of female family members.

Results from the aggregate analysis of 16,091 individual residential histories have challenged some existing migration theories and have required the reappraisal of common assumptions about migration in the past. There is little evidence that the level or nature of mobility changed dramatically in the two centuries after 1750; patterns of mobility show a high degree of stability over time and space; and most movement was short-distance within well-defined regional migration systems with only London exchanging large numbers of migrants with all parts.
of the country. Some movement down the urban hierarchy occurred in all time periods, and after 1880 migration from large to small places became more important than migration up the urban hierarchy; over the whole life course movement as part of a family grouping was a far more common experience than migration alone; and there were few differences between the migration characteristics of men and women. These results are not totally surprising. There have been pointers to many of these conclusions from studies of individual life histories and of specific localities where local populations have been linked between sources. The advantage of this study is that it utilises longitudinal evidence over a long time period and for all parts of the country, thus allowing local evidence to be placed within a broader context.

Individual experiences

Whilst aggregate analyses of the data provided by family historians and genealogists allow the broad pattern of migration and mobility in the past to be explored, one of the strengths of the data set is the large volume of individual case histories which have been collected. Although each life history has its own unique characteristics, selected examples can be used to demonstrate both the complexity of the migration process – something easily overlooked in aggregate analyses – and the ways in which the key components of the migration process remained essentially stable over time. These points are illustrated by examining two sets of four life histories, where each set consists of people born into similar circumstances in four different time periods (the 1750s, 1800s, 1850s and 1900s). The first set of life histories relate to people born in London and whose fathers were engaged in skilled manual work; the second set consist of people born in various rural districts whose fathers were agricultural workers.

The lives of the four migrants born to skilled workers living in London contain many similarities despite the wide timespan separating their births (Table 6). Each of the male children either followed their father’s trade or entered a similarly skilled occupation, and the female married a man following the same trade as her father. In each case most moves were concentrated in and around the same area of London, and it was the migrant born in the 1750s who in fact moved most frequently and over the furthest distance. These moves were directly related to his decision to become an Independent Minister later in life. All migrants moved for a variety of employment, life course and housing reasons with each migrant recording between four and eight residential moves during their life time. Skilled workers such as a cabinet maker, french polisher or printer would have earned a reasonable income in the 1850s, but would also have invested quite heavily in their local community to establish a workshop and develop links with customers. Such employment ties would have constrained mobility options, and it is notable that apart from Isaac T. (who combined his engraving with work as an Independent Minister), all migrants remained within easy commuting distance of the same part of London during their working lives. Herbert S. moved furthest from his workplace (in Bethnal Green) in 1936 when he moved to the popular and expanding suburb of Chingford (Essex). Here he lived next door to his brother (with whom he also worked). Motives for this
Table 6 Summary of individual life histories of four people born in London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isaac T.</th>
<th>Elizabeth M.</th>
<th>Henry M.</th>
<th>Herbert S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father an engraver</td>
<td>Father a cabinet maker</td>
<td>Father a carpenter</td>
<td>Father a coach painter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775+ employed as engraver, working from home.</td>
<td>No known paid employment – domestic duties</td>
<td>1869+ employed as French polisher in Bethnal Green</td>
<td>1918–25 employed as apprentice printer in Hackney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796+ Independent Minister and engraver.</td>
<td>Husband a cabinet maker</td>
<td></td>
<td>1925+ master printer in Bethnal Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married 1781</td>
<td>Married 1827</td>
<td>Married 1878</td>
<td>Married 1930, 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved:</td>
<td>Moved:</td>
<td>Moved:</td>
<td>Moved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779–Islington</td>
<td>1827–Hackney</td>
<td>1878–Bethnal Green</td>
<td>1907–Homerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783–Holborn</td>
<td>1837–Shoreditch</td>
<td>1879–Bethnal Green</td>
<td>1930–Hackney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786–Lavenham, (SFK)</td>
<td>1870–Hackney</td>
<td>1885–Bethnal Green</td>
<td>1933–Homerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793–Lavenham, (ESS)</td>
<td>1879–Tottenham</td>
<td>1893–Poplar</td>
<td>1934–Homerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811–Ongar, (ESS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1894–Bethnal Green</td>
<td>1936–Chingford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814–Ongar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1901–Bethnal Green</td>
<td>(ESS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822–Ongar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moves due to health (1779), housing (1786, 93, 1814, 22), employment (1783, 96, 1811)</td>
<td>Moves due to husband's employment (1827–70), widowhood (1879)</td>
<td>Moves due to marriage (1878) and housing/ lifecourse reasons</td>
<td>Moves due to housing (1907, 33) and family/ lifecourse reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died 1829, Ongar</td>
<td>Died 1887, Tottenham</td>
<td>Died 1903, Bethnal Green</td>
<td>Died 1978, Chingford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All locations were in the built-up area of London at the relevant date (though not necessarily in the county of London) unless otherwise stated.

Source: Lifetime residential histories provided by family historians.

move were clearly family ties combined with the desire to suburbanize to an improved environment.

The lifetime migration experiences of four migrants born into the families of agricultural workers in different parts of rural England also demonstrate many similarities (Table 7). The three males each, initially, took unskilled agricultural work similar to that of their father, though James R. varied his occupation (becoming an inn keeper for 10 years) and was eventually the most successful
Table 7: Summary of lifetime residential history of four people born in rural areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Henry D.</th>
<th>David H.</th>
<th>James R.</th>
<th>Anne C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born 1753, Plumpton (SSX)</td>
<td>Born 1806, Kelmarsh (NTH)</td>
<td>Born 1853, Millington (ERY)</td>
<td>Born 1901, Barton (LIN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father a shepherd</td>
<td>Father an agricultural labourer</td>
<td>Father a farm labourer</td>
<td>Father a shepherd and agricultural labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762+ employed as a shepherd's</td>
<td>1820+ employed as a shepherd</td>
<td>1867–78 employed as an agricultural labourer</td>
<td>1915–19 employed as a tailor's apprentice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then a shepherd</td>
<td></td>
<td>1878–88: innkeeper</td>
<td>No regular paid employment after 1919, but did some domestic work and took in paying guests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1888–98: farm manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1898+: tenant farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married 1780</td>
<td>Married 1830</td>
<td>Married 1877</td>
<td>Married 1920, 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved:</td>
<td>Moved:</td>
<td>Moved:</td>
<td>Moved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762–Falmer (SSX)</td>
<td>1830–Oxendon (NTH)</td>
<td>1857–Great Givendale (ERY)</td>
<td>1905–Wootton (LIN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769–Hangleton (SSX)</td>
<td>1851–Kelmarsh (NTH)</td>
<td>1871–Great Givendale (ERY)</td>
<td>1908–Broughton (LIN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770–Kingston by Lewes (SSX)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1877–Millington (ERY)</td>
<td>1911–Hull (ERY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773–Lower Stoneham, Lewes (SSX)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1878–Pocklington (ERY)</td>
<td>1912–Cleethorpes (LIN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776–Rottingdean (SSX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1915–Broughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1791–Plumpton (SSX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1920–Cleethorpes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? –Chailey (SSX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1952–Cleethorpes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moves due to employment, probably also other moves between farms in Sussex</td>
<td>Moved on marriage and for employment</td>
<td>All adult moves for employment</td>
<td>Moves for father's work (1905–12), own work (1915), marriage (1920, 52), housing (1962), health (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died 1836, Chailey</td>
<td>Died 1888, Kelmarsh</td>
<td>Died 1919</td>
<td>Died 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lifetime residential histories provided by family historians.

establishing himself as a farm manager and tenant farmer. Annie C. did not work on the land, and after her marriage took no regular paid employment, although she did contribute to the household's income by taking in paying guests in Cleethorpes in the summer and doing domestic work for neighbours. Each individual moved over short distances, mostly within the same locality, and slightly longer moves tended to be stimulated by external events. Thus in 1911 Annie C. moved with her parents from north Lincolnshire across the Humber to Hull due to her father's inability to find agricultural work. Within a year she had moved back to north Lincolnshire. Most moves were for employment reasons, with some agricultural workers moving frequently between farms wherever they could be hired. Thus Henry D. worked as a shepherd on at least four different
Sussex farms between 1769 and 1776, and such frequent short-distance mobility was typical of many agricultural workers. Because such moves rarely left records, the amount of mobility amongst agricultural workers is almost certainly under-stated in the data from family historians.

There are inevitably some unique features in every individual life history, and few personal stories precisely mirror the aggregate characteristics of the whole data set. But, despite such differences, the overall structures of the lifetime migration histories of these eight people were remarkably similar and, in particular, showed a high degree of stability over time. Although, in the twentieth century, the effects of a widening labour market, increased affluence and improved communications were beginning to have an effect (hence the suburbanization of Herbert S. to Chingford), the similarities between the personal migration histories are rather greater than the differences. The fact that the basic pattern and process of individual migration retained a high degree of stability over time and space despite large structural differences between localities and over time, suggests that the individual and life course factors which structured migration decisions within specific households were relatively unchanged. In both the eighteenth and twentieth centuries, in London and in Yorkshire, most people moved over short distances stimulated by a combination of employment, housing and family life course factors depending on their own particular circumstances. Longer-distance moves were unusual, often stimulated in part by an external event, and those that did move away from a familiar area sometimes returned later in their lives.
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AGE AT BAPTISM IN RURAL HAMPSHIRE IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Stephen Dewhurst and Andrew Hinde

There is at present increasing interest in extending family reconstitution and similar methods into the second half of the nineteenth century.¹ This interest has been fuelled by the recent debate about the nature of the fertility decline in England after 1850, and, in particular, the extent to which it was due to 'stopping' behaviour or birth spacing.² If fertility is to be analysed using parish register data for the period after 1850, it would be useful to have some indication of the distribution of the interval between birth and baptism for that period.

Previous studies of the age at baptism in England and Wales have concentrated on the pre-censal period, and have made use of the limited number of parish registers in which dates of birth were given as well as dates of baptism.³ These studies produced two main results. First, the median age at baptism rose slowly from about one week during the second half of the 17th century to about one month around the turn of the 19th century. Second, the variability between parishes increased greatly over the period. In particular, by the beginning of the 19th century there existed a minority of parishes in which birth-baptism intervals of several months were quite common.

Unfortunately, parish registers which give dates of birth are extremely rare (if they exist at all) after the early decades of the 19th century.⁴ Therefore the method used in earlier studies is not really possible. In order to study the age at baptism in 19th century England, we need to find a reliable alternative source of dates of birth for a large enough sample of births to enable meaningful conclusions to be drawn. Given a sample of baptisms recorded in a parish over a specific period, the civil registers could be used for this purpose, but obtaining dates of birth in the required numbers would be expensive and time-consuming. Therefore, we decided to experiment with using the information about ages given in the census enumerators' books (CEBs) after 1851 for children aged under one year at the date of the census. For such children, ages are typically given in months (or in weeks for very young infants). We took a sample of such children from the CEBs for seven rural parishes in northern Hampshire for the five censuses from 1851 to 1891. The seven parishes were Cliddesden, Farleigh Wallop, Greywell, Nately Scures, Up Nately, Mapledurwell and South Warnborough. Assuming the ages in the CEBs to be accurate, all these children
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were born in the year preceding each census.\textsuperscript{7} We added to this sample children whose deaths were recorded in the burial registers for the seven parishes, and whose dates of birth (calculated from the recorded dates of burial and reported ages at death) fell within the same years.

For each child, we then searched the baptism registers of the relevant parishes for a period beginning at the child's (estimated) date of birth, until either a matching baptism entry was found, or five years had elapsed. Applying this method produced, for a sample of births taking place in the year preceding each census, an estimated date of birth and a date of baptism (provided that the child was baptised in the parish before he or she attained the age of five years).

Critical to the success of this approach is the accuracy of the ages reported in the CEBs and the burial registers. We took these ages at face value. Thus, for example, a child stated in the 1851 census to be aged '8 months' was assumed to have been born on 30 July 1850; similarly, a child stated in the 1851 census to have been aged '6 weeks' was assumed to have been born on 17 February 1851. If these ages were reported in completed weeks and months, rather than (as we have assumed) to the nearest week or month, then we shall systematically underestimate the length of birth-baptism intervals by an average amount which should not be greater than two weeks.\textsuperscript{6}

A total of 240 children were included in the sample, of which 19 were found only in a burial register (that is, they had died prior to the census). Of these, the baptisms of 176 were found in the baptism register of the parish in which their census entry or burial entry was made. Seven children were found in the baptism register of another of the seven parishes. The remaining 57 children were not found in any of the baptism registers we searched (it is likely that many of these were baptised outside the seven parishes studied).\textsuperscript{7}

We have only used data for the 176 children whose baptisms were found in the register for their parishes of birth in calculating birth-baptism intervals.\textsuperscript{8} In eight of these 176 cases, the dates of baptism preceded the estimated dates of birth. We made the assumption that these children had very short birth-baptism intervals (less than one day).\textsuperscript{9}

The distribution of the ages at baptism of the 176 births which did lead to baptisms within the parish of birth before the child was aged five years are summarised in Table 1. The median age at baptism for the whole sample was 34 days. Only eight of the 176 births had birth-baptism intervals in excess of six months, the longest being 901 days. There is some evidence that the upper tail of the distribution was becoming stretched in the 1880s and 1890s: that is, the longest ten per cent of intervals became even longer than they had been earlier in the century. Table 1 also includes the distribution reported by Berry and Schofield for their 'median' parish during the period 1791–1812 for comparison. The latter is very similar to the distribution of our 'pooled sample'.
Table 1  Ages in days by which given percentages of children had been baptised: seven Hampshire parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth cohort</th>
<th>n. of births</th>
<th>25th</th>
<th>50th</th>
<th>75th</th>
<th>Semi-inter-90th quartile range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851–91 pooled</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Median' parish, 1791–1812</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The semi-interquartile range is a measure of the spread of the distribution. It is the range of days occupied by the middle 25 per cent of the recorded ages, when they are ordered from lowest to highest (or from highest to lowest).

Sources: Hampshire data derived from parish registers and census enumerators’ books (CEBs) for the parishes of Cliddesden, Farleigh Wallop, Greywell, Mapledurwell, Nately Scures, South Warnborough and Up Nately. For the CEBs, see Public Record Office HO 107/1680 and 1681 (1851), RG 9/706, 709 and 711 (1861), RG 10/1229, 1235 and 1237 (1871), RG 11/1249, 1255 and 1257 (1881), and RG 12/953, 958 and 960 (1891). ‘Median’ parish, 1791–1812 taken from B.M. Berry and R.S. Schofield, ‘Age at baptism in pre-industrial England’, Population Studies, 25(1971), 458.

We are aware that the method of estimating the distribution of birth-baptism intervals described in this short note is only approximate, since it relies on estimating dates of birth from sources which are less than precise. Nevertheless, we feel that it is capable of giving a good indication of the distribution of birth-baptism intervals, and of providing percentiles which are probably accurate to within two weeks. Its advantage is its wide applicability: it can be applied to any parish in which the parish register data are of reasonable quality, and certainly to most of rural England. Although clearly inferior to the method which uses reported dates of birth, it is still capable of identifying parishes in which birth-baptism intervals were either very long, or exhibited a high degree of variability.

NOTES

2. For an extended discussion of this debate, see S. Szerer, Fertility, Class and Gender in Britain 1860–1940, (Cambridge, 1996).
Laxton, 'Of such as are of riper years? A note on age at baptism', 48–54; and D. M. McCallum, 'Age at baptism: further evidence', 62–4.

4. The introduction of standard forms for the baptism register probably discouraged clergymen from including dates of birth (as they had to be entered as marginal notes). We have not come across any baptism registers which give dates of birth for more than a few exceptional cases after 1820.

5. For example, in the case of the 1851 census, they were born between 31 March 1850 and 30 March 1851.

6. For six children in our sample, it was possible to cross-check the estimated date of birth with a date of birth written in the margin of the baptism register. These six cases did not suggest any systematic bias of this kind. Note that in the censuses prior to 1881, enumerators were instructed to write down the ages of every person enumerated 'as they were reported': see D. Mills and M. Drake, 'The census, 1801–1991', in M. Drake and R. Finnegan eds, Studying Family and Community History, 19th and 20th Centuries: Volume 4, Sources and Methods: a Handbook, (Cambridge, 1994), 38–47. Only from 1881 onwards was 'age last birthday' explicitly asked for. On the reporting of children's ages in the 19th century censuses, see also E. Higgs, Making Sense of the Census: the Manuscript Returns for England and Wales, 1801–1901, (London, 1989), 69.

7. The proportion of children who were not baptised in the parish where they were born is (64 out of 240, or 27 per cent) is within the range reported in P. Razzell, Essays in English Population History, (London, 1994), 82–118 (especially Table 6, 92–3). This chapter of Razzell's book is a reprint of 'The evaluation of baptism as a form of birth registration through cross-matching census and parish register data: a study in methodology', Population Studies, 26 (1972), 121–46. We did check the burial registers of the relevant parishes for five years after the estimated date of birth of each child in the sample to find out if any of those who could not be traced in a baptism register were buried. We located the burials of three of the 57 children who were not traced to a baptism register. Either these children were buried unbaptised, or they were baptised in another parish (or in a nonconformist chapel).

8. Using only these children has the advantage of rendering our results more comparable with those of studies which have taken a sample of recorded baptisms. We excluded the three children who were buried unbaptised.

9. This is a somewhat arbitrary assumption. However, since we report the distribution of birth-baptism intervals using medians and other percentiles, all that is really required is the assumption that the birth-baptism intervals of these children are among the shortest 25 per cent of the intervals we can identify. We think that this is likely to be true.
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Notes on articles compiled by Terry Gwynne, books by K. Schürer

Mark Bailey

Mark Bailey questions the prevalence of the epidemic-disease explanation of the prolonged demographic decline in late medieval England which gives pride of place to mortality as the determining factor and, perhaps more challengingly, the more recent hypothesis that economic changes after the Black Death enticed women into the workforce thus depressing fertility. Whilst offering no firm answers he explores two general interpretations of the late medieval demographic regime. First, that there was very considerable variety in the late medieval demographic experience, e.g. levels of nuptiality and fertility fluctuated downwards as well as upwards. Second, the likelihood of considerable regional variations in demographic experience must be recognised.

David Butler

David Butler not only seeks to identify absentees but also to accumulate information about some of those missing. This is presented in a first instalment of information in an appendix.

Lori A Gates

This article will be helpful to LPS readers with interests in medieval demography and/or the position of widows in society. Lori Gates seeks to put medieval widows in a wider perspective, more akin to studies of early modern or modern widows. This means attempting to go beyond widows as transmitters of property within the medieval land market to examine as far as possible elements such as age at widowhood, number of dependants, social status, personal choice in connection with widow re-marriage and provision for widows. There is a useful survey of earlier work on medieval widows by Titow, Ravensdale, Howell, Franklin and Bennett, 20–2.
Nigel Goose

As the title implies, this is the first of a series of 12 volumes which are to be published based on the census for the entire county of Hertfordshire in 1851. This volume is divided into three basic parts. The first is an analysis of the census material for the Berhamsted region, the second is a reproduced transcript of the census enumerators’ books, the third is an alphapetical index to the 11,578 individuals recorded in the 8 parishes that comprise the district. For those with no particular interest in the individuals and families of this area, it is the 60 or so pages which form the opening analysis which will be the main interest, and it is this which forms the main focus of this notice.

The analysis of the material concentrates on three key themes: demographic structure, patterns of employment and household composition. The first of these is explored mainly through an examination of the age, sex and marital status of the various parish populations. Central to this is a discussion on marriage which points to the fact that the timing and overall propensity to marry appears to have been significantly influenced by local sex ratios. In short, women tended to marry earlier and more remained unmarried in parishes which had a relative shortage of men, and *vice versa*. Local employment opportunities for women may also have had a hand in the ‘marriage market’ but the relationship is not so clear. Following on from this, the second theme, employment, pays particular attention to the straw plaiting industry which was an important feature of this area of the county, especially for women and young children. The agricultural labour-force and the structure of farming is also considered. The third theme, looks at household structure, mainly through an analysis of household sizes and membership, concluding that structure was polarized between high and low status households with both being larger and containing more kin members than ‘average’, yet for different reasons.

An important feature of this work for others is that it is presented in a comparative perspective, and its many tables presented for the parishes studied will also provide a ready basis for comparison for those undertaking census-based research in other parts of the country. However, with this in mind, it is a shame that an opportunity appears to have been lost in that for those undertaking comparative analysis it would be far more useful to have the raw census data in the form of a useable computerized database rather than 285 pages of indigestable printout from a computer database!

Edward Higgs

Edward Higgs argues that the establishment of civil registration and of the General Register Office in England and Wales under the 1836 Registration Act is better seen in terms of the registering of property rights and early-nineteenth-
century debates over welfare provision, rather than the more customary emphases upon religion and medical science. The historiography of the issue is helpfully summarized, 116–8.

Edward Higgs


When the predecessor to this volume, Making sense of the census, was reviewed in this journal in 1989 (LPS 42), the notice ended by claiming that `it should be essential reading for all those working, or about to embark, on a census-based research project`. Clearly, this applies to Dr Higgs' new work, just as it did to the old. Despite the new title, cover and page design, this is basically a revised version of the original book. Some restructuring of the initial book has taken place, with the result that Parts I and II in the first volume have been combined into a single Part, but pages 7–96 are largely reproduced wholesale in the new volume. A short but valuable section has been added to the enlarged Part I of the new volume on the changing intellectual background to census-taking, yet unfortunately, two others – on the pre-1841 returns and the archival history of the material – have been dropped or severely cut. With the exception of the relocation of the couple of pages on missing returns, Part II of Clearer sense mirrors Part III of Making sense virtually word-for-word.

The key difference between the volumes is the inclusion of three new chapters in Part III of Clearer sense. The first two of these focus on the use of the census documents in research, in which the author sets out guidelines on how one might go about producing a census-based community history or study of particular individuals in the census. In so doing, technically-orientated concerns and issues such as sampling, record linkage and the problems of coding and classification are all investigated. However, although a number of possibilities are mentioned, readers will find themselves having to go elsewhere to follow-up many of the suggestions made. Of particular interest is the final chapter on the use of information relating to occupation. Focusing on this one aspect of the census material, this new chapter demonstrates the impact of the changing views on `employment' and its classification adopted by the General Registry Office during the Victorian period. This analysis also points to the dangers of taking the tabular material on occupational structure published in the official reports of the census at `face value', especially when comparing information from one census year to another. Indeed, this chapter underlines a message that rightly runs throughout the volume – that those using the census must always be aware of the reasons for which it was constructed and the ways in which it was compiled, and interpret it accordingly.

There are some omissions in this volume, most notably the history leading to the taking of the first census in 1801 and the development of the pre-1841 censuses, which were curiously dropped from Making sense. Despite the new final chapter, more could also be written about the content and use of the published census volume. However, it seems rather petty to pick minor holes in a volume which
must surely be central reading for anyone undertaking serious work on the nineteenth-century censuses. The key question to be asked is not over the book’s importance, this should be taken for granted, rather it is whether those already owning a copy of Making sense should renew it with a copy of Clearer sense. Each individual must judge, but £11.95 does seem a heavy price to pay for some 35 or so pages of new material.

David Lemmings

Although this article does not have a strictly demographic focus LPS readers may be interested in its analysis of the debates in the house of commons over the 1753 Marriage Act which reveal a variety of contemporary attitudes.

David Nicholas

Although the focus of this article is medieval Flanders LPS readers will find it an interesting contribution to the study of how young people were raised and treated in the middle ages. A discussion of the use of apprenticeship records is provided, 1106–9.

Frederick Pedersen

Frederick Pedersen argues that medieval court documents do not present a random sample illustrating trends in surrounding society; rather they tell us more about the people who actually used the courts than about social trends. His work on surviving fourteenth-century matrimonial cause papers reveals that a very high proportion of marriage cases originated among high-status litigants and that the status of litigants increased the further from York they lived. The documents on which the study is based are introduced, 407–10: cause papers and act books.

Jona Schellekens

Drawing partly upon research conducted while he was a visiting fellow at the ESRC Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure, the author offers a partial explanation for the roughly two-year rise in life expectancy at birth in England 1700–49 and 1750–99, from approximately 34 to 36. The study is based upon Charles Creighton’s ‘Irish Famine hypothesis’ of more than a hundred years ago.
Phillipp R Schofield

Phillipp Schofield argues that plague so altered the regime under which customary land was held that by the last decades of the fourteenth century newcomers were able to replace established families in the village hierarchy. The sources are court rolls and account rolls for the manor of Birdbrook in northwest Essex. It is the author's conclusion that by the beginning of the fifteenth century a manorial economy based upon labour service and peasant families enjoying the support of a wide kin-network had been swept away to be replaced by 'a more mobile and transient community'.

Leonard Schwarz

LPS readers will find this a useful review of John Landers's 1993 *Death and the metropolis: studies in the demographic history of London 1670–1830*. John Landers replies, 303–10

Daniel Lord Smail
'Accommodating plague in Medieval Marseille', *Continuity and Change*, 11 1 (May 1996), 11–41.

Rich notarial and judicial archives at Marseille allow a revealing examination of the response of the city's residents to the Black Death of 1348. A period of what the author calls 'accommodation' followed the plague during which alliances were created and reformed and property was shuffled about. The process was driven by marriages and remarriages; and by immigration. This is seen as a testament to 'reconstructive' practices within a flexible society.

Humphrey Southall and David Gilbert

The authors use the Registrar General's reports to explore the behaviour of the marriage rate in different regions and localities. Parish register evidence from Bolton is used to examine particular occupational groups. Marriage series are compared with statistics of trade union unemployment and small debts. All three indices are used as evidence of local economic conditions. The study reveals a close relationship between marriage statistics and the operation of the economy. The impact of economic distress at the local level is particularly significant.

Janet Spavold

Janet Spavold provides a description of the use of a Relational Database
Management System, i.e. Data Ease, for use with IBM or IBM compatible personal computers, to analyze inventory material. It was used by a local history class none of whom had previous experience of researching and none of whom had any qualifications in history beyond O-level. The result is an explanation which should suit the needs of any LPS readers contemplating the use of such a database for the first time.

Naomi Tadmor

Naomi Tadmor deliberately adopts the archaic concept of family, i.e. as household including its diverse possible dependants, as a focus for analysis in order to examine the validity of many of the categories devised by historians which are related to current quantitative research needs. Her sources are a mid-eighteenth-century diary, two conduct books and two popular novels. These allow her to examine the family as a linguistic concept; as an active usage employed in the eighteenth century.

Hans-Joachim Voth and Timothy Leunig

The authors use a dataset assembled by Floud, Wachter and Gregory on the height of recruits into the Marine Society 1770–1873 (see LPS 50, p68 for an earlier note on a debate arising out of this work). They argue that smallpox was an important determinant of height; those who had suffered from smallpox were significantly shorter. Hence the increase in height noted by Floud, Wachter and Gregory and put down by them to increased nutritional intake is likely to be at least partly explained by the eradication of smallpox.

Zhongwei Zhao

The author uses a computer micro-simulation system (CAMSIM) to examine changes in kinship patterns over the life course at the level of individuals. This simulation exercise reveals the effects for each simulated individual of fertility and mortality transition upon the number and types of kin who were potentially available for family-based support. This sort of study has frequently generated varying responses from LPS readers, some of whom have not always been impressed by simulation or abstract statistical exercises. The examination of the demographic changes in Victorian England and the demographic experiences of two generations (1851–5 and 1901–5), on pp.244–52 will perhaps be found more appealing by some readers. The editors remain hopeful that readers who feel strongly about such issues will use the correspondence section to air their views.
CORRESPONDENCE

Letters intended for publication in LPS should be sent to Kevin Schürer, LPS, Department of History, University of Essex, Colchester, CO4 3SQ.

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.

Aldenham and Hertfordshire militia lists

Dear Sir,

There are two points on which I would seek your assistance:

1. Have the family reconstitution studies by W. Newman Brown for Aldenham, Hertfordshire, been published?

2. Dr Steve Hindle has compared the population figures (using the appropriate multipliers) for Hertfordshire parishes based on the figures for the lay subsidy of 1524/5 and the hearth tax of the 1660s. Hertfordshire has by far and away the most complete set of militia ballot lists from 1758, as you probably know, and I would like to be able to calculate populations from those figures for various parishes in the county, especially for the early years when they covered men between 18 and 50. Has anyone worked out an appropriate multiplier?

This information will probably be relevant to the study of the Fleet marriages of Hertfordshire people which I am undertaking.

I shall appreciate any information and/or advice you can give me

Yours faithfully
F. J. Parker

Editors’ comment

To answer, first, the question about the work of W. Newman Brown, much of his work on the detailed reconstitution of the parish of Aldenham unfortunately remained unpublished before his death. An article entitled ‘Wider reconstitution’ was published in LPS, 7 (1971), together with a note on linking parish register information in LPS 22 (1979), and a chapter, ‘The receipt of poor
relief and family situation: Aldenham, Hertfordshire, 1630–1690', in R. M. Smith ed. *Land, kinship and life-cycle* (Cambridge, 1984). All of his manuscript material relating to Aldenham was left to the Cambridge Group and can be consulted there, by arrangement with the Group librarian (phone 01223 333185). The material was also used extensively by Fiona Newall in her Cambridge PhD thesis, 'Socio-economic influences on the demography of Aldenham: an exploration of the techniques and applications of family reconstitution' (1985). This can also be consulted in the library of the Cambridge Group. Dr Newall also published an article arising from her thesis work: 'Social mobility in the population of Aldenham, 1600–1800', in D. Jones-Baker ed. *Hertfordshire in History* (Hertfordshire Local History Council, 1991).

As to the question of multipliers for use in conjunction with the Militia Ballot Lists, we do not know of any specific figures used previously. However, it should not prove too difficult to derive proxy figures. Using Wrigley and Schofield's *Population History of England* as a guide, one might expect those aged between 18 and 50 to account for around 47–9 per cent in the period in question. Of these, the male population might have been about 22-4 per cent of the total. Using these figures would mean that one would have to multiply a given male population aged 18–50 in the range of 4.167 to 4.545 to gain an estimated total population. These figures are, of course, based on national aggregates and one might therefore need to adjust the proportions accordingly to take account of any significant local variation, as well as variations in the age bounds recorded in various the source documents.

**Migrating families**

Dear Sir,

I have been encouraged to write by the offer of advice in LPS 56.

Three years ago, I was a student at London University, studying for a Diploma in Genealogy and the History of the Family, and seriously considered relating my project to material I had found which suggested an interesting pattern of migration (in the event, I did a project on the accounts of a Suffolk blacksmith).

I came across the material while doing genealogical research aimed at establishing the relationship between my maternal grandmother and a 'cousin', who styled himself Frederick Middleweek-Poole. I have not succeeded in establishing any relationship between them. He was almost certainly the illegitimate son of Charlotte Middleweek, who was 'adopted' by a Poole family.

However, in the belief (from family folklore) that he was the son of a Frederick Middleweek-Poole (or just Middleweek) and Sarah (formerly Oliver, sister to my great-grandmother), I searched the St Catherine's registers for such a marriage. In doing so, I was struck by the locations of the marriages and noted them all. (An abstract is present in the table below),
Virtually all of these occur in locations north of Plymouth, in London, or in places in between. This suggests a pattern in which the Middleweeks originated in Devon, in villages north of Plymouth, and over several decades migrated east, many finishing up in London. Would this be worth a study, using censuses and perhaps parish registers, to try and establish the pattern of migration over time, possibly also looking at the occupations taken by the migrants?

Yours faithfully
Brian Strong

**Middleweek/Middlewick Marriages, 1850–86**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Registration district</th>
<th>Reference number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/1850</td>
<td>Middleweek</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Tiverton</td>
<td>X 423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1850</td>
<td>Middleweek</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>XI 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/1851</td>
<td>Middleweek</td>
<td>Eliza</td>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>VIII 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1852</td>
<td>Middlewick</td>
<td>Ann Maria</td>
<td>Lewisham</td>
<td>1d 683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middlewick</td>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>Newton Abbott</td>
<td>5b 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1852</td>
<td>Middlewick</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>5b 426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middlewick</td>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>5b 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middleweek</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>St Geo. Han. Sq.</td>
<td>1a 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middleweke</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>5b 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middleweek</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Crediton</td>
<td>5b 671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1856</td>
<td>Middlewick</td>
<td>Elizabeth Sarah</td>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>1a 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middleweek</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>5b 159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Editors’ comment**

It is clear from the article by Pooley and Turnbull, published in this issue of the journal, that the analysis of family-based life histories can add greatly to our understanding of migratory patterns in the past. Consequently, the study is certainly worth pursuing. It may also prove useful to refer to the article by Roy Prideaux, 'Descending lines and the search for connections in an expanding population', published in *LPS*, 36 (1986).
Gypsies Travelling