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ESSAY PRIZE 100
The three articles included in this issue of *Local Population Studies* cover a wide temporal and geographical range, from the fifteenth to the nineteenth centuries, and from Kent in the south to the north east of Scotland, by way of Cambridgeshire.

We are very pleased to be able to publish Andrew Blaikie’s article on north east fisher families in Victorian Scotland, our first Scottish piece since Stuart Robinson wrote on migration and occupation in Motherwell 1851–91 in *LPS* 61 (1998). This paper outlines some of the more significant elements of the distinctive demography of a small selection of fishing villages around Scotland’s north-east coasts, including the parish of Rathven, the seatown of Findochty, and the villages of Gardenstown, Whitehills and Footdee. Blaikie finds a new variant to contrast with Hajnal’s ‘European marriage pattern’, with its high age at marriage and high proportions of permanent celibacy, or Anderson and Morse’s Scottish variant of high fertility but low nuptiality, for the regime of the seatowns was one of early marriage, high proportions marrying and high fertility. It is argued that the buoyancy of maritime trade contributed massively to this pattern as village populations mushroomed. The social structure was at least as important as the economy, however, in determining population patterns, for the family-centred fishing trade served to produce highly endogamous kinship links, both genealogically and geographically, creating a hermetic family culture centred upon the simple nuclear family.

John Lee’s study of later medieval Cambridgeshire uses sources that will be familiar to all students of population and social structure in the later Middle Ages, the taxation returns of 1334, 1377–81 and 1524–5, to elucidate the pattern of local and regional development. As these lists were compiled on different bases, Lee focuses upon *relative* rather than absolute change in the fortunes of the different areas of the county. He discovers that the river valleys, containing high-quality arable and meadow land and a well developed market structure, retained its lead amongst the Cambridgeshire sub-regions in terms of both taxpayers and taxable wealth per acre between 1334 and 1524, despite some contraction of land under cultivation and desertion of villages as demand for grain fell from the fourteenth century onwards. The fen and fen-edge experienced some relative increases in taxpayers and taxable wealth, receiving the lowest relative reductions in their taxation quotas, and contained few examples of declining arable land, enclosure, and deserted settlement. The inhabitants of these areas benefited from the more diverse economic opportunities provided by the resources of the fen. The south-east uplands and western plateau, areas of later settlement, were less accessible and more difficult to cultivate, the heavy land of the western clay plateau in particular becoming uneconomical to cultivate in the adverse conditions of the later Middle Ages. These two sub-regions experienced the greatest relative decline
in taxpayers and taxable wealth, and contained the largest number of vills with declining arable land in cultivation and the greatest reductions in tax quotas. John Lee’s article is based upon his recently completed Cambridge PhD thesis, which is currently being prepared for publication by the University of Hertfordshire Press as Volume Three of its new series *Studies in Regional and Local History*.

Finally, we are very pleased to publish a follow up piece to our two recent articles on nineteenth-century workhouses (in LPS 61 and 62, Autumn 1998 and Spring 1999) by David Jackson, based upon his continuing work on Kent which also featured in LPS 66 (Spring, 2001) in the form of an article on migration and occupation in Sittingbourne. Jackson uses the Census Enumerators’ Books for eight workhouses in Kent in 1881 to provide a comparison with the published work on age, sex and marital status in Hampshire in 1851–61, Hertfordshire in 1851 and Leicester in 1881, and discovers striking similarities despite their chronological and geographical differences. In particular, the workhouse populations were composed predominantly of the young and the old and, despite variations, the sex ratio was skewed towards men. All workhouses showed a marked bias towards single people, complete families were relatively few in number and, except for vagrants, usually headed by women. Some Kent workhouses, however, also exhibited distinctive features, variations in the populations of two of them reflecting seasonal fluctuations in the availability of work and in the demand for transport in an area heavily dependent on agriculture and brickmaking. Migration patterns show the now familiar longer distance movement of vagrants, either alone or with their families, while the Medway and Sheppey workhouses exhibited higher than average numbers of inmates who had been born abroad, no doubt reflecting their role as naval and dockyard centres.

**Nonconformity in late-seventeenth century St Albans**

In *Local Population Studies* 68, we published an article by Pat Howe entitled ‘Identifying nonconformity in late-seventeenth century St Albans’. Unfortunately, the acknowledgements were omitted from the article, and Pat has asked us to include them in this issue. They read as follows:

‘I am grateful to members of the Seventeenth Century Group of the St Albans and Hertfordshire Archaeological and Architectural Society who over 12 years have contributed to the mass of data which underpins the substance of this article. I acknowledge the work undertaken in transcribing parish registers and the wills, in entering data on the computer, in family reconstruction, the assiduous searching of record offices for relevant information and for computer skills support. In particular, I should like to acknowledge the advice of Professor Margaret Spufford who so kindly read the first draft, the support and assistance from Clare Ellis, especially in relation to the work on the wills and, finally, the help and encouragement from the Editor of *Local Population Studies*.’
A Guide to Sources for Archaeology and Population Studies

Readers of LPS might be interested to learn that the Hampshire Record Office (HRO) has recently published a 24-page Guide to Sources for Archaeology and Population Studies. The Guide starts by describing three case studies: one rural, one urban, and one concerned with industrial archaeology, describing how research might proceed and identifying specific documents in the HRO collection relevant to each. The second part of the Guide contains brief descriptions of relevant classes of documents, including tithe maps, Bishops' Registers and other diocesan records, manorial court records, the Hearth Tax, parish registers, probate records, estate plans and surveys, census records, lay subsidies and trade directories. While the Guide is clearly designed for those interested in the local history of Hampshire, much of it is also of general relevance. It is very clearly written and laid out. The Guide is available, price £5.00, from Hampshire Record Office, Sussex Street, Winchester, Hampshire SO23 8TH.

LPS/LPSS conferences

In this issue of Local Population Studies, we include a report of the Local Population Studies/Local Population Studies Society conference held on 13 April 2002 in St Albans on the theme of migration. Next year’s conference will take place at the same venue on 12 April 2003, and will have as its theme ‘Children and childhood in industrial England’. A programme and booking slip is included with this issue of Local Population Studies.

Two new web-sites

To add to the growing multitude of on-line services, there are two new sites that may be of particular interest to LPS readers. First, the History Data Service at the University of Essex has published a new guide to using Geographical Information Systems, available at www. http://hds.essex.ac.uk/\ %22gis/index.asp. Second, the Centre for Metropolitan History at the Institute of Historical Research has completed its Gazetteer of Markets and Fairs in England to 1516, now available on-line at www.history.ac.uk/cmh/gaz/ gazweb2.html. The Gazetteer is described and discussed in the latest issue of The Local Historian, vol. 32, no. 4 (2002), 250–6.

The 1881 census transcription: a pilot evaluation for Hertfordshire

A brief summary of the results of a pilot evaluation of the 1881 census transcription organised by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Days Saints, and held in an enriched form at the History Data Service, University of Essex, has been published in a recent issue of Family Tree Magazine (vol. 19. no. 1, November 2002, 13–14). In general the results are remarkably reassuring, particularly given the bad press that the transcription has so often received, although errors in relation to both age and occupation are more common than for other categories of information, and considerable variation in the quality of
the transcription was discovered between different enumeration districts. Information on households, represented by oblique strokes in the returns, was recorded very erratically, while information on disability was very poorly recorded indeed in the Hertfordshire transcripts. Most of the errors found, however, will prove more problematic for genealogists than for local historians, for the error rates identified, even at their worst, are unlikely seriously to distort the overall results of calculations at parish level. A full report on this evaluation will be published in due course, and will be advertised in LPS: watch this space.

Editorial matters

This issue was edited by Andrew Hinde and Nigel Goose. The members of the Editorial Board would like to thank Margaret and Ken Smith for doing the typesetting. Please direct all enquiries to the LPS General Office (contact details at the foot of p. 2).

Martin Ecclestone
Peter Franklin
Chris Galley
Eilidh Garrett
Nigel Goose
Andrew Hinde
Steven King
Graham Mooney
Kevin Schürer
Matthew Woolard

December 2002
The second Local Population Studies/Local Population Studies Society conference was held at the Law Faculty of the University of Hertfordshire in St Albans on 13 April 2002. More than 60 participants attended. The theme of the conference was ‘Migration in Local, Regional and International Perspectives’.

The opening address was given by Colin Pooley (University of Lancaster), and was entitled: ‘Migration, mobility and meaning: does migration matter?’. Pooley contended that the outlines of migration patterns and processes in the past are well known. Most movement was over short distances and individuals had well-defined territories within which they moved; the smaller number of long-distance moves had particular characteristics (for example rural-urban migration).

We know, however, much less about the significance of all this mobility. We do not understand, for example, what ‘distance’ meant to people in the past. Neither do we have a good idea about how important specific migration streams were to particular places. For example, rural-urban migration might only have comprised a minority of all moves, but these moves might have been of greater significance, both for the individuals concerned and for the places they moved from and to, than most other moves. Pooley went on to suggest that in the twentieth century mobility (for example daily commuting) has increasingly substituted for residential migration. This has an impact on, for example, the engagement of people with the communities where they live.

David Hey (University of Sheffield) and Kevin Schürer (University of Essex) then presented papers on the use of surname data to infer mobility and stability. Hey’s paper, entitled ‘Surnames and the Hearth Tax returns as evidence for mobility and stability’ argued that in the past surnames tend to cluster in specific places, implying that families did not move very far beyond the hinterland of the nearest market town, an area which they called their ‘country’. Often, surnames can be traced back in documentary sources to a single origin in the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries; sometimes this can be confirmed using DNA techniques. The Hearth Tax of the 1660s can therefore be used to measure in-migration by looking for surnames alien to a county and searching for their origins. In Staffordshire, for example, such alien surnames had their origins in Lancashire, Derbyshire and Cheshire, and it seems the migrants were already in Staffordshire by the 1530s.

Schürer’s paper on ‘Patterns of internal migration and the search for cultural regions’ used surname data to obtain a ‘bird’s eye’ view of the past from the
1881 census. Over 30,000 different surnames were recorded in this census, but the commonest 500 of these cover half the population. The top nine surnames were the same (and, remarkably, in the same order) in 1881 and in 1996. Both rare names and common names can be geographically concentrated, and it is possible to establish boundaries and cultural zones by looking for natural discontinuities in the distribution of surnames. The degree of concentration of names is also a useful indicator. Schürer cited the contrast between west Yorkshire and south Lancashire. Yorkshire has many names (that is, great diversity), whereas south Lancashire has relatively few. Moreover names which occur in Yorkshire tend not to be found in south Lancashire.

The surname evidence for 1881 showed that London was connected to all parts of the country. There is no surname in any place outside London within the 10,000 most common surnames which is not also found within London.

The afternoon session began with a talk by Colin Holmes (University of Southampton) entitled ‘Immigrants in Britain 1900–2000: local and national perspectives’. Holmes began by charting the history of immigration and the study of immigration from the publication of E.G. Ravenstein’s ‘The laws of migration’ (Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, 48 (1885), 167–227; and 52 (1889), 214–301) and W. Cunningham’s Alien Immigrants to England (London, 1897). The largest group of immigrants in Britain in the early twentieth century was the Irish, who numbered more than all the rest put together. Apart from the Irish, Germans were most numerous before 1891, but they were then overtaken by Polish and Russian Jews. It was not until after the second World War that immigrants from the Caribbean and the Indian subcontinent featured in research, with the publication of K. Little’s Negroes in Britain (London, 1947) and J. Walvin’s Black and White (London, 1973).

Holmes pointed to four ‘enduring themes’ in migration research. First, though politicians like to believe that historically, Britain has not been a country of immigration, the evidence does not bear this out. Immigration has persisted over many centuries. Most of it (even in the twentieth century) was of whites rather than coloured people. Much of the literature on black and Asian migrants implicitly – and wrongly – assumes that they were invisible before the 1950s. Second, the belief that the English are a naturally tolerant people is questionable. There were attacks on Jews in Wales in 1911, on Germans in north-west England in 1914–1915 and on Russians and Poles in Leeds in 1917. Generally these conflicts were instigated by the working people, not by those in power (though this was not true of controls on black immigration introduced during the 1960s). Third, an ‘interactionist’ model works well as a way of understanding the process of immigration. Finally, it seems that when researching migration, the use of a wide range of sources is best.

There are, however, some gaps in our knowledge. There is a dearth of local studies of migrants and migrant communities, especially outside London. For example, there is no history of immigration into either Bradford or Liverpool, and no study of Belgian and Italian migration to the north-east of England. Studies of some national groups are lacking (for example Hungarians after
1956, and Iraqi Jews). Finally, there is a general lack of research on the contribution made by immigrants and refugees to our society.

The remainder of the afternoon session was devoted to three papers dealing with immigration during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The first of these was entitled ‘Migration from the Low Countries in the late sixteenth century: evidence from the French Protestant Church’, and was by Charles Littleton (History of Parliament). Littleton described the flow of 50,000 immigrants who arrived between 1550 and 1600 and who settled mainly in London and its suburbs. The English government compiled censuses of ‘aliens’, showing that in 1593 there were at least 7,000 in London (though this was only 4 per cent of the city’s population).

A Strangers’ Church was founded in London in 1550, disbanded under Queen Mary and re-established in 1560 under Elizabeth I. It had French and Dutch branches, although the congregation of the French branch came largely from the Low Countries (especially Valenciennes and Tournai). The ministers of the French church were, however, really French. The migrant community was highly mobile and went back and forth across the English Channel. The regularity of this travel up to 1585 casts some doubt on the precise status of these Walloon migrants in London. Finally, Littleton noted that it is inaccurate to lump these migrants together with the Huguenot migrants of the seventeenth century.

Andrew Spicer (University of Exeter) then presented some ‘Reflections on the French-speaking communities of Southampton’. Between 1567 and 1620 Calvinist exiles from the continent appealed to be allowed to settle in 40 houses, and to establish a cloth trade in Southampton. Southampton was not unique: they also settled in Norwich, Canterbury and Sandwich. The initial migrants came from the south of the Netherlands, one third of them hailing from Valenciennes. There were more arrivals following the Treaty of Namur in 1585, and people also came from the Channel Islands. The three groups (Dutch, French and Channel Islands) worked together economically, but maintained their separateness in marriage. Eventually, the French refugees overwhelmed the other two communities after the St Bartholomew’s Day Massacre in 1585.

Not much effort was made to monitor the arrival of the aliens in Southampton; neither was there much hostility. No ghetto developed, although there is some evidence of a degree of residential concentration. Integration, however, was slow, discouraged by the migrants’ belief that their exile would be temporary. The settlers looked to their home areas to provide ministers of religion, and remittances and bequests flowed back to the continent. Only when all hope of return to their homelands was extinguished did integration accelerate.

In the final paper, Lien Luu (University of Hertfordshire) discussed ‘Migration and British Society 1500–1700’. Migration was a motor of change in early
modern Britain in two principal ways. First, internal migration precipitated
the immense growth of London, transforming it from a modest capital city
with a population of 50,000 inhabitants in 1500 to a ‘sprawling metropolis’ of
575,000 souls by 1700. Secondly, overseas migration, through the transfer of
skills, stimulated the development of new industries. By looking at some
examples, Luu sought to show how migration precipitated economic and
social change in London and elsewhere. One example was the introduction of
large-scale production in beer brewing, encouraged by a change in the
drinking culture and ale consumption patterns. Other examples included the
coal trade in Newcastle and hop growing in East Anglia.

Local Population Studies and the Local Population Studies Society would like to
thank the University of Hertfordshire for providing comfortable
accommodation for the day, together with food and refreshment. The
sponsorship of the Centre for Regional and Local History at the University of
Hertfordshire and the British Society for Population Studies is gratefully
acknowledged. Finally, thanks are also due to Nigel Goose and his team for
organising the event.

Andrew Hinde
CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENT

WESTWARD HO!
MOVEMENT AND MIGRATION
3-6 April 2003
Exeter University

Organised by the South-west Family History Societies and sponsored by the Centre for South-Western Historical Studies, Exeter University

Preliminary programme

Thursday 3 April
Evening        Dinner
Graham Davis (Bath), ‘Myths and Legends among the Irish pioneer settlers in Texas.’

Friday 4 April
Morning        Opening session
William Van Vugt (Grand Rapids, USA), ‘Westward Ho: the British Meet the Natives in the Ohio River Valley.’
Eric Richards (Adelaide, Australia), ‘South Australia and the West Country.’
Andrew Hinde (Southampton), ‘Migration from west Dorset in the Nineteenth Century.’

Afternoon       Visit to Powderham Castle OR
Gordon Hancock (Newfoundland), ‘Migration between the West Country and Newfoundland.’
Peter Towey (Anglo-German Family History Society), ‘Germanic immigration to Britain, 1500–2000.’
Sheila Haines (Brighton), ‘Captain Hale, red herrings and brandy: the Petworth emigrant ship of 1833.’
Mark Brayshay (Plymouth), ‘The role of James B. Wilcocks, Plymouth’s mid-Victorian selecting agent, in assisted emigration to Australia from Cornwall, Devon, Somerset and Dorset.’
Paddy Fitzgerald (Omagh), ‘Early Irish migration into the south-west of England.’
Graham Davis (Bath), ‘The Irish in Britain in the Nineteenth Century.’

Evening        Federation reception and social evening

Saturday 5 April  Joint day with the Centre for South Western Historical Studies and Institute of Cornish Studies
Morning
Bruce Elliott (Toronto, Canada), ‘Nineteenth-century emigration to Canada from England’s West Country.’
Saturday 5 April (cont’d)  Bernard Deacon (Exeter), ‘Barra or Barrow? Bute or Burnley? Why did people in the nineteenth century emigrate and others just migrate?’
Philip Payton (Exeter), ‘Cornish migration.’
Sharron Schwartz (Exeter), ‘The making of a myth: the migration of South West metal miners to the New World in the early nineteenth century.’
Jill Chambers (Letchworth), ‘Forced migrants: “Swing” rioters transported to Australia.’

Afternoon  Tour of Exeter OR short paper sessions OR sessions on regional migration studies OR group sessions

Evening  Banquet and entertainment

Sunday 6 April
Morning
Moira Martin (Bristol), ‘Emigration of pauper children from Bristol to Canada 1870-1915.’
Diana Trenchard (Exeter), ‘Movement and migration within England from the South West in the 1800s.’
Andrea Buttons (Bristol), ‘Migration of indentured servants and malefactors to the West Indies during the seventeenth century.’
Roger Burt (Exeter), ‘Freemasonry and migration.’

Conference ends with lunch

Registration details and further information

The Conference is both residential and non-residential. Non-residential fees are £20.00 per day including lunch. For residential fees, booking forms and registration details contact Audrey Lovell, 784 Muller Rd. Eastville, Bristol, BS5 6XA.

For general information, contact Jane Ferentzi-Sheppard (tel: 01308 458061) or e-mail: jferentzi@aol.com, or look on the World Wide Web at www.cornwallfhs.com.
RURAL COMMUNITY HISTORY FROM TRADE DIRECTORIES

Dennis R. Mills

No general introductory work on trade directories has been published until now, nor have family historians included directories in their major booklet collections. Directories have fallen into this limbo partly because they appear straightforward to use, and partly because they are printed sources whereas the other great classes of source material are generally in manuscript form. This book sets out to fill the space so identified.

“Mills is to be commended for producing a highly informative work, which will be of great assistance to anybody investigating the history of rural communities. This publication is to be welcomed, as it raises the profile of a very valuable source.”

“This book is well illustrated throughout and contains a wealth of examples… It will be a welcome addition to every local history library and should become a standard reference.”
Gareth Shaw, LPS 68 (2002)

“This is a useful, thought-provoking booklet.”
Family Tree Magazine, 18 (6) (April 2002).

Orders to: LPS General Office, Department of Humanities, University of Hertfordshire, Watford Campus, Aldenham, Watford, Herts, WD2 8AT.
Cost: £6.00 (plus p. & p. £1.00, UK, £2.00 overseas). Make cheques payable to Local Population Studies
COASTAL COMMUNITIES IN VICTORIAN SCOTLAND: WHAT MAKES NORTH-EAST FISHER FAMILIES DISTINCTIVE?

Andrew Blaikie

Andrew Blaikie is Professor of Historical Sociology in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Aberdeen.

Introduction

In their comprehensive analysis of Scottish population patterns from 1860 to 1914, Anderson and Morse make a convincing case for that country’s demographic experience being decidedly different from that of its nearest geographical neighbours: ‘Scottish marital fertility ... was higher than that for England and Wales. Scottish nuptiality was consistently lower’.1 They conclude that the Scottish national regime was one of high fertility and high emigration but low nuptiality. Nevertheless, regional variations were affected by very different material considerations. For instance, late marriage in the Highlands occurred because crofters had to wait for fathers to die before obtaining their land, whereas in industrial areas of the Central Belt, the timing and incidence of marriage was more dependent on the state of trade.

Anderson and Morse’s analysis says nothing specifically about the fishing communities that fringed eastern Scotland. However, these settlements made a distinctive demographic contribution. This paper aims to outline some of the more significant elements of that distinctive demography by examining a small selection of fishing villages around Scotland’s north-east coasts.2 The sample includes Rathven, a large parish on the central Moray Firth, and Findochty, one of its half-dozen constituent sea-towns; Gardenstown and Whitehills, two villages along the eastern reaches of the same coastline, some 15 miles apart; and Footdee, a fishing village at the mouth of Aberdeen harbour, some fifty miles to the south of these enclaves. For comparative purposes the discussion refers to relevant calculations made for the inland farming parish of Rothiemay, the inland village of Aberchirder, a middle-class residential district (West End) of Aberdeen city and to regional and national figures. A number of other locations in north-east Scotland are also mentioned (see Figure 1).3

The fishing economy

The fishing villages were traditionally involved in whitefishing. White fish (predominantly cod and haddock) are demersal (living in deep water or at the bottom of the sea) and were traditionally caught on lines. This required using
baited hooks, a procedure that engendered high social cohesion since it was labour-intensive and drew upon all members of the family. In particular, women’s employment (and, to a lesser extent, that of children), included collecting bait, knotting hooks, baiting lines, preparing fish for sale and selling the catch, alongside domestic household work. As Baillie points out, these were not insignificant tasks. For example, each fishing trip would set out with up to 5,000 baited hooks aboard.4

The co-operative, kin-based, essentially egalitarian character of fishing – what Thompson and his colleagues refer to as ‘the moral order of free enterprise’ – was anchored by a share system:

To fish, a man had to invest in a vessel and its gear. Thus the crew of a boat were co-owners. Profits from fishing were shared out equally thereby creating social equality and cohesion in the community. Social cohesion was further

---

4 Baillie, John, 

---
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strengthened by a marriage system which undoubtedly developed as a consequence of business investments in boats. Young fishermen, because of the additional tasks required of a fisherman’s wife, almost invariably chose a bride from within a fishing community and in this respect would have been encouraged to marry the daughter of a fellow crew-member. This practice would have consolidated capital investment in the boat. The result of the share system was that members of the community identified with boats, and hence other families, to which they had some attachment and not with a particular stratum of society.5

By contrast, the instability that typified the herring industry, with its seasonal and unpredictable fluctuations in supply and demand, required considerable adaptations to the old share system. Herring fishing with drift nets ‘grew by slow erosion of traditional forms of fishing’ as increasing numbers of fishermen were stimulated by curers offering to engage boats.6 Profit opportunities began to be realised in the 1830s, with expansion, both in boats and in people, beginning around 1850 and continuing until 1914. Larger boats were needed, and the movements of the fish during the herring season necessitated the development of an itinerant lifestyle at odds with a home-centred family economy as men and women followed the shoals around the North-east from July to September, and south to East Anglia in the autumn. While young women were employed at piece rates in their droves as gutters and packers, independent middlemen intervened as curers thus supplanting wives in their marketing role.

The herring fleet consisted of many tiny parts drawn from over 100 separate communities along the Scottish east coast. Gardenstown fishers invested heavily in herring fishing, only returning to whitefishing as a mainstay after the boom, whereas Whitehills fishermen were rather less committed, retaining small, non-specialised vessels and a whitefishing presence throughout. In Findochty, as in Rathven’s main port of Buckie, population growth, particularly after the 1880s, came as a result of the herring boom. Meanwhile, from 1880, steam trawling came to dominate whitefishing by concentrating activity in the larger ports, thereby putting an effective end to line-fishing along the Buchan and Kincardine coasts, although having little effect on the Moray Firth villages. Its technology also needed only one skilled fisherman per boat, with the others being simply maritime labourers. By contrast, the herring ports, despite occasional crises, developed apace without adopting steam drifters until after 1900, and the Moray Firth seatowns – a mixture of whitefishing and herring-based settlements – flourished as never before or since.

Population growth and intercensal change

Many of the fishing villages along the Moray Firth coast had been erected by individual landowners between the late-seventeenth and early-nineteenth centuries. For example, Findochty was settled in 1716 by fishers from Fraserburgh and Gardenstown in 1720 by Alexander Garden of Troup, a ‘beneficent landlord who provided homes and boats in return for a share of
the catch? Although often planned as direct resettlements, many sea-towns were massively affected by the Victorian boom and thrived as densely concentrated irregular and cramped settlements.

During the nineteenth century, the population of Banffshire rose at every census. However, at parish level the pattern was far from even. Upland areas declined steadily from 1831, with lowland agricultural parishes later, if rather less sharply, following suit. In marked contrast, however, the coastal districts, stimulated by a fishing boom, witnessed a population explosion. This cumulative expansion became particularly pronounced in the later Victorian period, and lasted until the First World War. For example, between 1801 and 1911, the population of Rathven grew five-fold: in 1801 it was 3,901; by 1861, 8,240; 1891, 12,995, and by 1911 it was 15,995. Gardenstown, meanwhile, grew from 348 persons in 1841 to 1,107 by 1901.

The fishing villages were characterised by strong and persistent positive rates of natural increase. Indeed Baillie notes that Gardenstown’s fisher element would have doubled within 18 years had the rates of the 1860s continued. However, net migration trends fluctuated and – in Gardenstown, at least – the net in-migration of the 1860s and 1880s was counterbalanced by out-migration during other decades.

**Crude vital rates**

In Gardenstown birth frequencies rose from around 25 per annum in the 1850s to between 40 and 50 per annum by the end of the nineteenth century, achieving a maximum of 60 in 1898. However, when figures are adjusted into rates for Rathven, the crude birth rate remains consistently below both regional and national levels throughout the half-century. In view of the information that follows on nuptiality and fertility, these figures are perplexing, although – as with all calculations discussed in this paper – there is a potential problem of distortion due to small numbers.

Rathven’s low death rate (in 1871 it was 10.2 per thousand as against the north-east Scotland mean of 17.3) partially accounts for a high level of population retention, although one assumes that in-migration attendant upon the success of the fishery was a major factor.

**Age structure**

The coastal villages had a younger overall structure than the inland farming areas, although the proportions within the reproductive age-range (15–49) were almost identical. A recurrent feature of the age pyramids constructed for Gardenstown and Whitehills was the depletion of adult males. However, since fertility levels appear to have been unaffected by this, we must conclude that this was an artefact caused by the (temporary) absence of men at the fishing on the night that the census was taken. Certainly, the prevalence of ‘fisherman’s wife’ as a common designation among household heads would imply this.
Table 1  Crude birth rate, selected samples, 1861–91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rathven</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast region</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Civil registration certificates; census enumerators’ books; M. Flinn, Scottish population history: from the seventeenth century to the 1930s, (Cambridge, 1977), 340.

Sex ratios

The distortion created by persons absent at the fishing is also reflected in the recorded sex composition of village populations, with sex ratios indicating disparities in levels of absenteeism from one census to the next. In 1861, Findochty’s sex ratio, expressed as the number of men per one hundred women, was just 50 in the 15–49 year age range. This was partly due to the temporary absence of 103 men and 83 women, engaged in fishing and related activities on the night the census was taken. Assuming all these 186 individuals to be aged between 15 and 49 years, the ratio when augmented to include them is still only 82. In 1871 only one inhabitant was recorded by the enumerator as being absent on census night, and the sex ratios for the 20–24 and 25–29 year age ranges were identical at 94. However, the overall ratio at ages 15–49 years was just 79. A female bias within the reproductive, working-age section of the population was similarly evident along the coast, both at Whitehills (81 in 1851, 76 in 1861 and 74 in 1871) and – more markedly – Gardenstown (84 in 1851, 46 in 1861 and 59 in 1871). In both these instances the sex ratios quoted are for fishers only – according to adult occupation – aged 15–44 years. Imbalances were most strongly reflected in divergent sex ratios amongst single people. Thus, whereas Rothiemay records more men than women amongst the unmarried aged 20–34 years, in Findochty there were more single women than men in all reproductive age-ranges. We would expect such skewness to affect both marriage rates and fertility in that the probabilities of women finding husbands from their own age-group were restricted on average by around 20 per cent, and often considerably more, with a corresponding reduction (ignoring illegitimacy) in maximum possible fertility.

Age at first marriage

In 1794, the minister of Rathven wrote of his parishioners: ‘They go to sea as boys, at 14 years of age, become men at 18, and marry soon after; for it is a maxim with them, apparently founded in truth, that no man can be a fisher, and want a wife. They generally marry before 24 years at farthest; and always the daughters of fishers from 18 to 22 at most’. Sixty years later (1855–59) mean ages at first marriage in Gardenstown (calculated from individual ages recorded on civil marriage certificates) were 26.4 for men and 23.5 for women,
and for the long period stretching from 1855 up to 1974, the modal age for grooms was 24 and brides 23. In Whitehills the corresponding modal ages were 26 and 21 respectively. The low female ages are especially marked and compare with mean ages of marriage that never fell below 25.3 or rose above 26.7 in any decade from 1851 to 1900 for inland farming parishes, the North-east region or indeed Scotland overall.

**Fertility**

Clearly, one would expect low marriage ages to contribute to high fertility levels. In 1871, Gardenstown’s general fertility rate (GFR) was 205.7 and Whitehills’s was 186.0.14 These very high rates, which compare with GFRs of 135.4 for the North-east region, 135.5 for Scotland as a whole, and 114.0 for Rothiemay, were still higher for the fisher sectors of their respective populations, a figure of 226.3 being computed for Gardenstown.

**Nuptiality**

Anderson and Morse point out the striking contrasts in patterns of fertility and nuptiality between England and Scotland, noting how Scottish marital fertility was higher throughout the second half of the nineteenth century, while nuptiality was consistently lower.15 Between 1861 and 1901, the crude marriage rate for Scotland (which was always lower than that for England and Wales, but well above Ireland) hovered around 7.0 per thousand.16 Rates in the western Moray Firth parishes fluctuated considerably – Whitehills peaked at 105 (1881) and Gardenstown at 106 (1861), while both also saw rates as low as 37 (Gardenstown, 1901) and 66 (Whitehills, 1891). Meanwhile, though its crude marriage rates were never as low as those found among inland parishes affected by high levels of unmarried motherhood (33 for Marnoch (including Aberchirder) in 1881), Rathven never achieved a higher level than 52 per thousand between 1861 and 1891.

This said, the proportions of women ever married were higher in each age-group than the North-east regional mean, a trend that was most marked in the 25–29 year age group, clearly reflecting the impact of a relatively early mean age at marriage. This compares with figures of 55.7 per cent of women married in the 25–29 year age group in Scotland as a whole, 52.1 per cent in the North-east region, and just 39.9 per cent in the Highland Counties.17

The proportion of men married in their twenties was much lower in the farming parishes than the regional average, but the reverse was true in the seathowns. Thus in Findochty the proportion of men aged 20–24 in 1871 who were married (27.6 per cent) was over twice that for the North-east as a whole (13.5 per cent). The impact of relatively early marriage ages was most evident in the 25–29 year age group, in which 87.5 per cent of Findochty men were married compared with just 48.1 per cent regionally. In the 30–34 age group the percentage was again much higher (85.7 per cent as against 69.7 per cent) and decidedly above that of the agricultural zone. By contrast, in 1861 the inland farming parish of Rothiemay shows just 29.7 per cent of men aged 25–29 years
Table 2  Percentage of selected female age-groups ever married, 1871

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>Scotland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–34</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:  Census enumerators’ books;  M. Flinn, *Scottish population history: from the seventeenth century to the 1930s*, (Cambridge, 1977), 326–7

married and, even allowing for the effect of later marriage, only 61.5 per cent of men aged 30–34 years.

Throughout Scotland during the late nineteenth century, relatively low proportions of women – around 80 per cent – had ever married by the end of their reproductive period. Likewise, overall proportions never married stayed stable in Banffshire, shifting from 21.7 per cent to just 22.7 per cent between 1871 and 1911. And, taking 1871 as a guide, the proportion of Findochty women in the 50–54 year age group who were married or widowed was 81.8 per cent (88.9 per cent for ages 45–54). Nevertheless, the proportions married at different ages prior to this diverged sharply between fishing and farming parishes as we have seen. Measures of marital fertility and nuptiality show that compared with most of Western Europe, Scotland’s nuptiality stayed relatively constant through the early fertility decline, despite increased proletarianisation. Low levels occur for inland parts of the North-east region, particularly in the arable and livestock feeding zone characterised by small farms on poorer soils. However, because of the boost provided by the fishing communities, levels remained relatively high in the region overall.

Illegitimacy and bridal pregnancy

To a degree the low levels of marital fertility inland are explained by high levels of non-marital fertility. North-east Scotland was distinctive for its high bastardy ratios during the Victorian era. However, the pattern clearly disaggregates into high levels in the inland farming areas with more moderate levels (by Scottish standards) in the coastal parishes. Between 1858 and 1886, the 24 Banffshire parishes returned an alarming mean illegitimacy ratio of 16.2 per cent, almost twice the Scottish average. However, the variation between parishes was such that the five coastal parishes occupied the bottom five slots in the local bastardy league (with a mean of 11 per cent) while the top three parishes, all inland and dominated by agriculture, shared a mean of 24 per cent. Undoubtedly, since these are parish figures, the coastal areas were to a
degree affected by the mores of the farming sub-populations of their landward parts. Thus Seafield, consisting almost wholly of the sea-town of Portknockie and the parish with the lowest farming acreage, returned the lowest ratio of all at 7.3 per cent.20

Social control of sexual behaviour

The local commentator William Cramond claimed that in 1858, ‘there was not a single illegitimate case of a fishergirl or fisherman’s daughter’ in the county while in 1868 there was only one.21 Similarly, his contemporary Gerrard made the point that many fishergirls became pregnant, but ample housing provision and a distinct requirement for wives in the fishing economy ensured early marriages and relatively low bastardy ratios.22 Bridal pregnancy was not unheard of: Cramond found that in Seafield one sixth of first births between 1881 and 1886 occurred within six months of marriage. However, the Kirk Session Minutes for adjacent Rathven show considerable, and regular numbers of ‘antenuptial fornication’ cases.23 While the churches in the fishing parishes appear to have taken a rather less dim view of bridal pregnancy than of illegitimacy, Gregor nevertheless indicates the high degree of parental control over marriage: ‘A would-be groom indicated his wishes to his father who then contacted the bride’s parents to discuss details of worth and property. Announcements were only made after an agreeable settlement had been reached.’ 24

While ‘displeasure and scorn’ was vented against unmarried mothers in these tight, highly religious communities, young fishermen, unlike their rural counterparts, faced ‘no obstacle to renting’. Indeed, a thinly disguised fictional account of Gardenstown remarks that ‘the bridegroom’s father provides a new house completely furnished for the young couple’.25 Various contemporary accounts also note that in the fishing villages the occupational organisation demanded early marriage ‘rules’. Meanwhile, both contemporary folklorists and recent oral histories of the early twentieth century remark upon the crucial role of wives in the fishing economy. 26

Surname analysis and marital endogamy

Most Scottish communities were sufficiently open to allow considerable migratory traffic in marriage partners and incoming families. For instance, a total of 692 surnames appeared in the civil registration certificates of the farming parish of Torforthwald, Dumfriesshire (mean population c. 1,010) during the 84-year period between 1855 and 1939. Nevertheless, the remoter Hebridean islands were sometimes affected by limited outside contact. Thus, between 1776 and 1854 (a period of 78 years), just 49 surnames occur among the births and marriages recorded in the Coll parish registers (mean population c. 1,190). One third of the population was called McLean.27

Geographical isolation, though, was not necessary to restrict outside contact. The North-east region’s fishing villages were not geographically remote, but
there was remarkably little interaction between them and the surrounding farmland and intermarriage between fishing families and those from the immediate agricultural environs was rare indeed. While methods of hiring farm labour ensured that people (particularly those in the key reproductive age groups) moved frequently between farms and districts, the fishing villages were extremely self-contained.

Endogamous marriage was a feature of the coastal settlements. Between 1855 and 1974, 55 per cent of Boyndie marriages were contracted between partners living less than one kilometre apart; in Gamrie, the proportion was 44 per cent. Meanwhile, taking the census year 1881, 84.4 per cent of married women aged 16–49 years in Findochty hailed from within the parish (Rathven) while nearly 88.1 per cent of single women in the same age-range did so (82.1 per cent being native to Findochty itself). These figures have to be set against the drastically different proportions of 18.6 per cent and 45.3 per cent respectively for Rothiemay. Similarly, in 1891, while 56.5 per cent of all Aberdeen residents were native to the city, 95.1 per cent of the residents of the Footdee squares were Aberdonians. Rev. William Henderson had written some forty years previously that the fisherfolk of Aberdeen ‘seldom marry with persons not of their own community’.

They also tended to marry relatives. The frequency of particular surnames within fishing communities indicates pronounced genetic concentration and reflects high levels of marital isonymy (marriage between individuals with the same surname). For the eastern Moray Firth, Baillie finds 197 surnames in the Gardenstown marriage registers between 1855 and 1974, and 342 in Whitehills. However, in Gardenstown the majority of marriage partners (54.3 per cent) shared just four surnames: Watt, West, Wiseman or Nicol; in Whitehills 32.2 per cent were called Watson, Ritchie, Lovie or Findlay. In Findochty, most people were named Anderson, Flett, Smith, Sutherland or Thain. The same applies to the west: among 202 household heads recorded in Portessie in 1881 no less than 81 (41 per cent) had the name Smith and 59 per cent of the population shared just four surnames. As a consequence, individuals were recognised by everyday ‘tee-names’, which also appear in the census enumerators’ books. For example, in Portknockie, where Mair was among the commonest surnames, household heads were recorded as ‘Mair “Big”’, ‘Mair “Bo”’, ‘Mair “Bobbie”’, ‘Mair “Bobbin”’, ‘Mair “Cock”’, ‘Mair “John”’, ‘Mair “Shavie”’, ‘Mair “Shay”’, and so on, with entire families appearing thus:

John Mair “Shavie”, head
Eliza (Strachan Milne) Mair, wife
Eliza A. Mair “Shavie”, daughter
Alexander Mair “Shavie”, son
Andrew Ritchie Mair, son
David Mair “Shavie”, son
Elspet Smith Mair, daughter.
This phenomenon was not confined to the Moray Firth, but was widespread throughout the fishertowns of the North-east. Thus in Footdee, eight surnames spanned two-thirds of the population, and one third were called Baxter, Morrice or Guyan. Here, ‘Bowfer’, ‘Pokie’s Dod’ and ‘Foveran’s Ondy’ were all Baxters, as were ‘Annie Baxter One’ and ‘Annie Baxter Two’. Strikingly, not only do these patterns demonstrate concentrated gene pools, they also reflect just how enduringly micro-local the social ambit of each village were. Gardenstown and Whitehills are fewer than fifteen miles apart, yet the dominant surnames in each were quite different. The same may be said for all of the fisher enclaves around the North-east coast. By comparison, Lasker and Mascie-Taylor found that the four most common surnames throughout England and Wales for a sample period during the 1970s accounted for less than 4 per cent of all names mentioned in the marriage records.

**Implications for inbreeding**

Baillie’s study found clear distinctions between fishers and non-fishers within village populations. Marital isonymy was negligible amongst non-fishers, whereas amongst fishers 12 per cent of marriages were isonymous. Consequently, there were great occupational differences in the coefficient of inbreeding, with exceptionally high values among fishers. Here the degree of relationship was consistently at a level between first cousin and second cousin, thus representing values close to those obtained for the isolated Hutterite population of central North America, a homogeneous religious sect whose complete avoidance of birth control and communal living ensured maximum, unrestrained fertility. Arguably such values were attributable to random mating within a small population. However, evidence of ‘positive assortative mating with reference to surname’ was found in Whitehills where less high values prevailed. The effects of such inbreeding are difficult to judge, although contemporary medical writers suggested that both mental and physical health may have been impaired.

Levels of endogamy were connected to patterns of boat-ownership, and may have been higher where small-scale whitefishing predominated than in villages where herring fishing provided a livelihood. Exogamous marriages could have threatened the whitefishers because the introduction of non-village individuals would have meant dividing profits per boat amongst additional people. On the other hand, where fishermen had taken up long-distance herring fishing, their boats were financed by fewer individuals, often capitalists from outside the village. There was thus less pressure to maintain endogamous links. This theory is highly plausible, and is borne out in the different rates calculated for Whitehills (higher endogamy, whitefishers) and Gardenstown (lower endogamy, herring fishers). Nevertheless, taken as a whole, the impact appears minor and the fishertowns of the North-east coast, regardless of the type of fishing, are highly endogamous by comparison with any other type of community in Scotland at the time.
Another factor, which remains to be researched, is the influence of fundamentalist religion. The revivals of 1859–1860 precipitated the formation of evangelical splinter groups, and since the mid-nineteenth century the fishing villages of Northeast Scotland have been the main UK focus of the Plymouth Brethren. These include several sects, notably the ‘Closed’ Brethren, who refuse communion with those of other persuasions, and the ‘Exclusive’ Brethren, a subset with strict rules of dress and conduct. Brethren assemblies insist upon female silence in meetings and submission in the home, and arguably such constraining sect beliefs and practices had the effect of isolating villagers from the wider community and of promoting social as well as religious exclusivity.40

Family size

Fertility levels provide no real clue to the numbers of children per family group, although the majority of births in coastal parishes were to fisher couples whose propensity to have more than ten offspring was between two and three times that of non-fishers. Among marriages within Whitehills between 1880 and 1904, the proportion that ever produced any children within the village was 76.7 per cent, but among the fishing sector alone it was 95.7 per cent.41 Non-migrant families were generally larger than those of migrants.

Household size and structure

The Moray Firth villages appear distinctive in their demography. Assessing the extent to which population patterns were reflected in an equally distinctive pattern of household composition requires comparison between urban, rural and coastal contexts across the region. As Table 3 indicates, the nuclear family predominated. Siblings, in-laws, parents, aunts and cousins were rare, whilst nephews, nieces and sons- and daughters-in-law formed minuscule fractions of overall household memberships. The fishing communities, Footdee included, were characterised by higher levels of nuclearity than elsewhere, in that proportions of simple family units were greater than in the countryside or, in the Aberdeen case, other parts of the city. Whilst in the inland farming parish of Rothiemay and the rural village of Aberchirder, roughly half of all households were simple family units, the proportion climbed to almost three quarters in Findochty. The same division applied in Aberdeen, where married couples with children comprised just over three quarters of all households in Footdee, whereas in an elite suburb in the West End of the city approximately half conformed to this pattern.

The comparatively high rates of solitariness (largely amongst the widowed) in Rothiemay and Aberchirder help to explain differentials in mean household size – 4.8 in Rothiemay, 4.1 in Aberchirder and 5.2 in Findochty. However, in Aberdeen city, despite a very high rate of solitariness in the wealthy West End, household sizes did not vary markedly. Size variations tell us relatively little, since a domestic group could be smaller or larger because of either
poverty or affluence. Both Footdee and the West End had a mean household size of around five persons. However, the density of individuals per dwelling varied massively, with between four and five persons per windowed room in overcrowded Footdee, but nearer two windowed rooms per person in the spacious West End.

Table 4 shows that grandchildren lived in 21 per cent of Rothiemay households and in nearly 17 per cent in Aberchirder, but they were found in less than 12 per cent of Findochty homes. The incidence of illegitimacy varied positively with the proportions of households headed by grandparents. It was rare for grandparents and grandchildren alone to co-reside (1.7 per cent of households).

In large part, the Rothiemay and Aberchirder patterns reflect interdependency between grandparents, unmarried mothers and their illegitimate children. For similar reasons (and because rents were cheap and therefore attractive to impoverished widows and farmers’ wives whose husbands lived on distant farms), almost half (48.9 per cent) of all heads in Aberchirder were women, including 81 (22.5 per cent) who were never-married. By contrast, in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Northeast Scotland</th>
<th>Aberdeen city</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Findochty 1881</td>
<td>Rothiemay 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No family</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ‘Solitary’ – widowed and single; ‘No family’ – co-resident siblings, co-resident relatives of other kinds, persons not evidently related; ‘Simple’ family households – married couples alone, married couples with child(ren), widow(er)s with child(ren), married parent alone with child(ren), unmarried parent with child(ren); ‘Extended’ family households – upwards, downwards and lateral, including multiple family combinations. The presence or absence of servants does not affect this typology (e.g. solitaries are taken as living with themselves, even when there are servants in the household). Individuals defined by the compiler as ‘son’, ‘daughter’, ‘grandson’, ‘granddaughter’, ‘nephew’ or ‘niece’ are counted as children unless they are married – age does not enter into the definition.

Table 4  Households including grandchildren, selected samples, 1881

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rothenay</th>
<th></th>
<th>Findochty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Aberchirder</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head+wife+g/c</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow(er)+g/c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head+wife+child(ren)+g/c</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow(er)+child(ren)+g/c</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other combinations+g/c</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All including g/c</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of households

Findochty, where illegitimacy was low, the total was just over a fifth (22.1 per cent). Only four heads (2.2 per cent) were single women, a further 21 (11.6 per cent) were widows and 15 (8.3 per cent) were married. Similarly, very few widows lived together with their children plus grandchildren. In Footdee, a few widows lived alone, but most non-nuclear households consisted of interdependent relatives in extended families, or, in 1891, co-resident relatives.

The high incidence of simple family units in the fishing communities may be explained by several possible factors. First, as already noted, the womenfolk were pivotally involved in all aspects of the trade, from mending nets and baiting lines to selling the fish. Fishing still essentially relied on the combined labours of the family unit. Secondly, many residents lived in one-room cottages, in which nets and other equipment had also to be stored. This militated against the inclusion of further family (or indeed, any inmates). A mean family size of five is not large, yet the overcrowding of North and South Squares was the main reason why Aberdeen City Council resolved to develop a third square in Footdee in the 1870s. At that time, tenants were given the opportunity to buy their homes, and new storeys were added by owner-occupiers, facilitating multiple occupancy – but in separate households. Thirdly, as we have again seen, most residents were closely related to one another as well as being native to the district. As they came of age, young men and women in the village married one another and moved into houses a matter of yards away, rather than co-residing with either spouse’s parents. In the Moray Firth villages, the cramped, higgledy-piggledy layout of the seatowns was created by piecemeal development as
grooms’ fathers built houses for their sons prior to marriage, often adjacent to or abutting the family abode. In mid-Victorian Footdee, 25 (22.3 per cent) households each employed a single living-in servant. Seven housed lodgers, and six boarders. Just over half of all servants and half the boarders and lodgers stayed with nuclear families. By 1891, only three families (1.9 per cent) kept a servant, four included a single boarder, and one had three boarders. By this time Footdee, like all the fishing communities in the study, was very clearly dominated by close-knit simple family units, reliant on scarcely any extra-familial support.

Patterns of dependency

Given their rapid expansion, youthful profile and high fertility, most dependants in these villages were young. Moreover, the high degree of nuclearity suggests most were cared for within simple families rather than extended units. The buoyancy of the herring trade also shielded most against poverty. Unsurprisingly, in a total population of 936 only seven individuals, all women over 55, were recorded in the 1881 Findochty census as ‘parochial dependants’ (i.e. paupers). However, rather than being isolates, as Laslett’s ‘nuclear hardship’ hypothesis would predict, all lived in three-generation households: six were grandmothers, the other a great aunt. It is difficult to draw any conclusions from this pattern since they were so few in number, even compared with overall number living in non-nuclear households, and certainly do not justify any inference that high levels of collective welfare prevailed.

Conclusion

Hajnal’s west European marriage pattern suggests high proportions of women never marrying (around 15–20 per cent on average), with those that do marry marrying at relatively advanced ages. Meanwhile, Anderson and Morse’s Scottish variant demonstrates high fertility but low nuptiality. Our limited sample of fishing communities in the late nineteenth century indicates a different form again, for the regime of the seatowns was one of early marriage, high proportions marrying and high fertility. Undoubtedly, the buoyancy of maritime trade contributed massively to this pattern as village populations mushroomed. Age pyramids stayed relatively broad-based and youthful, although decreasing death rates were not offset by especially high birth and marriage rates at all times.

The social structure was at least as important as the economy in determining population patterns, and while the two intermeshed in the organisation of co-operative, family-centred tasks that bound trade in with the domestic division of labour, the social control of marriage was deeply constraining. These influences were to be seen in the extraordinarily endogamous nature of kinship links regarding both geography and genealogy.

Demographic and social trends are mirrored in patterns of household composition, especially in the overwhelming predominance of the simple
nuclear family and the corresponding scarcity of extended family forms. Non-kin were conspicuous by their absence while few elderly dependants were evident – a fact that reflects the contemporary prosperity of these communities as well as their relative youth.48 And, as we have seen, those that were impoverished relied on close family support through co-residence rather than living independently. Again, the underlying determinants lie in the social organisation of production and reproduction. The occupational horizons of whole families often stretched as far as Yarmouth and Lowestoft, as they followed the herring migration, but their discrete social world maintained a hermetic family culture that brooked no incursion from the surrounding hinterland. Unlike those in the pluriactive crofting townships to the west who fished while tending a patch of land and engaging in migrant labouring, these were specialist fisher families through-and-through.

NOTES


2. Creek Returns indicate 39 fishing ports around the coast from Aberdeen to Rathven. Their size varied from 11 to 180 boats, and from 23 to 480 fishermen per port. Findochty grew from 69 boats and 201 fishermen (1855) to 126 boats and 230 fishermen (1881). Over the same period, Gardenstown increased from 41 boats, 115 fishermen to 98 boats, 155 fishermen; and Whitehills from 51 boats, 150 fishermen to 89 boats, 188 fishermen. Aberdeen (including Footdee) expanded from 29 boats and 63 fishermen to 82 boats and 224 fishermen. These figures exclude large numbers of men and women involved in ancillary trades as coopers, gutters, packers and vendors: see K. Walton, ‘The distribution and structure of the population of Northeast Scotland, 1696–1931’, (unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of Aberdeen, 1951).


9. Baillie, ‘Structure of population’, 186–9 provides line graphs indicating annual frequencies but does not compute the crude birth rate.

10. These figures do not appear to have been distorted by the ‘snapshot’ effect of the census such that an itinerant segment in Rathven’s population contributed to the enumerated population but did not bear children there. The herring season depended heavily upon temporary migrants, mainly from the west coast, who would have been resident around the Moray Firth from July to September, but not in April when the census was taken. Although age structures and sex ratios were affected by the temporary absence of Findochty fishermen in 1861 (but not 1871), just five persons were recorded as ‘temporarily present’ in 1871, and three in 1881.
11. Baillie offers no explanation for the dramatic change in the sex ratio in Gardenstown between 1851 and 1861. The shift was still more marked in the 45 and over age range (from 67 to 23). This was very probably due to differences in classification by occupation – a retired, widower fisherman would be classified as a fisher whereas a fisherman’s widow might describe herself as ‘net weaver’ and thus be classified as a non-fisher (Baillie, ‘Structure of population’, 160). The corresponding ratios in the 45 and over age range for Whitehills were 107 (1861) and 100 (1871).


14. The general fertility rate as calculated here is the number of live births per thousand women aged 15–49 years, calculated as a three-year mean centred on the census year.


18. Arguably, a peasant mode of production still prevailed here in the 1870s, and it was this area that suffered greatest stress during the subsequent agricultural depression. Whereas high nuptiality had been encouraged during the phase of agrarian improvement from 1840 to 1870, marriage rates fell between 1880 and 1914. See A. Blaikie, ‘Scottish illegitimacy: social adjustment or moral economy?’, Journal of Interdisciplinary History, 29 (1998), 221–41.

19. High illegitimate fertility does not appear to have had the effect of depressing marital fertility. Rothiemay’s marital fertility rate in 1870–1872 (a three-year mean of legitimate live births per thousand married women aged 15–49) was 278, compared with a North-east region figure of 240 and a Scottish figure of 247. Its illegitimate fertility rate for the same period (a three-year mean of live births per thousand unmarried women aged 15–49) was 55 per thousand as against regional and national values of 35 and 23 respectively.

20. W. Cramond, Illegitimacy in Banffshire: facts, figures and opinions (Banff, 1888), Table I. The national mean between 1861 and 1885 varied between 8.37 per cent and 9.8 per cent.


22. J. Gerrard, The rural labourers of the north of Scotland: their medical relief and house accommodation as they affect pauperism and illegitimacy, (Banff, no date[1862]), 14.


30. Scottish census enumerators normally gave the parish in the ‘Where born’ column. However, for Rathven natives the settlement of birth within the parish was recorded in 1881.

31. Rothiemay was a high-bastardy parish, and when the unmarried mothers are considered separately a much higher proportion of 72.7 per cent are recorded as being native to the parish. A considerable part of this difference consisted of return migration to the home parish by women to bear their children. In other inland parishes, where bastardy levels were lower, we might therefore expect correspondingly low proportions of native women to be enumerated in
the census. Consequently, the dichotomy between the ‘stayers’ of the fishing villages and the ‘movers’ of the farming parishes may be still more marked generally than our sample comparison indicates.

32. In Footdee the proportions recorded as being engaged in fishing and ancillary work were 71.7 per cent in 1861 and 81.6 per cent in 1891.


34. Baillie, ‘Structure of population [thesis]’, 218–9, remarks that marriage records are most indicative since they screen out ‘noise’ from individuals who failed to reproduce.

35. New Register House CEN 167 (Seafield, 1881), ED 3. In nearby Buckie there were reputedly no less than 25 co-existent males whose birth certificates bore the name George Cowie. See P.F. Anson, Fising boats and fisher folk on the east coast of Scotland, (London, 1930), 203.


40. Culture in general and religious influences in particular are not the concern of the present paper.


42. Baillie, ‘Structure of population [thesis]’, 359. Since these proportions are calculated from civil certificates alone and do not account for outmigration they are underestimates.

43. ‘An Old Fisherman’, Gordonhaven, 74; Gerrard, Rural labourers, 14.

44. In all, 36 women and one man gave their occupation as servant, but 12 were family members, mostly daughters, who lived at home but worked in service elsewhere.


46. Although the historical sociology of fishing communities elsewhere around the Scottish and English coasts has been explored – see for example, Thompson, Wailey and Lummis, Living the fishing – it would be useful for comparative purposes to know more about their demographic structures.
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Introduction

Recent historical studies are increasingly highlighting the varying regional and local pace of economic development in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries. Even before the devastation of the Black Death of 1348-1349, which may have halved the English population, there is evidence of arable land falling out of cultivation in various parts of the country. Most regions experienced a substantial decline in population and land under cultivation during the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, in the wake of the Black Death and subsequent epidemics. The local impact of these general trends varied considerably, though, as some areas prospered with new trading and industrial opportunities. Cornwall and east Devon, for example, benefited from the expansion of tin mining, cloth making, livestock farming, maritime trade, and coastal fishing in this period. Rural cloth-making developed in a number of areas, including southern Suffolk, western Wiltshire, the Kennet Valley of Berkshire, and the West Riding of Yorkshire. Similarly, in the sixteenth century, while national trends show that the population was beginning to grow again and land values rise, the rate of growth varied across the country. This study examines the pattern of local and regional development in Cambridgeshire between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries, using taxation records to explore relative changes in population and wealth within the county.

In the absence of widespread statistics relating to births, deaths, or incomes, historians rely heavily on taxation records to examine changes in population and wealth between the mid-fourteenth and mid-sixteenth centuries. Although taxation assessments will never record the total population or possessions of a community, as some categories of people and wealth will always evade the charge or be excluded from assessment, they provide a useful indicator of trends. Three major taxation assessments, which cover most of England, span this period: the lay subsidy of 1334, the poll taxes of 1377-1381, and the lay subsidies of 1524-1525. With recent publications, the
numbers of taxpayers and amounts of taxable wealth raised from towns and villages assessed in these taxes have now been printed. Several studies have used these records to chart the distribution of population and wealth in different areas at a particular date: in Cambridgeshire, for example, studies based on hundreds, parishes, and three-kilometre squares have mapped the spread of wealth and taxpayers in 1334, 1377, and 1524-1525. To show change over time of course, it is necessary to compare totals for the same areas from different taxes. However, each of these taxes used a different basis of assessment, so direct comparisons from different taxes cannot be made. In this article, the published totals of taxpayers and taxable wealth have been used together with the original records of the 1524 lay subsidy to trace relative changes in population and wealth in Cambridgeshire.

Taxation records

The lay subsidy of 1334 introduced tax quotas for each town and village. These payments represented a fifteenth or a tenth of the total value of the moveable goods of individuals – royal demesnes and some boroughs paying the higher rate of one tenth. The lump-sum payments were levied on each community, which assumed responsibility for assessing and collecting the quota from its residents. The 1334 subsidy therefore reveals the relative wealth of different communities, but not of individuals. These quotas remained in place, with certain reductions, which will be examined below, throughout the fifteenth century.

The poll taxes of 1377-1381 assessed individuals rather than communities: the tax of 1377 levied at the rate of 4d on every lay person over 14 years of age, while the taxes granted in 1379 and 1380 were assessed partly on a graduated basis according to status. By 1381, there was intense opposition to these taxes, culminating in the Peasants’ Revolt, and they were abandoned. Where they survive, the returns of individual taxpayers can provide valuable evidence of employment and household structure. In other counties, such as Cambridgeshire, where the nominative returns have been lost, surviving receipts, recording the total number of persons taxed in each place, still provide an indicator of population distribution.

The Tudor lay subsidies were calculated on a different basis to previous taxes. Unlike the lay subsidy of 1334, there were no fixed quotas for each settlement, and all individuals who fell within the thresholds of the tax were liable to assessment. Two subsidies granted in 1523 and collected in 1524 and 1525 were particularly comprehensive, assessing all those with more than £1 in lands, £2 in goods, or £1 in wages. Taxpayers were charged on the value of their lands, goods, or wages, depending on which would produce the greatest tax revenue, although this was complicated by differing rates of tax for each category. For some regions, but sadly not Cambridgeshire, military surveys made in 1522 also survive, providing more extensive assessments.

The different bases on which the taxes were levied present difficulties when making comparisons. The fifteenth of 1334 was based on assessments of
moveable goods alone, and the poll tax of 1377 made a flat charge per person, irrespective of wealth, whereas the sixteenth century lay subsidies assessed goods, incomes and wages. Over time, the accuracy of the assessments may have varied, the definition of the moveable goods to be assessed could have differed, and prices fluctuated. Absolute changes in population and wealth between the subsidies cannot, therefore, be measured accurately, and direct comparisons will not be made between the different records.

However, relative rates of change within the county can be identified. If each locality is ranked, using the number of taxpayers or amount of taxable wealth, from highest to lowest at two different dates, the change in rank order for each locality between the two dates provides a measure of relative change. This technique, which has been used to compare variations in the distribution of population and wealth between different counties, towns, and sub-regions, between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries, is the principle behind the comparisons made here. This overcomes the problems of using taxes that assess different types of wealth or categories of people. While levels of accuracy and evasion may have varied considerably between taxes levied at different dates, it can be assumed that levels of accuracy and evasion did not generally vary dramatically within the same assessment.

Other evidence can supplement trends revealed in the taxation records of 1334, 1377 and 1524. The bishops’ census of 1563, recording the total number of families in each parish, provides another source for population estimates. However, an investigation of the returns from this ‘census’ has indicated large differences in accuracy between dioceses, and raises the possibility of totals being rounded, suggesting that it needs to be used with particular caution. In this study its use has been confined to a comparison of population totals between sub-regions, rather than individual parishes. Additional taxation records provide further evidence of the extent of economic contraction: the Nonarum Inquisitiones – a tax of one ninth on specific tithes in 1341; and reductions from the tax quotas of 1334 made in 1433 and 1446. Finally, the distribution of different groups of taxpayers in the various sub-regions of the county will be examined using the original returns from the 1524 lay subsidy.

Cambridgeshire sub-regions

Comparing taxation records on a county basis, Cambridgeshire declined in terms of its relative wealth and population between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries. Cambridgeshire fell from being ranked the eleventh wealthiest county (measured by taxable wealth per acre) in the lay subsidy of 1334, to twenty-first in rank in the taxation assessment of 1514-1515. Cambridgeshire was among those English counties experiencing a decline in their taxpaying populations between the 1377 poll tax and the 1524-1525 subsidies, calculated on the basis of taxpayers per square mile. Neighbouring counties of Essex, Hertfordshire, Huntingdonshire and Suffolk all showed more rapid rates of increase in both taxpayers and taxable wealth than Cambridgeshire. In comparison to England as a whole, therefore, or in comparison with most of its neighbouring counties, Cambridgeshire’s rates of
increase were low. A more detailed comparison of taxable wealth, however, dividing most of England into 610 areas of measurement, has shown that the pace of growth between 1334 and 1524 varied significantly in different parts of Cambridgeshire. Furthermore, the Cambridgeshire fenland, a large area of sparse settlement, tended to deflate the county’s wealth and population when measured by area, in comparison with smaller counties of denser settlement. Only analysis on a more detailed level can show the significant variations in population and wealth that occurred within the county.

Cambridgeshire was predominantly an agricultural county, but comprised important sub-regional contrasts in types of landscape, settlement, and farming patterns. Five sub-regions are defined in Figure 1. The allocation of parishes to sub-regions has had to be somewhat arbitrary, as in practice many parishes straddle more than one type of land. The area examined is the whole county of Cambridgeshire, together with the southern part of the Isle of Ely, extending as far north as the parishes of Sutton, Mepal, Witcham and Wentworth. The urban parishes in Cambridge, Ely, Newmarket and Royston are excluded.

The Cambridgeshire sub-regions were characterised by particular landscapes and geology, settlement patterns, and agricultural practices. The fen sub-region comprised the peat fen; the more fertile silt fen lay further to the north-
### Table 1  Taxable wealth per acre, by sub-region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Tax (£)</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Pence per acre</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1334</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen-edge</td>
<td>242.25</td>
<td>108,025</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen</td>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>28,869</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-east uplands</td>
<td>70.58</td>
<td>42,932</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River valleys</td>
<td>274.99</td>
<td>88,220</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western plateau</td>
<td>184.78</td>
<td>60,703</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>802.97</td>
<td>328,749</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1524</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen-edge</td>
<td>166.50</td>
<td>86,181</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen</td>
<td>66.71</td>
<td>31,540</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-east uplands</td>
<td>57.49</td>
<td>37,581</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River valleys</td>
<td>201.03</td>
<td>78,079</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western plateau</td>
<td>98.96</td>
<td>48,566</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>590.70</td>
<td>281,947</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Acreage from the total of parishes with surviving returns. The column headed ‘Pence per acre’ has been calculated as ((Tax in £)*240)/Acreage.


east, beyond the present area of study. Settlement in the peat fen was scattered, and the parishes large, although local, administration was concentrated under the single figure of the bishop of Ely. Pastoral farming predominated, while other resources, such as fish, fowl, reeds, sedge, turves and rushes, were exploited. The fen-edge sub-region shared areas of fen and clay in the north-west, and fen and chalk in the north-east. Open fields occupied a smaller proportion of land and parishes tended to be larger than in the valley areas, reflecting the large amounts of meadow and pasture and the difficulties in finding firm sites for building. Numerous smallholders supported themselves from the resources of the fen, and dairy cattle were prominent by the sixteenth century. The fen-edge area stretched south-east beyond Cambridge until this area was drained in the nineteenth century. The river valleys sub-region formed the central southern part of the county, around the four tributaries of the River Cam. Most parishes were carefully divided to provide a share of river frontage, alluvium, terrace, and upland slope. Chalk soils stretch from Guilden Morden in the west to Chippenham in the east. This was the ‘sheep-corn’ region, where barley was a major crop,
large flocks of sheep kept, and a three-course field rotation generally practised. Water meadows along the river were also used for dairy cattle. The river provided water-power for grinding corn and, in a few villages, for fulling cloth.\textsuperscript{20} The western plateau sub-region of boulder clay, originally woodland, was an area of later settlement than the river valleys. Despite the problems of drainage on the clay soils, agriculture predominated and barley was the main crop. The south-east uplands sub-region contained parishes that formed thin rectangles sharing the boulder clay and chalk heath, with villages lying along the 300ft contour. Settlement was much slower here than on the western plateau (a considerable amount of woodland remained at the time of Domesday Book) and continued until well into the medieval period. South-east Cambridgeshire contained the East Anglian pattern of field systems, with a large number of open fields, whereas the Midland pattern of two or three main fields was found in western and central Cambridgeshire.\textsuperscript{21} Several villages in the south-east uplands supplied Cambridge colleges with firewood and charcoal during the later Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{22}

Table 1 shows the changing taxable wealth per acre of the Cambridgeshire sub-regions between 1334 and 1524. The tax assessment for each vill in the sub-region has been added together, and the total divided by the total acreage of the sub-region to give a figure of pence per acre. The sub-regions have then been ranked from 1 (the sub-region with the highest pence per acre) to 5 (the lowest), using a technique based on that used by Yates.\textsuperscript{23} While the amount of wealth in each sub-region cannot be related directly between one subsidy and another, because different taxes assessed wealth in different ways, the relative position of the sub-regions in order of wealth at each date can be compared.

While the river valleys sub-region retained its primacy as the wealthiest area in terms of pence per acre throughout the period, there were significant changes. The western plateau and south-east uplands, areas of heavier clay soils, both slipped in rank by 1524. The increase in wealth in the fenland might suggest that alternative sources of income, such as pastoral farming, fowling and fishing, generated better returns during the later Middle Ages than areas where arable farming was more dominant.

Table 2 shows the distribution of population in the sub-regions, calculated by dividing the total number of taxpayers in each sub-region by the total acreage. The relative ranking of the regions displays similar trends to the distribution of wealth. The river valleys sub-region remained the most densely populated over the period. The relative size of the populations of the western plateau and south-east uplands declined after 1377. While the fen and fen-edge do not show entirely consistent trends, these sub-regions generally increased in relative wealth at the expense of the areas of the heavier soils, but did not challenge the primacy of the river valleys.

Table 3 presents the 1524 data in terms of wealth per capita, calculated by dividing the total amount of tax assessed in each sub-region by the number of taxpayers. This presents a somewhat different picture to measures of wealth by area, which tend to inflate areas of dense settlement and deflate areas of
sparse settlement. The fen-edge emerges as the most prosperous in per capita
terms, reflecting the abundance of resources available and the relative sparsity
of settlement. The fen-edge of the Breckland was also the most prosperous

Table 2  Taxpayers per acre, by sub-region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Taxpayers</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Taxpayers per 100 acres</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen-edge</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>95,877</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>31,540</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-east uplands</td>
<td>2,173</td>
<td>48,003</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River valleys</td>
<td>5,116</td>
<td>64,295</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western plateau</td>
<td>3,915</td>
<td>60,703</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,624</td>
<td>300,418</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen-edge</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>86,181</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>31,540</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-east uplands</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>37,581</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River valleys</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>74,066</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western plateau</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>50,309</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,770</td>
<td>279,677</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen-edge</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>81,500</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>31,540</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-east uplands</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>35,022</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River valleys</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>79,457</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western plateau</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>60,703</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,860</td>
<td>288,222</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Acreage from the total of parishes with surviving returns.

Sources: 1377: The poll taxes of 1377, 1379 and 1381, Parts i-ii, ed. C.C. Fenwick, British
England as indicated in the 1524/5 lay subsidy returns, ed. R.W. Hoyle, List and Index
Society, special series, XXVIII, 2 vols (Kew, 1998), ii, 28–35; 1563: British Library,
part of that particular region in the early fourteenth century. The river
valleys area does not emerge as a prosperous sub-region by this measure,
despite being the wealthiest and most populated in per acre terms. This was
because, as will be shown subsequently, the sub-region contained the largest
proportion of the poorest taxpayers in the county, which reduced the average
wealth per head.

Important sub-regional variations in growth occurred in Cambridgeshire
during the later Middle Ages. With falling demand for arable produce for
much of this period, the heavier soils of the western plateau and south-east
uplands experienced a contraction in settlement, and these areas experienced
the greatest relative falls in population and wealth and the largest reductions
in taxation within the county. In contrast, the greater opportunities for
pastoral farming and other activities allowed the fen and fen-edge sub-regions
to maintain, and in some places to increase, their relative shares of wealth and
population over the period. The river valleys sub-region remained the
wealthiest in per acre (although not in per capita) terms, and the most densely
populated area of the county in 1524 as it had been in 1334.

Analysis by parish

Comparison of taxation returns on a parish basis reveals that growth and
decline was not as uniform as the sub-regional trends might suggest. Figure 2
shows the changes in the ranking of parishes by wealth between 1334 and
1524. All settlements were ranked in order of wealth per acre in 1334 and 1524,
and the difference in rank order between the two dates was mapped.

The greatest increases in relative wealth, where vills increased 50 or more
places in rank order between the two dates, occurred at Haddenham and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Pence per taxpayer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fen-edge</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-east uplands</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River valleys</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western plateau</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Only parishes with totals of both taxpayers and wealth in 1524 are included.

Source: J. Sheail, The regional distribution of wealth in England as indicated in the 1524/5 lay
subsidy returns, ed. R.W. Hoyle, List and Index Society, special series, XXVIII, 2 vols
(Kew, 1998), ii, 28–35.
Wilburton on the fen, Soham and Burwell on the fen-edge, Guilden Morden, Ickleton and Linton in the river valleys, and Burrough Green with Westley Waterless on the south-east uplands. Significantly, there were no places on the western plateau with such a great increase in relative wealth. Other areas with smaller increases were scattered, including all the fen parishes surveyed, together with groups of parishes north of Cambridge, in the south-west near Royston, and in the south-east around Linton. A cluster of villages with growing relative wealth around towns might suggest an urban stimulus, but some areas of the greatest decrease, where parishes fell 50 or more places in rank order between 1334 and 1524, were also found near towns (for example Teversham and Milton adjoining Cambridge, and Great and Little Abington and Pampisford near Linton). The proximity of even an expanding town did not guarantee prosperity for the surrounding villages in the later Middle Ages.25

Figure 3 illustrates the changes in the ranking of parishes by the number of taxpayers between 1377 and 1524. The pattern is similar, but not identical, to the changes in relative wealth. The greatest increases occurred in the fenland vills of Wilburton and Haddenham, with smaller pockets of growth taking place in all the sub-regions. The largest decreases were again at Milton and Teversham, at Papworth Everard, and also at Barton, Clopton and Lolworth on the western plateau.
Attempting to explain what caused some parishes to show large relative increases in population and wealth between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries is far from easy. Some landlords offered greater opportunities for tenants to profit from their leases than others. At Wilburton for example, under the absentee bishop of Ely, tenants benefited from fixed rents: in 1609, the rents of assize and demesne land were at almost the same level as in 1507, while the farm of the manor remained at the same sum as that received around 1426. Some settlements sited on major roads expanded during the later Middle Ages. Haddenham commanded the principal entrance by land to the Isle of Ely, via the causeway that crossed the Ouse at Aldreth. Ickleton lay where the southern branch of the Icknield Way crossed the Cam, and Linton was sited on the main road from Cambridge to Haverhill. Some of the growing settlements supported markets, fairs, and non-agricultural trades, like Linton, Ickleton, and Gamlingay. There was no single pattern of development, but a variety of local experiences from which some trends can be identified.

Additional evidence of areas of contracting population and wealth

The analysis of taxpayers and taxable wealth by sub-region identified the western plateau and south-east uplands as experiencing the greatest relative decline in the later Middle Ages, but the comparison of individual parishes
Table 4  Uncultivated land in the Nonarum Inquisitiones, 1341

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Number of vills with uncultivated land</th>
<th>% of vills in sub-region with uncultivated land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fen-edge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-east plands</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River valleys</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western plateau</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


has shown that decline was not restricted to these regions. Additional evidence can help to highlight areas where the contraction of population and wealth was most acute.

The Nonarum Inquisitiones of 1341 was a tax of one ninth levied on the value of corn, wool and lambs within each parish. Assessments were compared with a valuation of clerical incomes in 1291, and jurors were required to explain discrepancies between the old and new values. In some cases, the jurors accounted for these differences by describing a contraction in the acreage of arable land between 1291 and 1341. Table 4 shows the number of vills in each Cambridgeshire sub-region where arable land had diminished. At least 5,730 acres were recorded as lying uncultivated in the county and the southern part of the isle, plus other land which was not specifically measured.29 The regions of heavier soils and later settlement, the south-east uplands and the western plateau, bore the brunt of this contraction.

In many Cambridgeshire vills, the jurors attributed this reduction in the amount of land under cultivation to the poverty of the tenants. The king’s frequent taxes and tallages had impoverished the tenants of Longstow, Kingston and Swaffham Prior, and resulted in the loss of 1,200 sheep which used to be folded at Gamlingay. The sterility of the land was blamed for the decline at Orwell, Weston Colville and Balsham. Flooding had damaged land at Impington and at Newton, where the loss was also attributed to the digging of turf and making of sewers. In ten vills, crops of Lent corn and peas had perished, while at Balsham, it was reported that corn and other goods fetched lower prices than they used to do.30 The Nonarum Inquisitiones reveal that, even before the Black Death, the agricultural expansion that had characterised much of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was coming to an end and the amount of land under cultivation was beginning to contract. As the Cambridgeshire returns show, the repeated burden of heavy taxes, the exhaustion of soil fertility, harvest failures, flooding, and price deflation, all took their toll on the agrarian economy of the early fourteenth century.31
Table 5  1433 reductions from 1334 tax totals, by sub-region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>1334 total in £</th>
<th>1433 reduction in £</th>
<th>1433 reduction in percentage terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fen-edge</td>
<td>247.35</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen</td>
<td>34.08</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-east uplands</td>
<td>70.58</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River valleys</td>
<td>278.49</td>
<td>30.14</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western plateau</td>
<td>184.78</td>
<td>28.35</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>46.61</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County total</td>
<td>894.98</td>
<td>95.66</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Assessments at one-tenth are included as one-tenth. The ‘county total’ also includes Ely, Newmarket, and Royston (which have all been excluded from the sub-regions).


In 1433 the total national yield in taxation from the fifteenth and tenth, fixed since 1334, was cut by £4,000. Every county was granted a remission of 10.4 per cent of its quota, to be distributed among ‘poor vills, cities and boroughs, desolate, wasted, destroyed, or very impoverished, or otherwise too heavily burdened with tax’. In 1446 the total sum remitted was increased to £6,000. These reductions remain mostly unpublished, and further research is needed to show how the reductions were implemented in different counties.32 Bridbury argued that the remissions were rarely granted to those areas in greatest need, and saw the reductions as a measure of control by the parliament over the Exchequer. Certainly the reductions should be viewed with the context of the political weakness of Henry VI’s government, which made such concessions easier to obtain.33 Local commissioners apportioned the reductions within each county in differing ways: in Essex, every village received the same proportional reduction; in other counties, the proportions varied widely between different settlements. While personal interests and local pressures may have influenced the decisions of commissioners, it appears that reductions were apportioned on the basis of need in some areas, including Suffolk and Cambridgeshire. In at least some counties therefore, the figures provide an indicator of the extent of the relative decline of wealth and population since 1334.34

Tables 5 and 6 compare the tax totals of 1334 with the reductions allowed in 1433 and 1490-1491 (the later containing the additional reduction made in 1446).35 The total tax assessment in 1334 has been divided by the total tax reductions for each sub-region. In both 1433 and 1490-1491, the western plateau and south-east uplands gained the largest percentage reductions. The fen and fen-edge received the smallest proportions of relief from taxation. This
Table 6  1490-1491 reductions from 1334 tax totals, by sub-region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>1334 total in £</th>
<th>1490-1491 reduction in £</th>
<th>1490-1491 reduction in percentage terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fen-edge</td>
<td>247.35</td>
<td>38.66</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen</td>
<td>34.08</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-east uplands</td>
<td>70.58</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River valleys</td>
<td>278.49</td>
<td>45.75</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western plateau</td>
<td>184.78</td>
<td>40.05</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>46.61</td>
<td>26.61</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County total</td>
<td>894.98</td>
<td>174.17</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: See Table 5.


reinforces the evidence from the lay subsidies of the relative contraction in wealth and population. Table 6 reveals the substantial reduction in taxation received by Cambridge, awarded to the borough in 1446 and confirmed in 1465. Other towns made similar pleas for reductions of tax or dues during the fifteenth century; historians have debated whether such pleas represent a genuine contraction in urban economies or merely the strength of civic lobbying.36

Figures 4 and 5 show the reductions from the 1334 tax totals made in 1433 and 1490-1491 on a parish basis. The parishes with largest reductions were scattered across much of the county, although a few concentrations stand out. There were a number of villages on the boulder clay plateau to the west, and in the south-east uplands. There is some correlation between those parishes with the largest reductions in 1433 and 1490-1491, and the parishes with the largest falls in rank by number of taxpayers and taxable wealth, though not in every case.

Figure 4 also shows the Cambridgeshire parishes recorded as possessing fewer than ten households in 1428, which were exempted from a subsidy in that year. The subsidy of 1428 differed from the regular lay subsidies, as it was a tax on ecclesiastical parishes and knights’ fees.37 In Suffolk, the parishes that gained exemptions tended to have small acreages and to be located on heavy soils, and there was a similar correlation in Cambridgeshire, particularly on the south-east uplands.38 Eight of the ten small parishes in 1428 received substantial subsidy reductions of 25 per cent or more in 1490-1491.

In parishes where populations had fallen substantially, ambitious landholders could consolidate and enclose their holdings with little opposition. Although a
marked change in land use from arable to pasture began in the mid-fourteenth century, most evidence for enclosures dates from a new public concern under the Tudors. Returns of the inquisition into enclosures of 1517 survive for only 5 out of 17 hundreds in Cambridgeshire. As Figure 5 shows, several of the villages in which enclosure took place had received large taxation reductions and experienced a considerable relative decline in population and wealth, including Childerley, Clopton, East Hatley, and Shingay. Fifteenth-century enclosures have also been correlated with areas of declining population and depressed economic conditions in Devon. These enclosures should be distinguished from the enclosure of common pastures in densely populated areas of the county in the mid-sixteenth century, such as at Cambridge, Landbeach, Ely, Downham, and Littleport, where there was intense pressure on grazing land. Enclosures generally, however, were limited in Cambridgeshire, possibly because, as Cunningham claimed, the market for foodstuffs provided by the Cambridge colleges gave landowners less incentive to convert from arable to pasture.
The most extreme manifestation of the contraction of population and land under cultivation was the desertion of village sites. These can be identified from national gazetteers of depopulated village sites compiled by Beresford and Hurst. As Figure 5 shows, deserted medieval villages tended to be found on the western plateau and river valleys in Cambridgeshire; very little enclosure or desertion of villages occurred in the fen or fen-edge regions. The date of abandonment of villages is not always clear, but most seem to have been deserted during the population decline of the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.43 Shrunken villages also tend to be found in the west and south-east of the county, although abandoned house sites also occur in some larger villages in the river valleys and fen.44

Distributions of taxable wealth

The surviving Cambridgeshire returns from the 1524 lay subsidy have been used to produce Table 7, showing the distribution of taxpayers by wealth. Categories of wealth follow those used by Spufford, Wrightson and Levine. Taxpayers assessed at under £2 were generally labourers and servants. Those
Table 7  Distribution of all taxpayers by wealth in Cambridgeshire sub-regions, 1524

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>&lt;£2</th>
<th>£2–4</th>
<th>£5–10</th>
<th>&gt;£10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fen-edge</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-east uplands</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River valleys</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western plateau</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  All assessments, whether based on lands, goods or wages, are used.


assessed at £2-4 were perhaps holding tenements of up to a yardland (30-40 acres) and could be described as husbandmen or craftsmen; those assessed at £5-10 were substantial husbandmen, craftsmen and yeomen, farming perhaps 50-60 acres, and often the most prosperous men in their village. Large farmers and the gentry had assessments of over £10.45

There were significant sub-regional variations in the distribution of different levels of wealth. The fen and fen-edge were characterised by the smallest numbers of wage-earners and the largest numbers of smallholders, with between £2 and £4 in wealth. Similar trends have been found in other regions where pastoral farming predominated.46 Assessments of less than £2 were most commonly found in the river valleys: nearly 10 per cent more taxpayers were charged at this rate in this sub-region than in the county as a whole. The river valleys region of Cambridgeshire displayed a similar inequality in wealth to parts of Norfolk and Berkshire. These were all major corn-producing regions, supplying London with grain, and contained large numbers of poor labourers and wealthy yeomen.47 A large number of poorer inhabitants, gaining income from wages rather than land, suggests a considerable demand for buying and selling foodstuffs and goods. In the Cambridgeshire river valleys, this was reflected in a concentration of markets and fairs and the development of trade in malt barley and saffron in this sub-region in the later Middle Ages.48

Conclusion

The river valleys retained its lead amongst the Cambridgeshire sub-regions in terms of both taxpayers and taxable wealth per acre between 1334 and 1524. This area had been the most densely populated part of the county at the time.
of Domesday Book, and had grown considerably during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The rivers provided easy access and high-quality arable and meadow land. This sub-region contained the greatest proportion of wage-earners, and this resulted in the development of a number of markets and trading opportunities. Nonetheless, this was a region based largely on corn-growing, and so it experienced some contraction of land under cultivation and desertion of villages as demand for grain fell from the fourteenth century onwards.

The fen and fen-edge experienced some relative increases in taxpayers and taxable wealth between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries. These regions received the lowest relative reductions in their taxation quotas, and contained few examples of declining arable land, enclosure and deserted settlement. The inhabitants of these areas benefited from the more diverse economic opportunities provided by the resources of the fen. The fen and fen-edge areas grew most rapidly at times of population expansion, most notably in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and again between the late-sixteenth and mid-seventeenth centuries, when these parishes became some of the most thickly settled parts of the county.49

The south-east uplands and western plateau, areas of later settlement, were less accessible and more difficult to cultivate. In the thirteenth century, at a time of growing population and low labour costs, these areas could be profitably cultivated. By the fifteenth century, however, the general contraction of population reduced the demand for cereals and increased the cost of labour; agricultural investment in these areas could no longer be justified. At times of agricultural depression, such as the later Middle Ages, and again in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, the heavy land of the western clay plateau in particular became uneconomical to cultivate, and farming in the sub-region became depressed.50 These two sub-regions experienced the greatest relative decline in taxpayers and taxable wealth, and contained the largest number of vills with declining arable land in cultivation, the greatest reductions to tax quotas, while a number of enclosures and deserted villages were to be found on the western plateau.

While the taxation records of the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries present many difficulties of interpretation, they offer the opportunity to compare relative changes in taxpayers and taxable wealth at a regional and local level. In Cambridgeshire, these changes were closely linked to the relative advantages of the different sub-regional economies, as they adapted to the changing economic circumstances of the later Middle Ages.
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KENT WORKHOUSE POPULATIONS IN 1881: A STUDY BASED ON
THE CENSUS ENUMERATORS’ BOOKS

David G Jackson

David Jackson has been employed in the pharmaceutical industry in Cheshire for 25 years. He was born and brought up in north Kent, and maintains his interest in that area by researching the history of his family and by carrying out small-scale population studies.

Introduction

To the Victorian poor, the workhouse was the physical embodiment of the New Poor Law of 1834 yet, although much statistical data was generated in the Reports of The Local Government Board, contemporary sources provide little information on inmates prior to 1891. Study of the information on workhouse inmates provided by the Census Enumerators’ Books (CEBs) can do much to correct this deficiency, but this rich source has been surprisingly neglected by historians, with the exception of studies of Hampshire in 1851 and 1861, Hertfordshire in 1851 and Leicester in 1881.1 The aims of this article are therefore to present work on the 1881 CEBs for eight workhouses in Kent in 1881; to provide a comparison with the work on age, sex and marital status in Hertfordshire, Hampshire and Leicester; and to provide some analysis of the information available on birthplaces.

The study area

Eight workhouses in north and central Kent were selected for study. These served the Unions of Ashford East, Ashford West, Faversham, Hollingbourne, Maidstone, Medway, Milton and Sheppey.2 The selected workhouses served rural and urban areas, and areas in which the armed services were an important factor. The area studied is shown in Figure 1 and covers approximately 1200 sq. km. The total population at the time of the 1881 census was 219,090.3 The study area includes the Isle of Sheppey in the north. Its mainland portion is bounded on the north by the coast between the Medway Towns (Gillingham, Chatham and Rochester) on the Medway Estuary in the west and Graveney, about 11 km. north west of Canterbury, in the east. The eastern boundary turns inland at Graveney, and runs about 25 km. to Brabourne, a village 10 km. east of Ashford. Here the border of the area turns to the south-west, touching the northern edge of Romney Marsh, before running north for a short distance. It then follows a line roughly westwards across the Weald to Yalding, 15 km. up the River Medway from Maidstone. The western limit of the area approximately follows the course of the Medway
as far as Maidstone. From Maidstone the border runs northwards to the Medway Towns.

Like the areas studied by Hinde and Turnbull and by Goose, the study area was predominantly agricultural. Hops and cereals were common, and beans, peas and root crops were also grown. Other industries were carried on along the north coast and on the Isle of Sheppey, and at Maidstone. Milton and its neighbour Sittingbourne were noted for oyster fishing, boat building, brick and cement making, papermaking and for the export of local produce. Brickmaking was carried on in nearby parishes. Important aspects of the economy of Faversham included oyster fisheries, the manufacture of explosives, cement and bricks, brewing, a seaport, trade in coal, timber and agricultural produce and shipwrights’ yards. On the Isle of Sheppey, the naval dockyard at Sheerness was an important employer, and the supplying of commodities to the vessels was an important factor in the local economy. In Chatham, the importance of the armed services is evident from the presence of the dockyard, barracks, military depot and military prison. A barracks was important in Maidstone, as were a market, prison, paper and oil mills, breweries, and manufacture of commodities including bricks, cement and agricultural implements. In the south-eastern part of the area, brewing,
brickmaking, and the manufacture of agricultural implements were carried on at Ashford, with the manufacture of bricks and tiles in a few other parishes in the south.

The study area, like other regions of Kent, benefited economically from its proximity to London and from the development of the railway. Agricultural produce, including horse fodder, corn, potatoes, fruit, dairy produce, wool and mutton, was in great demand in the capital, and access to the London market helped Kent farmers survive the agricultural depression of the 1870s. Building materials were in demand in the expanding capital, with the London building cycle reaching a peak in 1881. Brickmaking was particularly important in the northern part of the study area, especially around Milton and Faversham. Barges were required for transport of bricks, and these vessels were built on the coastal border of the study area. Employment in the locally important areas of agriculture and brickmaking was seasonal, with less work available and reduced demand for transport in the winter months. In periods when there was a genuine shortage of work, the poor would have been forced into the workhouse, and the deterrent effect of the institution would have been attenuated.

Poverty – the background

Reform of the Poor Law became an issue in the 1830s, in the wake of the Swing Riots and increasing poor rates. The findings of The Royal Commission for Inquiring into the Administration and Practical Operation of the Poor Laws led to the passage of The New Poor Law of 1834. Fundamental to the New Poor Law was the principle that relief of the able-bodied would be provided only in the workhouse (relief given in the workhouse was also called indoor relief). Benefits to those in work were to cease, and the principle of less eligibility meant that the poor would be deterred from applying for admission to the workhouse by the knowledge that their lot would be harsher and more disciplined than that of those outside the workhouse. Outdoor relief (that is, relief outside the workhouse) to the impotent was allowed but, with the exception of medical attendance, all relief to the able-bodied and their families was to be provided in the workhouse. Relief to children under 16 years of age was to be regarded as given to their parents. Control of the Poor Law by the Poor Law Commission through the agency of Assistant Commissioners was intended to enforce national uniformity, but day to day local administration, under the control of locally-elected Guardians, gave scope for wide variation.

The unit of administration was the union, comprising a group of parishes. Local variations in policy are exemplified by the failure of 18 unions to build workhouses in the first 20 years of the New Poor Law, the practice of disguising out-relief as sickness benefit, and giving assistance to the unemployed through the highway rate. The 1842 Outdoor Labour Test Order enforced the principle of less eligibility without recourse to the workhouse by allowing outdoor relief to the able-bodied in return for an unpleasant task, such as stone-breaking or oakum-picking. This order was followed by The Outdoor Relief Prohibitory Order of 1844, which consolidated earlier General
Orders allowing outdoor relief to the able-bodied in emergencies and to widows with dependent children. In 1847, when the Poor Law Board replaced the Poor Law Commission as the central authority, most rural unions and much of the south of England were subject to the 1844 Outdoor Relief Prohibitory Order. Nationally, about 20 per cent of unions were subject to the 1842 Outdoor Labour Test Order, and some of these made use of the 1844 Prohibitory Order as well. It is clear that the object of a nationally uniform system had not been achieved. In 1852 the Outdoor Relief Regulation Order attempted to restrict the form and duration of outdoor relief, but was extensively amended in response to local opposition.

In the 1860s Poor Law provision proved inadequate to deal with mass unemployment arising from the Lancashire cotton famine. The Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) Act of 1863 enabled local authorities to obtain cheap loans to employ laid-off (i.e. deserving) workers on such tasks as road digging. Concern about the adequacy of the Poor Law was increased when trade depressions led to large numbers of applications for relief, particularly in the poorer districts of London. There were fears about rising expenditure on Poor Relief, and there was also concern that when charity was used to help relieve the poor, duplication of effort was taking place. The Goschen Minute was written in 1869 by George Goschen, president of the Poor Law Board, in response to these fears. Goschen advocated the co-ordination of the Poor Law authorities and those administering charity, to avoid ‘double distribution of relief to the same persons’ thus ensuring that the available funds were efficiently used. Fundamental to the Minute was the view that relief under the Poor Law, which was a legal right of the destitute, should be reserved solely for the actually destitute and not for the simply poor. Relief of those whose wages were inadequate was to be the province of charity. This principle was to be applied to women, including widows with dependent children, who had previously been major recipients of out-relief. Goschen recognised that the system he prescribed ‘appears to be harsh for the moment,’ but he was strongly in favour of controlling expenditure on poor relief and encouraging self-reliance and thrift in the poor.

Although detailed information on the lives of workhouse inmates for the period under study is lacking, the extensive national statistical information presented in the Eleventh Report of the Local Government Board provides much useful background information on the plight of the poor in the period 1871–1881. The Report criticised those Poor Law Guardians who did not vigorously enforce the New Poor Law, but provided relief in money instead of in kind, as money was more susceptible to misappropriation by the recipient. The ratio of relief in money to relief in kind in 1880–1881 was 7:1. There was a sustained decrease in the mean number of paupers from 1,037,360 in 1871 to 790,937 in 1881. The ratio of total (indoor plus outdoor) paupers per thousand of the population fell from 46 in 1871 to 30 in 1881. In only one year (1880) were the total number of paupers and the ratio per thousand of the population higher than in the previous year. Over the same period, the number of outdoor paupers fell from 880,930 to 607,065; this decrease met with the approval of the Local Government Board, as it was considered to represent a saving in
expenditure on a group whose destitution was seldom satisfactorily tested. In 1871 the mean number of indoor paupers was 156,430, but in 1881 it had risen to 183,872. The total number of able-bodied paupers decreased from 172,460 (7.6 per thousand of the population) in 1871 to 105,000 (4.0 per thousand of the population) in 1881. Numbers of indoor and outdoor paupers both fell, but indoor paupers showed by far the greater decrease, reflecting the influence of the Goschen Minute.

The national ratio of outdoor to indoor paupers relieved on 1 January 1881 was 3.2:1.9 For the eight unions under consideration in 1881, ratios of relieved outdoor to indoor paupers varied from 1.5:1 for Faversham to 3.2:1 for Ashford West. For the eight unions the overall ratio was 1.9:1. Faversham had the lowest ratio of relieved paupers in the population (30/1000), while Hollingbourne had the highest (50/1000), but the figure for West Ashford was only marginally lower at 49/1000.10 For the eight unions as a whole, the figure was 39/1000. The mean annual cost per pauper was calculated as £7 12s 1d in 1871 and £10 4s 10d in 1881. This increase resulted from fixed costs, including loans and officers’ pay, which were less dependent on numbers of paupers than were variable costs.

Although workhouses were not intended primarily to provide care for the sick, there was a requirement that a doctor had to classify all paupers, to help determine their work and diet.11 Although such a requirement was apparently to the paupers’ advantage, there was no guarantee that an over-worked doctor would provide a satisfactory examination, and money for treatment might not have been available.

Most women giving birth in workhouses were unmarried. A total of 2,468 women gave birth in the workhouses of extra-metropolitan Kent in the period 1871–1880.12 Seventy-five per cent of these were unmarried and the marital status of 12 per cent was unknown. The reasons for a mother’s marital status being unknown are not clear. It is reasonable to suggest that unmarried mothers were more likely to conceal their status than were married mothers, but it is possible that in some cases no attempt was made to ascertain marital status. Whatever the interpretation, it is obvious that the great majority of workhouse births were to unmarried mothers. During the same period, 77 per cent of the national total of 86,447 women who gave birth in workhouses were unmarried and 6 per cent were of unknown status. In the 1850s, 90 per cent of births in the Winchester Workhouse were illegitimate, and it has been suggested that women entered the workhouse to make use of the lying-in facilities.13 The Eleventh Report of the Local Government Board states that conditions for childbirth in the workhouse were at least as favourable to the mother as childbirth outside. ‘Child-bed fever’ was a notable cause of death after childbirth, and the simple precautions (isolation, disinfection and disuse of contaminated wards) saved many lives. While the lot of unmarried mothers could not have been happy, they did at least enjoy this advantage over their married counterparts.

Seasonal variations in the numbers of paupers are apparent from the bi-annual returns. On 1 January 1881 the total number of paupers relieved was 809,518. On 1 July the total had fallen by 4 per cent to 773,361. In percentage terms, the
greatest decrease (41 per cent) was shown in able-bodied indoor adult male paupers, indicating the increased availability of work in the summer months. The number of vagrants relieved increased from 6,215 on 1 January to 6,461 on 1 July, an increase of 4 per cent.

Methods

Data for the eight workhouses was extracted from the transcript of the 1881 CEBs, distributed on CD-ROM by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. The data was imported into databases (one database for each workhouse) for manipulation. Workhouse officers and staff were deleted from the databases, and the total number of inmates remaining for each workhouse was checked against the tabulated data for institutions in the 1881 Census report. A small number (50) of inmates were returned as ‘casuals’, casual paupers, vagrants or tramps. These people were excluded from the main analysis, and are treated separately below. This approach was adopted because they were ‘one rung below the able-bodied settled poor,’ and the Poor Law guardians were under less stringent obligations to relieve them. Hereafter, unless otherwise indicated, the term ‘inmate’ should be taken to mean someone in receipt of indoor relief but who is not a ‘casual’, tramp or vagrant.

Figure 2 demonstrates, for the Milton and Medway workhouses, that the population had fluctuated over the year prior to the 1881 census, and emphasises the limitations of work based on the CEBs. There were marked variations over time in the numbers of inmates in both workhouses.
Nevertheless, the graphs for the numbers of inmates in the two workhouses show definite similarities, with numbers of inmates at their lowest in late August and in September, subsequently rising to a peak in February/March. These seasonal variations broadly reflect the national picture.

The composition of the workhouse populations: age and sex structure

Table 1 shows the composition of the workhouse inmates of the eight unions by age and sex in 1881. The view has long been held that elderly people and children constituted a significant proportion of workhouse inmates. The age profile of male and female inmates by five year age groups is shown in Figure 3, which demonstrates a number of clear features. At ages under five years, the numbers of males and females are almost equal, but thereafter males predominate up to age 14. From 15 to 49 years, females outnumber males, from 50 to 59 the numbers of males and females are almost equal, and then

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Ashford East</th>
<th>Ashford West</th>
<th>Faversham</th>
<th>Hollingbourne</th>
<th>Maidstone</th>
<th>Medway</th>
<th>Milton</th>
<th>Sheppey</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All inmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;15</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–29</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–59</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;15</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–29</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–59</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;15</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–29</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–59</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The totals in the bottom line refer to all inmates.

males predominate until age 89. Thereafter, most inmates are female, but this is considered to be a reflection of the higher survival rate of women.

In the eight workhouses studied, there is a clear excess of elderly and a marked shortfall in the percentage of those of ‘prime working age’ (aged 15–59) compared with the percentages in the population of the eight unions as a whole. Children (aged under 15) account for 34 per cent, those of prime working age (aged 15–59) account for 29 per cent, and the elderly (aged 60 or over) account for 36 per cent of inmates. The population of the area as a whole was composed of 37 per cent children, 55 per cent of prime working age and 8 per cent elderly.\(^\text{20}\) In the Hertfordshire workhouses in 1851, 34 per cent of inmates were children, 35 per cent were of prime working age and 32 per cent were elderly. The population of Hertfordshire comprised 37 per cent children, 55 per cent of prime working age and 8 per cent elderly.\(^\text{21}\) In the Hampshire workhouses of Winchester and Basingstoke in 1851, 40–45 per cent of inmates were children, about 40 per cent were of prime working age and about 20 per cent were elderly. People aged 15–59 constituted about 46 per cent of the population of Hampshire.\(^\text{22}\) In the Leicester workhouse in 1881, 28 per cent of the population was described as young and 38 percent as elderly, leaving about 34 per cent of prime working age.\(^\text{23}\)

It is apparent that in Kent, Hampshire and Hertfordshire, those of ‘prime working age’ were more heavily represented in the general population than in
the workhouse population. In Kent and Hertfordshire the elderly were far more heavily represented in the workhouses than outside, and the percentages of children in the workhouses were slightly reduced compared with the population as a whole. The population in the Leicester workhouse in 1881 was, like the other workhouses studied, dominated by the young and the old.

An attempt was made to identify family groups in the workhouses. The criteria for identification of a family were that the group should be enumerated together, the first member should be an adult of an age compatible with being the parent of the children, and that all children should be under fifteen years of age. The presence of a second parent was not mandatory. Women headed 57 of the 64 identified family groups. Of these women, 29 (51 per cent) were unmarried. In only one case were two parents present: a male of 58 and a female of 38, with children aged 14 and 12. There was also a preponderance of families without a male breadwinner in Basingstoke and Winchester in 1851 and 1861. Factors contributing to this paucity of families with a male head capable of work could include preferential employment of married men. If an adult male was admitted to the workhouse, the Guardians were required by law to admit his family as well, and would obviously be reluctant to take on this expense if other options, such as outdoor relief, were available. Family groups accounted for 65 adults and 204 children. The CEBs for the workhouses studied did not clearly identify orphans, so it is not possible, from a study of CEBs alone, to establish how many children were orphans and how many had been admitted for other reasons.

The elderly comprised 36 per cent of the workhouse population and 8 per cent of the total population in the current study, compared with 32 and 8 per cent in the Hertfordshire workhouses in 1851. The sex ratio (males per 100 females) in the current study for workhouse inmates aged 60 and over was 199, compared with 94 for the population as a whole in this age group. The current figures thus reinforce the view that workhouses held a disproportionate number of the elderly, and particularly of old men. Reasons for the relatively high numbers of old male workhouse inmates include lack of family support, ineligibility for outdoor relief through sickness in the family, physical exertion required for many male occupations and the paucity of old men’s domestic skills compared with those of women.

Sex ratios varied markedly between different workhouses, with the overall figure for all eight workhouses standing at 125. When the entire population of the eight workhouses is considered, Medway had the lowest ratio (84) and Milton had the highest (216). The second lowest ratio was that of Sheppey (104). All other ratios were greater than 124. The low overall figure for Medway is mainly the result of extremely low figures for the 15–29 and 30–59 age groups, which stand at 55 and 48 respectively, although the Medway figure for the 60+ age group is 99. Sheppey had ratios of 100 and 108 for the 15–29 and 30–59 age groups respectively, and its ratios for the 60+ group (167) and the under 15s (82) were also low. Both Medway and Sheppey Unions were home to Royal Naval bases (Chatham and Sheerness respectively), and it
is suggested that this may have distorted the sex ratio, as the wives of seamen may have gone into the workhouse when their husbands were at sea. Although the trend seen in Figure 3 holds in general, Tables 1–3 show marked variations in sex ratios between different workhouses. Sex ratios for the combined populations of the Hampshire workhouses of Basingstoke and Winchester were 123 in 1851 and 121 in 1861, for the Hertfordshire workhouses in 1851 the sex ratio was 149 (varying from 105 to 215 for individual workhouses), and for Leicester workhouse in 1881 it was 144.30

Marital structure

Table 2 shows the marital condition of workhouse inmates aged 20 years and over. Only 16 per cent of inmates (14 per cent of males and 18 per cent of females) were married, a figure in close agreement with the 15 per cent recorded for Leicester in 1881 and the 18 per cent recorded for Hertfordshire and Basingstoke in 1851.31 Single inmates comprised 39 per cent of the total, lower than the 1851 figures for Hertfordshire (44 per cent), Basingstoke (48 per cent) and the 1881 figure for Leicester (53 per cent). Of the total population of the eight unions, 65 per cent were married and 26 per cent were unmarried.32 The strong bias to the unmarried in the eight Kent workhouses is of a similar order to that for Hertfordshire in 1851, when 62 per cent of the total population were married and 28 per cent were unmarried. Reasons given for this bias in Hertfordshire, and also applicable to Kent, include lack of family support outside the workhouse, discrimination by employers, lack of eligibility for

Table 2  Marital condition of adult workhouse inmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford East</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford West</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holingbourne</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppey</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 8 unions</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

almshouse accommodation, failure to become established in the community, and being considered less deserving than married or widowed people.33

Of the 464 unmarried individuals aged 20 or over, 294 (63 per cent) were aged under 60, compared with 77 per cent for Hertfordshire. Males comprised 53 per cent and females 47 per cent of unmarried inmates aged 20–59 years. These figures again are very close to those for Hertfordshire in 1851 (56 per cent for males, and 44 per cent for females). Thirty-seven married men aged 20–59 years were inmates, comprising a mere 1.9 per cent of the total number of inmates, a figure in remarkable agreement with Goose, who found that 2 per cent of Hertfordshire workhouse inmates fell into this category.34

Birthplaces

According to the CEBs, 79 per cent of inmates were born in Kent (Table 3). When extra-metropolitan Kent as a whole is considered, 54 per cent of inhabitants enumerated in the county were also born there.35 There is considerable variation between the eight workhouses, with the percentages varying from 68 per cent for Medway to 95 per cent for East Ashford. The figure for Leicestershire-born inmates of the Leicester workhouse in 1881 was

### Table 3  Birthplaces of inmates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Kent</th>
<th>Rest of England</th>
<th>Wales and Scotland</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
<th>Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford East</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford West</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppey</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 8 unions</td>
<td>1793</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The totals in this table do not match those in Table 1 as they have been reduced by removing from the count all inmates for whom a birthplace was not given or was unclear.

**Source:** National index to 1881 British Census and 1881 British census, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints [CD-ROM] (Salt Lake City, Utah, 1999).
Table 4  Numbers of vagrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of total workhouse population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashford East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford West</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medway</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheppey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 8 unions 50 2.5

Source: See Table 3.

68 per cent. The workhouse populations of the eight unions and of Leicester showed a clear preponderance of inmates born in the same county. Percentages of the total workhouse population born in Ireland and abroad were 2.8 and 1.6 respectively. The percentages of Irish inmates were higher for Medway (5.7 per cent) and Sheppey (4.3 per cent). The percentages of inmates born abroad were 2.3 for Faversham and 3.1 for Medway.

Five inmates of the Faversham workhouse were born abroad. Three of these were born in the USA – a 32 year old widow born in New York, her ten-year old son, born in Connecticut and an eight-year old boy whose birthplace was given as America. The other overseas-born inmates of the Faversham workhouse were born in Canada and The Channel Islands. How these people came to be in the Faversham workhouse is unknown.

Sixteen individuals born overseas constituted 3.1 per cent of the Medway workhouse population. Ten of these were aged 15 years or under. Their birthplaces were Africa, Bermuda, India, Malta and Singapore. Of the remaining six, five were women aged 31–70. Their birthplaces were the Channel Islands, Belgium, India and Malta. The remaining member of this group was a 75 year old man whose birthplace was given as ‘Mount Sural’. Of the seven inmates whose birthplaces were given as India, four were scholars aged between 8 and 13 years and a fifth was a blacksmith aged 15. The remaining two were Emma Smith, an unmarried domestic servant aged 40, and Ann Marshall, aged 31, married, with no stated occupation. Four children named Marshall were identified in the Medway workhouse, and if the suggestion that they are all Ann’s children is accepted, the extent of her travels becomes evident. She was born in India about 1831, she was in Malta in 1871, India in 1873, Malta again in 1875, and in the Medway area from 1876. Patrick and John Flannery, aged 15 and 13 years, were also born in India, but their mother was not identified in the workhouse. Ann and Caroline Miskinmon, aged 13 and 10 years, were born in India. Eliza Miskinmiss, aged 52, married, and born in Portsmouth, was identified in the workhouse and may be their mother.
Although more work on the family relationships of inmates born abroad is required, evidence from the CEBs suggests that women and children found their way into workhouses many miles from their countries of birth, and it is suggested that they may have been the families of servicemen, who were posted elsewhere and did not take their families with them, or who simply abandoned their families.

### Vagrants

Society was less tolerant of vagrants than of paupers in general. Crowther states that the Poor Law Commissioners regarded mendicant vagrants as lazy, dishonest and undeserving of public compassion. While this view was no doubt justified in many cases, the same author also cites examples of men classified as vagrants who were travelling in search of work. The treatment of vagrants was so harsh that some died after being refused relief, but guardians were subsequently ordered to supply relief to vagrants. This they did, but the facilities offered to vagrants were less comfortable even than those provided for the majority of paupers.37

Various terms were used in the CEBs to describe vagrants. The CEBs for the eight workhouses being studied contain ‘vagrant’, ‘casual’, ‘casual pauper’ and ‘tramp’. In the case of Ashford West, the individuals were described as inmates in the separately-enumerated casual ward.38 The term ‘vagrant’ will be used in this work to include all these descriptions.

Table 4 shows that 2.5 per cent of those enumerated in the workhouses were classed as vagrants, with variations from zero (Sheppey) to 4.8 per cent (Milton). The age and sex distributions of vagrants are shown in Table 5. In all age groups, males outnumber females by approximately two to one. Most vagrants are in the prime working age category (15–59), with only nine younger than 15 and three aged 60–62. Thirty per cent of vagrants, a total of 15, were born in Kent, a much lower percentage than that for non-vagrants. Thirty-four vagrants were born in the rest of Great Britain/Ireland, and one was born in the USA. For both sexes, the commonest industrial class was agriculture. For males, building and industrial service (general labourers) were the next two most common classes, while a third of females had no

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age-group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Table 3.

Although more work on the family relationships of inmates born abroad is required, evidence from the CEBs suggests that women and children found their way into workhouses many miles from their countries of birth, and it is suggested that they may have been the families of servicemen, who were posted elsewhere and did not take their families with them, or who simply abandoned their families.

### Vagrants

Society was less tolerant of vagrants than of paupers in general. Crowther states that the Poor Law Commissioners regarded mendicant vagrants as lazy, dishonest and undeserving of public compassion. While this view was no doubt justified in many cases, the same author also cites examples of men classified as vagrants who were travelling in search of work. The treatment of vagrants was so harsh that some died after being refused relief, but guardians were subsequently ordered to supply relief to vagrants. This they did, but the facilities offered to vagrants were less comfortable even than those provided for the majority of paupers.37

Various terms were used in the CEBs to describe vagrants. The CEBs for the eight workhouses being studied contain ‘vagrant’, ‘casual’, ‘casual pauper’ and ‘tramp’. In the case of Ashford West, the individuals were described as inmates in the separately-enumerated casual ward.38 The term ‘vagrant’ will be used in this work to include all these descriptions.

Table 4 shows that 2.5 per cent of those enumerated in the workhouses were classed as vagrants, with variations from zero (Sheppey) to 4.8 per cent (Milton). The age and sex distributions of vagrants are shown in Table 5. In all age groups, males outnumber females by approximately two to one. Most vagrants are in the prime working age category (15–59), with only nine younger than 15 and three aged 60–62. Thirty per cent of vagrants, a total of 15, were born in Kent, a much lower percentage than that for non-vagrants. Thirty-four vagrants were born in the rest of Great Britain/Ireland, and one was born in the USA. For both sexes, the commonest industrial class was agriculture. For males, building and industrial service (general labourers) were the next two most common classes, while a third of females had no
reported occupation. Five vagrant families were identified, one in Ashford West Casual Ward, one in Hollingbourne Workhouse, two in Maidstone and one in Medway. (By family is meant one adult or two married adults with their children enumerated consecutively). The Hamilton family, enumerated in the Ashford West Casual Ward, had four members; parents James (a tailor) and Eliza (a tailoress) were born in Ireland and Scotland respectively, and their two children were also born in Scotland. The Smith family in Hollingbourne consisted of Frederick, an agricultural labourer, and Martha his wife who was described as a domestic servant, both aged 44, with their 14 year old son James. All three were born in Sudbury, Suffolk. The Edwards family, in Maidstone, consisted of William, labourer aged 41, his wife Harriett, aged 40, and their two children aged nine and one. William’s birthplace was New Orleans, Harriett’s was Canterbury, and the children were born in Essex. Also in Maidstone was Caroline Maguire, a 29 year old married woman with her three year old son. Both were born in London. Harriett Golby, a hawker aged 36 years, was enumerated in the Medway workhouse with her three children aged fourteen, ten and five. All were born in Chatham. Of the five families in the vagrant category, four clearly had origins outside Kent.

Conclusions

Despite the chronological and geographical separation of Hertfordshire in 1851, Hampshire in 1851–1861, Leicester in 1881 and Kent in 1881, there are striking similarities between the results of this investigation and those of Goose, Hinde and Turnbull, and Page. The workhouse populations were composed predominantly of the young and the old. Percentages of children in the populations of all areas support the view that there was a reluctance of large families to enter the workhouse or a reluctance to admit them. The sex ratio was biased towards males in the Kent, Hampshire, Leicester and Hertfordshire workhouses, although there were wide variations between individual Kent and Hertfordshire workhouses.

The marital structure was similar in the eight unions and in Leicester, Hertfordshire and Basingstoke, with married inmates comprising between 15 and 18 per cent of the workhouse populations in this and the three earlier studies. All workhouses showed a marked bias towards single people.

The highest percentages of inmates born abroad (including Ireland) were present in the Medway and Sheppey workhouses, and it is likely that these people were either naval personnel, dockyard workers, or their families. Overseas migrants would be unlikely to have relatives living locally, and would therefore be more dependent on the Poor Law in old age. In some cases, women and children went into the workhouse many (possibly thousands) of miles from their birthplaces. Most vagrants were male and of prime working age, as would be expected if they were travelling in search of work, but some vagrants were accompanied by their families.
Vagrants had, in general, migrated further from their birthplaces than non-vagrant inmates.

The workhouse populations of at least two of the workhouses studied (Medway and Milton) showed similar variations throughout the year from April 1880 to April 1881. The increase in numbers of inmates in the winter months reflects reduced availability of work.

In summary, this study of eight Kent workhouses in 1881 supports the findings of Goose, Hinde and Turnbull, and Page, who studied workhouse populations in Hertfordshire, Hampshire and Leicester respectively. In all workhouses, most inmates were single, and the populations were predominantly composed of males, children and the aged. Family groups were usually headed by women, except in the case of vagrant families. Variations in the populations of two of the Kent workhouses reflect seasonal fluctuations in the availability of work and in the demand for transport in an area heavily dependent on agriculture and brickmaking. Even proximity to the London market, while providing employment opportunities, was insufficient to insulate the poor from the effects of seasonal unemployment and the threat of destitution and the workhouse.

NOTES

2. Maidstone Union had a Workhouse School in addition to the workhouse. Children housed in the school were included in the analysis with inmates of the workhouse.
12. The term ‘extra-metropolitan Kent’ indicates the County of Kent excluding a small number of districts on the outskirts of London.
14. National index to 1881 British census and 1881 British census, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints [CD-ROM] (Salt Lake City; Utah, 1999).
17. In the tables, percentages are expressed to one decimal place. In the text, percentages have been
rounded to the nearest whole number, except for small percentages (less than ten) where rounding was considered inappropriate.

19. A discrepancy was noted in the census report for the total population for the Medway registration district. The stated total differed by 62 from the total calculated and checked by the author. The author’s calculated total was used.
23. Page, ‘Pauperism and the Leicester Workhouse’, 88–9. Comparison with Page’s figures is hindered slightly by a small inaccuracy in his Table III, in which two consecutive age ranges are 6–10 and 15–20.
24. Initially, an attempt was made to sort members with the same surname who were not enumerated consecutively, into family groups, but the information available from the CEBs did not allow this to be done with certainty, so the attempt was abandoned. Such family reconstitution may be possible if CEBs are used in conjunction with admission and discharge registers.
27. 1881 Census of Great Britain, Vol. III. Ages, condition as to marriage; occupations and birthplaces of people. BPP 1883 LXXX, 31–2.
37. Crowther, Workhouse system, 247.
38. According to the census report, six people were present in West Ashford Casual Ward, but only five were found when the census return was checked.
Mrs. Williams became interested in local history several years ago, and since moving to Wiltshire has obtained an M.A. in Local and Regional History at Bath Spa University College. She is Honorary Archivist to the Merchant’s House (Marlborough) Trust, where she is helping to set up a local studies library.

Readers of Local Population Studies will probably be familiar with the use of the nineteenth-century census enumerators’ books for the study of migration, but with few exceptions these have been studies of in-migration, or migration between small local areas. My particular interest is in small towns in general, and Marlborough in Wiltshire in particular. The town received its first charter in 1204, and remained a borough until 1974. Its location within the county and relative to other parishes and towns discussed in the text may be seen in Figure 1. Marlborough was something of a backwater between the coming of the turnpike roads (which destroyed its role in providing overnight accommodation) and the days of mass commuting. In the second half of the nineteenth century the only large employer was Marlborough College, and the economic life of the town was otherwise sustained by its role as a market, retailing and social centre, and by a few small industrial enterprises. Although Marlborough was only a small market town, with a population of just over 3,000, any search for the many people who migrated from the town during the nineteenth century would previously have been time-consuming and in many cases impossible. However, with the publication of the 1881 Census Index for England and Wales, it is now possible to study out-migration much more readily.

The Index has been produced through a collaboration between the Public Record Office, where the census enumerators’ books are deposited; the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (LDS), who have a doctrinal interest in genealogy; and the Federation of Family History Societies. As well as the separate county indexes, two national indexes have been produced, one of surnames and one of birthplaces. It is this birthplace index which makes possible the study of out-migration in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. The index has been issued as a series of microfiche, and also as a set
of CD-ROMs. An advantage of using the microfiche version rather than the CDs to obtain details of all those born in any locality is that on the microfiche all these people are listed in one sequence, whereas with the CDs each county must be searched separately. On the other hand, the CDs have the advantage
if one is studying persons residing in a locality who were not born there. Those contemplating using the 1881 index to study nineteenth-century migration would be well advised to explore both sources. The present study was originally undertaken using the microfiche version of the index.

The birthplace index is in alphabetical order of places within each county, so all the people listed as having been born in Marlborough should appear under ‘Wiltshire’, no matter where in England or Wales they were residing on census night. It must be remembered, however, that any secondary source is only as good as its input, and for various reasons (mainly to do with errors or ambiguities in the original enumerators’ books) not all the entries for people born in a particular locality will be found in the correct place in the index. For instance, a number of people born in Malborough, which is near Kingsbridge in Devon, appear in the Wiltshire listing. Some of these may be mis-spellings of ‘Marlborough’, whereas others may indeed have been born in Malborough, but their entry has strayed into the wrong county. With Marlborough a further difficulty arises because of variant spellings, both for Marlborough itself and also for the other Wiltshire town of Malmesbury. Entries such as ‘Marlbery’, ‘Marlsboro’ or ‘Malbridge’ could refer to either town. Luckily problems such as these, which are also present for users of the CD version of the index, cause less difficulty for the researcher who does not intend to locate the whereabouts in 1881 of everyone alive in England and Wales who was born in one particular place. However, any sample of persons drawn may include an element of bias if the birthplace name is more likely to be corrupted the further from his or her birthplace that a person is living.

A systematic sample of 100 people stated to have been born in Marlborough was taken from the total of 4,669 unambiguous entries in the Wiltshire section of the birthplace index, by taking alternatively every 46th and 47th name, whether or not the person was living in Marlborough at the time of the census. Note was also taken of all the other people living in each sample person’s household. Details of the households can be obtained either from the CD or the microfiche. Using the CD, the individual’s name, birthplace and birth year are entered, and a list of individuals matching these criteria are presented. When the particular individual sought is identified, full details of the household in which they are residing may be called up on screen. If using the microfiche version, the PRO reference (e.g. RG11/1306 f.127 p.33) is used to locate the household in the ‘as enumerated’ set of microfiche. The sample used on this occasion is too small to enable more than very general statements to be made, but has been chosen as a quick way of assessing the usefulness of the index to out-migration studies. Covering over 4,600 individuals, the total list of Marlborough-born persons in England and Wales is significantly greater than the 3,343 people enumerated in the town in 1881, which of course includes many people who were not born there. This suggests a high level of out-migration, but it must also be noted that the majority of those living in Marlborough in 1881 were not born there, indicating that the town had, or had had, a particularly high turnover of population in the late-nineteenth century.
Table 1  Analysis of movers and stayers by age and sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Movers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Stayers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ‘Movers’ are persons who were born in Marlborough but not resident in Marlborough in 1881; ‘stayers’ are persons who were born in Marlborough and resident in the town in 1881.

Source: National index to 1881 British Census, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints [CD-ROM] (Salt Lake City, Utah, 1999).

The assumed high level of out-migration is borne out by the sample (Table 1). Out of the 100 people born in the town, only 35 were still living in Marlborough (the ‘stayers’), while the other 65 had migrated (the ‘movers’). However, within the under-15 year age group, 16 were stayers while only 8 were movers, suggesting that most migrants moved before they settled down and started to produce children. Three of the child movers had migrated only as far as the adjoining parish of Preshute (see Figure 1). One of them had been admitted (with his six small brothers and sisters) to the Marlborough Union Workhouse which happened to lie in Preshute parish.

If the movers aged 15 years and over had indeed migrated in early adulthood, it would be expected that many of their spouses and most of their children would have been born outside the town. Nineteen of the movers had married and had at least one resident child. In only one case was the other spouse born in Marlborough, and in only two cases were the spouses born in other Wiltshire parishes (Table 2). Both of these were people who had moved from Marlborough to the nearby town of Pewsey, where all but one of their children had been born. One other man had married a Dorset woman, but both their resident children had been born in Marlborough, and they had moved only to Preshute. The remaining 15 of these 19 cases can be divided into two almost equal groups. In seven cases all or almost all of the children had been born in the same county as the non-Marlborough spouse, while the other eight cases, the children had been born in different counties from both their parents. For the former group it can reasonably be assumed that the Marlborough person had moved to the locality where his/her spouse was born, and it should be possible to find the relevant marriages, but in the latter group there is no way of knowing where the couple were living when they married. Eight of the sample movers were children of all ages living with both parents. In four of these families one of the parents had been born in Marlborough; in one case one of the parents was born in Market Lavington,
Table 2  Marriage patterns of movers and stayers with resident children, 1881

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Moved from Marlborough</th>
<th>Stayed in Marlborough</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough-born spouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Wiltshire-born spouse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse born outside Wiltshire</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: See Table 1.

about 14 miles away; but in the other three families neither parent nor any other child had been born in Marlborough, suggesting a few highly mobile families with no local connections. In no case were both parents born in Marlborough.

Of the stayers, only two were heads of household, while another six were the wives of heads. The two men had married women from nearby parishes, and all the women had married Wiltshire men, mainly from Marlborough and nearby villages, and in any case no further than Urchfont which is 11½ miles away, and the only locality beyond the hinterland supplied by Marlborough market. All the children of these couples had been born in Marlborough or within a few miles of the town. Twenty of the stayers were children of all ages living with both parents. In three of these cases both parents were born in Marlborough, and in another ten both parents had been born in Wiltshire (including Marlborough). One other father had been born in Hungerford, just over the Berkshire border and only nine miles away. One head of household told the enumerator that he did not know where he had been born, and since his surname was Smith his origin would be very difficult to find. In the other five families, one of the parents had been born in north Wiltshire, and the other in five different counties, but in all cases all of the children were Marlborough born. This supports the conclusion inferred from the movers, that most people moved before marriage rather than after.

How far did the movers move? About one quarter (17 out of the 65) were still living in Wiltshire. All but four of these were living with other family members, and in every case most of the rest of the family were also Wiltshire-born. The two servants, one living in Calne and the other in Trowbridge, were resident in families with mainly Wiltshire-born members. Only the theology student at the Missionary College in Warminster was living in a household composed largely of people from other counties.

Nine of the movers were living in the adjacent county of Berkshire. The largest group, 18 in all, were those who had moved to London, although since this was before the formation of the County of London in 1885, they were scattered
over the counties of Middlesex (11), Surrey (3), Essex and Kent (2 each). Another migrant had also moved to the rural Surrey parish of Egham. Twelve other movers were to be found in the south of England: four each in Somerset and Gloucestershire, two in Hampshire and one each in Oxfordshire and Cornwall. Three movers had migrated to eastern England and five to the Midlands and North.

Unlike the movers who had stayed in Wiltshire, those who moved into other counties were far less likely to be accompanied by other family members born in Marlborough, again suggesting that those who were most mobile were likely to have moved early in their adulthood. The type of settlement lived in by the movers also tends to differ between those living in Wiltshire and those outside. Those in Wiltshire were living in villages or small towns, and none had moved to Swindon or Salisbury, the two largest towns in the county. By contrast, those who moved out of Wiltshire tended to favour the larger towns and cities of the counties in which they were to be found. As well as the 18 in metropolitan London, six of the nine Berkshire residents were living in Reading, all of those in Gloucestershire were either in Bristol or Cheltenham, and others had moved to Southampton, Birmingham and Manchester.

In analysing the moves of Marlborough people, it must be remembered that it is only the counties of England and Wales have been included in the index. Anyone moving to Scotland or Ireland, or emigrating abroad, will not be recorded. By contrast, all people living in England and Wales on census night are recorded, so that the numbers and percentages of immigrants to and emigrants from any locality cannot be compared unless it is certain that no-one has moved into the locality from outside England and Wales.

Since employment opportunities in Marlborough were limited largely to retail and service occupations, a different occupational distribution is to be expected between those who moved and those who stayed. Table 3 includes all those who were economically active, together with the spouses of married women in the sample. The table again indicates that the Wiltshire movers were more like the stayers than the other movers. This is particularly true in the ‘labourers and domestic’ category. Those in this category who stayed in Marlborough or only moved within Wiltshire were mainly men working as farm or domestic servants, or as agricultural labourers. By contrast, almost all the long-distance movers in the same category were female domestic servants; only one was a male general labourer. Of those who had moved outside the county, far more were likely to be working as tradesmen and craftsmen. The people at the bottom of the economic spectrum seem not to have had the enterprise to move away to find work, while anyone who had learnt a craft or trade was more likely to find employment in a more economically active area. It must be remembered, however, that there is no way of knowing from the census data whether the job that a mover was doing in 1881 was the same as the job he did before he left Marlborough.

This pilot study has concentrated on the town of Marlborough, and it is impossible to make any broad comments on the conclusions reached without
Table 3  Occupations of movers and stayers, 1881

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Stayed in Marlborough</th>
<th>Moved within Wiltshire</th>
<th>Moved outside Wiltshire</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades and crafts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers and domestic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:**  See Table 1.

comparing the results with those of other localities. Migration patterns at this period were almost certainly different between town and country areas, and different again between towns, particularly those of different sizes. It will be instructive to compare the migration data from Marlborough with those of the other leading Wiltshire towns. Swindon was a dynamic industrial town, and would certainly have had far more in- than out-migration. Trowbridge was also industrial, but its economy may have been less vibrant than Swindon’s. Salisbury was the ecclesiastical and social centre of the county, while Devizes showed signs of continuing prosperity, although its textile trade had declined. The migration patterns of all these towns would surely be different, and it is possible that a study of a larger sample of towns from the 1881 index would give results which would enable the economic history of any town to be understood through its migration pattern alone. Use of the microfiche and CD versions of the birthplace index in conjunction should enable a full picture of the migration profile of any locality to be fully evaluated.
All articles reviewed were published in 2001 unless otherwise stated.


Following in the footsteps of the Stockport Research Group, who made extensive use of probate inventories in their *Stockport in the mid-seventeenth century, 1660–1669* (S. McKenn and C. Nunn eds, Stockport, 1992), Paul Anderton provides a detailed analysis of 59 Nantwich inventories for the same decade along similar lines, with special reference to agriculture. Comparisons are made between Nantwich, Stockport and Lichfield by category of wealth and by category of possession, but unfortunately no wider comparisons are offered. A particular feature of the Nantwich inventories was the degree to which some town dwellers depended upon agriculture in one way or another, with 21 of the 59 keeping cattle, and numerous additional references to dairy or milkhouses, cheese chambers and stocks of cheese. As for Cornish towns, where a similar situation prevailed, in terms of value the investment in livestock was relatively small, accounting for only 7.6 per cent of total assets (see C. North, ‘Merchants and retailers in seventeenth-century Cornwall’, in T. Arkell, N. Evans and N. Goose eds, *When death do us part: understanding and interpreting the probate records of early modern England*, (Oxford, 2000), 296–7). A further comparison with Nantwich inventories of the 1630s and 1670s reveals a steep decline in cattle ownership after 1671, and a similar fall in the quantities of cheese in store. The Nantwich evidence, therefore, appears to contradict David Hey’s conclusion for the wider region about the steady advance of a specialised cheese industry throughout the seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries.


This article adds to the flurry of articles which have recently appeared on the nineteenth century population history of Kent (for others see A. Perkyns, ‘Migration and mobility: six Kentish parishes, 1851–1881’, *Local Population Studies*, **63**, 30–70; the paper by Jackson reviewed in *Local Population Studies*, **65**, 70; and the paper by Jackson reviewed below). Frittenden, the locality analysed by Betts, lies right in the centre of the county, south of Maidstone on the low Weald. His analysis of marriage patterns and family structure among the farmers of that parish shows that there was a degree of assortative mating,
though this was by no means sufficient to render the farmers a ‘closed caste’ (p. 49). Betts also analyses the role of kinship, and concludes that it is hard to make generalisations: individual family circumstances were important.


This article is written by an oral historian who also writes and researches on issues relating to reminiscence and life review, and is therefore ideally placed to compare and contrast the two procedures. She concludes that there is much that is similar, including the focus upon interrogation, the influence of context upon how accounts are developed and responded to, and issues surrounding ownership of the product. But there are differences too, central to which is the fact that for the oral historian the older person is the source of evidence, while for the researcher into reminiscence the older person is the evidence. There are also different issues of ownership, in the context of which it is interesting to learn that the United Kingdom Copyright Act of 1998 states that in an interview situation the owner of the copyright in the words is the speaker, while the copyright in the recording belongs to the person who arranged it. A final difference, of course, is the extent to which the oral historian emphasises the importance of the wider historical context, not only in relation to a particular life but also in relation to a particular community and society.


Town plans, Poll and Hearth Taxes, probate inventories and a variety of miscellaneous sources are used to reveal Northwich as a small town of perhaps 500–600 inhabitants in the 1660s, with tightly packed housing and an economy dominated by its salt houses, some owned by the townsmen themselves and others occupied by them but owned by outsiders. While most of the population was poor (86 of the 128 individuals listed in the Hearth Tax in 1664 were exempt from taxation), the town was dominated by about half a dozen wealthier families who jealously guarded their privileged position as burgesses. This gave them considerable authority and influence over town affairs despite liability to interference from the lord of the manor.


Why did generation after generation of Cornish miners continue to expose themselves to harsh and dangerous work in the mines, even though wages were not high (and could be insecure) and the work was likely to shorten their lives? Burt and Kippen argue that economic models of rational choice provide a sufficient answer. Put simply, none of the alternatives was more attractive. Agriculture in the south west of England was notoriously badly paid, much worse even than mining, and the higher wages in mining more than
compensated for the inferior conditions. Most other mining districts in England and Wales offered work which was no better paid, and still dangerous (though higher wages in the South Wales coalfield did attract some Cornishmen). The only rational alternative was emigration to work in overseas metal mines, for example in North America or South Africa, where the skills of Cornish miners meant that they could command wages much higher (even several times higher) than those at home. The paper includes some very interesting data on the mortality of Cornish miners compared with coal miners and males living in ‘healthy districts’.


Clarke reminds us that the Huguenot contribution and influence extended well beyond the confines of London and the realms of trade, industry and finance, by presenting the story of six Huguenot refugees (Duelly, Passebon, De Grassemere, de La Rocque, Dubois and Coste) who served as successive tutors in the Clarke household in Chipley, Somerset, from 1687 to 1710. The Clarkes had been encouraged by John Locke to employ a Huguenot, testifying to the esteem in which the French were held in matters of education and culture, but the results for the family were mixed, and it is clear that some of those appointed found the rural life less than idyllic and hankered after an early return to the more lively and cosmopolitan life of London.


This paper examines the first and second editions of Malthus’s An Essay on the Principle of Population (1798) from the viewpoint of Malthus as welfare economist, with particular emphasis upon the desirability of a steadily rising real wage. The import of the first edition is that such a rise is impossible, either under capitalism or under an egalitarian system such as that proposed by Godwin, whose views Malthus had set out to refute. But in the second edition there is greater emphasis upon the preventive check to population growth, presenting the possibility of restraint by the present generation, leading to higher real wages for the next. This opens up the possibility of a ‘free lunch’ for all generations, since no self-sacrifice is required from the present generation which behaves in its own enlightened self-interest. This, it is argued, is a ‘permissible simplification’, which conflates the social welfare of labourers with economic welfare, and ignores the ‘costs’ of either moral restraint or prostitution. The paper is an entertaining discussion, but there is no significant edification for the population historian here.


Diseases and injuries affecting the mercantile marine in the nineteenth century are not well recorded. Hence the successive medical reports compiled by W. Johnson Smith and published by the Seamen’s Hospital Society, indicating
admissions to the Dreadnought and Albert Dock hospitals 1875–1905, provide a valuable insight, and these are discussed in some detail here. The reports suggest that cholera and scurvy had subsided considerably by the late-nineteenth century. Diseases considered to be more common among seamen than in the population at large were, in order of importance, ‘ague’, dysentery, enteric fever and thoracic aneurism, though again the evidence suggests a clear downward trend in ague and dysentery, possibly due to improved food and water supplies. ‘Surgical’ admissions were completely dominated by venereal disease, with peaks of over 450 cases per annum in 1883 and 1887. Even these figures stand well below that reported by George Busk FRS to the Committee on Venereal Diseases in the Army and Navy in 1865, who had suggested an annual admission rate to the Dreadnought of 1,500–2,000 cases. The incidence of venereal disease appears to have declined further by the start of the twentieth century. Only very limited attempts are made to explain these trends.

T.G. Davies, ‘“And where shall she find a doctor?”: incidents in the history of medicine in Gower during the nineteenth century’, *Journal of Glamorgan History: Morgannwg*, 45, 29–54.

The first resident medical man in the Gower peninsula, Daniel Davies, was unqualified, and belonged as much to the folk-healing tradition as to orthodox medicine. He was succeeded, however, in 1839 by George J. Perry, who had gained medical, surgical and apothecary training at Bristol and University College, London. Both served as medical officers to the Gower district of Swansea Poor Law Union, and were underpaid, burdened with excessive work and responsible for an extensive geographical area. It is argued that the Public Health Act of 1872, which allowed the establishment of the Gower Rural Sanitary Authority, had a considerable impact upon health in the area, while another important development was improved communications with Swansea, bringing hospital services there within easier reach. Largely through the relation of a series of incidents, as indicated in the title, rather than through a systematic study of provision and its demographic consequences, it is concluded that, while improving medical provision in such remote areas had been far from easy, the century did see the gradual creation of a more modern medical service.


Egan calculates the population of Greenwich between 1616 and 1750 from baptisms, applying a constant baptism rate of 35 per 1,000 per year for the whole period. He also makes estimates from the 1662 Hearth Tax (using a household multiplier of 4.5), from the Compton Census (ratio of communicants to population of 1.5) and from lists of households recorded in the Overseers Accounts of 1696, 1724 and 1750 (household multiplier of 4.5). The results are gratifyingly consistent, with only the total calculated from the Hearth Tax lying more than 10 per cent away from the total derived from baptisms. An upward correction of 10 per cent to the baptism totals produces
an even closer match. The ‘best fit’ line between the various figures suggests growth from perhaps 3,200 in 1620 to 6,800 in 1750, with a higher rate of growth in the mid-seventeenth century than was apparent nationally.


Much has been made of the decline in working class church attendance in the later nineteenth century. This paper provides a test of allegiance in the three towns of Barrow, Lancaster and Preston through a re-analysis of a series of oral history transcripts, originally collected by Elisabeth Roberts for her book *A woman’s place: an oral history of working class women 1890–1940* (Oxford, 1994), and now held at the Centre for North-West Regional Studies at the University of Lancaster. Of the original sample of 165 individuals, born mostly in the period 1885–1915, 125 described attending church or chapel and/or Sunday school during their youth, and of these 89 were suitable for analysis. A further 23 could not be satisfactorily classified, and thus the final sample comprised 66 individuals. Of these, as many as 42 are classified as ‘loyalists’, being very actively involved with their church, seeing it as an extension of family life and exhibiting an almost proprietorial air towards it. Fifteen individuals fitted the category of ‘opportunity seekers’, having no strong allegiance but attending different churches periodically to attend social gatherings or to gain charitable support. The final nine were the ‘rejecting’ group, rejecting religious practice and sometimes its teaching too, but there is no evidence that this was due to either poverty or socialist views: a poor relationship with particular clergy was the most commonly cited cause. It is concluded that although there was a greater variety of leisure activities available in the form of theatre, cinema and dance halls, these did not replace the church but were combined with it. The church thus continued to provide important unifying, social and leisure opportunities for substantial numbers of working class men and women well into the twentieth century.


In this admirable local study Falvey examines the responses to the attempted enclosure of parts of Berkhamsted Common in Hertfordshire in 1619–1620 and in the 1640s. She finds that those who rioted against these enclosures were drawn from all ‘sorts’ of people, not merely from the ‘poor commons’, and many of them were men of independence with a strong political sense. Local office holders, concerned to maintain order, were unlikely to feature, but in both periods the office holders in Northchurch had a strong interest in the common and proved willing to lead the protest. The riot of 1620 proved unsuccessful and failed to prevent the enclosure of 300 acres, but the unrest in the 1640s succeeded in thwarting the Crown’s plans to enclose a further 400 acres. It is likely that exogenous factors also played a part in determining the outcome, for by the late 1630s public opinion had swung against enclosure and the Crown’s programme of projects, while Charles I was also increasingly
preoccupied with more serious threats to his authority. Although such external factors clearly played their part, Falvey emphasises the importance of local context to an understanding of social protests of this type.


This paper does not focus upon the early modern period as a whole but upon the late-seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and reports the results of a study of the court records of the London Consistory, the Peculiars of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Court of Arches, the High Court of Delegates and the King’s Bench, 1660–1800. The overall conclusion is that neither dependency nor supervision ceased upon marriage, at least for the middle and upper ranks that feature in the evidence consulted here. A number of examples of involvement are produced, including offering advice and support by letter writing, living with one or both sets of parents for a short time after marriage (which, we are assured, was ‘not unusual’), helping financially or through facilitating useful connections, mediating between quarrelling partners, offering refuge from violent husbands, and interfering in marriages with a view to foster discord (a role, apparently, that was already a special prerogative of the mother-in-law). Both withholding of the wife’s portion and threatened withdrawal of the husband’s inheritance were, on occasion, used as weapons, particularly if it was felt by the parents that the husband was not behaving reasonably. Quantification, as the author accepts, is impossible, for there is no way of knowing how often couples had recourse to other relatives in difficult situations, or to those to whom they were completely unrelated.


Some readers of *Local Population Studies* may be familiar with H. Rider Haggard’s survey of rural England in 1901 and 1902 (published as *Rural England, being an account of agricultural and social researches carried out in 1901 and 1902*, (London, 1902)). In a manner similar to James Caird 50 years before him, Haggard travelled the country ‘with the intention of enquiring into the state of English agriculture and the reasons and remedies for the rural depopulation’ (p. 209). Haggard gathered his data by interviewing rural residents and, in this paper, Freeman looks at the characteristics of those he interviewed. It seems that Haggard largely spoke to farmers, landowners and other ‘establishment’ figures, and not to those who might be able to articulate the views of labourers, still less to the labourers themselves. As a result, Freeman, argues, Haggard produced a biased picture of rural life, and his diagnosis of the causes of rural depopulation was, at the very least, incomplete, as it fails to mention the tied cottage system, which was the labourers’ biggest single grievance.

It was common in the late-nineteenth century for agricultural labourers, especially those in southern England, to be characterised as ‘deferential, dependent and ignorant’, dull and slow, unwilling to better themselves (or even incapable of self-improvement) (p. 174). This view was encapsulated in the stereotype of ‘Hodge’, the epithet most famously used by Richard Jefferies in his book *Hodge and his masters* (1880). In this paper, Freeman examines this representation of the farm labourer, suggesting that by the time Jefferies’ book was published, it was already becoming somewhat anachronistic. For, beginning with the brief heyday of the National Agricultural Labourers’ Union in the 1870s, views of the agricultural labourer were changing. The improvement in the economic position of the labourer in the 1880s and 1890s, which was both cause and consequence of rural depopulation, was associated with the arrival of a nobler perception of the farm worker whose ‘silence now reflected his awesome timelessness and latent strength rather than empty-mindedness and non-cooperation’ (p. 185). Nevertheless, ‘Hodge’ was not killed off until well into the twentieth century, especially among rural commentators who did not acquaint themselves with the views of labourers (such as Rider Haggard, discussed in the previous review).


This paper assesses the extent of regional variations in infant mortality in England during the period 1570–1840. It does this by the ingenious technique of combining regional mortality patterns from the early years of civil registration with the national estimates produced for earlier years by E.A. Wrigley, R.S. Davies, J.E. Oeppen and R.S. Schofield, *English population history from family reconstitution 1580–1837*, (Cambridge, 1997), and additional estimates for sixteenth and seventeenth-century London and York. Infant mortality in London peaked during the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries at levels in excess of 300 per thousand births, compared with between 160 and 200 per thousand for non-metropolitan England before declining during the second half of the eighteenth century, ‘although that underlying decline was mitigated and even reversed in some places by both urbanization and industrialization’ (p. 75). This is an important paper which marks a significant advance in our understanding of regional variations in the demography of pre-industrial England and Wales.


These four papers all deal with various aspects of institutions. For Southwell Workhouse in Nottinghamshire, Smith has described the lack of improvement in infirmary provision until the early 1870s, despite the extension to the building when it became the Southwell Union Workhouse in 1836. In 1870–1873, however, more space, equipment and staff were all provided, including the appointment of a dedicated nurse at £15 *per annum*, although the rapid turnover in the staff (who required no training) may well indicate the undesirability of the job. Further extension was undertaken in 1914, by which time the infirmary (particularly the maternity ward) catered for non-residents, while a new, separate infirmary block was built after 1924 which provided greater opportunities for segregation, and staffing levels steadily improved. By 1950 the workhouse infirmary had evolved into Greet House, a more specialised residential home for the elderly, which operated through to the 1980s.

Following some rather questionable historical background, which paints workhouse conditions as almost uniformly grim through from the early-eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth centuries, Pocock provides a useful description of some of the main types of documentation available to the historian in both local and national repositories under the New Poor Law. This is followed by an account of the building of the Redruth Union Workhouse, and a description of the regime and diet of the paupers there in the 1840s. Extracts from the Master’s Weekly Report Book for the early 1840s provide a flavour of some of the difficulties faced, and the punishments that were meted out to recalcitrant inmates.

Staying with Cornwall, Harradence provides a detailed account of 100 years of the building, extension and equipping of Cornwall Lunatic Asylum. Cornwall made an early response to the Act for the Better Care and Maintenance of Lunatics of 1808, for its asylum was one of only nine in operation by the 1820s. However, it seems to have proved repeatedly inadequate for the number of applicants, particularly after the Act of 1862 allowed the Lunacy Commissioners to remove ‘lunatics’ from workhouse to asylum with guardians’ agreement.

Murphy returns us to the private sector, with a fascinating description of the profit-making institutions for the insane in east London in the early-nineteenth century, which as late as 1844 housed about 1,600 patients paid for from poor relief funds, besides some 200–300 more in private patient establishments. Two families dominated provision in this area, the Warburtons and the Mileses. While most of the 36 ‘mad-houses’ in London were very small establishments, the two Bethnal Green asylums and Hoxton House operated by these families were huge, with nearly 500 patients each, larger than the
better known St Luke’s or Bethlem. Almost all City of London parishes and many further afield in south-eastern England contracted to send their pauper lunatics there, and both proprietors adopted a business strategy of ‘low cost, high volume’. While some private asylums, particularly private patient only houses, were respectable and kindly and even occasionally lavish, successive government reports in 1816 and 1827 reveal the most appalling conditions in both of these large institutions. The Bethnal Green house employed thuggish keepers, responsible for beatings, sexual abuse, shackling and brutal force-feeding, while the policy of never refusing an applicant could result in two, sometimes three, sleeping in one bed. Pauper patients were left naked on wet straw beds in unheated rooms, filthy and infested with vermin. At Hoxton House it was overcrowding and mismanagement rather than sadism that produce the appalling conditions. The notoriety of the Bethnal Green houses was instrumental in producing the Act for the Regulation of Mad-houses in 1828, and to his credit John Warburton, who took over from his father in 1831, effected a transformation that produced a model institution within 15 years. Despite the damning report of 1827, neither house lost its license, and both continued to operate into the later nineteenth century. Their proprietors waxed rich and respectable – Jonathan Miles even achieved a knighthood – though presumably not for services rendered to the sick.


This article discusses patterns of morbidity among the monks of Westminster Abbey, a Benedictine foundation situated in an urban environment, in the periods 1297/8–1354/5 and 1381/2–1416/17, the choice of periods being determined by the availability of data. The typicality or otherwise of evidence taken from a monastic infirmary is discussed, and it is accepted that on the one hand that the monks probably enjoyed a standard of living resembling the substantial gentry or merchant class and were likely to report to the infirmary at a level of sickness which the poor were obliged to disregard, while on the other hand they were subject to dormitory sleeping and exposed to the enhanced dangers of an urban environment. Morbidity is compared across the two periods, and also with the seasonality of male adult mortality for early modern England. All three sets of data reveal high values in the spring followed by a summer trough. For the period 1297/8–1354/5, however, this trough is followed by further pronounced peaks in October and December, a feature not found in the other two series. This, as well as the summer trough, suggests that bubonic plague did little to shape the pattern of morbidity here in the long term, while the spring peaks might be explained in terms of the unsettling climate of the season or possibly the dietary changes that were an inevitable part of the monks’ Lenten regime. To cap an article fraught with interpretative difficulty, an attempt to determine whether or not there was a close relationship between the seasonality of morbidity reveal here and the contemporaneous seasonality of mortality proved inconclusive.
In this debate John Hatcher is responding to Sandy Bardsley’s article published in *Past and Present* 165 (1999), which bore the same title that Hatcher has now chosen. Bardsley had argued, on the basis of evidence from Ebury manor records and prosecutions for breaches of the Statutes of Labourers in the East Riding of Yorkshire, that the scarcity of labour following the Black Death of 1348–1349 did not lead to equal daily wages for men and women, as some have claimed. Rather, patriarchal structures triumphed over the impact of demographic crisis. Hatcher points out that while day rates continued to show gender differentials this was not true of piece rates, and hence women were paid equivalent wages to men for the performance of the same tasks or the same amounts of work. An abundance of evidence shows that, on average, women possess less physical strength than do men, and hence differentials in daily payments simply reflect productivity rather than gender discrimination, and such discrimination is entirely rational in a competitive labour market, such as that prevailing after the Black Death. Custom and prejudice rather than supply and demand can only work effectively when an occupation is shielded from competition, by restrictive practices of one kind or another such as commonly operated in medieval towns. Furthermore, although the degree of betterment remains debatable, there is much evidence in the research of Rogers, Beveridge and Farmer that points to a degree of levelling up of women’s wages relative to men in this period, which is reflected in the relatively low differential discovered by Bardsley herself compared with other historical periods. Unfortunately, the Ebury data lack detail, and cannot bear the weight of a more sophisticated interpretation.

In her reply Bardsley restates her argument that the ratio between women’s wages in the late medieval countryside was fairly constant before and after the Black Death, ignoring Hatcher’s counter claim. She goes on to challenge him to produce the evidence of equal piece rates that he claims to have found, while warning that piece rates less commonly identify specific individuals than do time-rate payments, leaving open the possibility that the work was subcontracted. She also questions his argument that custom and prejudice can only dictate wages when an occupation is shielded from competition. For, first, the superior strength of men does not necessarily translate into the performance of more work, for stamina is also a relevant factor. Second, the gender wage gap persists in areas of work that do not rely on physical strength. And third, such gaps vary significantly in magnitude over time and place. These variations are, of course, affected by the forces of supply and demand, but the persistence of wage discrimination demonstrates that economic practices are not solely determined by rationalism and efficiency.

One can easily imagine how this debate might progress, for each side might equally claim misrepresentation and insufficient evidence. One hopes instead that the evidence upon which Hatcher relies is indeed now presented, that
more attention is paid to the specific historical circumstances within which gender differentials in wages are considered, and in particular that comparative evidence on piece rates is produced, which might give a clearer perspective upon the novelty or otherwise of the post-plague period.


The study reported here shows that geographical variations in infant mortality in England decreased between the 1890s and the mid-twentieth century, but that they have re-emerged to some extent since then. The same applies to the gap between urban and rural areas. The study is based on the use of Geographic Information Systems methods with computerised historical census and registration data.


In this paper, Hatton and Bailey compare the recording of women’s work outside the home in the 1911 and 1931 censuses and in various surveys of towns undertaken in 1912–1914 and 1929–1937, especially the New Survey of London Life and Labour (NSLLL) of 1929–1931. They conclude that there is no evidence that the censuses systematically under-recorded women’s work. They did miss some part-time employment, but this undercounting was compensated by ‘significant overcounting of employment among women in their middle years whose labour force attachment has effectively lapsed’ (p. 105). The NSLLL, which was a survey of working-class households, underestimated employment in domestic service, as most domestic servants were living in middle-class households. Readers of *Local Population Studies* might like to relate Hatton and Bailey’s findings to other recent studies of the recording of women’s work in censuses, such as M. Anderson, ‘What can the mid-Victorian censuses tell us about variations in married women’s employment?’, *Local Population Studies*, 62, 9–31.


This article tells the story of the *British Medical Journal* (*BMJ*)’s campaign against infanticide and ‘baby-farming’ in the 1860s and 1870s. ‘Baby-farming’ was a practice whereby young working-class women could give their infants away to women who would look after them (for a fee). In the event, many of these infants were grossly neglected and their mortality rate was such that the practice approximated to infanticide. Though clearly there was a moral case to be made against ‘baby-farming’, the *BMJ*’s campaign was not entirely without self-interest, for it enabled the medical profession to put forward the argument that childbirth and matters connected with it were too important to leave to working-class women, opening the door to their increased medicalisation.

Pamela Horn provides a brief discussion of the servants’ book kept by Mrs Sally Davis of Bloxham in Oxfordshire, a widow of 61 years when the book commences in 1852, through to her death 10 years later. The book, which was continued by other family members through to 1891, is reproduced in a reordered format for ease of comprehension, and its contents are placed within the wider context of domestic service, both in Oxfordshire itself and nationally.


This article laments the transmission of poverty down the generations, using data from the Marine Society (which recruited poor boys for the Royal Navy). The paper offers two theses. The first is that female-headed households were much more likely to be poor than male-headed ones, even in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. The second is that the poor law could act very effectively to alleviate poverty among these households and thereby prevent the establishment of a ‘cycle of deprivation’.


In 1839 the New Zealand Company was established to promote English emigration to the colony, which had not previously been a ‘conventional destination’ (p. 682). The Company employed agents to disseminate information and to seek applications from prospective migrants. These agents could be very effective. The town of Alton in Hampshire (where one of the authors of this ‘Review’ now dwells) had the highest rate of applications in England, mainly because of the valiant efforts of the agent there, one Abraham Crowley (a local brewer and a major employer in the town). The Company seems to have considered itself as being in competition with other destinations, and so sought to persuade those already thinking of emigrating to consider New Zealand, rather than, say, Australia. It devoted less attention to trying to attract ‘new’ applicants.


Readers of the Local Population Studies Society Newsletter will recall Jackson’s recent paper on the agricultural depression in the parish of Borden (see the review in Local Population Studies, 65, 70). In this paper he broadens the focus to six parishes around Sittingbourne, including Sittingbourne itself and the aforementioned Borden. He uses the census enumerators’ books for 1881 and 1891 to trace married male heads of household from one census to the next. The results showed a high degree of geographical stability, but this varied by occupation. Using the classification of occupations recommended by W.A.
Armstrong (‘The use of information about occupation’, in E.A. Wrigley (ed.), Nineteenth-century society: essays in the use of quantitative methods for the study of social change (Cambridge, 1972), 226–52), it was found that brickmakers and agricultural workers had the lowest mobility and casual labourers the highest—though there are some doubts about the recording of the occupations of the latter group, which means that the linkage process may have exaggerated their mobility.


This paper reviews seven recent books on Irish emigration, mainly to (mainland) Britain. Jackson shows how recent work has revised much of the earlier literature by focusing more on women (previously neglected), allowing that some migrants were Protestants, and pointing out that not all migrants were unskilled and thus inclined to reduce wages among the indigenous workers in the communities where they settled.

C.E. Jones, ‘Personal tragedy or demographic disaster?’ Local Population Studies, 66, 14–33.

This article describes the coal-mining accident which occurred at Hartley Pit in the parish of Earsdon, Northumberland, in 1862, in which almost 200 miners lost their lives. Using the census enumerators’ books, parish registers and published census reports, Jones describes the impact of the accident on the demography of the parish during the following decade. Her conclusion is that, though the accident led to many individual families being bereaved, taken as a whole ‘the community did not disintegrate, and the impact of the tragedy upon the wider parish of Earsdon was muted’ (p. 31). This was largely because of ‘in-migration of miners from other areas ... expansion of the agricultural sector [and] ... the provisions of the relief fund’ (p. 31). The parish of Earsdon may, of course, be familiar to readers of Local Population Studies as one of the Cambridge Group’s family reconstitution parishes described in E.A. Wrigley, R.S. Davies, J.E. Oeppen and R.S. Schofield, English population history from family reconstitution 1580–1837, (Cambridge, 1997).


Steven King and John Stewart urge local historians to seek out the rich Welsh archives and to write the history of the poor law in Wales at both a local and a national level, giving examples of what might be achieved. The article includes a brief discussion of recent and current debates in poor law historiography in general. It also makes the point that local studies (especially of the New Poor Law) are still in short supply in England, despite there being a great deal of material available (for example in the minute books of Boards of Guardians and the MH12 records in the Public Record Office).

The disparate groups of people who settled in England between the fifth and seventh centuries had widely different identities, some of which existed among them as migrants, and some of which were effects of their migration. Kleinschmidt seeks to discover what sparked post-migratory changes in these collective identities such that a distinctive ‘gens anglorum’ (people of England) emerged. His conclusion is that the *gens anglorum* was ‘not the result of a seemingly autonomous identify-forming process among its members but a construct which followed from the will of rulers’ (p. 111). In other words, it was the result of deliberate intervention by those with power and influence, not just a chance meeting of collective minds.


Peter Laslett makes a plea for historians to learn more about statistical significance, causal analysis and representativeness. Traditional history suffers from the perennial problem of the ‘sample of one’. It is impossible to know how ‘typical’ this ‘one’ is, as the location of the rest of the distribution is unknown. The problem is the same whether it is one person, or one local community, or even one county.


The main purposes of this article are to show how it is possible to establish the urban hierarchy of a region in the later Middle Ages, and then to make a judgement as to the stability and maturity of the system in the face of the national demographic decline and economic contraction that the period experienced. The perfect region is almost impossible to identify, so the surrogate used here is the three adjoining counties of Leicestershire, Northamptonshire and Rutland, which share a number of similar features, particular in terms of topography and settlement patterns. Very sensibly, towns are defined by a concentration of residents pursuing a variety of non-agricultural occupations, and 23 were included in the survey. The main sources used to establish urban rankings are the well-known taxations of 1334, 1377 and 1524–1525, while a range of documentary and archaeological evidence is brought to bear to establish occupational sophistication, commercial and migratory patterns, topographical and social structure, administrative features and material culture. It is the common urban features that emerge most strongly from this study, as well as the remarkable compatibility of the written and unwritten evidence. With regard to change over time, despite the abundant evidence in the region of demographic contraction, this was a feature of town and countryside alike, and there was no change in the essential character of the urban hierarchy. Although towns such as Stamford and Brackley exhibit clear evidence of difficulty, no large town fell back into the ranks of the market towns, and most of the market
88
towns retained their urban functions. This shows that the urban system of c.1300 had achieved sufficient maturity to retain its structure even through an extended period of demographic decline and economic instability.


This is a fascinating account of some 24 court cases involving legitimacy and bastardy in Scotland. Disputes could arise either ‘when the children were born of a lawful marriage but it was alleged to be impossible, whether because of impotence of physical separation, for the husband to be the true father’ or ‘when the children were allegedly not the issue of a lawful marriage’ (p. 46). Much work for Scottish lawyers was created under the second possibility as Scottish law allowed certain ‘irregular’ forms of marriage to be lawful, such as cases where a couple were generally considered by their acquaintances to be husband and wife by ‘habit and repute’. Unlike English law, Scottish law allowed children to be legitimised later in life, if their parents subsequently married. In 1830 a ruling by the House of Lords created a situation where, if an unmarried Scottish couple bore children in Scotland, moved to England while still unmarried and bore more children while resident in England, and then returned to Scotland and married there, the children they had borne in Scotland would subsequently be regarded as legitimate, whereas their children born in England would remain bastards.


These two papers continue the debate in the pages of the *Economic History Review* about the effect of smallpox on height, reported in the ‘Review of recent periodical literature’ in *Local Population Studies* 67. Leunig and Voth respond to criticism of the quality of the data by repeating their earlier analysis using only data for literate boys, on the grounds that the recording of smallpox would be better for this subset than for the whole sample. The results show that the height-reducing effect of smallpox among this group is even greater than before. In his response, Razzell remains unconvinced that the Marine Society data can ever provide a definite answer to the question of whether smallpox reduced height.


In this long and complicated paper, Millward and Bell try to unpack and separate out the multifarious causes of the infant mortality decline in late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century Britain. Noting that the apparently sharp turning point in 1900 was probably an artefact of a rise in mortality from diarrhoeal diseases during the 1890s, they analyse mortality from diarrhoea and causes other than diarrhoea separately in 36 towns in England and Wales.
from 1870 to 1910. Their claim (which they support by various quite intricate pieces of analysis) is that the health of mothers was a crucial determinant of infants’ life chances, affecting ‘the condition of the foetus, the quality of its immune system [and] the quality and quantity of breastfeeding’ (p. 727). Improvements in mothers’ health were a powerful determinant of the downward trend in infant mortality after 1870. The lower fertility of British women during the last decades of the nineteenth century contributed to this improvement, as did rising real incomes. It is, perhaps, worth noting that an effect of falling fertility on infant mortality was recently suggested by Robert Woods in his book *The demography of Victorian England and Wales* (Cambridge, 2000), 295–305.


Morris describes a record linkage exercise in which he searched for middle-class persons in Leeds using the 1832 and 1834 Poll Books and contemporary trade directories. He discusses the methods used, the setting up of the database, and the different definitions of ‘middle-classness’ which different sources give rise to, stressing the fact that people in the past leave traces suffused with subjectivity which reveal how they wished themselves to be seen. The Appendix includes details of an occupational classification based on the principles used by the Office for Population Censuses and Surveys 1970 classification 1968 Standard Industrial Classification.


‘The history of the eighteenth-century Highlands has been written as though no woman, other than Flora Macdonald, ever lived there’ (p. 201), is Stena Nenadic’s challenging opener, and this is the product of a focus on clanship and its martial functions, together with an over-arching preoccupation with Jacobitism. To rectify this situation, this paper discusses the changing experiences of women connected as wives and daughters to the Campbells of Barcaldine in the Benderloch area of northern Argyllshire, an advanced Protestant clan. Evidence is problematic, particularly early in the period, for these women still belonged to an oral culture, and hence what we know about them is mainly gleaned from the correspondence of men or from occasional legal documents. Nevertheless, that which is available affirms the central role of women as producers of male heirs, and also their role as managers of the domestic and some aspects of the commercial life of their households. By the early-nineteenth century, however, the Highland gentlewoman was increasingly a city dweller, whose experience of life in the Highlands was often a transitory one, defined by summer holidays and occasional longer periods of residence. There was therefore an increasing detachment from traditional Highland life, and immersion in a middle class, literate culture, with vastly different expectations. So although women had remarkably little formal power in the political, commercial or military worlds, they did
influence decisions that were taken within the private world of the family, and hence contributed to the long-term undermining of clan relationships and Gaelic culture.


Nicholas Orme shows how archaeological, manuscript, literary, religious, financial and other records reveal the widespread use of toys (some unisex, some gendered), in medieval England. There is clear evidence of a ‘toy industry’ by at least 1300, while dolls were certainly manufactured and sold commercially by the Tudor period. Games too were commonplace, both sedentary and active. It is also clear that parents took an interest in their children, and both indulged them and tried to shape them; but there is evidence too of a special culture of childhood which, it is argued, has changed very little over the centuries. These discoveries drive another nail into the coffin of the thesis of Philippe Ariès, who argued that children in the pre-modern past both acted and were treated as little adults.


The Irish in nineteenth-century towns are often characterised as demoralised and impoverished immigrants, a significant social problem to their hosts and regular objects of hostility. This study of Ashton-under-Lyne in Lancashire which, despite its title, is by no means confined to the 1860s, presents a modified view. The Irish only arrived in Ashton in any numbers from the 1820s, but by 1841 they accounted for 10 per cent of the population, their number doubling again to 5,290 by 1861 by when they constituted 15.6 per cent of the population. Some did indeed occupy the poorest areas of the town, and contemporaries identified a ‘Little Ireland’, but many also lived in better parts of the town alongside English neighbours, and in 1861 they constituted only 6 per cent of the inhabitants of the Union Workhouse. Nor did they keep themselves apart, for the 1861 census also reveals that 19 per cent of households within the Irish community contained a married couple in which only one partner was Irish, and if unmarried and widowed household heads are excluded from the calculation the proportion rises to 25 per cent. Their occupations show that they were almost without exception to be found on the lower rungs of the occupational ladder, mostly in lower paid positions in the cotton mills. But they were far from universally consigned to casual labouring, and this concentration in the mills was shared with the English working class in the town. Crime statistics do reveal that the Irish were considerably over-represented, and that they were particularly prominent in offences involving rowdy behaviour, though again drunkenness was by no means confined to the Irish in the town. They were at their most visible as a religious body, the Catholic church standing at the centre of Irish community life, and while the church reinforced their separate religious identity, it also attempted to reduce the cultural gap by teaching the socially and politically conservative gospels of temperance, improvement and loyalty to the Queen. There is little evidence of ongoing tension between the Protestant and Catholic communities, although
this did suddenly emerge with some force following the growth of Fenianism in the late 1860s, coming to a head in May 1868 with three days of rioting, when hundreds of English rampaged through Little Ireland, sacked two Catholic chapels and left three dead and hundreds injured or homeless. It is clear, therefore, that, however restricted the level of visible anti-Irish sentiment in the 1860s, there was still much latent prejudice that could be provoked by the right stimuli. This is a welcome piece of revisionism, but in the light of the events of May 1868 one wonders if the author has been straining just a little too hard to make the case for integration.


This article examines the constraints upon the consolidation of landed wealth in the late medieval period imposed by contemporary attitudes to the economics of marriage. In the wake of the Black Death, demographic conditions were uniquely favourable to the transfer of property through female inheritance, while the late medieval period was also the last to show a powerful regard for the rights of daughters as heiresses, prior to the strengthening of male lines that the early modern era witnessed. However, Payling argues that, for the wealthiest families, securing an heiress for their eldest son of equivalent social standing was inordinately expensive, while it was also difficult to find a suitable female partner of sufficient rank. ‘New’ families, however, rich in cash rather than in land, had less to lose than established families because their heirs commanded smaller portions, while they also had a greater incentive to hazard the speculative element in heiress marriages. Local studies clearly show that the gentry families most determined in their search for heiresses were those newly risen to higher gentry ranks, while longer established families tended to be more cautious, at least in the case of their eldest sons. This disinclination for the greater families to pursue heiresses for their elder sons was thus one powerful factor operating to prevent the consolidation of ever-larger estates through accumulation. Like their eighteenth-century successors, therefore, late medieval landed families were not concerned to expand their acreage indefinitely.


More history of ideas than historical demography, this article offers a textual analysis of Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene* to demonstrate his rejection of the medieval sacrament of extreme unction and praise of the rite for the Visitation of the Sick as it was redefined by English Reformers, focusing upon healing through faith and amendment of life rather than through the external application of a mystical substance.


This is a very interesting paper in which Reid uses a rare data set to analyse the factors associated with the risk of stillbirth or the death of a baby in his or her
first month of life (neonatal mortality). The data set relates to most of the births registered in Derbyshire (except for the larger towns) during the years 1917–1922 and was compiled by health visitors. The analysis is quite complex, and uses statistical modelling. The results demonstrate that the factors associated with stillbirths and neonatal mortality were broadly similar. There was an increased risk for multiple births, boys compared with girls, births where a doctor was present at delivery, and ‘high parity’ births (that is, births which were the fourth or later children of the same mother). The mother’s reproductive history was also very important: if a mother had experienced previous stillbirths or infant deaths the risk of this happening to subsequent children was greatly increased. One would, of course, expect this to happen as stillbirths and neonatal mortality are heavily influenced by genetic factors and other birth complications, many of which will tend to affect all the children of a particular mother.


Unlike Crewe or Swindon, Derby was not exclusively a railway town in the late-nineteenth century, so it provides an opportunity to assess whether railway workers formed an ‘occupational community’. Revill shows how the railway workers in Derby formed a complex sub-population, in which all grades and social classes were represented. The railway workers also supported many social institutions (though the notoriously ‘stingy’ Midland Railway did not provide direct financial backing for many of these). In this sense, then, they had a communal life outside the workplace. However, the article fails to tackle the key question of what the relationships were between the railway workers and the rest of the town. Moreover, the notion of ‘occupational community’ used here seems different from that used by Howard Newby in his description of rural England in the late-nineteenth century (see, for example, Green and pleasant land: social change in rural England, (Harmondsworth, 1980), 156–164).


This piece measures the source and flow of alms to the Greyfriars in York as recorded in 141 wills written or proved during the 1530s in the city itself and its neighbouring towns and villages. The abiding popularity of the friars, already attested by Claire Cross, David Palliser and Barrie Dobson, is confirmed. In York itself both laity and clergy turned to the friars for prayers and the celebration of masses, they occasionally took part in funeral processions and there was no diminution in charitable bequests to them. But a more striking and novel discovery of this study is the remarkably high level of almsgiving in the surrounding towns and villages, even from as far away as Skipton (some 35 miles). In fact the city itself accounted for fewer than 40 per cent of the total number of benefactors. This confirms that the friars’ apostolate was not limited to the cities in which they lived, a conclusion also supported by some fragmentary evidence of regular visits by them to more outlying areas.

In a development of his paper reported last year, Rushton and his co-author restate the argument that the data contained in the Valor Ecclesiasticus of 1535 can be re-worked to establish the amount of poor relief provided by the religious houses and hospitals on the eve of their Dissolution. Accurate calculation requires rectification of the data to allow for the incompleteness of the returns, underestimation of gross income by some religious houses and socio-political bias in the membership of the commission assigned to undertake the valuations. The authors develop a statistical model to allow for these factors, and recalculate the figures using net rather than gross income. Allowance for the first two factors suggests that the figures originally calculated by Savine should be doubled, while inclusion of a further allowance for the bias of the commissioners suggests that on the eve of Dissolution charitable provision amounted to roughly 7 per cent of monastic income, compared with Savine’s estimate of circa 2.5 per cent. The conclusion is the same as reported previously: the Dissolution may have had a far greater impact on the lives of the poor than has often been assumed.


This article argues that economic performance and infant mortality in pre-transition England were more strongly connected than previous research has indicated. In The population history of England 1541–1871: a reconstruction, (London, 1981), E.A. Wrigley and R.S. Schofield argued that long-term mortality changes were not closely related to economic changes. But the publication of E.A. Wrigley, R.S. Davies, J.E. Oeppen and R.S. Schofield, English population history: from family reconstitution: 1580–1837, (Cambridge, 1997) allows the determination of age-specific mortality trends, at least in the early stages of life. By adapting the data for 26 parishes provided in the latter book, Schellekens finds evidence of a very strong association between trends in post-neonatal mortality and trends in real wages, particularly evident for the turning points that occurred in the 1610s and 1800s. Furthermore, trends in neonatal mortality correlate with other economic factors which, it is argued, can be regarded as proxies for living standards – female age at first marriage and changes in marriage seasonality – particularly for the turning point circa 1710. For early childhood mortality, however, there is a much weaker correlation with economic factors. Whether or not these are acceptable proxies must be open to debate, while trends in the real wages of building labourers continue to be employed as a surrogate for the living standards of the population as a whole. Even if such procedures are justified, the author concedes that the mechanisms which lie behind the correspondences discovered here remain obscure.

S. Schwarz, ‘“This is truly the golden harvest”: personal accounts of Cheshire migrants to Australia, c. 1852–1860’, Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 149 (2000), 119–44.
Australia’s increasing popularity as a destination for emigrants in the mid-nineteenth century was linked to the provision of government assisted passages and the discovery of gold in 1851–1852. Convicts aside, just over half of the 624,545 United Kingdom emigrants arriving in Australia between 1831 and 1860 had been government assisted. Not surprisingly, these have left their mark very firmly in the historical record, and historical accounts are based squarely upon them, but very little is known about those who emigrated unassisted by either government or charitable agencies. For Cheshire, however, there are a few exceptionally well-documented individuals, and these form the basis of this article. These case studies illustrate the diversity and complexity of the migrants, who were anything but an undifferentiated mass of poverty-stricken rural dwellers. The correspondence reveals that some skilled workers from Chester were among them, while the experiences of the Brown family suggests that international migration cannot be divorced from internal movement, for periods of permanent and temporary residence in Australia were logical extensions of the development of a ‘migrant mentality’. Some individuals, usually without their families, made a regular practice of temporary migration, a pattern that became characteristic of the late-nineteenth century. There is also support for Baines’ argument concerning chain migration, for letters, shipboard journals and return migrants all provided a stream of information to encourage others. Not all chose to go, of course, and many that did were responding as much to economic difficulties (particularly unemployment) at home as much as to opportunities abroad. The Cheshire evidence, therefore, confirms that a crucial factor in migration was the responsiveness of individuals to the flow of information from friends and family.


In the first of these papers, Leigh Shaw-Taylor uses the writings of those around at the time to argue that parliamentary enclosure could not have played much of a part in ‘proletarianising’ the agricultural labourers, for the simple reason that many of them were largely proletarian before. Few of them had common rights for grazing, and though rather more kept cows, the cow-keepers were still only a minority (and often quite a small minority). Only in exceptional circumstances with paternalistic landlords was the situation different. The evidence he uses comes mainly from south-east England and East Anglia, and the sources used include Arthur Young’s contributions to the Annals of Agriculture, the Board of Agriculture’s county reports covering the period 1794–1811, and a range of pamphlet material. Shaw-Taylor’s second paper makes the same argument using estimates of the value of non-wage sources of income (for example fuel rights), using evidence from Northamptonshire, Buckinghamshire and Cambridgeshire. By far the most important of these was the possibility of keeping a cow. It is important to
realise that the fact that enclosure did not turn a peasantry into a proletariat does not mean that enclosure had no ill-effects on the rural poor. Though they already exhibited many of the characteristics of a proletariat, enclosure may have made them worse off than they had been before.


This paper presents a summary of the genesis of E.A. Wrigley and R.S. Schofield’s The population history of England, 1541–1871: a reconstruction (London, 1981), with some interesting remarks on the challenges that the work posed to the computing techniques current at the time (such as the 80-column punched cards). Schofield also includes a useful summary of how vital event totals were adjusted, and of how the results of the back projection exercise revealed the operation of the preventive check. There is not much new here, but the paper is, nevertheless, useful as a distillation of many years’ research activity.


This short paper builds upon a previous study of the pre-1660 registers for Dentdale. While acknowledging the difficulties posed for this later period by nonconformity and the impact of infant mortality upon baptism figures, Stacey finds that the number of vital events recorded in the extant Quaker registers was relatively small as quite a few known Quakers used the parish church, and the figures are thus used unadjusted. No attempt has been made to establish the possible impact of migration. The raw totals of vital events suggest that for roughly 80 years after 1660 the population of Dentdale remained almost static, with just a small overall surplus of baptisms over burials. Mortality crises occurred every seven years or so, with large surpluses of burials in the 1690s and 1720s. Smallpox struck in 1722, 1750 and 1762–1763, but Dentdale escaped the plague epidemic of 1665 completely. Significant changes occurred after 1730, from when the number of marriages and baptisms increased substantially, while the proportion of recorded bastards grew from 3.5 per cent in 1710–1739, to 4.7 per cent in 1740–1769 and 7.8 per cent in 1770–1799. It is suggested that the apparent population growth indicated by these figures corresponded with a period of local prosperity based upon horse-breeding, butter-making, a flourishing cooperage industry and by-employment in the knitting of gloves and stockings. A return to population stagnation in the early-nineteenth century occurred when these activities were past their peak. Clearly, it would require a far more detailed and rigorous analysis than is possible in this short paper to establish such connections with confidence.


From the wages of women labourers in late medieval England discussed above by Hatcher and Bardsley, we ascend to the more rarified atmosphere of
the early life stages of elite women in early-medieval France and England. Stoertz argues that the early life stages of such women were not divided between childhood and adolescence, largely due to the fact that they married so early, often before puberty. But these years were shaped to a considerable degree by preparation for marriage, for marriage prospects influenced their early education and place of residence, and the wedding ceremony itself served as a symbolic rite of passage into ‘adulthood’. Nevertheless, the tender age of some brides continued to be taken into consideration after they had wed, and hence they were often introduced gradually to adult sexual and social responsibilities, and provided with special caregivers for their protection and guidance. Full social adulthood could thus arrive at different times. Ultimately, the early lives of these elite women demonstrate that the perception and experience of life stages is far from universal.


This article describes the long history of the practice of inferring the existence of an historical process from observations about cross-sectional geographical variation at a point in time, a phenomenon which Arland Thornton describes as ‘reading history sideways’. The early theorists of the demographic transition did it, as did many scholars of European historical demography who believed that extended families were common in pre-industrial Europe: ‘[i]nstead of reading the history of actual societies from the past to the present, they believed they could read the history of the European past in the non-European present’ (p. 451). The article will be of interest to readers of *Local Population Studies* because of its insistence that ideas matter.


Although the term pornography was not coined until the nineteenth century, and pornographic literature is often assumed only to have appeared in any quantity in the eighteenth century, this paper identifies a large body of printed material produced in England throughout the seventeenth century which has variously been described as ‘bawdy’, ‘lewd’, ‘ribald’, ‘erotic’, ‘libertine’ or ‘pornographic’. While only a very small number of continental publications explicitly depicted sexual body parts, the genre as found in England comprised works which contained matters of a sexual nature, and which could be used to learn about sex and/or stimulate a sexual response in the reader. A common feature of this literature depicted a young girl’s initiation into sexual knowledge and the arousal of her desire for full heterosexual intercourse through watching another couple in such enjoyment. This voyeurism is central to the effectiveness of such material, playing as it does upon the distinction between the public and private spheres, with the illusion of privacy being constantly breached, in a period when it is commonly suggested that public living was increasingly giving way to a more private style of life.

This article reassesses the gang labour system. Verdon argues that gangs were largely confined to western Norfolk and that they mainly employed children and teenagers. The figures she quotes, though (p. 50), suggest that more than one out of every six gang-members was a married woman, which, given the likely age and sex composition of the eligible workforce, is a large proportion. Gangs provided a convenient labour supply for both farmers and labourers. Moreover, they did not displace adult male workers, but carried out additional tasks required by ‘high farming’. The gang system declined during the second half of the nineteenth century, but lingered in parts of west Norfolk (for example the Swaffham area) into the 1890s.


Wareing shows that violence and deception played a key role in the early North American settlement. Seventeenth- and eighteenth-century narratives contain frequent reference to both legal and illegal recruitment of indentured servants, and the context of this is explored in this paper, paying particular attention to the ways in which individuals were ‘spirited’. Four groups are identified: those who went of their own free will, often to escape obligations relating to family, debt or criminality; those who were willingly persuaded, and were thus responding to real opportunities; those who were ‘over-persuaded’, and were thus deceived; and those whose departure was wholly involuntary, being sent against their will by their families or even kidnapped. It is impossible to estimate the proportions who fell into each group, and it is admitted that the direct evidence provided by indenture forms includes only a small sample of the total and excludes an unknown number of unindentured servants. But the evidence suggests that only a tiny minority were able to negotiate their terms, as so few possessed higher skills, and it is probable that a ‘good majority’ of London servants were taken or sent by a recruiter, that a ‘substantial proportion’ of these were inveigled, and ‘some’, principally children, were forcibly kidnapped.

R. Webber, ‘St Erth parish apprentices, 1803 to 1838’, *Old Cornwall*, 12, 23–5.

This short paper describes the process of pauper apprenticeship and its use in early-nineteenth century St Erth. A total of 34 apprentices were placed between 1803 and 1838, the great majority by married couples, with only four from single parent households and one an orphaned child. Their ages ranged from 7 to 15; unfortunately an attempt to convey their sex ratio is foiled by a typographical error. The recorded recipients were all men, 30 of them farmers, one a vicar, one an innkeeper, one an esquire and the other a ‘spinster’ (sic). Ten of the overseers or churchwardens themselves became recipients.

In this paper, Mrs Williams uses the criteria used by Clark and Slack (*English towns in transition, 1500–1700*, (Oxford, 1976)) to show that Marlborough was definitely functioning as a town in the late-seventeenth century. She describes its role as a market centre at the junction of transport routes, and explains how over-reliance on the trade generated by its use as an overnight stop on the London-Bath route led to its decline in the early-eighteenth century when turnpiking allowed the journey to be completed in one day.


The census enumerators’ books (CEBs) for the 1901 census were made available from the beginning of 2002. In this paper, Woollard summarises the political and administrative background to the census, its conduct, and the content of the CEBs. Changes since 1891 included changes to the question (new in 1891) about whether each occupied person was an employer, and employee, or neither; a new question on homeworking, and the addition of a distinction between ‘lunatics’ and ‘imbeciles or feeble-minded persons’. The paper then describes changes to the occupational classification between 1891 and 1901. Woollard concludes with some suggestions for local research using the 1901 census, focusing on topics which have not hitherto received much attention.
CORRESPONDENCE

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

Editor’s note

Readers are reminded that the Editorial Board is always prepared to offer
advice on subjects within the scope of *Local Population Studies*, so if you think
we might be able to help please do not hesitate to contact us.

The Hearth Tax

Dear Sir,

I was very interested to read Sarah Pearson’s letter in *Local Population Studies* 68. I have recently been looking at the 1662 Hearth Tax list for Marlborough, Wiltshire (the only one which survives) and I was struck by the fact that the Bailey and High Wards had a far higher average number of hearths per household than the other three wards of the borough. I had assumed that this was because the richest people of the town tended to live in these wards, which also contained several large coaching inns. Unfortunately, part of the membrane for High Ward is damaged but, by using the ward total, it can be seen that seven houses in the part of the ward where the most prominent citizens lived had 56 hearths between them. One of these houses, known as the Merchant’s House, is currently undergoing extensive restoration. It is one of the least altered of the houses built after the fire of 1653, and was probably taxed on ten hearths. However, Sarah’s letter has suggested another possible reason for the greater number of hearths in the houses of these wards.

The Marlborough fire of 1653 was a severe one, and a total of 212 houses were destroyed. Most of these were situated in Bailey and High Wards and are known to have been rebuilt during the following two or three years. If, as seems likely, Wiltshire followed the Kentish example of increasing numbers of hearths in houses built in the second half of the seventeenth century, the rebuilt houses would have averaged more hearths than the older ones in the other wards, whether or not the richest people lived in them.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs I.L. Williams
7 Chandler Close
Jump Farm
Devizes
Wiltshire SN10 3DS
Tel. 01380 728055
Naming of children

Dear Sir,

Working on the sixteenth century records (manorial court rolls, wills, title deeds, etc.) of the small village of Tilsworth in Bedfordshire, I was struck by the number of boys and men in the second half of the century called ‘Gabriel’. This name is not common at other periods or, apparently, in other localities. The resident Lord of the Manor from 1540 to 1582 was Gabriel Fowler. Was it customary to christen children in honour of their social superiors, and is it likely that the Lord of the Manor would have stood godfather to the boys? Have other researchers noticed a similar phenomenon?

In contrast to this, a friend has commented on the absence of girls named ‘Victoria’ in local records for the second half of the nineteenth century, when they might have been expected, in honour of the Queen. Are ‘Victorias’ lacking throughout the country, and does this require explanation?

Yours faithfully,

Joan Schneider
171 High Street North
Dunstable
Bedfordshire
LU6 1JW
The

Local Population Studies

Essay Prize

A prize of £100 will be offered on a biennial basis for the best full-length essay accepted for publication in Local Population Studies written by an author who has not previously published a full-length article in an academic historical journal.

All articles submitted should conform to the standard requirements of LPS, and should thus focus upon British local or regional population history, broadly defined to encompass related areas of social and economic history, should provide contextualisation within the wider historical context, and should not exceed 7,000 words in length (including endnotes).

The award will be made retrospectively at the end of each two-year period, and the next award will be available for articles published in 2001/2002 (LPS 66-69).

Adjudication of the award will be by the LPS Editorial Board, and will be decided at its January meeting, for the first time in 2003.

The Board reserves the right to withhold the award should no suitable candidate be forthcoming.

All authors wishing to be considered for the Prize should indicate this fact when making their submission, should provide a curriculum vitae, and should certify that they have not previously published a full-length article in an academic historical journal.