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EDITORIAL

The three articles in this issue of *Local Population Studies (LPS)* deal with the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The first, by Anthony Poole, concerns the problem of calculating English population totals from Anglican registers in the second half of the seventeenth century. Poole looks at recent attempts to provide correction factors to offset the effects of baptismal delay. Using evidence from Cranbrook and its environs in the Kentish Weald, he shows that for a few decades during this period, lengthy delays between birth and baptism were relatively common. Certainly, in these parishes the effect of baptismal delay is likely to have been greater than that allowed by E.A. Wrigley and R.S. Schofield in *The population history of England 1541-1871: a reconstruction*, (Cambridge, 1989). The article suggests some possible causes for the delay, and points out that they may well have applied across the rest of the country. If so, the accepted view that there was a decrease in England’s population during the years 1660-1680 may need reconsidering.

The second article, by Cathy Smith, charts the changing fortunes of six Nottinghamshire towns between 1680 and 1840. Smith shows that during this period some towns prospered while others became marginalized. In the case of Nottinghamshire, it tended to be the smaller towns that saw a decline in their fortunes. However, Smith warns us to be wary of over-generalizing about the divergence in the fortunes of small and large towns during this period. Some Nottinghamshire towns that saw quite respectable levels of economic development were not especially large. Perhaps it is more accurate to say that large towns tended to expand, but that the fortunes of smaller urban centres depended on local circumstances.

In the third article, Neil Spencer and David Gatley move us forward to the nineteenth century, and the use of registration district data. Their paper extends that published in this journal in 1997 by David Gatley (see *LPS* 58, 37-47) which described a project designed to computerize the 1861 census and vital registration statistics at the registration district level. This project produced an extremely useful (and user-friendly) database. In this paper, Spencer and Gatley show how cluster analysis can be used to detect geographical patterns in these data, and to categorize the registration districts. One obvious use of this technique (though by no means the only one) is to assist in the selection of localities for more detailed study.

The ‘Research in progress’ section makes a welcome return in this issue. Our contribution to it comes from Betty Halse, who describes a study of population mobility in a small parish in North Yorkshire. An unusual and attractive feature of Halse’s study is its long time-frame, encompassing both the early modern period (or the ‘parish register’ era) and the nineteenth century (or the ‘census’ period). Also noteworthy is the variety of sources she is using, which range from the conventional census enumerators’ books and parish registers to enclosure awards, wills and Land Tax Assessments.
Anne Whiteman

We report with some sadness Anne Whiteman’s death earlier this year at the age of 82. In the words of her *Times* obituary, she was ‘a splendid example of the best kind of Oxford college tutor, endlessly enthusiastic about teaching, with a remarkable ability to listen’ and provide support. She was also ‘the kind of scholar who revelled in the process of research and editing and cared deeply about getting everything right’. Her long-awaited work, *The Compton Census of 1676: a critical edition*, (London, 1986) was finally published a year after she retired from Lady Margaret Hall, where she had served as Vice-Principal. Her many other administrative roles included acting as Vice-Chairman of the University Grants Committee and Chairman of the Bodleian Library’s standing committee.

Not surprisingly, Anne Whiteman did not become an active and valued contributor to *LPS* until after her retirement. Her chapter on the Compton Census in *Surveying the people* (K. Schürer and T. Arkell, eds, (Oxford, 1992), 78-96) summarized brilliantly the main concerns of her masterly ‘Introduction’ to the *Critical edition*, which she supplemented by ‘The use of the Compton census for demographic purposes’ (*LPS* 50 (1993), 61-6). Two very comprehensive articles on ‘The Protestation returns of 1641-2’ followed (*LPS* 55 (1995) 14-26 and *LPS* 56 (1996), 17-29), with a final contribution just two years ago, entitled ‘Mean household size in mid-Tudor England: Clackclose hundred, Norfolk’ (*LPS* 60 (1998), 20-33). All were products of her undying intellectual curiosity, distilling a lifetime’s profound learning; they were also written in collaboration with like-minded scholars: Mary Clapinson, her former student; Vivien Russell, her senior officer in the wartime Women’s Auxiliary Air Force; and Tom Arkell.

Anne Whiteman’s initial interest in the Compton Census grew from work for her doctorate on Seth Ward, Bishop of Salisbury. She realized then how carefully most of its returns had been compiled and the subsequent use of these data by E.A. Wrigley and R.S. Schofield and many others for demographic purposes convinced her of the pressing need to unravel as many of their secrets and inconsistencies as possible. For example, the heading ‘Conformists’ often covered all denominations, some parishes counted groups other than men and women of an ‘age to communicate’, and it was rarely clear when their totals included attached chapellries. Anne Whiteman soon realized that the precise form in which the data were requested, collected and processed locally often provided vital clues to the nature and quality of the bald figures and she readily applied the same thorough, probing approach to the Protestation returns which she studied. She was equally wary of using single multipliers derived from any national mean household size to estimate local population totals because she knew that the mean size varied among particular communities as much because of the presence or absence of singleton households as of large ones. She was therefore naturally impatient with those who applied simplistic interpretations to such sources or who knew what their researches would reveal before they began. Future scholars would be well advised to appreciate the full extent of Anne Whiteman’s scholarly legacy.
When death do us part

We are delighted to announce the latest book to be published by LPS. Entitled *When death do us part: understanding and interpreting the probate records of early modern England*, it contains a collection of essays by leading scholars of the period. The volume is edited by Tom Arkell, Nesta Evans and Nigel Goose. It costs £14.50, and may be ordered from all good booksellers, or directly from the LPS General Office at the University of Hertfordshire (the address is printed inside the front cover of this issue). When ordering from the LPS General Office, please enclose a cheque for £15.50 (UK) or £16.50 (overseas) to include postage and packing, made payable to ‘Local Population Studies’.

1901 Census project

Many readers will have been following the progress of the Public Record Office’s 1901 Census project with interest. For those who have not come across it before, this project aims to digitize the census enumerators’ books (CEBs) for the 1901 Census and to make them available over the internet from 2002 onwards. The Public Record Office has awarded a contract to the Defence Evaluation and Research Agency (DERA) to carry out this mammoth task. An Advisory Panel to the project, comprising members of various user communities, has been set up. Kevin Schürer, who is a member of the LPS Editorial Board, is also a member of this Advisory Panel. For more details see the ‘Editorial’ in *LPS 64* (1999), 5-7.

According to the project’s latest fact sheet, there will be ‘free access to a basic index which will allow users to search by name and place’. To view (and, if you have the facilities, to print) a single page from the 1901 CEBs will cost £0.80. However, those interested in the demography of local communities in the past usually want to see sequences of pages, relating to whole villages, or parts of towns. Unless some special arrangements are made, the cost of viewing the 1901 CEBs for a parish of, say, 800 persons, is likely to be about £24.00. This issue has been causing concern to local historians.

When *LPS 64* went to press, the situation was that the Public Record Office was aware of the needs of local historians and, according to their basic fact sheet was ‘discussing [the issue] with our Advisory Panel and … seeking a solution’. To date, there is no further information about what this ‘solution’ might be. The issue is not mentioned in any of the three updates about the project published in June, August and December 2000. The only definite information which has come to light is that viewing some of the introductory sheets to each CEB (for example the Enumerator’s Description Sheet) will be free. This will slightly reduce the cost of viewing the CEBs for a whole parish, as these introductory sheets are usually essential reading for those interested in local demography.

However, the minutes of the latest meeting of the Advisory Panel, held on 16 November 2000, sound a more optimistic note. According to these minutes:
‘the arrangements for charging users who want to look at a number of images in sequence … [were] still being worked on with DERA. It was hoped that a decision on this type of research could be made in the Spring … it was the intention to have the “village” package as part of the main service.’ We await developments.

Some readers may be interested to know that a pilot project has been run using the 1891 CEBs for Norfolk, and these will be available over the internet from the spring of 2001. There will be a charge for using the pilot, though the level has yet to be fixed.

More information, including copies of the basic fact sheet, the three updates of June, August and December 2000, and the minutes of Advisory Panel meetings, may be obtained from the Public Record Office’s 1901 Census project website (http://www.pro.gov.uk/census/).

Editorial matters

This issue was edited by Andrew Hinde. The members of the Editorial Board would like to thank Margaret Smith for doing the typesetting in her customary unfussy way. Please direct all enquiries to the LPS General Office.
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BAPTISMAL DELAY: SOME IMPLICATIONS FROM THE PARISH REGISTERS OF CRANBROOK AND SURROUNDING PARISHES IN THE KENTISH WEALD

Anthony Poole

Anthony Poole was formerly a teacher of classics and deputy headmaster at Wimbledon College. He is now researching part-time for a Ph.D. at Roehampton Institute (Surrey University), looking at inter-family relationships in the Weald of Kent in the second half of the seventeenth century.

Introduction

Those who have moulded our understanding of population history in the early modern period have generally accepted that during the sixteenth century and the early part of the seventeenth century rapid baptism was the norm. Avoidance and delay were factors which came slowly but increasingly into play during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The purpose of this paper is to show that for a few decades following 1660, when the monarchy was restored and the Anglican church re-established, some Wealden parishes in particular, and probably other parishes elsewhere, saw substantial delays between birth and baptism. It is further argued that, in calculating population totals, insufficient allowance has been made for such lengthy delays despite the probability that they were widespread. If this is so, then population figures calculated on the basis that during this period baptism commonly followed closely upon birth will substantially underestimate true population totals.

This paper uses evidence which comes from work on the relationship between the family and society in the Kentish Weald in the late seventeenth century. This has involved the total reconstitution of Cranbrook and its six neighbouring parishes of Benenden, Biddenden, Frittenden, Goudhurst, Hawkhurst and Staplehurst for the period 1660–1700.1 It starts by summarizing the problems for the demographer which are commonly associated with the delay between birth and baptism and looks at attempts to solve these problems. Then, after some background comment on the Cranbrook area, the evidence for the local parishes is explored in more detail and related to the historical context of the last four decades of the seventeenth century.

Population figures from parish registers: some problems

During the last 40 years of the seventeenth century a proportion of those who lived within the boundaries of any parish habitually followed the letter of the law and had their children baptised as the Church of England demanded. They were to ‘defer not the Baptism of their children longer than the first or second
Sunday next after their birth, or other Holy-day falling between, unless upon a
great and reasonable cause, to be approved by the Curate. 2 Others, for
whatever reason, avoided Anglican baptism altogether. 3 Yet others had their
children baptised but delayed that baptism beyond the time recommended by
the ecclesiastical authorities, sometimes to a considerable extent. In follows,
therefore, that any attempt accurately to calculate population totals by using
statistics based on baptismal figures must first determine what proportion of
births fell into each of the three baptismal categories.

Of those studies which have set out to gauge the adequacy of Anglican
parochial registration as a basis for calculating population the most compre-
hensive coverage is to be found in Wrigley and Schofield’s *The population
history of England 1541–1871*. 4 They based their calculations on aggregate
totals taken from parish registers, and ultimately chose 404 of these to repre-
sent approximately 10,000 parishes in the country. In assessing the validity of
their conclusions, it is relevant that they included Cranbrook, along with its
neighbours Benenden, Biddenden, Goudhurst and Staplehurst, among the
selected parishes. They knew that if they were to achieve an accurate estima-
tion of the total population of England before the nineteenth century they
needed to solve the problem of inadequate Anglican registration even among
their chosen parishes by devising corrective techniques. Within that global
problem, with its many ramifications of registers which were truncated, or
had lacunae, or were at times slipshod, they needed to look at the specific
problem of converting baptismal figures into statistics for total births. 5

In this context they saw a need to compensate for three factors: the increase in
nonconformity, the gradual lengthening of the interval between birth and
baptism, and any remaining gap between the totals produced by these
changes and ‘true’ totals of births. In relation to the second of these factors
they recognized that there was a gap between birth and baptism; that not to
take that gap into consideration by some suitable corrective figures would
jeopardize the accuracy of any population calculations; and that the gap was
increasing over time. 6

**Population figures from parish registers: towards some answers**

The increasing gap between birth and baptism is reflected in Wrigley and
Schofield’s estimates, decade by decade, of the number of Anglican baptisms,
nonconformist baptisms, delayed baptisms and residual non-registration per
10,000 births. 7 In their estimation, for the period 1540–1549 Anglican baptism
accounted for all the 10,000 births; from 1550–1559 allowance was made for
delayed baptism (37 per 10,000 and growing), and from 1640–1649 allowance
was also made for nonconformist baptism and residual non-registration (12
and 29 per 10,000 respectively). Wrigley and Schofield’s figures for the entire
period 1540–1700 are shown in Figure 1. The graph flattens as delayed bap-
tism increasingly gives way to nonconformity and baptismal avoidance as
suggested causes for the under-registration of births.

The figures most relevant for our purpose are shown in Table 1. They show
that, between 1640 and 1700, Wrigley and Schofield saw the nonconformist
factor (column 2) being an increasingly important component of the under-registration of births in Anglican baptismal registers. Concurrently, baptismal avoidance (column 4) is shown to parallel that rise, but to do so about two and a half times more quickly. Even more significantly, the table shows how the authors saw a steady growth in the proportion of delayed baptisms (column 3), reflecting an increasing tendency not to have one's children baptised within a week of birth. The figures also show this trend growing less rapidly throughout the second half of the seventeenth century, relative to nonconformity and avoidance.

The same figures were presented in percentage terms by Jeremy Boulton, and we include his figures in Table 2. Boulton's figures for the relevant years, emphasize the point that the contribution of delayed baptism to under-registration declined over the second half of the seventeenth century from 75 per cent to 50 per cent.

Wrigley and Schofield based their correction figures for population totals on the hypothesis that, whereas in some sixteenth century parishes baptism followed very closely on birth, 'in later centuries the two drifted further and
### Table 1  Recorded Anglican baptisms and baptisms added to take account of various factors, per 10,000 births, 1640–1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Anglican baptism totals</th>
<th>Inflation for Nonconformist</th>
<th>Delayed baptism</th>
<th>Residual non-registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1640–1649</td>
<td>9,606</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650–1659</td>
<td>9,512</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660–1669</td>
<td>9,418</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670–1679</td>
<td>9,327</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680–1689</td>
<td>9,233</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690–1699</td>
<td>9,158</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790–1799</td>
<td>7,734</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>1,313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 2  Components of under-registration in England, 1640–1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Overall percentage not registered</th>
<th>Percentages of total due to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious dissent</td>
<td>Delayed baptism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640–1649</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650–1659</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1660–1669</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670–1679</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680–1689</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1690–1699</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790–1799</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** These figures have been derived from the same source as those reproduced in Table 1 above. The percentages in the three right-hand columns are percentages of all the under-registration in the relevant decade. Thus, for example, in the decade 1640–1649, 3.9 per cent of births were not registered, and of these 3.9 per cent, nine of every ten were not-registered because of delayed baptism.

further apart until, by the later eighteenth century, there was a median interval of about a month between birth and baptism, although with wide variation from parish to parish.9 This hypothesis is fundamental to their calculations. They based it entirely on a notion mooted in the seminal paper on age at baptism which Berry and Schofield had published in 1971.10 Berry and Schofield’s conclusions were based on printed registers which they identified from 11 London parishes, 15 northern parishes (in Cumberland, Lancashire, and Yorkshire) and 17 parishes scattered over central and southern England.

Within these 43 parishes Berry and Schofield found the provision of both birth and baptism dates largely limited to just four periods: during the Commonwealth, 1653–1660; the aftermath of the introduction of the Marriage Duty Act, 1695–1705; and two later periods, 1771–1789 and 1791–1812. They treated these four periods as three, conflating the first two into 1650–1700, even though no returns at all were identified between 1671 and 1694 and only two between 1662 and 1694, and concluded that during the period 1650–1700 ‘baptism generally took place early’.11 To base conclusions on the two exceptional periods of the Commonwealth (when ecclesiastical registration was officially suspended) and the aftermath of the Act of 1695 (when for a time registration practice was considerably tightened) and to apply them to the whole of the intervening period is clearly questionable. Yet these conclusions are central to Wrigley and Schofield’s procedure, despite the fact that at the end of their article Berry and Schofield entered the caveat that ‘it would be dangerous to assume that the interval between birth and baptism in any parish, at any point of time, is either early or late’.12

Subsequent to Berry and Schofield’s article a series of notes in Local Population Studies added to the available parish samples, using their guidelines, with minor adjustments, as the basis for tables.13 The resulting picture still fails to cover 1660 to 1695, but it shows such a wide variation in baptismal delay between one parish and another, irrespective of period, that the concept of a gradual drifting apart of birth and baptism is hard to sustain. It follows that the appropriateness of some of Wrigley and Schofield’s corrective formulae must be called into question.14

In their more recent work English population history from family reconstitution, Wrigley, Davies, Oeppen and Schofield continue to accept Berry and Schofield’s hypothesis.15 They do, however, assert that the birth-baptism delay was ‘perhaps the weightiest single reason for anxiety about Anglican registration coverage.’16 They accept that reconstitution data go a long way to correct the under-counting of birth-baptism delays, but are unwilling to readjust the earlier aggregate data on which their population totals were based, on the grounds that such correction is too minor to merit reworking them.17

The Cranbrook area in context

Before we look in more detail at the evidence from the reconstitution of some Wealden parishes it would be as well to look briefly at Cranbrook and its environs so that the evidence can be seen in context. Cranbrook itself was one
of the largest parishes in Kent and possibly the most populous. One might even question whether a parish as large as Cranbrook could be considered a single community at all, in view of its floating population, its physical size (over 10,000 acres) and its incorporation of a number of distinct districts and hamlets. As a result of its size some parishioners had to travel up to five miles to attend a ceremony or service at the parish church. To distance was added the sheer difficulty, at least in winter, of moving about on the churned-up muddy tracks which abounded in the neighbourhood where the bye-roads were ‘so very deep and miry as to be but barely passable till they are hardened by the drouth of summer’. The six parishes that shared their borders with Cranbrook were smaller and less populous.

The general area retained much of its ancient woodland and had been settled comparatively late. Some of its hamlets and scattered farms did not develop until the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and all of these were probably enclosed from the beginning. The emphasis of farming was pastoral rather than arable, and the forests provided work in wood crafts such as carpentry, turning and charcoal-burning as well as iron smelting. The local practice of partible inheritance meant that farms tended to be on the small side but the population which they had to support was large, and this, together with the greater freedom which pastoral farming brought to the people, provided the classic environment for the development of local industry.

Cranbrook provided a market for the surrounding parishes and had long been established as the centre of the cloth-making industry of the Weald. Evidence from family reconstitution for the period 1650–1700 confirms that it was a centre in which cloth-working held a greater sway even than agriculture. The very detailed registers of banns of marriage for the period 1653–1662 show that, among bridegrooms from Cranbrook itself (a sample of 153), 44 per cent were occupied in the cloth industry and 29 per cent in agriculture, these two areas of occupation together accounting for 73 per cent. If we then look at bridegrooms from beyond the boundaries of Cranbrook (a sample of 221), we see that in its neighbouring parishes the reverse was true, with those involved in agriculture (36 per cent) predominating over those in the cloth industry (29 per cent). The distinction between those involved in farming and those involved in the manufacture of cloth is somewhat blurred at the edges, however, as wealthier clothiers, like the local gentry to whose ranks many of them aspired, owned land and sometimes called themselves yeomen.

The registers after 1662 show that work in the cloth industry remained a major occupation for a large proportion of men in Cranbrook and its environs; clothiers continued to be active at least to the end of the century. By the time of the Civil War, however, the industry was already declining. This decline continued in the following decades both in Cranbrook and in nearby Biddenden, the rector of which wrote in 1683: ‘The parish of Biddenden … [is] … not so populous now as formerly when the clothing trade there flourished.’
Factors affecting population estimates

So far, doubt has been cast upon the adequacy of the allowance which Wrigley and Schofield made for baptismal delay in the late seventeenth century when they were calculating national population statistics. We now need to look at the evidence as it appears in the reconstitution of Cranbrook and its environs, and see to what extent it supports their calculations. Inevitably the discussion will touch on the kindred problem of how many people deliberately avoided baptism altogether, but it is not the purpose of this paper to attempt that calculation. The effect of baptismal delay on the validity of projecting total population statistics may not be as radical as the effect of total avoidance, but because of the nebulous nature of the evidence it is more easily overlooked. For our purposes the effects of delayed baptism on population figures are best looked at under three headings: infant deaths, multiple delayed baptisms and other late baptisms.

Infant deaths

Wrigley and Schofield considered the effect on their calculations of the one month delay between birth and baptism which they accepted as the norm by the end of the eighteenth century. Taking the not untypical scenario of an infant mortality rate of 200 per 1000 live births, with one half of all those deaths occurring in the first month of life, they argued that one live birth in ten would be lost if there was a month’s delay before baptism. The infants whose lives were so cut short would bypass the baptismal register and appear directly in the burial register; we would know of their existence only from their burial. The extent of this problem in the Wealden parishes under consideration between 1650 and 1700 can best be illustrated by the figures given in Table 3.

Because the registers actually record some infants as dying unbaptised we have a figure for those who, either because of delayed baptism or because of baptismal avoidance, escaped the baptismal register. We also know the number of live births. In consequence we can be reasonably certain that in Benenden 103, or seven per cent, of the children who were born live at this period were not registered in the baptismal register. In Biddenden the figure is 177, or 11.3 per cent, and in Cranbrook 213, or 6.8 per cent. In these three parishes unbaptised infant burials represent between 37 and 47 per cent of all infants dying within the year, somewhat less than Wrigley and Schofield’s estimate that 50 per cent of deaths under one year were of unbaptised infants excluding still births. The corresponding figures for Hawkhurst (18 per cent) and Staplehurst (22 per cent) may reflect a different pattern of infant mortality or a more rapid baptismal rate. One should also bear in mind the very clear instruction from the church authorities that those dying unbaptised should not receive a Christian burial; it is possible that the ministers at Hawkhurst and Staplehurst were more punctilious than their colleagues in the other three parishes about not burying unbaptised infants. The evidence from Hawkhurst, however, confirms a rapid baptismal rate there, with less burial in church of the unbaptised. The same may be true of Staplehurst.
Wrigley and Schofield’s concern, that a substantial number of infants died unbaptised because of the delay between birth and baptism, is therefore well founded in the cases of Benenden, Biddenden and Cranbrook, but less so in Hawkhurst and Staplehurst. What needs to be stressed, however, is that they assumed that the numerical effect of delayed baptism in the late seventeenth century was less than half that at the end of the eighteenth (Table 1).

Table 3  Live births of children from the reconstitution of five parishes in the Weald of Kent, c. 1650–1700

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Benenden</th>
<th>Biddenden</th>
<th>Cranbrook</th>
<th>Hawkhurst</th>
<th>Staplehurst</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total children recorded</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>3,129*</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>8,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number dying aged under 10 years</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>3,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of whom infants aged under 1 year</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of whom unbaptised</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages of children recorded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dying aged under 10 years</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dying as infants aged under 1 year</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dying unbaptised</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dying unbaptised as a percentage of those dying aged under 1 year</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *The Cranbrook burial register often refers to deaths of children simply as 'child of …', without specifying a name. As a result, in 284 out of 3,271 entries it has been impossible to tell whether the deceased was an established child or a newborn. The figure of 3,129 quoted for ‘total children recorded’ represents the mean between the maximum of 3,271 and minimum of 2,987 children born alive. Correspondingly, the percentages given for Cranbrook in rows 5, 6 and 7 also therefore represent the mean between, for row 5: 42.8 per cent and 46.8 per cent; for row 6: 16.8 per cent and 18.4 per cent; and for row 7: 6.5 per cent and 7.1 per cent.

Source: Reconstitution of the five parishes for the period 1650–1700.
Multiple delayed baptisms

Wrigley and Schofield’s corrective figures take no account at all of the effect of delayed baptism where individuals did not die but went on to be baptised years later. The year in which such persons’ baptisms were registered was sometimes far removed from their year of birth. It would be useful to gauge the effect such misplaced baptisms might have on the aggregate analyses which provide the basis for population estimates.

That great numbers of parishioners of Cranbrook were not bringing their children to church for baptism is made abundantly clear by the crie de coeur of the vicar, John Cooper, in the baptism register in August 1664, ‘Multi in Parochia nostra nati, Pauci Sacramento renati’. More pertinent to topic of baptismal delay, Cranbrook displayed a pattern of multiple baptisms which stretched from 1664 to at least 1697. Between these dates there was a fairly constant flow of family baptisms, with six figuring in each of 1670, 1671, 1672, 1684, 1685 and 1697, and at least one in virtually every year. John Cooper was the vicar responsible for the first of the major series by bringing into the Church the family of Richard and Ann Knowles, whose four children (aged six, four and three years, and two months) were all baptised on 18 June 1665. During the next three years, before his death in July 1668, a further seven families had several of their children baptised at the same time by John Cooper.

Charles Buck succeeded John Cooper as vicar of Cranbrook, and continued the process begun by his predecessor of bringing into the Church whole families of children by multiple baptism. On occasions the oldest of the children being baptised was no longer properly a child; thus on 2 February 1671, five members of the Unycombe family, children of William and Jane, and a sixth (presumably a cousin), were baptised; the eldest was 21 years of age, the youngest two months. On 30 November 1684, six children of William and Elizabeth Rofe were baptised, ranging in age from 19 years through 14, 9, 8 and 4 years to 18 months. The following year saw Thomas and Mary Merryal’s five children (aged between 18 and 2½ years) all baptised on 20 April. Even as late as 1697 we find Peter and Mildred Walter having their children baptised en bloc on 5 April: Mildred aged ten years, John (nine), Peter (eight), Benjamin (seven), Elizabeth (four), Abraham (three) and Isaac aged ten months.

These examples are drawn from those children for whom the registers give birth dates as well as baptisms. There are also instances of multiple baptisms where we do not know the ages of the children, as for example the three daughters of James and Mary Potter baptised on 29 December 1697. Though possibly triplets, it is more likely they include at least two coming late to baptism. Robert and Elizabeth Spillet, whose daughters Elizabeth and Sarah were baptised respectively in 1668 and 1671, had three other children, John, Henry and Elizabeth, who were all baptised together on 4 April 1681, some six months after their father’s death. These family baptisms give us ample warn-
ing that the date of baptism can bear little relationship to the date of birth in the post-Commonwealth period. We should also remind ourselves that these are only ‘delayed baptisms’ because we are viewing them with the benefit of hindsight; to the contemporary, until the decision to baptise was taken, these families were avoiding baptism altogether.

Other late baptisms

To the incidence of delayed family baptisms can be added evidence from the Cranbrook registers for the main bulk of parishioners. For 28 per cent of baptisms in the registers between 1661 and 1700 we have dates of birth as well as baptism. The delay between birth and baptism ranges from a few hours to 30 years (Table 4). For whatever reason, in the period after the Restoration only 25 per cent of the population of Cranbrook for whom we know both birth and baptism date had their children baptised within a month of birth. If it is assumed that all the 72 per cent of baptisms with unrecorded birth dates were baptised within one week, an upper limit can be calculated for the proportion of all live births that were baptised within a certain number of weeks. This upper limit is shown as line B in Figure 2, where line A represents the data for Cranbrook in Table 4. The incidence of multiple baptisms within families, with no birth dates given, shows that it is unlikely that the true distribution is very close to line B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cranbrook 1661-1699</th>
<th>Benenden 1663–1679</th>
<th>Benenden 1680–1699</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage with both dates known</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of those baptised within 1 week</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Parish registers of Benenden and Cranbrook, with percentages limited to baptisms where birth dates are also given.
The Cranbrook figures are supported by the baptismal registers of its neighbour Benenden which provide an exceptionally comprehensive view of baptismal practice, with 61 per cent of birth and baptism dates known between 1663 and 1679, and nearly 98 per cent for the period 1680–1699. Just as at Cranbrook, lengthy delays do occur, cases of 28 and 29 years being recorded in 1681 and 1689 respectively. However, the concentration of longer delays (of more than a year) is in the 1660s and 1670s, as is the incidence of parents bringing their children along for family baptism. Between 1663 and 1679 only 48 per cent of the population of Benenden for whom we know both birth and baptism date had their children baptised within a month of birth, whereas by 1680–1699 (when virtually all entries have both birth and baptism dates) this figure had risen to 74 per cent (Table 4). Figures 3 and 4 show the upper and lower limits on the true distribution of baptism delays for Benenden in 1663–1679 and 1680–1699 respectively.

At nearby Biddenden the registers between 1650 and 1699 provide both birth date and baptismal date for a mere seven per cent of births, a situation which precludes analysis. At least part of the pattern is repeated, however, with some families delaying baptism, for instance Christopher and Ann Clarke in 1663 (children aged 16, 14, 12 and 11 years); John and Mary Henman in 1664 (children aged seven, five and three years and an infant), and Richard and
Figure 3  Benenden: delayed baptisms 1663-1679

Notes:  See Figure 2.

Figure 4  Benenden: delayed baptisms 1680–1699

Notes:  See Figure 2.
Martha Venos in 1675 (aged five years, three years and one year). Hawkhurst provides birth dates for more than a third of those baptised, but in this case the pattern is generally for rapid baptism (81.5 per cent within the month). There were a few remarkable exceptions including seven adult baptisms. For example, on 27 October 1676, John Nokes, ‘aged about 24 years desiring the sacrament of Baptism and answering for himself was baptised’; and on 7 December 1677, Susannah Edmeate, ‘being of years of discretion and able to answer for herselfe was then Baptised, but she was borne 28 February 1653’.

The effect of baptism delays on aggregate baptismal totals can be estimated by tabulating the total number of baptisms in each parish for five-year periods, deducting those over the age of twelve months whose year of birth is inaccurately reflected thereby, and assigning them to their correct year of birth (Table 5). From this it will be seen that Cranbrook provides the greatest percentage of entries misplaced (in 1661–1665 the total baptised should be increased by 14 per cent, in 1681–1685 the total decreased by 12 per cent). Overall, the pattern is to increase the baptismal totals by between three and four per cent in 1661–1670, and correspondingly to reduce them in 1676–1695 by between two and six per cent.

**Reasons for baptismal anomalies, 1660–1700**

There can be little surprise that the pattern of delay between birth and baptism was transformed at or soon after 1660. In 1643 the Episcopal hierarchy had been officially abolished, and over the following years the structure of the established church collapsed; it could not re-establish itself overnight. The Restoration in 1660 found the uniformity of the established church shattered, and sectarian practices and anticlerical sentiments jostling alongside each other. Thus, although the Act of Uniformity of Public Prayers made orthodox public baptism mandatory again in 1662, strict enforcement proved impossible. Church court records of the 1660s list page after page of laymen ‘refusing baptism’ for their children. The churchwardens of Great Parndon, Essex, regretted in 1664, ‘many children as yet unbaptised which were born in that notorious rebel’s time’. As late as 1699 Robert Barrett, a medical writer, refers to bringing children to baptism as ‘a duty nowadays too much neglected and slighted’. In some parishes there was much rejoicing at whole families returning to the fold, with several children being baptised at the same time.29

In their work on Terling in Essex, Wrightson and Levine note that in 1679 approximately 15 per cent of the householders were practising only a very severely limited conformity to the restored Church of England, while in addition something over 20 per cent were failing to attend church at all. They go on to note: ‘A number of former Baptists or Quakers were also won back in the course of the 1670s, bringing in droves of children to be baptised all at once and to have their dates of birth and baptism entered in the parish register.’30 This parallels the situation in the Weald, and helps to explain delayed baptisms in Cranbrook and its environs in these years. It could also apply to parishes across the whole of the country.
## Table 5  Baptisms realigned to year of birth where known

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Benenden</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1661–1665</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666–1670</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671–1675</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676–1680</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681–1685</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686–1690</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Biddenden</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1661–1665</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666–1670</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671–1675</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676–1680</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681–1685</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Cranbrook</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1661–1665</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666–1670</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671–1675</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676–1680</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681–1685</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>+14%</td>
<td>+9%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Hawkhurst</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1661–1665</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666–1670</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671–1675</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676–1680</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681–1685</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>+1%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Staplehurst</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1661–1665</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666–1670</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671–1675</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676–1680</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681–1685</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Overall totals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before realignment</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After realignment</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>+3.6%</td>
<td>+3.3%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

A – baptisms of children (sometimes adults) over 12 months old subtracted from the 5-year total because the birth date fell outside that period;

B – baptisms added to the appropriate five-year period.

**Source:** Parish Registers of Benenden, Biddenden, Cranbrook, Hawkhurst and Staplehurst.
Wrigley and Schofield identified areas which featured rural handicraft industry as ‘settings in which nonconformity was strongest, but in which there was also the most pronounced tendency to eschew all religious ceremonial or to be intermittent and laggard in observance’.31 That there was a real nonconformist problem in the Wealden parishes is borne out by consideration of the Compton Census of 1676. In his return Charles Buck, the vicar for the central parish of Cranbrook, indicated approximately 1,300 persons in the parish over the age of 16 of whom one or two were suspected to be papists and 400 to be ‘sectaries’ of all sorts, including for the most part Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists and Quakers. Over 30 per cent of the adults of Cranbrook, therefore, remained nonconformists, and actual communicants numbered only 100.32 For Benenden, Nicholas Monyman reported, ‘I find by diligent inspection 560 persons, men and women over 16’, as well as 24 papists and 45 nonconformists (six or seven Anabaptists and Quakers, the rest Presbyterians); more than ten per cent of adults in Benenden remained nonconformists of one hue or another. He added that there were ‘82 at Holy Communion this Easter-tide’.33

When Jonathan Pleydell made the Hawkhurst returns he said, ‘I finde upon diligent Inquiry 1,000 men and women over 16’; of these he estimated about 150 (15 per cent) to be nonconformists. For Frittenden Robert Newton made a typically precise return, recording approximately 215 persons of years of discretion, men and women, and near ‘100 under age boys and girls; in all 300 and over’. Among 84 nonconformists he included ‘2 or 3 obstinate dissenters,’ 31 Anabaptists or so suspected, two Quakers, two Brownists, between 30 and 40 ‘Newtralists between Presbyterians and Conformists’, and 11 or 12 ‘licentious or such as profess no kind of Religion’. In broad figures some 20 per cent of his flock were nonconformist.34

Stephen Sowton, responsible for the Staplehurst returns, noted 455 inhabitants over the age of 16 of whom 295 were conformists and 160 nonconformists. In terms of the proportion of nonconformists to conformists this bears out the importance of Staplehurst as a centre for dissent: 35 per cent of parishioners were not conforming to the established Church. This no doubt reveals the influence of Daniel Poyntell, the nonconformist minister who stayed put in the parish in which he had held the benefice under the Commonwealth. Finally in what Ann Whiteman picks out as ‘an example of returns given in a slipshod or feckless way’, the Rector at Biddenden, Moses Lee, reported: ‘I conceive there cannot be less than 7 hundred’, of the dissenters: ‘I conceive there are betweene fourore and an hundred of all sects of what denomination soever, mostly Anabaptists, some Browne.’35

The Compton returns, therefore, confirm that the parishes under consideration possessed substantial nonconformist populations (Table 6). With some marked exceptions, the further a parish was from Cranbrook the less nonconformity it displayed, but local circumstances (the personality of the incumbent, for instance) seem to have played a more important part in this than local industry or topography. The presence of a nonconformist element, however, does help to explain the proliferation of delayed multiple baptisms,
with families returning to the fold and individual adults seeking baptism as nonconformity lost its attraction.36

Consequences for the demographer

In calculating annual baptismal figures Wrigley and Schofield used multipliers to offset the effect of delayed baptism, nonconformity and residual non-registration, but in each of these areas they were punctilious in admitting the tentative nature of their solutions. When they came to apply correction figures to offset the increasing delay between birth and baptism they accepted that ‘the estimates of shortfall … are subject to some margin of error’.37 They further admitted that any set of correction factors devised to offset the growing importance of nonconformity must necessarily be arbitrary, and concluded that ‘it would be idle to pretend’ that the full set of final inflation ratios for baptism linked to the schedule of corrections already made for nonconformity was ‘demonstrably correct’.38 Indeed they accepted that, particularly before 1801, their multipliers were based on a ‘balancing act of probabilities rather than inference from indisputable fact’.39 Nevertheless they asserted that the ‘robustness of the estimates should not be underestimated’.40

Table 6 Percentage of non-conformists in central Wealden parishes of Kent according to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inner ring</th>
<th>Middle ring</th>
<th>Outer ring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beneden</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Headcorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biddenden</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>High Halden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Horsmonden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fittenden</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lamberhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkhurst</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Marden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudhurst</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Newenden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staplehurst</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rolvenden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smarden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenterden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The ‘rings’ are defined as follows:
‘inner ring’: Cranbrook and immediately adjacent parishes;
‘middle ring’: Kentish Wealden parishes adjacent to the inner ring;
‘outer ring’: Kentish Wealden parishes adjacent to the middle ring but not in inner ring.

From their figures it is possible to calculate the multipliers which they saw as appropriate to delayed baptism alone in each decade between 1660 and 1699: 3.9 per cent, 4.1 per cent, 4.3 per cent and 4.6 per cent (in chronological order). Such figures greatly undervalue the effects of delayed baptism as we have seen them in Cranbrook and its environs. At least for the decade after 1662, a multiplier of some three to four per cent is needed simply to offset the effect of baptisms delayed for a year or more (see Table 5). These are often due to multiple (family) baptisms, which were not accounted for by Wrigley and Schofield, who saw them as rare before the end of the eighteenth century. To this three to four per cent one needs to add the calculated percentages of live-born infants dying before baptism, which, for the generation after 1660, average about six per cent in the Cranbrook area (see Table 3). This is the factor which Wrigley and Schofield did account for, but undervalued because Berry and Schofield believed that the median baptismal delay did not reach one month until 100 years later. Wrigley and Schofield assumed a steadily increasing delay, which produced a median of about 18 days by the end of the seventeenth century.

Based on these assumptions, Wrigley and Schofield produced the generally accepted version of the pattern of population change in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, illustrated by Figure 5. This shows a downturn in

Figure 5  Population trends 1541-1741

population between 1658 and 1686 which gradually recovered between 1687 and 1717, at which point the population had returned to the level of 1657. The years of decline, 1658–1686, are precisely the years when in Cranbrook and its environs baptismal dates least represent birth dates; a feature which may well be true of the country as a whole.

Conclusion

It would be inappropriate simply to apply correction figures derived from the Cranbrook area to the national population graph. They relate only to delayed baptism, and do not therefore take into account the high rate of baptismal avoidance implied by contemporary nonconformity which would require a far greater correction. Moreover, they apply to only one per cent of the 404 parishes which were used to make up the graph, and one cannot argue persuasively from the specific to the general. But there is good evidence of the atypical nature of the decades after 1660 in the Church of England as a whole, and it may be assumed that registration of baptism was affected in many parishes. The least one can say is that the evidence from the Cranbrook area suggests that the accepted downturn in national population between 1658 and 1686 may have been exaggerated.

NOTES

1. For total reconstitution see P. Sharpe, 'The total reconstitution method: a tool for class-specific study?', Local Population Studies, 44 (1990), 41–51. Of the parishes studied, work on Frittenden and Goudhurst is as yet incomplete.


3. This is particularly true of Baptists, who started in Biddenden in the 1640s and spread to Cranbrook in 1648 (Cranbrook registers survive from 1682) and Quakers who arrived in the area in 1655 and rapidly established themselves. On Baptists see L.J. Maguire, Cranbrook Baptist Church, (General Baptist Assembly, 1995). On Quakers see G. Draper, 'The first hundred years of Quakerism in Kent,' Archaeologia Cantiana, 122 (1993), 317–38 (part 1); and Archaeologia Cantiana, 14 (1995), 1–22 (part 2). On the Congregationalist Church see D. Russell, Cranbrook congregational church: a short history; (1993). In general see C.C.R. Pile, Dissenting congregations in Cranbrook (Cranbrook and Sissinghurst Local History Society, 1953); and G. Nuttall, 'Dissenting churches in Kent pre-1700' Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 14 (1963), 175–89


13. The first of these notes was D. Woodward, ‘The impact of the Commonwealth Act on Yorkshire parish registers’, *Local Population Studies*, 15 (1975), 15–29. Woodward looked primarily at the years of secular registration, 1653 to 1660, and in the process examined the registers of 354 Yorkshire parishes. The concentration of this evidence is almost exclusively on the Commonwealth period, which was in many ways exceptional. In particular Parliament required that births be registered, not baptisms, and that lay registrars be elected to do the registering. As a result some registers are very full, others non-existent. Woodward’s Yorkshire parishes during the Commonwealth range from Hornsea (1654–1657), with 90 per cent of the parish being baptised within four days, to Royston (1654–1660), where it took a full month for 90 per cent to be baptised. Even after all these extra examples, the Restoration period remains uncovered, the only two examples to hand failing to meet the parameters laid down by Berry and Schofield; they do, however, imply a very great widening of the birth baptism gap at this time.

17. They make this point despite indicating that some 6.7 per cent of births between 1630 and 1679 had to be added as ‘dummy’ births to cover cases where there was no baptism but evidence from burials, and some 5.2 per cent had to be added between 1680 and 1729 (see Wrigley, Davies, Oeppen and Schofield, *English population history from family reconstitution*, 113).
19. Such districts include Chittenden, Colliers Green, Courtstile, Glassenbury, Goldford, Hartley, Hesseldens Wood, Milkhouse, Plushinghurst [Flishinghurst] and Wilsley Green.
23. The registers of banns normally provide the date of marriage, name and origin of bride and groom, occupation of groom, and the name of the father (and sometimes mother) of both the bride and groom together with the father’s origin and occupation.
26. ‘Many are born in our parish, few born again by the Sacrament’.
28. 2 February was the Feast of the Presentation or Candlemas, and was (like Easter) a favourite for baptisms.


31. Wrigley and Schofield, *Population history of England* 136. See also G. Nuttall, ‘Dissenting Churches in Kent’; P. Collinson, *Godly people: essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London, 1983) 527–62 (esp. 558); and 12, in which it is written that ‘Sectarianism and doctrinal idiosyncracies appear to have persisted obstinately in districts with an old dissenting tradition, such as the Weald of Kent and parts of Essex.’


33. Whiteman, *The Compton census*, lli and 25 (note 106). In Whiteman the incumbent is incorrectly referred to as Nicholas Longman.


36. G. Draper, ‘The first hundred years of Quakerism in Kent’, 330, makes the point that many second generation Quaker families returned to the Anglican fold. On the other hand there plenty of instances in these Kentish parishes at this time of known nonconformist families who appear in the Anglican registers for marriages and burials, but who avoided Anglican baptism altogether.
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Introduction

It has been argued that as larger towns grew and transport improved from 1680 to 1840 so smaller towns came into increasing competition with their neighbours and some, those usually least well placed in terms of natural resources and communication routes, underwent de-urbanization.1 Everitt estimated that by 1770 ‘perhaps as many as one third of the 800 market towns in England and Wales had become extinct’.2 However, this leaves over 500 towns still in existence by the early nineteenth century and recent work has presented a more optimistic picture of the demographic and cultural performance of small towns, including towns with populations of under 1,000.3

This paper uses a case study of six Nottinghamshire market towns to evaluate the extent to which our picture of small towns in this period needs to be reassessed. It will concentrate on three aspects of these towns’ experience. First, their demographic progress will be examined. Second, their economic performance will be analysed and linked to demographic change. Population growth is usually accompanied by an expansion in economic opportunities and wealth. Clark argues that some form of economic specialism, whether it be in manufacturing, services or leisure, underpinned many small towns in Georgian England.4 Langton also points to advances made in the organic economy which brought ‘greater commercialization and increasing consumption of ever higher order goods and services’, and shows how this stimulated urban growth.5 Finally, the demographic and economic development of the Nottinghamshire towns will be discussed in relation to the broader eighteenth century and early Victorian English experience.

The six towns examined are Newark, Mansfield, Worksop, East Retford, Ollerton and Bingham. Between 1680 and 1840 Nottinghamshire had ten market towns, including the county town itself. As in many other parts of England, this number represented a decline compared with earlier periods but it remained stable into the nineteenth century.6 The six towns were chosen for three main reasons. First, they were geographically dispersed about the county (Figure 1). Worksop and East Retford lie to the north; Newark, Mansfield and
Figure 1  Nottinghamshire market towns in the eighteenth century
Ollerton are more centrally placed on an east-west axis; while Bingham lies close to Nottingham in the south. The geographical dispersal of the towns means they represent a variety of different local agrarian economies, largely reflecting local differences in geology and soils. Second, and more important, they varied greatly in size. By 1841, the parish of Newark had a population of 10,195, but the chapelry of Ollerton only 777. This diversity of size reflects the very differing fortunes of the towns over this and earlier periods and raises interest as to what, if anything, was common to their development between 1680 and 1841. Third, in this diversity of size we can distinguish Clark’s variety of smaller town type, from the larger established centres (usually boroughs) to middling market towns (often unincorporated) and minor or ‘micro-towns’ with fewer than 800 inhabitants at the end of the seventeenth century. Such distinctions might allow for the inclusion of places like Ollerton. With a population under 800 even in 1841, Ollerton was barely large enough to qualify as a town. None the less, this small settlement had a market for most of our period; it continued to be classified in contemporary histories and directories as a town. There is also evidence to suggest that it continued to operate as a central service place within its immediate rural hinterland. In 1841 Ollerton supported 62 different occupations, including grocers, druggists, surgeons, merchants, watch and clockmakers, a surveyor, a carver/gilder and a bookseller. The significance of this range of occupations can be gauged by a comparison with one of the largest villages in Nottinghamshire at the time – Laxton. In 1841 Laxton had a population of 641, and possessed only 22 different trades and professions, and none of the specialisms found in Ollerton. In this instance, therefore, contemporary classification and function have been key determinants in defining urban status.

Population growth in the Nottinghamshire market town, 1674–1841

It is perhaps surprising that, for a period much noted for its urbanization, we know so little about the growth of individual towns lower down the urban hierarchy. For much of the period, as with larger towns, we have to rely on snapshot estimates of population from sources like the Hearth Tax Returns until the census return of 1801. Table 1 provides population estimates for the Nottinghamshire towns from 1664–1674 to 1743 based on the Hearth Tax Returns, the Compton Census and Archbishop Herring’s returns. These figures have to be treated with caution. Of particular significance here is the difficulty in distinguishing between town and parish. The Hearth Tax returns are not parish based yet Archbishop Herring’s returns are: we are not, therefore, comparing like with like. The census returns are parish based except for Ollerton where the figures given are for the chapelry. Table 1 illustrates how varied the parish sizes were. With the parish of Worksop covering 17,935 acres it is likely that many of the inhabitants inhabited a rural rather than an urban environment. More specifically, the Compton Census does not include a specific household count for Ollerton and the household figures for Mansfield and Newark, as taken from Archbishop Herring’s returns, indicate an approximation rather than a count.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Parish Acres</th>
<th>Hearth Tax 1664–1674</th>
<th>Compton Census 1676</th>
<th>Archbishop Herring’s returns 1743</th>
<th>% population Increase 1664–1743</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total no. of households</td>
<td>% non-chargeable</td>
<td>Population estimate</td>
<td>Total no. of people recorded</td>
<td>Population estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>c145</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>616–653</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Retford</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>893–945</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>7,252</td>
<td>c370</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,573–1,665</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>1,931</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2,401–2,543</td>
<td>1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ollerton</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>213–225</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksop</td>
<td>17,935</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,521–1,611</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The population estimates from the Hearth Tax and Archbishop Herring’s returns have been obtained by multiplying the total number of households by 4.25 – 4.5. The population estimate from the Compton Census has been obtained by multiplying the total number of people recorded by 1.5. The damaged returns for the Hearth Tax in 1664 for Bingham and Mansfield suggest that those for 1674 lack nearly 30 and over 50 non-chargeable households respectively so these have been added to the 1674 totals. In East Retford and Newark, the 1664 Hearth Tax totals have been used because the 1674 totals do not include non-chargeable households. The Worksop total uses the 1664 Hearth Tax Return but this includes the figures for Osberton, Scrofton, Kilton, Welbeck, Gaitford, Shireoak and Ratcliffe. The figure for Worksop alone is 184 and this could represent the town’s inhabitants but since the data for 1743 and later census data relate to the whole parish, any Hearth Tax figure that represented less than the whole parish would be misleading.
Bearing these considerations in mind and applying a range of multipliers, the local demographic picture from 1664 to 1743 is mixed. Only the largely rural parish of Bingham seems to have experienced population decline. Baptisms and burials for the Hundred of Bingham from 1700 to 1740 show this area to have suffered the worst excess of burials over baptisms in 1720 for the county as a whole. Worksop’s population in 1743 was the same as in 1664. Again, this was a large rural parish and Wood’s study of population, based on the parish registers, suggests the actual town of Worksop saw a steady population increase from the 1690s. It would seem that the early eighteenth century was particularly difficult for the more rural parishes. Nottinghamshire, like the country as a whole, experienced a short-term decline in population in the late 1720s. Burials reached a peak in the county between 1727 and 1729. The reason for this, as Beckett suggests, is that nationally the late 1720s were years of bad weather and poor harvests. Newark, Ollerton and Mansfield, by contrast, appear to have experienced population increase from 1664 to 1743. Again the baptism and burial records support this. In Wood’s analysis Mansfield’s population saw the largest growth, followed by Newark.

The second half of the eighteenth century, by contrast, saw most of the towns doubling their population. Only the smallest, Ollerton, failed to do so (Table 2). From 1801 to 1841 the population of the Nottinghamshire market towns continued to grow with an average increase for all six towns of 43.5 per cent. This was better than in some other regions: for example, the average population increase among 15 towns in the North Riding was 32.3 per cent. More generally, Clark argues that by 1811 England was on the eve of large-scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Population totals of Nottinghamshire market towns in the census enumerations of 1801–1841</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>1801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Retford</td>
<td>1,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>5,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>6,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ollerton</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksop</td>
<td>3,263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: In the case of Ollerton the figures given are for the chapelry rather than the parish. The columns headed ‘% increase’ give the percentage increase over the previous census.
industrial transformation’ and this had a detrimental effect on smaller towns which ‘became increasingly marginalized from the accelerating juggernaut of urbanization’. To some extent this chronology fits the experience of Nottinghamshire. Newark and Mansfield had seen the highest growth rates from 1743 to 1801, and were also the two towns that established quite a strong textile manufacturing base. Their growth rates, along with those for East Retford, more than halved between 1801 and 1841 compared with the previous half century. Worksop and Bingham experienced a smaller decline in population growth rates, while Ollerton saw its rate of population growth increase in the last 40 years of this study. The eighteenth century proved to be a period of mixed fortunes. By the early nineteenth century we see a growing distance developing between the two smaller towns of Bingham and Ollerton and the four larger towns. This could go some way to supporting the arguments of those who believe the eighteenth-century saw a rationalization of the urban network. None the less, such a generalization needs to be carefully qualified. East Retford and Ollerton, each with populations under 1,000 in 1674, saw some growth in the first half of the eighteenth century and the fortunes of all the towns appears to have improved from 1743 to 1801. Taking the highest population estimates for 1664/1674, Mansfield’s population increased at least five-fold from 1674 to 1841, Newark’s and Worksop’s quadrupled, Ollerton’s and Bingham’s trebled and East Retford’s nearly trebled. Newark and Mansfield remained the largest of the towns throughout the period, with the second half of the eighteenth century seeing their most significant growth. With the six towns at least doubling their population during the eighteenth century, demand for employment, goods and services must also have increased. The following sections will show that the economic development of these towns fits neatly with the pattern established for demographic performance.

Table 3  Number of different occupations recorded in the probate documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>1680–1720</th>
<th>1721–1760</th>
<th>1761–1800</th>
<th>1801–1840</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksop</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Retford</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ollerton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Nottinghamshire Wills and Probate Inventories, Nottinghamshire Archive office, PRMW and PRNW.
Economic development and change, 1680–1840

Two distinct phases of economic development appear in the Nottinghamshire market towns. The first encompasses the period from 1680 to 1770 and is characterized by an expansion of the traditional role of the market town as a centre for trade and services (Table 3). The number of trades and crafts, together with professional services, increases steadily in this period. By the early nineteenth century, it is clear that this development is far more noticeable in the four larger towns – Newark, Mansfield, Worksop and East Retford. Most of the demand for these goods and services probably came from the local market and inventories show an increasing range of goods appearing in Nottinghamshire homes. By 1841 all the towns, including Bingham and Ollerton, supported a much more varied occupational structure. The second phase of economic development, noticeable from the 1770s, is the introduction of large-scale agricultural and textile industries catering for national and international markets. This is accompanied by a rapid physical expansion of Newark, Mansfield, Worksop and to a more limited extent East Retford. These new aspects of the market town economy by no means totally superseded more established economic practices like catering for travellers and the marketing of local produce. The introduction of manufacture, however, did transform the local economy from one predominantly of exchange and service functions to one in which production for national and international markets came to play a far more significant role.

Diversification of the occupational structure, 1680–1841

Each of the Nottinghamshire market towns saw some increase in the range of trades and professions it supported. Most of these new occupations, like more established trades, were small in scale, often based on a single household. The recurrence of specialist trades and crafts between towns suggests that each town was supported by a fairly local market. This kind of development, according to Crafts, was characteristic of the national picture in the eighteenth century.20 Home consumption, particularly of fashionable and luxurious items among a greater proportion of the population, suggests domestic demand was flourishing.21 Of particular note was the growth of trades and crafts catering for consumer and leisure goods and services, suggesting the flourishing home market in this period shed its invigorating influence on smaller and medium market towns as much as the provincial centres. In this respect the Nottinghamshire market towns shared in a much broader experience. Using data from trade directories, Corfield has shown that, whereas only a few hundred job designations were recorded in the seventeenth century, by the 1770s and 1780s the number was 1,964.22

Analysis of wills and inventories reveals that, between 1680 and 1720, 69 different occupations were recorded in the six Nottinghamshire towns. This figure rose to 76 between 1721 and 1760, 89 between 1761 and 1800 and 108 between 1801 and 1841.23 The largest range of occupations in any one town was to be found in Newark with 72 between 1801 and 1841. It is difficult to judge
whether this was a greater than average range of occupations for a market town. Marshall found 38 occupations recorded in Kendal in 1695, which was then larger than any of the Nottinghamshire market towns, with a population of about 2,500. Patten’s analysis of East Anglian towns between 1650 and 1699 shows that most of the smaller towns had no more than 30 different occupations and a number had significantly fewer.

The most frequently recorded occupation between 1680 and 1720 was that of farmer or yeoman (69 inventories), illustrating just how important agriculture was at this point. Other common occupations included maltsters, innkeepers, shoemakers and cordwainers, butchers, bakers, mercers, tanners, ironmongers, joiners, dyers, wheelwrights and masons (Table 4). Between 1680 and 1720 the key occupational areas were in agriculture, provisions, building and construction, metalware and leather goods. To this can be added the services of barbers and apothecaries. Newark, Mansfield, East Retford and Worksop also supported more specialist trades such as haberdashery, saddle-making, bodice-making and the making of cutlery. Only Newark and Mansfield offered the more specialized services of whitesmiths, hatters, gardeners, merchants, a clerk and a clock maker by 1700. Newark and Mansfield continued to support a wider range of specialist crafts, trades and services throughout the eighteenth

### Table 4: Occupations recorded ten or more times in the probate documents 1680–1840

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1680–1720</td>
<td>Farmer/Yeoman (69), Maltster (30), Innkeeper and Shoemaker/Cordwainer (25), Butcher (24), Draper/Mercer (22), Tanner/Leatherdresser (16), Apothecary/Surgeon (15), Blacksmith (14), Barber (11), Baker (11), Labourer (10), Chandler (10), Fellmonger/Glover (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721–1760</td>
<td>Farmer/Yeoman (75), Innkeeper (59), Maltster (43), Butcher (23), Shoemaker/Cordwainer (21), Draper/Mercer (21), Joiner (12), Apothecary/Surgeon (12), Fellmonger/Glover (11), Labourer (11), Gardener (11), Tailor (10), Baker (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761–1800</td>
<td>Innkeeper (78), Farmer/Yeoman (72), Maltster (30), Shoemaker/Cordwainer (23), Grocer (21), Butcher (20), Carpenter (15), Draper/Mercer (14), Tailor (13), Joiner (13), Framework Knitter (13), Fellmonger/Glover (12), Apothecary/Surgeon (12), Merchant (12), Shopkeeper (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801–1840</td>
<td>Farmer/Yeoman (110), Innkeeper (53), Labourer (36), Shoemaker/Cordwainer (17), Butcher (16), Baker (15), Grocer (14), Framework Knitter (14), Bricklayer (13), Tailor (13), Maltster (12), Gardener (12), Plumber/Glazier (11), Boatman (10), Wheelwright (10), Miller (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The numbers in brackets record the number of inventories for each occupation

**Sources:** Nottinghamshire Wills and Probate Inventories, Nottinghamshire Archives Office, PRMW and PRNW.
century. By contrast, only 13 different trades and occupations were recorded in the probate documents for Ollerton between 1801 and 1841, and none was particularly specialized.

There are problems with using probate records to analyse occupational change. They represent only a minority of the population and this tends to be its wealthier members. Nor do they reveal occupations fully. As Spufford has argued, ‘we are becoming more and more conscious of the importance of both dual incomes and of the family budget’. Despite these drawbacks, probate inventories do give an indication of what types of individual amassed sufficient wealth, in terms of movable property, to have an inventory taken. From the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the evidence of trade and commercial directories shows that the occupational structures of all the towns had become more complex than the inventories suggest. For example, even the smaller towns of Bingham and Ollerton had, by 1832, watch and clock makers, tea dealers, an attorney, a confectioner, a hatter, china and glass dealers, druggists, tobacconists, wine and spirit merchants, cabinet makers and paper makers. Newark’s working population included printers, bankers, stencillors, musical instrument makers, upholsterers, perfumers, dealers in London hats, portrait painters, jewellers and toy dealers.

Trade directories are a more thorough source than probate inventories, although they too are selective in their coverage. A comparison of directory trade listings with that of the census enumeration for Ashby-de-la-Zouch shows that directories tend to list only higher status occupations. Similarly, for Newark, Pigot and Company’s National Commercial Directory (1842) has no mention of over 80 different occupations recorded in the 1841 census. Significantly, the missing occupations are mostly the more menial ones. In Worksop, only 25 per cent of occupations are included and the figure falls to 15 per cent for Bingham. Even so, more specialized trades and professions are included in the trade and commercial directories. By 1841 the census recorded 242 different occupations for Newark, 245 for Mansfield, 153 for Worksop, 134 for East Retford, 88 for Bingham and 62 for Ollerton.

Bearing the source limitations in mind, key occupational growth areas seem to have come first in the retailing of clothes and textiles, the production and retailing of fashionable furniture and general grocery stores, often selling a range of goods from the colonies. Highly specialized traders such as china and glass dealers and instrument makers were in business locally by the second half of the eighteenth century (if not earlier), along with chemists and surveyors and an early reference to textile manufacturing (hosiers) (Table 5). Between 1801 and 1841 wills and inventories exist for a larger array of traders, professionals and manufacturers. It is, of course, unwise to place too much confidence in occupational descriptions. Probate inventories and, later on, directories often reveal some occupational pluralism. Nominally specialist traders could be selling a range of unexpected goods (often groceries). Most retailers were probably opportunists and sought to make profits however they could. Thus, in 1700, a Newark mercer, Thomas Newham, left not only hose
and gloves, drapery ware, silkware and haberdashery ware but also groceries in his shop. It might be assumed that Newark did not sustain the level of trade required for Thomas Newham to concentrate solely on textile goods but the inventory for Mary Manning showed a more specialist stock in her shop. Mary Manning was a hatter and the inventory listed over 257 hats. Nor was Newark the only town that could sustain such focused shops: similar inventories for mercers, hatters and haberdashers appear in Mansfield and East Retford. It should also be noted that whereas inventories often reveal late seventeenth century tradesmen with a farming interest, this was on the decline in the larger market towns from 1680 to 1760. Whereas up to 1720 23 out of 73 inventories (31.5 per cent) from Newark recorded agricultural stock for individuals not described as farmers, 40 years later the number had fallen to only 26 out of 135 inventories, or 19.3 per cent.

Not all of these businesses were necessarily small, localized enterprises: some shopkeepers had outlets in more than one town. The inventory for John Calvert (1689) detailed stock in his shop at Newark, and referred to stock kept in a second shop at Grantham. In 1726 Amos Torr, a Worksop brazier, left goods in his shop at Worksop as well as in shops in Tuxford and East Retford, the two nearest market towns. While demand may have been local for most traders, supplies came from much further afield. Many shops stocked goods acquired from outside the county and country: Dutch thread and cloth, Irish and Russian cloth, German steel and Manchester ware, for example.

The range of goods sold and the distance over which some of these items had to be transported underlines the importance of location. Not surprisingly, the range of specialist shops was limited in the smaller towns of Bingham and Ollerton: neither was situated near a major traffic artery and both suffered

---

Table 5  New trade and professional titles recorded in the probate documents, 1721–1840

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1721–1760</td>
<td>Chair Maker (2), Soap Boiler (2), Shop Keeper (2), Pewterer, Confectioner, Basket Maker, Wool Comber, Cabinet Maker, Stationer, Bookseller, Musician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761–1800</td>
<td>Excise Officer (6), Chemist (3), Corn Factor (2), Paper Maker, Hardware Dealer, Clog Maker, Steward, Plasterer, Painter, Tool Maker, Instrument Maker, Hosier, Gunsmith, Surveyor, China And Glass Dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801–1841</td>
<td>Brush Maker (4), Book Keeper (2), Map Maker (2), Broker (2), Linen Manufacturer (2), Patten Maker (2), Coal Dealer (2), Lace Worker (2), Spoon Maker, Flaxmonger, Bleacher, Meal Man, Attorney, Machine Maker, Horse Dealer, Engraver, Pipe Maker, Auctioneer, Architect, Frock Maker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The numbers in brackets record the number of inventories for each occupation. Where no number is printed, only one inventory exists for that occupation.

Sources: Nottinghamshire Wills and Probate Inventories, Nottinghamshire Archives Office, PRMW and PRNW.
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because of this. Improving roads put these towns into more direct competition with their neighbouring towns. As one contemporary noted in 1843 Bingham was ‘unfortunately situated and circumstanced’ between the two superior markets of Nottingham and Newark ‘with a population too small to command any material consumption, and too remote from the Trent or any great road to form a depot’.\textsuperscript{35} In comparison, East Retford, which had no industrial interests by 1835 and at the beginning of our period was little bigger than Bingham, had become entirely dependent ‘upon the retail trade carried on with the inhabitants of the surrounding agricultural districts’.\textsuperscript{36} Critical for its fortunes, though, was the redirecting of the Great North Road through the town in 1766, which made it the principal post and staging town in north Nottinghamshire.\textsuperscript{37}

Three conclusions can be drawn from the occupational evidence. First, whereas most of the market towns appear to have had no more than a basic range of facilities in the late seventeenth century, by the late eighteenth century, and certainly by 1841, all the towns, irrespective of size, supported a considerably increased range of trades and services. There was, however, a clear hierarchy. The 1841 census shows Newark and Mansfield had nearly double the range of trades and services supported by Worksop and East Retford. These towns in turn had a significantly broader range than either Bingham or Ollerton. Second, transport and communications were essential in determining the relative success of each town. Newark was situated on the Great North Road and the Fosse Way. Improvements to the River Trent, running alongside the town, opened communications to Gainsborough and the north. Mansfield, though less well connected, lay on the main traffic routes north-west from Nottingham and had road connections outside of the county with Chesterfield and Sheffield. The completion of the Chesterfield Canal in 1777 did much to improve the position of Worksop and East Retford. East Retford’s fortunes were equally enhanced with the re-direction of the Great North Road through the town. By 1841 it was easier for people living close to Bingham and Ollerton to get to other towns and therefore the eighteenth century transport improvements brought these towns more directly into competition with their neighbours. This is probably why the incidence of dual occupations remained higher throughout the period in Bingham and Ollerton; although inventories seem to show that as a general feature of market town life, this phenomenon was on the decline. Finally, the economic development that has been described, in particular for the period from 1680 to around 1770, probably catered predominantly for a local market, even if the businesses themselves operated on a wider geographical basis. This fact does not, however, diminish the importance of such development to the local economy and, cumulatively with similar economic development elsewhere, to the national economy. Three market towns in Staffordshire saw their roles change with the arrival of solicitors, booksellers, surgeons and a letter print presser by 1818.\textsuperscript{38} The same is true of Kirkby Stephen in Westmorland, Melton Mowbray in Leicestershire, and market towns in the Vale of York and Cumbria, reminding us that ‘not only taste and fashion, but also the growth of rural wealth and spending power’ needs consideration.\textsuperscript{39}
New directions: the Nottinghamshire market towns as industrial producers, 1770–1841

In one sense the diversification in the occupational structure of the Nottinghamshire market towns and the growing sophistication of trades and crafts within them was just the rejuvenation of the traditional role of these towns as trading and service centres catering for local demand. The scale of the role had changed but in essence its nature had not. From the 1770s, this traditional role was accompanied by something new to the market towns – that of large-scale producer and manufacturer. Industrial production can be dated from this time and is likely to have been the main reason behind the doubling of the four larger towns’ populations between 1743 and 1801. Three industries became important to Newark, Mansfield, Worksop and East Retford from the late eighteenth century. The first two, flour and malt production, developed from long term interests but the scale of production and the market were something new and specific to this period. The third, textile manufacture, was completely new.

Petitions for and against river improvements show that the Nottinghamshire market towns were exporting wheat and malt from the county in the late seventeenth century. By the nineteenth century much of this produce was processed in the towns before being exported from the county, Newark producing flour for a national market by 1800. Water and steam mills were operating by 1820. The 1841 census listed 77 millers and four flour dealers and in the same year two Newark businesses disposed of 80,000 sacks of flour generating a revenue of £92,000. Worksop was the other main flour producer, by 1828 possessing mills powered by water, steam and wind.

The second main agricultural processing industry was malting. In 1793 Newark’s chief trade was believed to be ‘in the malting line’, described as ‘considerable and greatly increasing’. In 1798 Robert Lowe argued that the Newark breweries were on a par with those of Burton Upon Trent, especially regarding their trade to the Baltic. By 1816 Newark was supplying the counties of Nottingham, Lincoln, Stafford, Chester, Warwick and York and by 1841 50,000 quarters of malt was sent annually to Manchester, Liverpool and London. The situation was similar in Worksop where, in the early nineteenth century, it was impossible to miss ‘the great number of malt kilns standing in almost every direction’. Worksop’s malting industry had reached its peak by 1821 when its maltsters paid duty of £50,021; this fell to £36,639 in 1825 and £36,596 in 1831. Between 1832 and 1841 the number of maltsters had fallen from 40 to 13, explained at the time as a result of the growing importance and scale of Newark’s malting trade.

Even at county level we can see a gradual centralization of malt production. In the early eighteenth century Newark, Mansfield, Worksop and, to a lesser extent, East Retford, all had successful maltsters. By the late eighteenth century Newark and Worksop emerged as the two primary malt producers, both benefiting from cheap transport by river or canal to the growing markets north of Nottinghamshire. By the 1840s only Newark retained its malting
industry. This centralization did not automatically lead to the economic decline of the other towns, although the loss of East Retford’s malting interests early in the eighteenth century might be one reason why it failed to enjoy the same kind of growth experienced by Newark, Mansfield and Worksop. In Mansfield in particular the decline of malt production was to some extent masked by the growth of the town’s textile industry, and by the late eighteenth century the manufacture of cottons and linens had been introduced to Worksop, East Retford and Newark with varying degrees of success.

The first evidence of large scale textile production in Nottinghamshire came with the building of Papplewick mill on the river Maun, near Mansfield, in 1785. The mill was 100 feet long, 30 feet wide and six storeys high. It was a purpose-built mill, of which there were some 15–20 in Britain by 1780. By 1801 there were five mills by the river Maun, on the outskirts of Mansfield. In 1829 the number had increased to eight. A calculation for 1816 estimated that the average mill in Mansfield was employing 211 workers. Raw cotton was being imported from America and Brazil via Liverpool. Shipping dues, for one mill, were being paid in New York and exports to the value of £996 17s were sent to a Philadelphia merchant in 1819. By 1841 40.7 per cent of Mansfield’s population was involved in textiles, excluding the 562 framework knitters working in domestic industry at the time, the stockingers and framesmiths.

By 1794 Eden wrote of cotton as the principal manufacture of Newark, referring to a mill employing ‘upwards of 300 people, chiefly women and children’. Another mill was built by a local linen manufacturer, George Scales, in the early nineteenth century. Textile production in Newark, however, never came to dominate the local community to the same extent as in Mansfield: the 1841 census recorded only 13.3 per cent of the town’s population employed in textile related occupations. In 1788 Major John Cartwright set up the ‘Revolution’ mill in East Retford, operating 6,000 spindles powered by steam and employed 600 workers. Within three years, however, the business was struggling and eventually collapsed. Chaloner and Marshall argue the collapse was due to three main factors: the limitations of transport, the owners inexperience and the fact that there was no tradition of large scale enterprises in such a specialized field and, therefore, no body of skilled labour to call upon. One further mill was set up in East Retford and two in Worksop, none surviving for more than a few years. Although success was limited in East Retford and Worksop, it is clear that local entrepreneurs had felt there was the potential for establishing textile manufacture in the two towns. Perhaps the success of businesses in nearby Mansfield and Newark had created false hopes, but the experience was by no means limited to Nottinghamshire. In Kendal, Cumbria, linen manufacture had developed by 1800. Similarly, in Brampton factories were established for the manufacture of ginghams and other materials. The same was true of market towns in Essex. As the example of East Retford shows, however, it was crucial that local circumstances were favourable.
There can be little doubt that for four of the Nottinghamshire market towns (Newark, Mansfield, East Retford and Worksop) the mid eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries saw considerable economic development and expansion. This is not to say that these towns were untouched by more general periods of depression, such as that following the Napoleonic Wars in 1815, although there is little information as to the dislocation created. Despite periods of depression, of greater consequence to these towns were the expansion in scale of agricultural processing, the introduction of textile manufacture and the increase in trades and services. It is these aspects of the market town economies that help to explain the demographic growth experienced after 1743. The eighteenth century saw the marginalization of some towns, usually the smaller ones like Bingham and Ollerton, poorly situated in relation to main traffic routes and with insufficient local demand to support economic development. This said, in Nottinghamshire at least, towns with populations of under 2,000 by 1743 and (in the case of East Retford) under 3,000 by 1841 were still able to participate profitably in the growing home market and sustain a doubling of population between 1743 and 1801. This case study suggests the streamlining of the urban network during the eighteenth century was more complex than is appreciated. In Nottinghamshire, in Cumbria and East Yorkshire, some small and medium sized towns enjoyed prosperity, demographic growth and economic diversification. The interesting question is why?

Very few towns, irrespective of size and including large provincial centres and county centres, had seen their economies entirely transformed by 1840. There was no wholesale transfer to industrial production, and the development of steam powered mills did not automatically undermine more traditional domestic industry. Hudson argues that the economic history of this period has remained hamstrung by a ‘type of modernization theory’ that divides the eighteenth century (and early nineteenth century) into its more ‘traditional’ (domestic) and ‘modern’ (industrial) parts. Perhaps the same is true of urban studies. The rise of provincial, port, spa and manufacturing towns with populations in excess of 20,000, and increasingly noted for their specialist economic functions, was clearly something new to this period and unique to the English experience. But should this blind us to the developments taking place in the more traditional market towns of Georgian and early Victorian England?

The Nottinghamshire market towns saw the traditional aspects of their economy expand along with the introduction of large scale manufacture while they also grew in size. Wrigley describes eighteenth and early nineteenth century society as having been in the advanced stage of an organic economy, an economy that had experienced considerable growth and development but one that as yet was still limited in its use of inanimate sources of energy and inorganic sources of raw materials. Not until the use of coal became widespread was the economy able to advance and revolutionize its scale of production and output and this, according to Wrigley, did not occur until the mid nineteenth century. Interestingly, Berg too dates the decline of domestic manufacture only from the second third of the nineteenth century. Prior to that time advances
in agricultural productivity, urbanization and the deployment of labour were largely accompanied by a growth in traditional small scale industries catering ostensibly for the local market. There were exceptions to the rule (in particular the production of cotton and the malting and brewing industries) but this was as true for Newark and Mansfield as for larger towns like Manchester and Leeds. It might be suggested, therefore, that the organic economy Wrigley describes produced an environment that was conducive to a much more general expansion of economic opportunities and demographic growth among a wider range of urban and indeed rural settlements than has been fully appreciated. Notinghamshire is, of course, only one county and the fortunes of market towns within it cannot be used to present a general model of change. None the less, the work of Wrigley, Goose and Raven has shown that the experience found in Notinghamshire is not unique. What is clear is that regional patterns of infrastructural resources like water, communications and to some extent coal were crucial to local development, as were regional sources of capital for industrial and commercial development, at least up to the 1830s and 40s. It should also be noted that Clark has pointed to the way regional disparities among small towns were becoming more acute during the eighteenth century. Further regional and local studies (particularly for the south and East Anglia) are obviously needed before we can talk confidently about the full pattern of demographic growth and economic change for this period. While it might be easier to trace such developments in the larger towns of Georgian and Victorian England, this case study of Notinghamshire shows the experience was not exclusively theirs.
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Introduction

In this paper we describe a technique for analysing the relationship between migration, population, age structure and occupational structure. The analysis is based on materials compiled by David Gatley, whose work on computerising the 1861 census was described in an earlier issue of this journal.1

The analysis is based on census data compiled and computerised at the level of the registration district.2 As a unit of analysis with which to study the population geography of England in the nineteenth century, registration districts are not perfect. Many contained several diverse and distinct communities, involved in different occupations and having different patterns of migratory behaviour. Amalgamating the data from these sub-groups into a single registration district necessarily involves some loss of information. However, with 635 districts covering England and Wales, the level of detail available is still appreciable. Registration districts also have two advantages over other units of analysis. First, they give us national coverage, enabling us to examine migration on a national basis while retaining a degree of detail not available with a division of the countries into areas such as counties. Second, the degree of information available at this level in the 1861 Census is particularly detailed.

To undertake our work we extracted several strands of data from the census. The first data strand involved records of the proportion of males in each registration district employed in six occupational sectors: manufacturing, agriculture, service occupations, mining, transport and the armed forces. The grouping of six occupational sectors was carried out in accordance with the classification schemes of Booth and Armstrong, but we have deviated slightly from them in a few instances.3 First, we have included clerks and dealers along with public service workers in the service sector. Second, dockyard artificers have been reclassified under manufacturing. Third, we have excluded both general labourers and construction workers from our analysis, because general labourers tended to move from industry to industry, and many construction workers were also migratory workers. Their inclusion, therefore, is likely to have biased the results. Finally, the armed forces have been placed into their own sector.
The second data strand contains the age profile of the population in each registration district, using age bands 0–14 years, 15–29 years, 30–44 years, 45–59 years, and 60 years and over. The third strand looks at the change in the size of the population of each registration district since the 1851 census. These second and third strands give us signals as to the shifts in population around the country in the mid nineteenth century, while the first strand enables us to look for reasons for the shifts that involve different occupations being located in varying concentrations in different parts of the country.

There are factors that, because of lack of space and the need to simplify our work, we have not been able to address. Notably, this analysis does not consider the employment and migration of women.

**Cluster analysis**

The technique that we apply to the 1861 registration district data is known as *cluster analysis*. The object of cluster analysis, as used here, is to identify cases that have similar profiles over the variables in a data set and place them together into groups or ‘clusters’. In this work, cluster analysis enables us to group together registration districts that are similar with regard to the variables under consideration although they may be very far apart geographically. This grouping of the districts is useful from a practical point of view, as with 635 registration districts an analysis of each district individually is not really feasible. Discussion of the characteristics of registration districts in terms of clusters is very helpful in understanding the population geography of the country as a whole.

In this paper, we use a hierarchical type of cluster analysis. This starts by treating all the registration districts as distinct (that is, we imagine there are 635 groups, each containing one district). The two districts that are ‘nearest’ to each other, where by ‘nearest’ we mean having the most similar profiles over the variables in the data set, are then amalgamated to form a ‘cluster’ of two, which is then treated as a single group. After amalgamating the two most similar districts, therefore, we have 634 groups, 633 containing one district, and one containing two.

The process of amalgamation of the two closest groups is then repeated many times. There is a choice of methods (linkages) to use for forming the clusters in hierarchical cluster analysis. One frequently used type of linkage is Ward’s method and it is this which we employ here. There are several text books that discuss cluster analysis. Prominent among these are books by Everitt, Manly and Chatfield and Collins. A good example of an application of cluster analysis in a historical setting is given by Power and Campbell. Any standard statistical software can be used to carry out the cluster analysis used in this paper. The authors used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) but others (for example Minitab, SAS, or S-Plus) could have been used equally effectively.

One key aim of cluster analysis is to group the cases (in our example, the registration districts) into a small number of ‘natural clusters’, in which each cluster
includes registration districts which are similar to one another with respect to the variables being considered, but registration districts in different clusters are dissimilar. An important issue, therefore, is that of deciding how many 'natural clusters' exist in the data set. A review of many mathematical criteria for helping to make this decision is given by Milligan and Cooper. Here we prefer to use an intuitive method developed by the authors of this paper.

We carried out three cluster analyses, each using one of the strands of data mentioned above. The 'natural clusters' were identified and the characteristics of each such cluster examined. After carrying out the cluster analysis for each of the three strands of data, each registration district can be identified with an occupational cluster, an age profile cluster and a population change cluster. To examine population change in relation to occupation and age structure, the interrelationships between the occupational clusters, the age profile clusters, and the population change clusters are examined.

### Table 1  Mean number of males aged 20 years and over per thousand employed in various sectors: eight occupational clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of districts</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Service occupations</th>
<th>Mining</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Armed forces</th>
<th>% population change, 1851–1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster A</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster B</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster C</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster D</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster E</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>+16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>+19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster G</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>+62.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This table should be read as follows. In the registration districts in Cluster A, an average of 140 out of every 1,000 males aged 20 years and over were employed in manufacturing, 573 in agriculture, 89 in service occupations, 12 in mining, 21 in transport and 7 in the armed forces.
Clustering with regard to male occupational structure

A hierarchical cluster analysis was carried out using data for the six occupational sectors. Eight ‘natural clusters’ were identified. Table 1 shows the mean number of males aged 20 years and over employed in each occupational sector per thousand males aged 20 years and over, both nationally and for each of the occupational clusters, ordered according to their mean change in population between 1851 and 1861.

In cluster A are districts with a much higher than average number of males aged 20 and over employed in agriculture (we have called this the ‘high agriculture’ cluster). Cluster B is similar except that agriculture dominates to a slightly lesser extent (‘agriculture’ cluster). Cluster C contains districts such as Coventry and Rochdale, employing a large proportion of people in manufacturing (‘manufacturing’ cluster). In cluster D are mining communities (‘mining’ cluster). Cluster E contains districts which are service centres with a noticeably larger than average number of males aged 20 and over working in service occupations (‘services’ cluster). Typically these districts are in London or are regional centres such as Derby and Worcester. Cluster F districts have a high proportion of men in the armed forces (‘armed forces’ cluster). These districts, such as Colchester and Plymouth are regional centres as well as military areas, and contrast with districts in cluster H such as Farnborough and Farnham which are dominated to an even greater extent by armed forces and are not regional centres. We label cluster H ‘major armed forces’. In cluster G we have high numbers of people employed in transport (‘transport’ cluster). These districts are mainly ports such as Gravesend and Liverpool.

Clustering with regards to age profile

For each registration district, the proportion of the population in each age band (defined earlier) was calculated. A cluster analysis was carried out for the age bands using standardised data. Five ‘natural clusters’ were identified. In Table 2, the mean number of people per thousand in each of the age bands is shown for each of these clusters, ordered according to their mean population change. The mean number of deaths per thousand in 1861 and the mean sex ratio (males/females) are also shown.

Cluster 1 has a large proportion in the 60 years and over age group and to a lesser extent in the 45–59 year age group (‘high 45 and over’ cluster). This is associated with relatively low mortality and low or negative population growth, possibly caused by younger people leaving these (mainly rural) districts. Cluster 2 has a higher than average proportion of people in the 0–14 year age band (‘high 0–14’ cluster). It may be that these districts have seen a birth rate higher than the national average in the years preceding the 1861 census. Districts in cluster 3 are mainly regional centres. The proportion of people aged 45 years and over is high, and the proportion of people aged 0–14 years is low (‘low 0–14, high 45 and over’ cluster). In cluster 4, there is a low proportion aged 45 years and over (‘high 0–44, low 45 plus’ cluster). London districts and large towns in the north of England are prevalent in this cluster. Possibly
young adults have moved into these areas to work and started families, meaning that older people will form a smaller proportion of the total population in the districts. Their relatively high death rates may also be associated with the low proportion of elderly. Cluster 5 has a large proportion in the 15–29 year and 30–44 year age bands, and a low proportion aged under 15 years ('low 0–14, high 15–44' cluster). These districts are mainly in central London (people may have moved in to work but not yet started families) or are associated with military bases (where military personnel provide the reason for the unbalanced age profile).

**Clustering with regard to population change**

The percentage change in population from the previous census in 1851 to the 1861 census was used to cluster the registration districts with regard to population change. We concluded that seven ‘natural clusters’ exist. The mean percentage change in population between the 1851 and 1861 censuses is shown in Table 3 for each of the population change clusters.

We see that cluster I has, on average, a drop of almost six per cent in population from 1851 to 1861, possibly because of people moving away in search of work. In the largest cluster (cluster II), the population hardly changed from 1851 to 1861. In cluster III the population increased by almost 10 per cent on
average. A 19 per cent average increase in population is noted for districts in cluster IV, and even larger increases are observed in cluster V (32 per cent on average) and cluster VI (67 per cent on average). The largest increase in population occurs in cluster VII containing just one district, Farnham, where a military base had a large impact. It is likely that the increases in population for clusters IV, V and VI were caused by an influx of people looking for work. Differential death rates for the clusters are not responsible for the different levels of population change.

**Relationships between clusters**

Cross-tabulations of the occupational clusters and age profile clusters, of the occupational clusters and population change clusters, and of the age profile clusters and population change clusters are shown in Tables 4–6. For each comparison, these tables compare the actual numbers of registration districts in each cell and the numbers which would be expected if the two dimensions were independent. So, for example, the top left-hand cell of Table 4 (+80) shows that there are 80 more districts in this cell that we should expect if age profile and occupational profile were independent.

From Table 4 we see that the two agricultural clusters have more districts than expected in the first age profile cluster, where the proportion of people aged 45 and over is large. Younger people have probably left these rural (agricultural) districts, leaving older members of those communities. The ‘manufacturing’ and ‘mining’ clusters show similar patterns in that age profile clusters 1 and 3 are under-represented and age profile clusters 2 and 4 are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of districts</th>
<th>Average % population change, 1851–1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>+11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster I</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster II</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster III</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>+9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster IV</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>+19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster V</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>+32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster VI</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster VII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+161.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
more highly represented than would be expected. It can be hypothesised that this effect has been brought about by the workforce in the manufacturing and mining industries starting families once they have migrated to these areas and found work.

The ‘services’ cluster has a deficit of districts in the ‘high 45 and over’ cluster, made up for by having more districts than expected in the age profile clusters 3 and 4. In age profile cluster 3 we may be observing older people in regional centres staying put while the younger generation migrate away (producing a low birth rate and smaller proportions in the 0–14 age group). In age profile cluster 4 we may be seeing an influx of people into the districts to work in the manufacturing, service or transport sectors causing the ‘high 0–44, low 45 and over’ pattern to be over-represented. With such small numbers of districts in the armed forces occupational clusters, it is difficult to discern any pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Relationship between age profile clusters and occupational clusters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational clusters (with descriptions)</td>
<td>Age profile clusters (with descriptions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cluster 1 (high 45 and over)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster A (high agriculture)</td>
<td>+80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster B (agriculture)</td>
<td>+16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster C (manufacturing)</td>
<td>–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster D (mining)</td>
<td>–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster E (services)</td>
<td>–31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster F (armed forces)</td>
<td>–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster G (transport)</td>
<td>–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster H (major armed forces)</td>
<td>–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of districts in each column</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: For interpretation, see text.
with regards to the age profile cluster that we can claim to be meaningful.

From Table 5, we see that the prevalence of agriculture is clearly related to low or negative population change, probably largely as a result of migration from the rural areas to more industrialised areas.

Districts in the ‘agriculture’ and ‘manufacturing’ clusters show similar patterns, with more districts than would be expected in population change clusters III and IV. There is also a tendency for the manufacturing districts to have more representation in the higher population change clusters as well (perhaps due to migration and higher birth rates due to the presence of recently arrived

Table 5  Relationship between population change clusters and occupational clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational clusters (with descriptions)</th>
<th>Population change clusters (with average percentage change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cluster I (5.8 % decrease) Cluster II (0.5 % increase) Cluster III (9.6 % increase) Cluster IV (19.3 % increase) Cluster V (32.5 % increase) Cluster VI (66.7 % increase) Cluster VII (161.5 % increase) Number of districts in each row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster A (high agriculture)</td>
<td>+29  +53  -31  -23  -20  -7  0  250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster B (agriculture)</td>
<td>-6   -5   +14  +7   -7  -3  0  149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster C (manufacturing)</td>
<td>-7   -16  +11  +6   +6  +1  0  86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster D (mining)</td>
<td>-4   -9   +8   -1  +5  +1  0  39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster E (services)</td>
<td>-5   -12  -2   +8  +7  +3  0  63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster F (armed forces)</td>
<td>-2   -3   0    +3  +3  0   0  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster G (transport)</td>
<td>-5   -6   +2   0   +5  +4  0  30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster H (major armed forces)</td>
<td>-1   -2   -1   0   +3  +1  +1  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of districts in each column</td>
<td>126  247  125  67   52  17  1  635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
workers starting families). The ‘services’ and ‘transport’ clusters and both armed forces clusters are associated with population increases, again probably as a result of migration and higher birth rates due to recently arrived workers having children.

In Table 6 we see a very clear relationship between the age profile clusters and population change clusters. Age profile cluster 1, with a high proportion of people aged 45 and over, is clearly composed disproportionately of districts where population change was negative or zero. Districts in age profile clusters 4 and 5 (containing high proportions of young people of working age) are associated with substantial increases in population. Age profile clusters 2 and 3 are associated with more moderate population increases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Relationship between population change clusters and age profile clusters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age profile clusters (with descriptions)</td>
<td>Population change clusters (with mean percentage change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cluster I (5.8 % decrease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 1 (high 45 and over)</td>
<td>+44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 2 (high 0–14)</td>
<td>–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 3 (low 0–14, high 45 and over)</td>
<td>–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 4 (high 0–44, low 45 and over)</td>
<td>–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 5 (low 0–14, high 15–44)</td>
<td>–1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of districts in each column</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: For interpretation, see text.
Conclusions

The use of cluster analysis in this work has enabled us to examine the characteristics of all 635 registration districts existing in the 1861 census. A detailed discussion of the individual characteristics of all the districts would prove unwieldy and confusing, but by clustering similar districts together, a simplified pattern emerges. This pattern is then much more amenable to interpretation.

We have carried out a cluster analysis of the registration districts using three different strands of data. This resulted in three different ways of clustering the districts. By then looking at the three separate two-way tables that could be produced, we were able to draw conclusions about the relationships that exist between the three strands of data.

In the patterning of Tables 4, 5 and 6, some of the well-known relationships between occupation, age structure and migration in mid-nineteenth century England and Wales can be discerned. We see the movement of people in their younger working years away from the traditional occupations associated with agriculture towards jobs in towns and cities associated with service industries, manufacturing and transport. This movement of people has led to registration districts having age distributions biased towards surfeits and/or deficits of people in certain age bands, notably the 15-44 age range. Also, although England and Wales experienced a 11.9 per cent rise in population between the 1851 and 1861 censuses, the movement of people has meant that this increase was far from evenly distributed. Some areas saw increases far in excess of the 11.9 per cent as people moved in, and others saw very little change in the size of their population or even experienced population decline.

The methods used in this paper can be used to try and detect patterns in any large database. The census records in England and Wales are a rich source of information on the population and it would be of interest to look at strands of data other than those discussed in this paper. Analyses of the other Victorian and more modern censuses using these methods may yield results that can be compared and contrasted with those shown in this paper. Patterns of change may also be revealed. In addition, the resulting ‘clusters’ of similar registration districts could be mapped, revealing aspects of population geography. Finally, it is not only the census that yields large databases to which the methods shown here can be applied. The Great Britain Historical Database contains many data sets (including part of the 1861 census) that could be analysed using these methods.
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NOTES

2. The data are obtainable on disk from the Local Population History Book Club by contacting Dr...
Peter Franklin, 46 Fountain Street, Accrington, Lancashire BB5 0QP.


8. The names we have given the clusters here and in following sections should be regarded as tentative names to be used as labels rather than as descriptions of the essential natures of the clusters.


10. See http://hds.essex.ac.uk/gbh.asp.
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Introduction

This short note reports on progress on an investigation of population mobility in the moorland village of Levisham in north Yorkshire. The study arose out of the observation by the village local history group that during the nineteenth century few families seemed to stay in the village for longer than one generation. In contrast, the examination of wills from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries revealed the same names for generation after generation. The purpose of the study was to try to quantify this change in patterns of family mobility, and to discover if the increase in mobility was a continuous, gradual process, or whether it proceeded in ‘fits and starts’. If the latter, could the periods of increased mobility be related to specific events?

The village

Levisham is situated on the edge of the North York Moors five miles north of Pickering, on the south-facing slopes of the Tabular Hills. Steep valleys on either side inhibit easy access to the village. The parish covers about 3,000 acres, two thirds of this being heather moorland. It has always been an agricultural community, practising mixed farming (with a strong emphasis on sheep). Iron was mined on the moors from prehistoric times, but an attempt to revive iron production in the nineteenth century proved not to be commercially viable.

Levisham has historically been a community of small farmers. The seventeenth century Hearth Tax returns show only two houses with more than one hearth, one of those being the Rectory. Of the 20 allotments of land made by the Enclosure Award of 1770 from the 511 acres of arable land on the three open fields, the two largest were each a little under 100 acres. Almost a century later, in 1848, at the time of the Tithe Award the largest holding was 251 acres. During the eighteenth century, the head of one family started to style
himself as a ‘gentleman’. He had, indeed, acquired the lordship of the manor, but at the time of enclosure his holding of 48 acres was only the fourth largest in the parish. The coming of the railway in 1836 opened up more job opportunities for local families and brought in a few new people who were not dependent on the land. Nevertheless, agriculture remained the main occupation until the later years of the twentieth century.

The number of households in the village can be ascertained from the seventeenth century Hearth Tax returns, and both the number of households and the population are more accurately known after 1801 from censuses (Table 1). Between these two periods there was a small decrease in the number of households. The population appears to have peaked in 1831 at 168 persons. During the second half of the nineteenth century, both the number of households and the population declined.

Table 1  Number of households and population, Levisham: 1662–1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1664</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 1662 and 1664 figures based on Hearth Tax returns. 1673 estimate based on Compton Census figure of 70 adults, adding 37 per cent for children. Nineteenth century figures based on population censuses.
The present study

The study is making use of a wide range of sources. First, there are the nineteenth century census returns. Second, we have used the parish registers. Bishops’ Transcripts of these exist for the period 1600–1700 (with a gap from 1638–1661); the originals exist from 1700 onwards (with a gap from 1736–1753). These sources have been complemented by deeds from the North Riding Registry of Deeds; the Hearth Tax Returns for 1662, 1664 and 1673; an Enclosure Award from 1770; the Tithe Award from 1848; and Land Tax Assessment records which cover the period 1781–1832. Finally, about 100 wills of Levisham people survive, covering the period from 1541–1734. These wills are almost the only surviving source for the period before 1600.

The study began by compiling a list of the names that occurred in the ‘continuous’ sources (that is, the wills, parish registers and deeds). The period of investigation was divided into 50-year sub-periods, and the number of new names appearing in each 50-year sub-period tabulated. Table 2 summarizes this information, showing the number of new names that appear in each 50-year period and the length of time that these names were continuously present. Table 3 performs a similar analysis, using data for the nineteenth century census returns for the 1841–1891 censuses.

This approach to the analysis is, admittedly, rather crude. There is the assumption that one name means one family. Sometimes this is the case, but there are several different families with the same name. Clearly, a name that relates to more than one family is more likely to persist. Some names may appear as ‘new names’ but actually refer to the descendants of existing families by the female side. Some of the sources, for example wills, relate to people with property (even if only a very small amount). They are likely, therefore, to refer to the most settled families. Prior to the nineteenth century, there will have been many people, such as farm servants, who spent some time living in the village whose names never made it into any records. Even the nineteenth century records do not pick up people who came and went between censuses and did not have any family events to feature in the parish registers. Despite these limitations with the approach we have used, it is possible to identify long-term changes in the mobility of the population.

Core families

During the period 1541–1650, 15 names were continuously present in the village for six generations or more. All are names of farming families, of men described in their wills as ‘yeomen’ or ‘husbandmen’ (there being no apparent difference between the meanings of the two terms). In the mid sixteenth century, these men were typically leaving sums of money (a few pence) to the parish church, items of clothing to members of their immediate family, and farm animals (sheep, oxen, cows and horses) and equipment to their children. The will of the head of one of the foremost ‘core’ families, who died in 1562, mentions a total of seven shillings in cash, one ewe or lamb each to various children, three bullocks, two oxen, three horses and ‘an ooxgang of corn’.
Table 2  Names occurring in ‘continuous’ sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number of new names</th>
<th>Number ‘surviving’ in village for at least the number of consecutive periods shown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541–1600</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601–1650</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651–1700</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701–1750</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1751–1800</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801–1850</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: This table should be read as follows. In 1541–1600, 17 new names were recorded. Of these, 12 were also mentioned in the period 1601–1650 (that is, they remained in the village for two consecutive periods), 11 were mentioned both in 1601–1650 and 1651–1700 (that is, they remained for three consecutive periods), and so on. In the period 1701–1750, there was an unusually large number of marriages, leading to a number of new names which seemed abnormally high. When no indication was given in the register of the place of origin of either of the parties and when neither name was found elsewhere in the parish records, these names were excluded.

Sources: See text.

Table 3  Names appearing in nineteenth century census returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Number of new names</th>
<th>Number ‘surviving’ in village for at least the number of consecutive censuses shown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: This table should be read as follows. In the 1841 census, 43 names were recorded. Of these, 24 were also mentioned in the 1851 census (that is, they remained in the village for two consecutive censuses), 22 were mentioned in both the 1851 and 1861 censuses (that is, they remained for three consecutive censuses), and so on. In the 1851 census, 21 new names appeared. Of these, only six were mentioned in the next census, and only four in both the next two censuses, etc.

Sources: Census enumerators’ books, Levisham
The picture that can be built up from these wills is of a small, tightly-knit, largely self-sufficient community centred on the church, very much inter-related, and carefully managing and bequeathing its frugal resources.

After 1582, a new feature appears in many wills: the first item is the bequest to the eldest son of ‘my title and term of years …’ in tenements, house, land, closes and common pasture. Sometimes this is spelt out more precisely as ‘all my rights under the lease of Sir Henry Gates …’. It appears that Sir Henry Gates of Scarborough, an important political figure in the area, had acquired the title to lands in Levisham which he passed on to various local husbandmen in the form of 2,000-year leases. These small farmers thereby became virtual freeholders. From this time there are also increasingly frequent mentions of ‘closes’ and ‘intacks’ in addition to a share of arable land in the three open fields and common pasture. These ‘intacks’ were enclosures taken from land which had been part of the Royal forest of Pickering where previous generations had suffered regular fines for poaching, taking wood, or making encroachments. By the seventeenth century, the lists of bequests are generally longer, with larger sums of money, more livestock, and more furniture and household goods. The ‘yeomen’ or ‘husbandmen’ of this period were by no means wealthy, but they held the title to land which provided adequately for themselves and their families, and they passed this on to the next generation.

The years from 1701 to 1750 show a higher proportion of names present for only one or two generations, and five of the ‘core’ families disappeared. Only three of the original 15 ‘core names’ are mentioned in the 1770 Enclosure Award (though there are two other names connected by marriage with one of the ‘core names’). While having a stake in the community in the form of a title to agricultural land seems to have been a primary condition for long settlement of a family in the village, by the eighteenth century this seems no longer to have been enough on its own. A clue as to the reason for this can be found in an observation by John Tuke: ‘It is observable that in those families that have succeeded from generation to generation in the same farm, the strongest attachment to old customs prevails; such have the most confined ideas …’. In other words, the ‘core families’ tended to be slow to adopt new farming practices, which reduced the productivity of their farms. In the years following Enclosure, there is evidence from the Register of Deeds that land in the village was being bought as an investment. Various ‘gentlemen’ from Pickering, Scarborough and the surrounding area, a ‘dealer in hardware’ from a nearby town, a clockmaker, a corn factor, a surgeon and two spinsters all figure in land transactions. Seven names disappear from the village in the generation following Enclosure, and two of the ‘core names’ that had remained, both having represented yeoman families in the sixteenth century, appear in the list of paupers receiving poor relief early in the nineteenth century. Of the 21 new names that appeared between 1751 and 1800, more than half do not appear after 1800 (Table 2). The same pattern is true of the period 1801–1850 (Table 3).

**Trades and professions**

The occupations represented in the village in the nineteenth century include clergyman, schoolteacher, iron ore proprietor, innkeeper, miller, station master,
gamekeeper, tailor/dressmaker and cordwainer. There were also labourers (both ‘general’ and agricultural) and servants. The servants, mainly hired for a year at a time, are naturally the most transitory. The labouring families are diverse, some remained for only one census, others appear in as many as five censuses. Among those in trades and crafts, no family was present for more than four consecutive censuses. The commitment of those following trades or professions is not, like that of farmers, tied up with land. These people have a marketable skill, and can be expected to move in response to job opportunities.

All six of the families present in the parish in every census from 1841 to 1891 were farmers. However, many ‘farming’ names stayed only for one or two generations, and it appears that from the eighteenth century onwards, farming in Levisham came to have more of the characteristics of a trade or a profession, rather than those of a way of life tied to a particular location. By 1848, at the time of the Tithe Award, there were 13 tenant farmers and only three owner-occupiers. The names of the three owner-occupiers are among the persisting names. Among tenant farmers, movement from one farm to another within the area seems to have been the norm.

Conclusion

Throughout the whole of the 350-year period studied, the nature of the village remained the same: it was a community of small farms. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a traditional type of subsistence farming was practised based on the use of three arable open fields and shared common pasture. The ‘yeoman’ farmers operated on a small scale, but held a virtual freehold of their land, which was passed down from father to son over many generations. By the early eighteenth century, this traditional way of life was becoming less economically viable. Land, including shares in the open fields, was being bought and sold; and long-established families disappeared from the village. The 1770 Enclosure Award rationalized and endorsed changes that had already taken place. Following enclosure, a new style of farming developed which required both new capital and new ideas, and this attracted new men who were not rooted in the village in the way their predecessors had been. In the nineteenth century the farmers (who still provided the stable core of the community) were supported by a more mobile population of professions and trades, and a still more mobile pool of labourers.

NOTES

REVIEW OF RECENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE

Nigel Goose and Andrew Hinde

All articles reviewed were published in 1999 unless otherwise stated.


During 1999 the journal History and Computing made a welcome return to the shelves, with the long-delayed publication of volume 9, which ‘officially’ bears the date 1997! These two articles concern the ‘multiple pass’ strategy in automatic linkage of historical records advocated by Harvey, Green and Corfield in History and Computing, 8 (1996), 78–89. Perhaps the most interesting point Adman makes in his paper is to note the ‘apparent lack of progress’ in record linkage since the publication of E.A. Wrigley ed, Identifying people in the past, (London, 1973). Despite three decades of effort, no generally accepted approach to the record linkage of data from the census enumerators’ books (CEBs) has emerged. Much effort has been expended on the use of computers to speed up the procedure, but there is still debate about whether it is best entirely to automate the process, or whether to use computers as an aid to manual identification of links. The paper by Tilley and French reports a test of the entirely automatic ‘multiple pass’ approach using CEB data from Kingston, Surrey, and Microsoft’s Access database. The sections of the paper dealing with the application are thorough and will assist others in trying out the approach for themselves. The authors come down quite firmly against fully automatic linkage. They conclude that ‘multiple pass algorithms ... have a value but only in establishing potential links’ and that ‘true matches must be confirmed by a human researcher, not just within the multiple pass approach but with all techniques that incorporate some form of algorithm’ (pp. 131–2).


In this paper, Anderson attempts to correct the impression given in a number of recent studies that the reporting of married women’s employment in the nineteenth century census enumerators’ books (CEBs) is seriously deficient. He points out that it is ‘fast becoming a new orthodoxy’ that ‘the reporting of married women’s employment in the CEBs is so bad that the data are almost useless for serious analytical purposes’ (p. 10). After analysing data from
Lancashire and Cheshire on textile employment and the employment of the wives of craftsmen, traders and labourers, Anderson reaches the view that the CEBs give about as fair a reflection as could have been expected of the gainful employment of married women. Seasonal agricultural work is under-recorded, but this is not surprising given that the census took place in the spring. His conclusion is that ‘the census enumerators’ books must remain, for many parts of the country at least, the best indicator that we have of variations in married women’s gainful work activity in the mid-nineteenth century’ (p. 27).


This is a short history of inoculation and vaccination against smallpox, focusing on whether and to what extent vaccination alone was responsible for its decline in England and Wales. It also discusses the history of the arguments for and against compulsory vaccination.


Proofs of age survive in England from 1272 to the end of the Middle Ages, generated by the need to establish exactly when a ward of the king should receive his inheritance, and this was achieved through an inquest involving a jury of 12 men. They were required not only to tell the judge whether the heir was of age, but also how they knew, providing an unusual insight into the sorts of things that medieval men remembered as significant events. Bedell examines those proofs that survive between 1272 and 1327, encompassing memories of 1,371 separate events recalled by over 1,000 men, mainly in their forties and fifties but ranging widely across the social spectrum. Those which survive from the reign of Edward I (to 1307) are the more reliable, for thereafter Bedell detects a tendency for them to become formulaic. He finds that the events commonly remembered were overwhelmingly personal and family events, births, marriages and deaths accounting for fully 65 per cent of the total, followed by other life-cycle events, and land transactions. Concern with broader issues, such as the weather, warfare or political milestones feature rarely, suggesting an insularity in the horizons of medieval men whether they were barons or carters.


Boothman’s study employs the partial enumerations of the population of Long Melford contained in the Easter Offering books alongside a reconstitution of its parish registers to estimate mobility and stability in the parish. Almost as if in answer to Rollinson (reviewed below), she finds surprisingly high levels of stability compared to many other extant studies, a stability that was more marked in the ‘urban’ parts of the parish compared to the more ‘rural’ areas. In 1684 compared with 1676, 75 per cent of those who had not been buried in
Long Melford remained in the parish. Those who could be identified as poor were slightly more mobile, but this was a difference of degree rather than of kind, and amongst all social groups there was a large stable core exhibiting a rootedness that spanned several generations. Whilst the period studied was one in which migration had slackened compared to the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, Boothman suggests that the range of economic activity found in Long Melford may have provided an incentive to stay rather than leave, although she also notes that the size of the parish, at around 5,000 acres, must have a bearing upon the contrast found between Long Melford and other less extensive parishes.


Both these papers are based on Broad’s study of a number of parishes in North Buckinghamshire. In the first, he argues that a full understanding of the operation of the Old Poor Law in individual parishes requires the historian to consider each parish’s peculiar characteristics, such as the availability of other charitable funds. He maintains that up until the late eighteenth century, each parish was able to use these funds, together with common rights and other measures, to mount a flexible approach to poor relief which best suited its situation. Thereafter, however, this system was progressively overwhelmed by increased demand for relief. The second paper is a study of landownership in the contrasting Buckinghamshire villages of Steeple Claydon and Middle Claydon, focusing on the situation of the small to middling farmer. The paper has some interesting observations to make on the process by which parishes became ‘open’ or ‘closed’.


In a salutary attempt to refine our understanding of the double standard of sexual morality, Capp demonstrates both the importance of male sexual reputation to the respectable classes and the various ways in which some women were prepared to turn this to their own ends. Respectable men could thus be vulnerable to wronged or calculating women, who cannot be universally regarded as passive and helpless victims despite the undeniable balance of power that men held. Numerous examples, admittedly mainly from London sources, are given of women attempting or threatening to shame men, to blackmail them into marriage, to gain compensation and financial support, and to extort money cynically or for the purpose of revenge. Quantification is beyond reach, as Capp acknowledges, though one might ask for some clarification of phrases such as ‘quite often’ (p. 79) or ‘a significant number’ (p. 80) that implicitly quantify. But if the ‘sub-culture of semi-professional sexual extortion’ was most probably confined to London, there is no doubt that
sexual reputation was an issue of importance to men across the country, and its exploitation was a potential weapon available to the weak.


This article describes a method for estimating the proportion of any set of numbers which are exact counts and the proportion which have been rounded (for example to the nearest five, ten or hundred). The method is quite general and may be applied to any historical set of numbers, for example a set of ages drawn from a census enumerators’ book. The authors apply the method to a set of reported numbers of people attending religious services in the 1851 Religious Census. They conclude that just over half the returned congregations seem to have been rounded, suggesting the possibility that the total number recorded as attending divine service on the appointed Sunday in 1851 was overestimated. The authors attempt to work out the degree of overestimation, and arrive at a figure somewhere between two and four per cent. Readers should note that the proposed method is statistical in nature, and its application requires a certain level of numeracy. However, the description given is fairly clear, and the method may easily be carried out using spreadsheet packages.


In this paper Drake uses the census enumerators’ books (CEBs) to examine domestic service. He stresses regional and local differences in the ways servants were recorded in the CEBs, and in the proportion of kin-servants. He joins in the general encouragement (to which many other authors have given voice) to future researchers to link the CEBs to other sources, but points out that institutional servants may be more fruitful subjects for this kind of study, as more documentation is likely to survive for them than for household servants. This paper should be read in conjunction with that by Hancock reviewed below.


A valuable addition to the sparse literature on medieval demography is our own Martin Ecclestone’s analysis of the Glastonbury head-tax lists, lists of men aged 12 and over who were regularly recorded until they either died or acquired land, thus encompassing a lowly social group for which evidence is generally unattainable. Whilst most lists allow only the calculation of crude death rates, and not surprisingly produce very low figures given the age bias of the evidence, the detailed court rolls for the manors of Longbridge Deverill and Monkton Deverill allow, with the help of model life tables, the estimation of expectation of life at age 20. He concludes that this stood at 26 to 29 years,
excluding the high mortality during the famine of 1315–1317, figures that are only slightly below those calculated by Razi for the richer tenants of Hale-sowen and by Hatcher and Harvey for early fifteenth century monks. Mortality in the Black Death was, however, high, averaging 57 per cent overall, with a range between 36 and 76 per cent across the various manors.


This article examines the economic and social relations between the stone workers of the Isle of Purbeck in Dorset and the co-resident agricultural population during the nineteenth century in the light of Newby’s idea of the ‘occupational community’. Evidence is produced to demonstrate that the stone workers were part of a distinctive and exclusive ‘economic community’, the geographical extent of which stretched far beyond the boundaries of Purbeck. Recruitment to this community was strictly controlled through an apprenticeship system operated by a centuries-old trade organisation. Once recruited, stone workers were extremely reluctant to leave the trade, moving away from the Isle of Purbeck in order to pursue it rather than becoming farmers or farm workers in Purbeck. A belief that they possessed ancient privileges (which they were prepared to defend in court) encouraged the stone workers to maintain their exclusivity. In the non-economic spheres of life, however, it seems the stone workers and agricultural workers interacted as if they were a single community.


This paper reports a study of 1,685 Irish-born inhabitants of Hammersmith and Fulham listed in the 1851 census returns. As with the Irish elsewhere in London at that time, these people were mostly born in south-western Ireland (especially the counties of Cork and Limerick). They generally had poorly-paid, casual employment, many of them working in the market gardens which were numerous in this locality at that time. They lived, typically, in crowded and insanitary conditions. Some, though not all, were refugees from the Irish Famine of 1845–1849, and these refugees were living in conditions even more marginal than the rest – although of course, this may simply have been because in 1851 they were all recent migrants.


This paper is an analysis of the populations of the 11 Hertfordshire workhouses in 1851. Nigel Goose shows that these workhouses contained a proportion of children which was close to that in the population as a whole. People of working age, and married people in general, were under-represented, and the elderly over-represented, especially poor old men. The fact that children were not over-represented in the Hertfordshire workhouses may be due to the
availability of employment in the straw plaiting and hatmaking trades. An implication of the article is that an understanding of the composition of workhouse populations requires a good deal of knowledge about the local economic situation within each Poor Law Union.


This is a study of the structure of middle-class households in a small area of west-central Glasgow between 1851 and 1891, using the census enumerators’ books. The results show that nuclear families only constituted 66 per cent of households in 1851, falling to 59 per cent in 1891. Non-nuclear families were mostly extended laterally (that is, they contained siblings, nieces and nephews of the head) rather than vertically. In this, they were not the same as the extended working-class households noted by Michael Anderson in his famous study of Preston (*Family structure in nineteenth century Lancashire*, (Cambridge, 1971)). The proportion of households which was extended did not vary clearly with wealth or status within this middle-class group: thus the hypothesis outlined by Steven Ruggles in his recent book *Prolonged connections: the rise of the extended family in nineteenth century England and America*, (Madison, 1987) is not supported by this evidence.


The first of these articles is a detailed critique of a paper published by Komlos in 1993 (*Economic History Review*, 46, 768–82). In the latter paper, Komlos argued that the nutritional status of English men declined in the mid eighteenth century, at the same time as rapid population growth began, because of Malthusian-style pressure of population on resources. He based his analysis on the reported heights of runaway servants whose masters advertised in newspapers in the United States. Grubb takes issue with Komlos’s analysis for a variety of reasons, many of which are technical and rather arcane. In the second paper, Komlos resoundingly defends his earlier analysis, backing up his argument with a further barrage of statistics and technical points. Most readers of *Local Population Studies* will probably be less interested in the debate about analytical techniques than in the question at issue: whether the second quarter of the eighteenth century was a time of declining nutrition associated with rapid population growth.

R. Hancock, ‘In service or one of the family? Kin-servants in Swavesey 1851–81, Ryde 1881 and Stourbridge 1881’, *Family and Community History*, 2, 141–8.

This paper analyses data from the census enumerators’ books (CEBs) for
the three places mentioned in the title. The object of this exercise is to examine the prevalence of ‘kin-servants’, these being persons described in the ‘relationship to head of family’ column of the CEBs as kin, but who, according to the ‘occupation’ column, were working in domestic service. The proportion of all domestic servants who were ‘kin-servants’ varied from about 20 to 40 per cent (30 to 50 per cent if only servants aged 20 years and older were considered). An apparent increase in this proportion in Swavesey between 1851 and 1881 was apparently due to an increase in the proportion of persons working as domestic servants but living in their own homes.


This study of a Cambridgeshire village shows that emigration from rural England in the nineteenth century was not simply a matter of people being pushed out by poverty. It has been well known for many years that a ‘friends and relatives’ effect operates to encourage the migration of those familiar to previous migrants, a process often termed chain migration. This study shows that it can also work in origin communities to influence emigration patterns. Most migrants from Melbourn were from the agricultural working and labouring class, who were more likely to emigrate than other classes. Finally, the importance of the energy and enthusiasm of the person charged with recruiting potential emigrants is stressed.


The north of Kent is becoming one of the most intensively studied areas of the country from a local demographic perspective, as demonstrated, for example, by Perkyns’s paper reviewed below and Barry Reay’s book *Microhistories: demography, society and culture in rural England, 1800–1930*, (Cambridge, 1996). This paper tries to assess the impact of the agricultural depression on employment patterns in the parish of Borden, near Sittingbourne, by using record linkage on census data for male heads of household between 1851 and 1891. Compared with other decades, the depression decade 1871–1881 saw a greater movement out of agriculture, mainly into ‘general labouring’ occupations, which may reflect the impact of the depression in agriculture. The article also describes an attempt to trace male out-migrants from Borden during the 1870s by using the machine-readable 1881 Census data. Only two out of every five of the out-migrants who had been in agriculture in Borden were still in agriculture in their destination parishes; most of the rest had gone into mining or ‘general labouring’ occupations.

This short article emphasises the fact that many early feminists opposed abortion on the grounds that it epitomised the male domination of women. It also makes the interesting point that many pioneers of the birth control movement (such as Annie Besant in England) made a clear distinction between contraception and abortion, approving of the former and disapproving of the latter.


This important paper analyses local-level migration in six parishes in northern Kent, close to the River Medway. Perkyns shows that short distance migration was extremely common, and formed the majority of all migration. She also points out that many recent studies using aggregate data (for example Dudley Baines, *Migration in a mature economy: emigration and internal migration in England and Wales*, (Cambridge, 1985)) focus on long-distance migration; it is unwise to infer the age structure and death rates of short distance migrants from the results of such analyses. In her study area, she finds that migrants tended to concentrate in ‘newer’ occupations, rather than in long-established ones, like agriculture. Economic opportunities (or lack of opportunities) were important in driving migration flows. The paper includes a wide range of detailed analyses that will repay close scrutiny. Its results should also be compared with those reported in the paper by Jackson reviewed above.


This is a fascinating and entertaining piece, which, as its introduction claims, shows that Malthus was ‘not the cold-hearted monster that was often portrayed’ (p. 47). It includes a brief biography of Malthus, and a good deal of material on the people with whom he associated. The different views which his contemporaries held of the great man are described, though the overall tone is very sympathetic. It is highly recommended to readers of *Local Population Studies*.


In the first of these contributions, Riley uses Friendly Society data for Morcott in Rutland, Ashbourne in Derbyshire, Llangeitho in Cardiganshire and Abthorpe
in Northamptonshire to show that trends in mortality and morbidity did not move in parallel during the nineteenth century. While mortality declined as the century progressed, the duration of periods of sickness tended to increase, implying an increase in sickness prevalence. Riley accounts for these divergent trends in morbidity and mortality by suggesting that the disease profile was changing from acute infections to respiratory and degenerative diseases, which lasted longer. Harris is sceptical about both Riley’s data and his interpretations. He says that Friendly Society records are dependent on definitions of sickness and attitudes towards the use of the Societies by their members. He also suggests that improved childhood health (resulting, for example, from the decline of infectious diseases) may have affected adult health years later. The nature of any such effect may, of course, be complex.


In this paper, Rogers tackles two questions: first, was the landed elite in the eighteenth century closed to new money? Second, did the prosperous merchants and businessmen treat their wives more generously than did the landed aristocracy? The answer to the first question seems to be ‘no’. The fact that many businessmen did not spend their newly-made pile on a country ‘pile’ was because they were not really interested in becoming landed gentry. A fair proportion of those who were interested managed to find a country seat. The answer to the second question is probably ‘yes’. Businessmen did treat their wives more generously, and this was because ‘fewer businessmen were interested in creating and sustaining landed estates through patrilineal male descent’ (p. 30).


In a fascinating discussion of different ways of conceptualising space, settlement and migration which roams over eight centuries despite its early modern focus, Rollinson not only re–emphasises the importance of movement, but argues that it should be given primacy in an understanding of the development of early modern English society. The empirical content of the article focuses upon Cirencester, a town of some 2–3,000 people which relied heavily upon immigration even to maintain its size in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, as evidenced by both aggregate analysis of its parish registers and nominal linkage between baptismal registers and a ‘census’ of 1608. Not surprisingly, it was the poorer craftsmen and tradesmen that showed the greatest mobility. The typicality of Cirencester’s experience must, however be questioned, for much of its natural decrease was due to a devastating mortality crisis that carried off a third of its inhabitants. Far from all towns, and particularly far from all small towns, were so unfortunate, and recent work by Goose, Galley, Dobson and others demonstrating that even far larger towns
could and did achieve natural increase in this period is ignored. Movement, both permanent and temporary, was of course the life-blood of early modern towns both large and small, but corporation records also reveal evidence of remarkable stability, of both personnel and structures, a stability that one expect to be even more marked in the English countryside, which is where most people lived.


Like the article by David Levine reviewed in *Local Population Studies* 63 (1999), 78, this is an extended review of the Cambridge Group’s recent book on family reconstitution (E.A. Wrigley, R. Davies, J. Oeppen and R.S. Schofield, *English population history from family reconstitution 1580–1837*, (Cambridge, 1997)). While regarding the book as of great importance, admiring the effort it represents, and accepting the general story of English population history told in the book, Ruggles is critical of several aspects of the work. First, the parishes used by the Cambridge Group are larger than average. Hence they were more ‘urbanised’ and likely to have experienced faster growth and have a higher population density than the average parish. The representativeness of the parishes also varies over time, and this problem is not resolved by the weighting scheme used in the book. Ruggles also feels that an opportunity to assess how local conditions affected demographic behaviour was missed. Second, Ruggles is still concerned about selection bias arising from the fact that only a minority of the population is reconstitutable. Third, he feels that the problem of censoring results in an underestimate of measures like the expectation of life at birth and the length of birth intervals. Because of these problems, and also because of linkage failures, the under-registration of vital events and random error, Ruggles thinks that we should be ‘wary of the precision of virtually every estimate in the book’ (p. 127). He does not mean that they are ‘necessarily wrong ... [but he is] ... unpersuaded that they are right’ (p. 127). He also stresses that much more could be done if and when the original data are made freely available to researchers.


These two papers are both concerned with parishes in Cumbria. The first analyses population cycles between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. The authors show that mortality crises in these communities could trigger a set of cyclical oscillations in numbers of births and deaths, often with a period of about 43–46 years. The persistence of these cycles was greatest where a ‘density-dependent check’ (that is, a check arising from pressure of population on resources) was operating most strongly. The second paper focuses on the
parish of Penrith. It analyses infant mortality using the Bourgeois-Pichat method of estimating its exogenous (due to infections, etc.) and endogenous (due to congenital malformations, birth complications, etc.) components. The decline in infant mortality in Penrith between 1550 and 1800 was mainly due to a fall in endogenous mortality, and this fall was sustained throughout this 250-year period. In this, Penrith was unlike the 16 parishes studied by E.A. Wrigley (see his paper in Population Studies, 31 (1977), 281–312), in which endogenous infant mortality rose until about 1700 and then declined. Penrith, however, lies in that area of northwest England which suffered from periodic subsistence crises during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and it may have been that poor maternal nutrition during pregnancy during this period led to levels of endogenous infant mortality being unusually high in that region.

P. Sharpe, ‘The female labour market in English agriculture during the Industrial Revolution: expansion or contraction?’, Agricultural History Review, 47, 161–81.

This article reviews the literature on women’s farm work during the eighteenth century. Sharpe notes that there are opposing views on this topic: some argue that the adoption of improved farming methods led to an increased demand for female labour; others take the view that during the second half of the eighteenth century the sexual division of labour on farms became more marked, and that this was associated with a decline in the amount of work women did. Having re-evaluated the evidence, including some new sources not apparently used by historians in this context before, Sharpe concludes that there is little evidence for any change in the sexual division of labour. It does seem that female wages fell during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, but this is not necessarily evidence of reduced opportunities for female labour. Finally, there is evidence of regional differences in trends over time.


The authors of this short but thought-provoking piece want local historians to engage with the debate going on among historians in general as to whether history is about a search for ‘objective truth’ or whether it is about the writing of narratives. Local historians, they say, tend to take the aim of ‘objective truth’ for granted. In other words, they are empiricists, or modernists, the object of research being to get as close as possible to this ‘truth’ (I suspect that this is true also of historical demographers working on local communities). This paper argues that this will not do. Local historians must engage with the debate if they are not to become increasingly marginalised within the discipline of history. Local Population Studies readers might also be interested in the two replies to this piece printed in Local Historian, 30 (2000), 124–6.

There seems to be a veritable flood of regional or local studies of small owners or occupier of land (see the papers by Brumhead, Hallas, and Moore-Colyer reviewed in Local Population Studies 63, 72, 75 and 79–80 and the paper by Broad reviewed above). This very detailed paper stresses the ‘fluid and complex nature of the structure of landownership’ (p. 184) in the part of Cumbria studied. Customary tenure survived into the twentieth century in several townships. Many of Shepherd’s observations echo those made in Hallas’s aforementioned study of landownership in the north Yorkshire Pennines, especially the way in which owners often let out part of their own property while simultaneously taking a tenancy in order to occupy the right ‘mix’ of land types.


Barry Stapleton will be familiar to many readers of Local Population Studies because of his work on Odiham, one of the parishes contributing to the Cambridge Group’s recent family reconstitution volume (see the article by Ruggles reviewed above). This is the latest paper to result from his work. It is a study of 43 families who persisted in the parish for three or more generations during the period from 1525–1850. It relates persistence to family strategies concerning inheritance and to social mobility. Stapleton finds few general rules by which these interrelationships can be summarised. Partible inheritance, for example, sometimes made for downward mobility but not always. However, it does seem that low fertility and high infant mortality, leading to a greater chance of only one son or daughter surviving their parents, did help to maintain the family property (whether farm or business) intact. High fertility and low infant mortality over several generations was eventually associated with a decline in a family’s fortunes.


In another paper discussing the Cambridge Group’s reconstitution volume (see Ruggles’s paper reviewed above), Vann focuses on the findings about fertility. He is particularly interested in the conclusion that a rise in marital fertility contributed to the overall rise in fertility during the eighteenth century, (see the article by Wrigley reviewed in Local Population Studies, 63 (1999), 84). Since it seems that this rise was largely due to early-marrying women continuing childbearing for longer, this raises the question as to why they did not go on having children for so long in the seventeenth century. Vann suggests that it is at least possible that family limitation (possibly through coitus interruptus) was being practised in
this earlier period, as Wrigley himself suggested many years ago in his famous article on Colyton (Economic History Review, 19 (1966), 82–109). According to Vann, family limitation is ‘a repressed theme in the book’s treatment of changes in fertility, so that it leaves the question of its prevalence still open’ (p. 93).


The population of the Sheffield suburb of Attercliffe increased from about 4,000 to about 36,000 between 1841 and 1891. This increase was due to the growth of iron and steel manufacture in the area. This study focuses on tracing the populations of four streets over this 50-year period. Despite the rapid growth of heavy industry, the population was dominated by families (not groups of unmarried men). Among these families, extended kinship networks were important (indeed a high proportion of between 13 and 20 per cent of households were ‘extended’ in some way). Prior to the arrival of the iron and steel industry, the population of Attercliffe had been occupied in ‘light trades’ such as the manufacture of cutlery and edge-tools. Families engaged in these light trades lived in and amongst the iron and steel workers, but were reluctant to marry members of the newly arrived iron and steel working families. The study also examines residential persistence (from census to census), showing that persistence in the same street was low, but that persistence in the same locality was considerably higher.


This article is a study of some 50 detailed settlement examinations from Cumbria, which give detailed residential and occupational histories. Many of the examinants moved from place to place frequently, although mostly within a fairly circumscribed area. Maps of several representative histories are presented. The high mobility was true not only of those who were servants, but also of tenant farmers (and even owner-occupiers). The occupations reported by the examinants ‘were not always clearly defined at a particular moment in time and were liable to change even in the short term’ (p. 245).


Although this paper was published in 1997, it has hitherto escaped notice by these review articles, and is of such direct relevance to local population studies that it is worth a mention here. The paper compares population totals from several parishes in north Wiltshire derived from the
Compton Census of 1676 and the Marriage Duty assessment lists of 1697–1700, also using for comparison Hoskins’s ‘rule of thumb’ that the population total is roughly equal to the average annual number of baptisms multiplied by 30 (see W.G. Hoskins, *Local history in England*, (London, 1959), 143.). The author reviews the limitations and difficulties with both her sources. She concludes, surely correctly, that it is unwise to use a single set of figures taken in isolation to estimate population totals. Her results seem to suggest, though, that the Marriage Duty assessment lists are more reliable than the Compton Census as guides to the populations of these parishes.


This short paper describes one of Malthus’s less well-known contributions to population studies: his explanation of why bread prices in England increased so markedly in 1800 and 1801. Malthus’s argument is that the English poor relief system allowed the poor to retain purchasing power even in times of dearth and thus increased the effective demand for bread, spreading the shortage through the majority of the population. The poor relief system thus in a sense bound together the fortunes of rich and poor. Put another way, it ‘democratised’ the dearth. In other places, for example Scandinavia, the lack of a similar system meant that in hard times the poor could not possibly enter the market for grain and bid up the price. Malthus’s analysis prefigures more modern analyses of famine, notably the ‘entitlement approach’ of Amartya Sen described in *Poverty and famines: an essay on entitlement and deprivation*, (Oxford, 1981).
CORRESPONDENCE

Letters intended for publication in the journal should be sent to the Local Population Studies General Office, Department of Humanities, University of Hertfordshire, Watford Campus, Aldenham, Watford, Herts WD2 8AT.

EDITORS' NOTE

Readers are reminded that the Editorial Board is always prepared to offer advice on subjects within the scope of Local Population Studies. 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, please do not hesitate to contact us at the address above.

A nineteenth century refuge for unmarried mothers?

Dear Sir,

I am researching infant mortality with the Open University for a D Phil., and I am sending you an interesting piece I have discovered on an address in Loughborough town which seems to have become a refuge for unmarried mothers.

Number 31, Cambridge Street, Loughborough, Leicestershire was unlike any other address in the town in the 1890s. According to the vaccination registers, during the period 1880-1910, 32 births and four deaths took place there. Of these, 20 were births outside marriage and a further seven births were to the head of the household. All but three of the births outside marriage appear to have survived infancy. The head of the household also lost one of his children before 12 months of age. Of the mothers, we know that there was a teacher of music, a dressmaker, a canvasser and a milkman’s assistant, with the rest being either domestic servants or having no recorded occupation.

From the 1891 census enumerator’s return we learn that the house was occupied by a coal-carter and his wife, Sam and Sarah Hull, both in their early thirties, with two children of their own aged seven and two years. There was also a 25-year-old lodger, described as an ‘ironmonger’s assistant’. Two male boarders were also listed, one aged two months and the other eight months. The elder of these was the son of a traveller who registered the child giving the Cambridge Street address in July 1890. The younger one was registered as born outside marriage at number 31 in early 1891 but the mother was not there at the time of the census in April.

During the period studied, there were 60 births outside marriage in the town’s workhouse, of which at least 12 died before reaching their first birthday. Elsewhere, however, such births occurred mostly singly and unsystematically across the town (apart from a small area around the Convent where none
occurred!). Why, then, should so many have taken place in this house? It has been said that employers and their sons were to blame for many of these ‘fallen women’, but I think there are too many instances in Cambridge Street for it to be the case that one employer was paying to have his servants cared for during confinement! Was the family at number 31 particularly sympathetic to the plight of young girls whose families would not or could not care for them in their hour of need? Did they have a religious or pecuniary interest in performing the service? Were the women referred to them by a local society or medical body?

I have found a reference to the Infant Life Protection Act of 1872 which provided ‘for compulsory registration of all houses in which more than one child under the age of one were in charge for more than twenty-four hours. Each such house was required to have a license issued by a justice of the peace’ (W. L. Langer, ‘Infanticide: a historical survey,’ History of Childhood Quarterly, 1 (1974)), 353-8. Unfortunately, Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Record Office does not appear to have any records of such licensing. At this point I do not know if such records may survive and be kept further afield.

If any readers can suggest answers to my questions, or know about other refuges like this, please could they get in touch with me?

Yours faithfully,

Norma A. Cattell
8 Ayrshire Close
Barwell
LEICESTER LE9 8HQ
E-mail: norma.cattell@virgin.net

Symbolism and ritual of marriage

Dear Sir,

I am writing to appeal for help from your readers. I am a student at Oxford Brookes University and am currently researching my dissertation. The project is based on extending John Gillis’s work on symbolism and ritual of marriage, particularly costume, gift giving, honeymoon and engagements.

If any readers have come across references to this type of information (from diaries or otherwise) and would be willing to pass them on to me, I should be very grateful.

Yours faithfully,

Catherine Long
79 Kelham Hall Drive
Wheatley
Oxon., OX33 1SL
NOTICES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The future of historical demography

A one-day meeting organized jointly by Local Population Studies, the British Society for Population Studies and the University of Hertfordshire

To be held at the University of Hertfordshire, St. Albans on Saturday 7 April 2001

This one-day meeting is designed to explore the future of historical demography in Britain. The provisional programme includes the following contributions:

Peter Razzell
The central role of nominal record linkage and local studies in the future of historical demography

Robert Woods
Demography in urban history: what we should be doing now the Cambridge urban history of Britain is complete

Alan Armstrong
Regional approaches to nineteenth century historical demography

Nigel Goose
Region and locality in nineteenth-century census studies

Andrew Hinde
Historical demography or population history: does it make any difference?

Other speakers are likely to include Steven King and Bill Luckin.

The registration fee will be £20, to include lunch. For details and to register, please contact:

Professor Nigel Goose
Department of Humanities
University of Hertfordshire
Watford Campus
Aldenham
nr Watford
Hertfordshire
WD2 8AT
e-mail: N.Goose@herts.ac.uk