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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.¹ 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 1850.²

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.³ 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.⁴ 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.⁵ 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).⁶ 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).⁷ 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. 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. 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.

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*. 11 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. 12

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. 13

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. 14
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 Archdeaconry of Yorkshire 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.18 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.19 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.20 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'.21 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>Papists</th>
<th>Other non-conformists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>144</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</th>
<th>increase</th>
<th>decrease</th>
<th>decrease</th>
<th>total net increase</th>
<th>total net increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>2,303</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>15,152</td>
<td>12,622</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></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</th>
<th>increase</th>
<th>decrease</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulmer (lower)</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dickeing (lower)</td>
<td>2,236</td>
<td>1,934</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,152</td>
<td>12,622</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2,530</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| North  | Bulmer (upper) | 4,463| 3,584| -879     | -19.7    |          |          |               |              |
|        | Cleveland     | 6,143| 7,319| 1,176    | 19.1     |          |          |               |              |
|        | Dickeing (upper) | 1,180| 1,895| 715      | 60.6     |          |          |               |              |
|        | Rydall        | 4,030| 3,918| -112     | -2.8     |          |          |               |              |
| Totals |              | 15,816| 16,716| 1,891    |           |          |          | 991           | +5.7         |

| West   | Ainstie (New) | 5,664| 5,003| 661      | 11.7     |          |          |               |              |
|        | Ainstie (Old) | 4,722| 8,355| -363     | 77.0     |          |          |               |              |
|        | Craven        | 6,114| 6,320| 206      | 3.3      |          |          |               |              |
|        | Doncaster     | 10,346| 11,869| 1,523    | 14.7     |          |          |               |              |
|        | Pontefract    | 15,524| 26,830| 11,306   | 73.0     |          |          |               |              |
| Totals |              | 42,370| 58,377| 16,668   |           |          |          | 661           | +38.0        |

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.
(Figure 2). 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 706/760, 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
Figure 2: Population change in the Old West Riding c. 1672–1743, by parish.
Figure 3  Population change in the Old East Riding c. 1672–1743, by parish
Figure 4: Population change in the Old North Riding 1670-1743, by parish
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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. 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 Stillington-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). 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, Kirkby 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 Kirkby 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. 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.
24. Neave, 'Rural settlement contraction'.
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.
35. Batley, Birstall, Bradford, Calverley, Crofton, Emley, Hartsheda, Horbury, Kirkburton, Kirkheaton, Mirfield, Ossett, Sandal Magna.
36. Neave, 'Rural settlement contraction', suggests Beverley's natural population between 1670 and 1764 decreased though the estimates increased, 2,800 people to 3,500.
38. Wrigley, *Continuity*, 14–7