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EDITORIAL

This issue of *Local Population Studies* includes a rich array of contributions, in the form of our usual three major articles, two research notes inspired by previous contributions and issues raised in the journal, as well as our regular Spring items: News from the universities, which this year features the Open University, and book reviews.

The first of our three articles, by Richard Dyson, examines the experience of poverty in Broughton, a rural parish in north Lincolnshire, large in extent at approaching 8,000 acres in 1831 though with a population just over 900 at the same date, in the last 75 years of the Old Poor Law. Defining the poor in a fairly restricted but at least clearly identifiable manner as those in receipt of relief, Dyson uses evidence from relief payments 1761–1820, detailed accounts of the overseers of the poor extant from 1761 to 1780, the parish vestry minutes for 1830–35, together with supporting evidence from parish registers and settlement examinations, to ask two key questions: who were the poor, and how generous was the system of formal relief in providing for their needs? The answers, which are based largely on the two short periods in the 1760s and early 1830s for which detailed evidence survive, reveal that only a minority of the population of the parish received assistance from the poor law at any one time, the relief lists being dominated by the old, the widowed and young children, and nor was poverty necessarily a continuous state. Relief rolls did rise by the early nineteenth century, in particular extending increasingly to married men with families, but even by 1803 only 15 per cent of the population were given support by the parish. Those deemed to be in need were generally given just enough to survive on, pensions and casual relief for the majority of paupers approaching the proportionate earnings of a typical labourer, while other sources such as charity and foraging on commons and in woods were also relied upon, though to an extent that is impossible accurately to gauge. The poor law in Broughton, as elsewhere, operated more as a safety net rather than as an all-encompassing welfare system. The same level of dependency in terms of number relieved was not found here as has been discovered in some more southerly counties such as Oxfordshire, but insofar as the south-east/north-west dichotomy proposed by Steve King has general validity, this Lincolnshire parish appears to have had more in common with the south-east than it did with the north-west.

Our second article, by Henry Woledge and Michael Smale, examines patterns of migration in east Yorkshire in the eighteenth century, using the evidence from appeals against removal orders heard at the East Riding Quarter Sessions 1708–99. A total of 457 different cases were abstracted, providing 1,235 records of persons removed, of which 1,017 were usable for the purpose of studying migration. Some of their conclusions provide local confirmation of trends identified elsewhere, such as the predominantly local nature of migration, with a 12km. radius generally defining the main catchment area,
and towns showing a predominance of inward movement and generally greater mobility, while both towns and vagrants were associated with migration over longer distances. The analysis offered here also confirms another feature of the county previously identified from more anecdotal evidence, and that is the attraction of newly enclosed areas in the Wolds to migrants, drawn in by the increased employment opportunities available, though there is otherwise little correlation evident between farming types and extent of movement. In other respects, however, there is a strictly local pattern that contrasts with some previous studies: in particular, distances moved on average in rural parishes here were significantly lower than those found in rural Essex.

The third article is by Michael Saxby, one of the regular correspondents to *LPS*, who offers a new approach to the measurement of age at baptism through a case study of the parish of All Saints, Sudbury, in the early nineteenth century. Saxby considers the previous methodologies adopted by Schofield and Berry and by Jackson and Laxton, and argues that the first, which calculates the interval after birth in days by which one quarter, one half and three-quarters of the sample children had been baptised, suffers from the fact that it hides the incidence of parents having their baby baptised on the day of birth; while the second, which graphically displays the cumulative proportion of baptisms in a given interval of days, presents problems of presentation for parishes where the gap between birth and baptism could be very extended. The alternative approach suggested here is to calculate birth-baptism intervals from the date of birth rather than from the date of baptism, on the grounds that the initial decision on when baptism occurs is made by parents at the time of birth, and the subsequent date of baptism is merely the result of this earlier decision. This allows for the impact of environmental conditions in producing this choice which, while not the only reason for choosing when to baptise, must have played an important role.

The first of our two research notes, by Kevin Schürer and L. Dillon, is a response to a letter in the previous issue of *LPS* written by Joan Schneider, commenting on the absence of girls named Victoria in the village of Tilsworth, Bedfordshire, in the second half of the nineteenth century. Using the computerised 1881 census for England and Wales held at the UK Data Archive, University of Essex, and a similar computer database for Canada from the same year, they show that girls named Victoria are indeed lacking throughout England and Wales, especially in the north of England, Wales and Scotland, while the name was used much more frequently in the Canadian colony. This subject appears to have struck a chord, and is also taken up in our correspondence section. The second research note comes from Malcolm Smith, and is written in response to Andrew Blaikie’s article in *LPS 69* on the demographic characteristics of fishing communities on the Moray Firth, exploring the question as to whether there is evidence about the demographic structure of fishing communities elsewhere, and whether other occupational groups might be demographically isolated in the same way as fishing communities appear to be, taking case studies from the North Yorkshire coast, the Ards Peninsula, County Down, and the Durham coalfield. Smith finds both similarities and contrasts, while demonstrating that great care needs to be taken in measuring marital endogamy among different occupational groups.
Finally, we are grateful to Michael Drake for providing us with news about the latest developments at the Open University of interest to readers of *LPS*, as well as to Eilidh Garrett who remains responsible for this item, and to Chris Galley for compiling a valuable, wide-ranging collection of book reviews to reinforce the upgrading of this section of the journal announced in *LPS* 66.

The Old Bailey proceedings 1674–1834

A valuable recent addition to on-line historical resources is the proceedings of the Old Bailey between 1674 and 1834, which can be found at www.oldbaileyonline.org. The database is billed as a ‘fully searchable online edition of the largest body of texts detailing the lives of non-elite people ever published, containing accounts of over 100,000 criminal trials held at London’s central criminal court’. This is not strictly true at the time of writing, for the data transcription and inputting is an ongoing process, with (only!) 22,000 trials covering the period from December 1714 to December 1759 being published in the first tranche. Trials from 1760 to 1799 are due to be available in late Spring of this year; those from 1674 to October 1714 in Autumn 2003; and those from 1800 to 1834 in the Spring of 2004, at which point an international conference will be held to mark the completion of the project.

This is a very user-friendly database. Searches can be conducted by keyword, by name, by street, parish or public house and by date. It is also possible to compile statistical tabulations across specific fields, such as type of crime by punishment. Further assistance takes the form of a comprehensive guide to the Old Bailey proceedings, which provides historical background on the Old Bailey itself, examining the courthouse, the history of its proceedings and advertisements contained therein; crime, policing, trial procedures and punishments; London life from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries; and the Black, Gay, Irish, Jewish and traveller communities of London. Massively funded by the New Opportunities Fund and the Arts and Humanities Research Board, this web resource is clearly an extremely valuable and welcome undertaking upon which the project directors, Robert Shoemaker of the University of Sheffield and Tim Hitchcock of the University of Hertfordshire, are to be warmly congratulated. Rather in the manner of Thomas Sokoll’s edition of the *Essex pauper letters 1731–1837*, reviewed below, if in a very different and more readily searchable medium, it provides fascinating insight into the lives of non-elite people between the late seventeenth and early nineteenth centuries, through the glass of the experiences of those who found themselves in trouble with the law.

*LPS* and the LPSS: towards merger

The extended and sometimes tortuous discussions about possible merger between *LPS* and the LPSS have recently gathered pace. At a meeting held on 29 January 2003, representing the *LPS* Board and LPSS Committee, it was agreed that there was a willingness to move to greater coordination between the two bodies and subsequently to full merger. A new management structure for the two organisations has been agreed, which provides in the first instance
for greater coordination. This involves the establishment of a Joint Management Committee (JMC), to consist in the first instance of all LPSS Committee members and all LPS Board members, which will meet annually. Its remit is to provide guidance to the LPS Editorial Board on the contents of each published issue of the journal and to advise the Board and Committee on all matters concerning the journal and the newsletter; to provide guidance to the LPS Editorial Board on proposals for new book projects; to organise annual conferences; to offer guidance on the Book Club; to oversee arrangements by which LPS provides services to the LPSS; to oversee financial transactions between the two bodies; and to consider matters of publicity and long-term planning. The Chairman, Secretary and Treasurer of the LPSS will act as Chairman, Secretary and Treasurer of the JMC. The level of subscription paid by members of LPS and the LPSS is to be brought into line, with all now receiving two issues of the journal and two issues of the newsletter per annum, and all having access to the discounts offered by the Book Club. At this stage the two organisations are to maintain their separate identities, with their respective constitutions unaltered, and will continue to operate as separate charities. The Committee of the LPSS will continue to be elected at the Annual General Meeting, and the LPS Board will continue to appoint its own Chairman, Editor, Treasurer and members. These proposals, after extensive discussions within the LPS Board and with formal and informal meetings with the LPSS, were agreed at the first JMC meeting held in Sheffield on 29 January 2003, and ratified at the LPSS Annual General Meeting held in St Albans on 12 April 2003. The Treasurer of LPS, Martin Ecclestone, has agreed also to take on the role of Treasurer of the LPSS, this position being vacated by Roger Bellingham to whom our sincere thanks are due for all his hard work over many years, thus providing a single Treasurer for the two societies. The next step in the process will be to make informal enquiries to the Charities Commission with regard to the possibility of merger into a single charity with combined assets, and I will be reporting on further developments in the next issue.

LPS projects

Two book projects are currently agreed and in preparation. The first, which has been advertised in previous LPS editorials, is a collection of essays under the provisional title of Women's work in industrial England: regional and local perspectives, which will build upon the papers contributed to the LPSS Ambleside conference, reproduce a small number of seminal articles which have appeared previously in LPS, and include a larger number of newly commissioned chapters. The second and more recently agreed project, to be edited by Graham Mooney and Eilidh Garrett, is a study of the sources generated by the provision of health services and the potential information they provide to the student of local populations. The sources to be studied include national government publications such as the reports of the Registrar-General and the Local Government Board; local authority documents such as Medical Officer of Health reports; the archives of hospitals and workhouses; and the records of friendly societies and insurance companies. The period to
be covered is yet to be finalised, but will probably span *circa* 1830–1948. A third project, a study of the General Register Office 1837–1952, is currently under consideration but is yet to be finally agreed.

**LPS/LPSS 3rd annual conference: Children and childhood in industrial England**

The third annual conference of *LPS* and the LPSS was held at our established venue in the Law Faculty of the University of Hertfordshire in St Albans on 12th April, and was again a resounding success. The delegates, some 55 in number, were treated to a series of stimulating papers which kept the audience captivated throughout a very busy schedule, and produced a host of fascinating and engaging questions from the floor. I would like to take this opportunity once again to thank the speakers for their contributions: Peter Kirby, Mary Clare Martin, Anna Davin, Andy Gritt, David Gatley and Eilidh Garrett. Thanks are also due to our hosts in the Law Faculty, particularly to Sandra Gray who advised on the internal arrangements this year, to Barbara Bennett who again provided an excellent buffet lunch, and to the Learning Resources Centre and security staff without whom the event would have been impossible to stage. My personal thanks are due to Vanessa Chambers who handled the administrative arrangements with her usual exemplary efficiency. A full report on the conference, prepared by Chris Galley, will appear in the next issue of *LPS*.

**Editorial matters**

The *LPS* Editorial Board has recently been further reinforced by the addition of Lien Luu, lecturer in history at the University of Hertfordshire, whose main research interest is immigrants and their impact in early modern England. On behalf of the Editorial Board I would like to thank Ken Smith for typesetting this issue of the journal. All enquiries should be directed to the usual address, given at the foot of p.2. Please note, however, that the Department of Humanities of the University of Hertfordshire is relocating from Aldenham to Hatfield during the summer, and in due course a new postal address will be advertised. In the meantime, the email address will remain the same, and post will obviously be forwarded in the normal manner. If telephone enquiries prove problematic, the *LPS* editor can be reached on 01727 833470.

Nigel Goose

April 2003
THE EXPERIENCE OF POVERTY IN A RURAL COMMUNITY:
BROUGHTON, NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE, 1760–1835

Richard Dyson

Richard Dyson is employed in the motor industry in Oxford. He is currently studying part-time for a PhD at Oxford Brookes University, researching urban poverty in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Introduction

The Elizabethan Poor Law Acts of 1597 to 1601 codified a national system of relief for the poor that lasted over two centuries until the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834. Each parish in England and Wales was obliged to provide relief for those in poverty who were regarded as deserving of support, chiefly the old, sick and children, provide work for those who were unemployed, and punish those who were unwilling to work. A local rate was to be levied to finance relief and parish officers were appointed to administer the system. Further legislation in 1662 (drawing on previous legislative concern in this area) restricted relief to those who possessed a settlement from the parish concerned; with a few exceptions, settlement was usually gained by parentage (or birth in the case of illegitimate children), marriage for women, apprenticeship, or one year’s farm or domestic service. The old poor law, as it came to be known, had a profound effect on English society, influencing the poor and ratepayers alike, and over the last 20 years historians have written extensively about its effects and about the nature and extent of poverty in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Lincolnshire, however, has been largely neglected by historians, and very little work on the poor law in the county has been produced. This article will attempt to add to our understanding of this topic. It will concentrate on the last 75 years of the old poor law, 1760–1835, a period that saw much social and economic change with, for instance, the impact of the agricultural revolution and the French wars. A case study will be made of one parish in a relatively neglected part of the county, Broughton in north-west Lincolnshire. Broughton possesses detailed overseers’ accounts for the period 1761–1780 and vestry minutes for the 1830s, and these, together with a complete set of parish registers and supporting evidence such as settlement examinations, will allow the identification of trends in poverty over time. Two main themes will be examined. First, who were the poor in this period: were relief lists dominated by the elderly and women or were other groups, such as married men with families, also represented? Second, how generous was the relief system of the time: was it the main basis of
support for the poor or did they have to seek other means to maintain themselves such as self-help and charity?

Broughton is a large parish, having an area of 7,880 acres in 1831, and lies on the western side of the river Ancholme, just north of the town of Brigg, on a mixture of clay and sandy soils. The land was not particularly fertile at this time; despite periodic attempts to drain the Ancholme valley, there was still much flooding there while the upland sandy soils contained mainly woods and rabbit warrens. Most of the inhabitants, nevertheless, worked on the land: in 1811, 125 out of 169 families in the village were employed in agriculture. Much of the arable land in Broughton had been enclosed in the seventeenth century but significant areas of open carr (meadow) and dry commons on sandy soil still existed in 1841 and final enclosure did not take place until 1849. There were few owner-occupiers, most of the farms were leasehold; in 1786, the date of the first surviving land tax assessment, 49 per cent of land by taxable value was owned by Charles Pelham, the future Lord Yarborough, and 25 per cent was owned by Thomas Shirley. In 1830 the second Lord Yarborough and the successor to Thomas Shirley, Ellys Anderson Stephens, owned similar taxable proportions. In common with much of rural England, the population of Broughton rose over the period: from an estimated 425 inhabitants in 1721, numbers increased to 729 in 1801 and 915 by 1831. With its mixture of good and bad soil types, a mainly agricultural workforce working on leasehold farms and a rising population, Broughton was similar to other villages in north-west Lincolnshire in this period. No single parish is ever completely representative, but Broughton can be considered as reasonably typical of other settlements in the area.

Defining exactly who was poor in Broughton at this time is a difficult process, for poverty is a relative concept and definitions can vary. It could be argued
that everybody from an agricultural labourer downwards was ‘poor’ to some extent.12 For the purposes of this paper, however, a narrower definition of poverty is adopted; the poor will be defined as those who were in receipt of some form of relief from the parish, either pensions or casual relief. This definition is by necessity restrictive, excluding those, for example, who received charitable aid or did not have to pay poor rates. People may also have applied for poor relief and have been turned down, thus not featuring in the records. Some categorisation is, nevertheless, necessary so that we can interpret and compare data.

**Expenditure and numbers on relief**

The amount spent on poor relief in Broughton rose throughout the period, in common with the rest of the country.13 Figure 1 shows the average annual expenditure, including administration, for each decade, from 1761 to 1820 (records unfortunately cease after this date).

From an average of £41 per year in the 1760s poor relief expenditure gradually increased to an average of £67 per year by the 1770s. The figures show that there was an apparent fall in expenditure in the 1780s, but data for only three years is available for this decade and it is more likely that there was a continuation of the upward trend. Expenditure certainly rose again from the 1790s onwards, increasing every decade and reaching an average of £415 per year by the period 1811–1820. The peak year for relief was 1817, when £561 was spent. Evidence about how many people received relief is less plentiful, the only figures available are from the 1761–1780 overseers’ accounts and parliamentary surveys from 1803 and 1818.14 The 1830 vestry minutes unfortunately do not show how many people were in receipt of relief at any one time. The existing data nevertheless shows a significant rise in numbers, as Table 1 illustrates.

This increase both in poor law expenditure and the numbers of people receiving relief, even allowing for population increase, suggests that the level of poverty in Broughton grew over the period, a trend that was common

**Table 1**  Average numbers of paupers on relief, Broughton, selected years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1761–80</th>
<th>1803</th>
<th>1813–15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workhouse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual relief</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioners</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** LAO, Broughton by Brigg Par. 10/3, Parish account book 1761–1781; Parliamentary Papers, 1803–4, VIII, 284–85; Parliamentary Papers, XIX, 254–55.
throughout the country. Nevertheless, the amount of people being relieved still remained small in comparison with the village population. Estimating the total numbers of people dependent on relief is difficult; poor law accounts normally record payments to one member of a particular family only and so dependants, such as children, are not always included. It is possible, however, to make a rough estimate of the total numbers reliant on relief by using a multiplier to allow for other family members and here a nominal figure of 1.8 has been used, representing a typical pauper household size of the time. Estimating Broughton’s population at 600 in the 1770s, only about 4 per cent of its inhabitants were dependent on relief at this time. In 1803 the proportion had increased to some 15 per cent of the population, and in the period 1813–1815 it averaged 12 per cent, but the poor still formed only a minority. Many parishes in the vicinity actually had a smaller proportion of their population receiving poor relief. Out of a sample of ten nearby parishes, again allowing for dependants, the average proportion of those receiving relief in 1803 was 8 per cent, and in 1813–1815, 11 per cent. In some southern counties in 1803 it has been estimated that up to 40 per cent of people were dependent on poor relief. Poverty, to reiterate, is a relative concept, and we are only dealing here with those who received parish support; but nevertheless its scale in Broughton and the immediate area, as measured in these terms, must not be over-emphasised.

Recipients of relief

Who were these recipients of relief? Using the Broughton parish registers, a partial family reconstitution of the people who received regular relief was undertaken (those receiving casual relief cannot be included as the 1830 vestry minutes record only a few occasional payments which are almost certainly an underestimate). Individual paupers were linked with their baptism, marriage and burial records, if known, to establish their ages and familial background. Even if people were not born in the parish it was often possible to estimate their ages if they had been married there by using a standard average age at marriage. By this means it was possible to identify around 85 per cent of the paupers named in the records and establish their approximate ages. The numbers involved are nevertheless still small: 35 people for the 1761–1780 accounts and 45 for the 1830–1835 vestry minutes. One must, therefore, be cautious in interpreting these figures and any conclusions can only be tentative. Table 2 gives details of pensioners for the period 1761–1780 by sex and age.

The Broughton relief lists, in common with most English parishes of the period, were dominated by certain groups of people: the elderly (both male and female), younger women and children. Together these groups accounted for 28 people or 80 per cent of the sample of 35 (the ages of five individuals could not be traced). Five of the younger women were widows between the ages of 20 and 39. Typical was Mary Leaning, who with three young children became a pensioner in 1771 when her husband, a labourer, died. There were also six single women, four of whom had illegitimate children. Elizabeth Dial for instance received a pension of 1s. per week for five years after the birth of
Table 2  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Widows</th>
<th>Spinsters</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60-plus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: LAO, Broughton by Brigg Par. 10/3, Parish account book 1761–1781; Broughton parish registers.

her illegitimate child in 1769. Five children also received pensions separately or had their board and lodging paid for. Hannah Hollingworth, who was orphaned at the age of four in 1763, was given board and lodging, together with regular payments for clothing, for the next seven years. The largest group, however, was the elderly, defined as those over 60, with 12 individuals receiving regular relief. Thomas Sleight for instance, a married labourer, first appeared in the overseers’ accounts in 1772, when he was in his early 60s, receiving £1 2d. for clothing. In 1776 he was given a pension of 3s. a week which was later reduced to 2s. a week after the death of his wife in 1777. Sleight continued to receive this pension, with occasional payments for clothing and ‘washing’, until his death in 1780. It is noteworthy that only two of the recipients of regular relief were married men under the age of 60. One of these, John Hare, received a pension in the two years prior to his death in 1780 at the age of 47 and may have suffered from ill-health. The other, Amos Hare, was the only married man with a family to receive relief, having a total of 12 children (six dying before the age of five) from 1754 to 1777. Amos Hare, however, only received a pension for short periods, in 1767 and 1771, the rest of the time he was left to fend for himself apart from occasional small cash payments.

Turning to those who received regular relief from 1830 to 1835, a slightly different picture emerges. Table 3 gives details of the pensioners for this period. The elderly, younger women and children had fallen as a proportion of the total, comprising 29 people or 64 per cent of the sample of 45 (the ages of seven individuals could not be traced). There were 14 individuals over 60 years, 14 women below this age (of whom five were widows and five were unmarried mothers) and one child. The number of men below the age of 60 had though increased when compared to the 1761–1780 figures, with 9 individuals or 20 per cent of the total, seven of these nine being married with children. William Foster for instance, a labourer aged 31 with a wife and three young children, was granted a pension of 5s. per week in December 1832.
Table 3 Age groups of Broughton pensioners 1830–1835.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Widows</th>
<th>Spinsters</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60-plus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: LAO, Broughton by Brigg Par. 10/5, Select vestry minutes 1830–1835; Broughton parish registers.

Another labourer with a wife and three children, William Thompson, received a pension of 10s. per week in 1831 and in January 1832, ‘...applied for further relief and work was found for his family’.

This increase in the early nineteenth century in the number of men under 60 receiving regular relief, especially those with families, has also been seen in other studies of the period. Growing rural unemployment may have been one factor. The late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries witnessed significant social and economic change in rural Lincolnshire. Broughton experienced no parliamentary enclosure during this period, with its often adverse consequences, but its population did increase and this, coupled with a lack of alternative work opportunities, may have led to labour surpluses and unemployment. At the same time real wages remained static or increased only slightly, and what work there was became increasingly seasonal. All but one of the seven married men were granted relief by the vestry in the winter and spring months, the period when demand for agricultural labour was typically at its lowest.

The effects of this increase in the number of married men receiving relief must not be exaggerated, however: the vast majority of poverty was still caused by what has been termed life-cycle events. As we have seen, at least 80 per cent of those receiving regular relief in the 1761–1780 period and 64 per cent of those in the 1830–1835 period were the elderly, young children, widows or single parents, all distinct life-cycle situations. Orphaned children had to be cared for; old age reduced the earning capacities of both men and women as their physical capabilities diminished; widowhood meant the loss of the husband’s earnings and forced many women into poverty, especially if they had young children and little alternative means of support. Those at the bottom of the social scale were usually the most vulnerable although higher status individuals could also be affected. Using the Broughton parish registers, it was possible to trace the occupational
background of 13 pensioners (or their husbands in the case of widows) from the 1761–1780 accounts. Twelve of these had a labouring background but one pensioner, Elizabeth Caister, was the widow of Henry Caister, who was always referred to as ‘Mr’ in the parish registers and was probably of a higher social status. A wider social range was found in the 1830–1835 vestry minutes. Out of 21 pensioners or their spouses whose occupations could be traced, there were 10 labourers and 4 servants or housekeepers, all low status occupations, but there was also a mariner, a tailor, a baker, a pipemaker, a publican, and even a farmer and a schoolmaster. Ann Shaw, who was granted a pension of 2s. per week at the age of 55 in 1834, was the widow of a publican who had died in 1818. In an 1828 rate valuation she was recorded as renting 35 acres of land worth £15 10s. per annum, a significant sum. Another pensioner, Joseph Wilson, aged 68 in 1831, was a former schoolmaster who in 1828 had rented 19 acres of land worth £6 15s. per year. The relative wealth of both of these individuals in 1828 was clearly insufficient to prevent them requiring support from the parish a few years later.

The duration of poverty varied. Some individuals received relief payments for many years, but for others it was more of a short-term affair, with people moving in and out of poverty as their life-cycle circumstances altered. The 1761–1780 overseers’ accounts allow us to calculate the relief histories of some 19 individuals (people whose relief histories occurred at the beginning or the end of the period had to be omitted). It was found that the average duration of a pension was 5.3 years. Some individuals did of course receive pensions for much longer. Elizabeth Baldwin, a single woman, was on the pension list continuously from 1761 to 1780, the end of the accounts, and was described in the parish registers as a pauper when she died at the age of 74 in 1792. Others, however, were given a pension for much shorter periods. Magdaline Markham, widowed in 1754, only received a pension in the two years prior to her death in 1766 at the age of 67. Mary Dial, unmarried with an illegitimate child, only received a pension for two years, from 1776, the date of her child’s birth, to 1778. Such short periods of relief may, of course, reflect a severe attitude on the part of the Broughton overseers, but they also suggest that poverty, for some, may have been only a temporary experience, forming just one part of their life-cycle. The 1830–1835 vestry minutes unfortunately do not record the duration of relief, and so a direct comparison cannot be made with the earlier period, but there are a few examples of poverty being similarly short term in nature. Mary Sharp, a widow with four young children, was granted a pension of 5s. per week in 1835. By 1841, however, she had established herself as a confectioner, and lived in her own house with three of her children and a 15 year-old dressmaker. She had managed to improve her circumstances despite remaining a widow.

The case of the Dawber family provides a detailed example illustrating these trends. Robert Dawber, a labourer, married Rebecca Balderson at Broughton in 1764, the couple producing five children over the next six years, though only three, two boys and a girl, survived past the age of two. The family first
appeared in the overseers’ accounts in 1772, when Robert Dawber was paid £2 6s. 4d. ‘for relief’, but this seems to have been a temporary period of hardship for there is no further record of them until 1777, when Robert Dawber died, probably still in his late 30s. The parish paid for his burial and granted a pension of 4s. per week to his widow and her three children. In 1778 this pension was reduced to 2s. per week and in 1779, after the parish had paid for the apprenticeship of the girl, Elizabeth, and one of the boys, James, it was paid for only 18 weeks. In 1780 Rebecca Dawber only received 1s. a week for 10 weeks. The overseers’ accounts cease at this date but a surviving indenture records that the other son, John, was apprenticed to a miller at Caistor in 1781.26 Rebecca Dawber never remarried, and was buried at Broughton in 1789. The Dawbers almost certainly had a low income; Robert was after all a labourer, but the poverty that Rebecca Dawber and her children experienced in 1777 was caused by a life-cycle event, the death of her husband. This particular phase of hardship only lasted three years, however. As her children were apprenticed out Rebecca Dawber came to need less and less relief herself until by 1780 she received only 10s. for the whole year. We do not know if Rebecca Dawber required further help from the Broughton overseers after this date, as the records cease, but for a time at least she was largely able to support herself. One of her children, John Dawber, later encountered hardship again; in 1784, at the age of 19, he appeared in a Broughton settlement examination, indicating that he had applied for relief there or was likely to become chargeable to the parish. The overseers, however, removed him to Binbrook St Mary’s in eastern Lindsey, the last parish where he had been an apprentice.27 The case of the Dawber family thus shows that poverty was not always long lasting in nature, but could be short term and temporary. Hardship could nevertheless re-occur, as the example of John Dawber illustrates, and for some individuals it may have formed part of an intermittent pattern, people experiencing it periodically at different stages of their lives.28

Assessing the generosity of poor relief

How generous was the relief system practised in Broughton during this period? Some historians have argued that the poor law was almost a welfare state in miniature, occupying a central place in the lives of the poor, while others have stated that it was harsh and inflexible, functioning only as a safety net for those facing destitution.29 How did the parish authorities support the poor in Broughton? As was typical in rural areas at this time, the main mechanism for aiding the poor was outdoor relief. Some paupers were given weekly pensions, typically 1s. or 1s. 6d. in the 1760s and 1770s and 3s. in the 1830s. Casual relief was also administered, both in cash and in kind. The parish doled out small cash payments to individuals, gave money towards rent and medical expenses and even paid for funerals. Clothing and fuel in the form of furze (brushwood) or coal was also provided. The Broughton overseers also paid for pauper children to be apprenticed and on occasion even arranged weddings when unmarried women became pregnant to avoid having to support illegitimate children. Broughton also had a small
workhouse, built in 1780. Its exact function is not clear; it only had eight occupants in 1803 and 1815 and the vestry minutes for 1837 refer to it as a ‘workhouse for widows’ so it may have been no more than some form of pauper accommodation. It was almost certainly less important for most of the poor than outdoor relief.

In order to begin to quantify the value of the pensions and casual relief that the poor received, Figure 2 gives a breakdown of the different amounts of pensions paid to paupers in Broughton in the periods studied.

Pension payments in Broughton were broadly similar to those of other eastern and southern parishes that have been examined. In the 1760s the majority of pensions granted were at the level of around 1s. per week; a decade later, however, payments of 1s. 6d. and 2s. per week were becoming more common. Even higher amounts were recorded on occasion: 12 per cent of payments in the 1770s were at the level of 3s. or more per week. By the 1830s pensions had increased considerably in value and over half of all payments were above 3s. per week. There had been significant inflation in the intervening years; it has been estimated that during the Napoleonic War period prices doubled and although they fell again after 1815 they still remained above pre-war levels.

As in the earlier period there was much variation: the highest pension granted was one of 10s. per week while payments of as low as 1s. per week occasionally occurred.
Such variation in the amounts granted makes evaluation of the relative generosity of pensions rather difficult; some individuals also received casual relief (clothing and fuel for example) that could significantly augment their income. It might be possible to compare pensions to prices, examining what they were worth against a basket of basic necessities such as the cost of bread, fuel, clothing and rent; but evaluating the relative weighting of these items is extremely difficult, given the very limited information we have about the consumption habits of the poor, and no household budgets have survived in north Lincolnshire for either of the periods that we are studying. Perhaps a better alternative is to compare relief payments to the wages of the lowest paid to try to establish how closely pauper pensions matched the average wage of an agricultural labourer. For the 1761–1780 period no wage data can be found for the parish of Broughton itself, but on the nearby estates of Charles Pelham at Brocklesby (who also owned land at Broughton) agricultural labourers were paid an average of 7s. 6d. per week in the 1770s. This figure is much higher than even the most generous pension of the time (4s. per week) but labourers’ wages typically provided for a whole family while pensions usually supported one or two individuals only. We need to adjust the data to reflect the actual number of people reliant on a pension. Let us take the example of a labourer with a wife and two small children, solely dependent on his weekly wage of 7s. 6d. It has been estimated that adult males consumed one and a half times as much as women and children. Therefore the labourer would consume 2s. 6d. of the total wage himself and his wife and two children 1s. 8d. each. We can thus generalise that adult males would require approximately 2s. 6d. per week to meet their most basic subsistence needs, women and children 1s. 8d. each. It must be stressed that these calculations are heavily reliant on assumptions, especially with regard to family size. Wages remained constant regardless of the size of family and so labourers with larger numbers of children may have had to rely on lower subsistence thresholds than the ones quoted above. The calculations omit any additional income that a labourer might have received from, for instance, cultivating a small plot of land or any work that wives and children might perform. Labourers with families might also have paid different levels of rent to paupers, especially if the paupers were single and lodged in other households. The thresholds can thus only be regarded as a rough guide and any conclusions drawn from them must be regarded as tentative.

Table 4 compares the median weekly income, including casual payments such as clothing, of different groups of pensioners (single men, single women, children, married couples and family groups) with the estimated basic subsistence minimum using the above assumptions. Only people receiving pensions in the 1770s have been included, pensions were slightly lower in the 1760s and there is no accurate wage data from this decade to make a proper comparison. The data shows that for single men, single women and children their median income from pensions and casual relief was approximately the same as the basic subsistence minimum. A few people did receive much less; one woman, Sarah Belton, only received 1s. per week for example, but the majority nevertheless were probably just
about able to survive on their payments. It must also be stressed that some of these individuals may have received free accommodation and fuel. Poor or common houses are mentioned in the parish accounts as are ‘coals and furze for the poor’. Childless couples only had a median income of 60 per cent of the subsistence level, however, even though all four couples in the sample were over the age of 60, and would probably have needed to supplement their income by other means. Evaluating the relative generosity of relief given to the seven family groups (families or single parents with children) is more difficult, as they each had different numbers of children. Three unmarried mothers (each with one child) only received 1s. per week, which would have supported their offspring but not themselves. There were three widows, each with three young children, but only one, the previously mentioned Widow Dawber, received anything approaching a reasonable income, 5s. 3d. per week, the other two had to make do with 2s. 8d. and 3s. per week, which would have been insufficient to maintain their families. The 1s. 6d. per week in 1771 that the parish gave to Amos Hare, the only married man with children, would also have been well below what was needed for himself, his wife and four children.

By the period 1830–1835 labourers’ wages in the Broughton area had increased to an average of 12s. per week. Using the same assumptions as before, that males consumed half as much again as women and children, this would mean that an adult male needed about 4s. per week to meet his basic needs, women and children about 2s. 8d. per week. Table 5 compares the weekly income of Broughton pensioners in the period 1830–1835 with this estimated basic subsistence level. Only pensions are included, as there is no consistent data available on casual payments.

For single men, single women, children and childless couples the median pension granted provided about 70–90 per cent of the minimum needed for
subsistence. This is below the percentage seen in the statistics from the 1770s. However, the data does not include any casual payments and some free or subsidised accommodation for the poor may still have existed; 10 parish houses were recorded in the 1828 rate assessment. If a notional allowance is made for these factors the figures are broadly comparable to the previous period. Again some individuals received much less than the subsistence level; two elderly pensioners, William Streets and Elizabeth Hix, were only given 1s. 3d. per week and 1s. 6d. per week respectively. The majority were nevertheless possibly just able to manage on their pension payments. Just as in the 1770s, interpreting the relative position of family groups is more complex and we can again only be subjective. Some payments were clearly inadequate and people would have had to resort to other earning opportunities; for example Mary Sharp, with four young children, and William Foster, married with three children, were both given only 5s. per week. Others, however, received more generous payments almost equalling the average 12s. wage: three married men with families were given pensions of 8s., 9s. and 10s. per week respectively.

Throughout both periods that we have examined the Poor Law in Broughton seems to have acted as a safety net. The majority of single adults and children, and to a lesser extent childless couples, were given just enough relief to live on. Family groups faced more varying degrees of generosity: some were given pensions almost equivalent to a labourer’s weekly wage, others received much smaller amounts and would have had to seek other earning opportunities. There seems to be an expectation from the parish authorities that people should earn for themselves wherever possible; full pensions were only given to those, such as children or some of the elderly, who could not support themselves by any other means. Paupers did benefit from the fact that in the vast majority of cases their pensions were regular, paid over continuous periods of months or years, whereas due to the seasonality of farm work labourers did not always receive a constant income. To take just one example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Median income</th>
<th>Subsistence level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single men</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3s. 0d.</td>
<td>4s. 0d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single women</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2s. 6d.</td>
<td>2s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2s. 1d.</td>
<td>2s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childless couples</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4s. 6d.</td>
<td>6s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family groups</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>not avail.</td>
<td>not avail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For income calculations see text.

Source: LAO, Broughton by Brigg Par. 10/5, Select vestry minutes 1830–1835.
a labourer on the Brocklesby estate of Lord Yarborough in 1832 was only paid for 269 days when the maximum number of days that he could have worked was 312.\textsuperscript{39} The level of generosity must not be exaggerated, however. We are only comparing pauper incomes with those of agricultural labourers, themselves relatively poor according to investigations and reports from the period.\textsuperscript{40} The parish authorities could also be harsh on occasion. Parish support for children was not necessarily a guarantee that they would receive it later on in life. In the 1760s Hannah Hollingworth, an orphan, was given board and lodging while a child before being sent away to work as a servant. When, however, she later returned to Broughton and needed assistance, the overseers removed her on the grounds that she had now obtained a settlement elsewhere.\textsuperscript{41} The same fate befell John Dawber, who was similarly removed in 1784. The 1830 accounts record that people were sometimes taken off the relief list for no apparent reason and the select vestry disputed the decision of the local JP, Sir Robert Sheffield, to grant one pauper 5s. a week, stating that ‘some mis-statement by the applicant must have been made to Sir Robert Sheffield or the above order would not have been granted’.\textsuperscript{42} These reservations aside, it can still be argued that the parish authorities in Broughton supported people when they were in need, whether they were elderly, widowed, or married men requiring support for their families. Relief was seldom generous, was constantly reviewed and often only of a short duration, but it was nevertheless granted to most of those who required it.

\textbf{Alternative welfare strategies}

The poor law was not the sole means of support for people in poverty, however. Alternative welfare avenues such as charity, familial support, self-help and access to common rights were also available at times. It is difficult to quantify exactly the degree of assistance provided by these alternative welfare networks but some basic points can be made about them. Information on charitable activity in Broughton is very limited. Parliamentary surveys of charity from the period make only one reference to an eighteenth-century charity worth about £12 per year for teaching poor children.\textsuperscript{43} A Reverend Robert Carter, from the nearby village of Redbourne, did, however, leave £10 a year to be donated to the poor of Broughton in the late 1780s.\textsuperscript{44} Thirty-five people were also recorded in 1750 as being given 6s. or 6s. 6d. (almost a week’s wages at the time) from the rent of a house left in a will; eleven of these individuals later featured in the 1761–1780 overseers’ accounts.\textsuperscript{45} Some degree of charity thus existed in Broughton, but the limited evidence available for it suggests that its scale and consequent effect on peoples’ lives was probably small.

Poor people, especially the elderly, may also have received support from relatives. Evidence from pauper letters and household censuses in eighteenth-century Essex has revealed that some elderly paupers received care from their adult children or even lived with them.\textsuperscript{46} No pauper letters or censuses survive from Broughton to confirm this assumption, however. We do know from the parish registers that some Broughton paupers had adult children
living in the village at the same time as they were claiming relief; at least four paupers from the 1761–1780 period and five from the 1830–1835 period. Magdaline Markham, a pensioner in 1765, had a married son living in Broughton in the same year. Ann Shaw, a pensioner in 1834, had a son (a publican) and a daughter, the wife of a blacksmith, residing in the village. In the absence of any definite evidence we can only guess at what support such relatives provided, if any. It could be argued that most married labourers with families would have lacked the resources to look after any aged parents. Evidence of familial support does, though, exist in the nearby village of Willoughton, which lay ten miles to the south of Broughton. An inventory dated 1764 of the possessions of George Lupton, an elderly pauper, survives which reveals that the parish agreed to pay his son in law John Banister 1s. per week ‘to take George Lupton my father in law and to board and supply him with all necessaries’ in return for the use of his goods. Familial support for the poor almost certainly existed in north-west Lincolnshire, but more evidence is needed to assess its true significance.

Self-help among the poor was more common. Pensioners from both the late eighteenth century and the 1830s who received very small amounts such as 1s. per week would also have had to work to support themselves. Levi Hare was given 1s. per week in 1832 ‘for his youngest child’: presumably he was expected to support his wife and two other young children by himself. Poor people were also given employment by the parish, lodging other paupers and caring for the sick, for example, and work was often provided for individuals just before or after they were granted a pension. William Crowder was paid by the Broughton overseers for looking after the orphan Hannah Hollingworth from 1762 to 1765 and two orphans from the Fiddle family in 1766, prior to receiving a pension himself in 1768. Anne Brown, a pensioner from 1762 to 1773, was paid 8d. per day for 44 days for serving the masons working on the parish poor houses in 1774. In December 1831 Susannah Sowerby was paid 2s. 6d. per week for looking after two elderly pensioners; a year later she herself was given a pension. On some occasions, therefore, the Broughton overseers used work as an alternative source of support for the poor. People who were still physically able were often provided with work before old age or some other infirmity prevented them from supporting themselves.

As noted above, Broughton still contained some common land, final enclosure not occurring until 1849. Commons and wastes often served as a source of support for the poor, allowing them to cut furze or turf for fuel and graze animals. There is no specific evidence of fuel-gathering on the common in Broughton, but in the township of Brumby, which lay immediately to the west, a survey from 1787 recorded that the inhabitants had the right to dig for fuel on the common there. Animals may also have been kept by the poor on the meadows adjoining the River Ancholme. The overseers’ accounts of 1761–1780 record that one pensioner, Widow Leaning, kept a cow, the parish contributing a weekly sum towards its upkeep, probably recognising its value to the widow and her three children. In 1774 William Moody was actually
given £1 10s. to help purchase a cow, which may have helped him to defer claiming relief for he did not become a pensioner until 1778. Broughton’s sandy soil also allowed for the creation of rabbit warrens; these were often privately owned by the late-eighteenth century but there may have been poaching opportunities for the poor. The woods on the western side of the parish may have been another source of sustenance, although how much access the villagers had is uncertain. We do know, however, from the diary of Abraham de la Pryme, vicar of Broughton in the late seventeenth century, that people then picked lily flowers in the woods and sold them. This practice was still occurring as late as 1869, according to the Victorian editor of the diaries.51 The evidence concerning Broughton’s commons is limited and rather circumstantial, but the poor nevertheless made some use of them.

Conclusions

Most of the evidence for this study has been confined to two periods, 1761–1780 and 1830–1835: little detailed information is available about the poor in Broughton in the 1790s and the early 1800s, a period of economic change and rising relief expenditure. The gaps in the records also mean that it is not possible to trace the relief histories of most individuals over their complete life-cycle. Nevertheless, it is still possible to establish some basic patterns from the available evidence. Only a minority of the population of Broughton received assistance from the poor law at any one time. The relief lists were dominated by those who were vulnerable because of life-cycle circumstances: the old, the widowed and young children. The numbers receiving relief did rise by the early nineteenth century, in particular extending increasingly to married men with families, but even by 1803 only 15 per cent of the population were given support by the parish. Poverty was not necessarily a continuous state either; some individuals did receive pensions for very long periods, but for others their period of dependence was much shorter and there is evidence that some people moved in and out of poverty as their life-cycle circumstances altered. Those who were deemed to be in need were generally given just enough to survive on, pensions and casual relief for the majority of paupers falling slightly below or equalling the proportionate earnings of a typical labourer of the period. There were exceptions, though, and the Broughton overseers could be harsh at times, cutting off relief or removing people who had been supported in the past but who no longer had a settlement. Alternative welfare avenues were also used by the poor. Charity, familial support, self-help and the resources of Broughton’s commons and woods all seem to have been utilised to varying degrees, though the effect of these is hard to assess given the limited evidence available.

The poor law in Broughton thus seems to have operated more as a safety net, available as a last resort, rather than as an all-encompassing welfare system. We have not found the same level of dependency as in more southerly counties like Oxfordshire, where it has been estimated that in 1803 some 40 per cent of the population received help from the poor law.52 The limited evidence for other north-west Lincolnshire parishes suggests some similarities
to Broughton, with relatively small numbers on relief and comparable pension levels. More local studies are needed to further explore the poor law and poverty in this area, and only when this is complete will we be able to place the conclusions obtained from Broughton in their proper context.
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MIGRATION IN EAST YORKSHIRE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Henry S. Woledge and Michael A. Smale

Henry Woledge graduated in geography and geology at Keele University and after early retirement from a career in town and country planning has pursued his interest in local history. Michael Smale, a graduate of Oxford and York Universities, is currently working towards a PhD at Hull University, focusing upon migration into later nineteenth-century Hull.

Introduction

The system of relief for the needy poor in England and Wales, which operated from the sixteenth century, has left a wealth of records. A prominent element of the system, from 1662 onwards but with continual modifications, was that relief was provided by the parish where people were ‘settled’, and in the eighteenth century they were liable to be ‘removed’ back to that parish in order to obtain relief. The resulting documents are essentially of four types: settlement certificates, settlement examinations, removal orders and appeal orders. Certificates were provided by the parish of settlement, accepting responsibility in case of need, to enable a person to move to live and work in another parish. Examinations were made to establish where a person’s settlement was: taken under oath (but nevertheless not always truthful) they vary from the minimal (for example, 3 May 1790 John Hare. Settlement at Nunburnholme) to detailed accounts of relevant information, especially in the 19th century. Removal orders were the legal means of moving people to their place of settlement and give the date, the people concerned, the places removed from and to, often the status of women (singlewoman, wife, widow) and sometimes the ages of children. East Riding examples are John Beal, wife and children, Birdsall to Thixendale, 16 June 1707, and Isabella Clapham, widow, Hedon to Scarborough, 21 August 1795. When a parish to which people were to be sent disputed the removal order, an appeal could be made to Quarter Sessions, which could order the confirmation, reversal or modification of the original order.

In the East Riding, only a small fraction of the settlement and removal documents has survived. Not counting Quarter Sessions appeal cases, records remain for only some dozen out of 180 parishes, and only some 140 settlement certificates in all appear to have survived. The Petty Sessions system, unlike in Kent, does not seem to have developed in the East Riding until the nineteenth century, and so there is no relevant Petty Sessions material. On the other hand, for the whole period for which some records survive (1647 to 1862), a roughly equal number of cases is available for study from the Quarter Sessions
appeal records. What proportion of removals went to appeal is impossible to
tell, but it is likely to have been quite small. Of the 55 removal orders from
Beverley identified from other sources in the East Riding of Yorkshire
Archives Office, none recur among the 34 removal appeal cases from Beverley
included in this study.

The Quarter Session appeal cases from the eighteenth century cover removal
from 200 places in the county and to 278 places, some beyond its boundaries.
Many places, not unexpectedly, fall within both categories (‘from’ and ‘to’) so
that the total number of places mentioned is 353, a much greater number than
is available from the dozen or so parish sources. So Quarter Sessions cases
have been chosen for study because they give a wider geographical coverage
than could be gained from other available sources, and offer the prospect of a
more meaningful county-wide analysis for a given volume of data. Hull had
its own Quarter Sessions, as did Beverley and Hedon. The Beverley Quarter
Sessions records have not survived in a usable form and the surviving Hedon
records, perhaps because borough and parish were the same, do not include
any appeal cases.8 However, Beverley cases appear among the East Riding
material.

Various studies of the labouring classes over the last 80 years have been based,
partially or substantially, on settlement and removal material. Most have
concentrated on the nature of the poor law system itself or its consequences for
the lives of the poor. For instance, Snell, Landau and Wells are concerned
about the administration of the poor law and the motives of those instigating
removal.9 Movement in itself is not the main focus of these writers’ interests.
The present study is not concerned with welfare, only with the contribution of
poor law records to migration studies. Their use in this way can be traced back
to Redford as long ago as 1926.10 More recently Parton, Pond and Song among
others have examined movement in local areas using poor law data, but they
used removal orders and settlement certificates rather than appeal orders.11 In
the case of the East Riding the survival of appeal orders provides an
opportunity to examine movement patterns over a whole county for almost all
the eighteenth century.

Although work on migration is extensive, that which deals with local
movement within a county or to and fro across its boundaries is much more
limited. This is largely due to the lack of suitable source material or the
difficulty of using what is available. Those studying migration have therefore
turned to a wide variety of sources. Noble’s view is that ‘Marriage distances
are perhaps one of the most cogent indicators of mobility’, and she used parish
registers as well as other sources for detailed population analysis of East
Riding towns.12 Holderness also used parish registers to investigate personal
movement in several rural Yorkshire parishes.13 Pickles used Hearth Tax
assessments and an archiepiscopal visitation.14 Apprenticeship and criminal
records have also been used.15 Quaker records can provide a direct link from
place to place but have concomitant limitations.16 Lastly Kussmaul, writing
mainly about the south and east of England, combined settlement certificates
with a rare series of records of a hiring fair.17 She concluded that the spatial
component of mobility is very difficult to measure, but that ‘movement over long distances was rare, and that mobility did not tend to be random and cumulative, but directed and bounded’.18 The present study will comment on this conclusion.

The limitation of all these studies is that each is restricted to a local area or to a particular group within the general population, and each set of source material imposes its own peculiar constraints. It is therefore difficult to make meaningful comparisons. Pooley and Turnbull used a combination of census data and individual family histories to analyse migration and movement on a national scale from the eighteenth to the twentieth century19. They have thus provided a whole range of benchmarks against which the results of other research can be measured. Comprehensive as their work is, it inevitably omits important local variations. Their maps cannot show, for instance, the importance of the movement of fishermen from Devon to Hull and Grimsby in the nineteenth century.20 In terms of generating benchmark data this scarcely matters, but in terms of the development of the east coast fishing industry it is highly significant both locally and nationally. Local studies are required to set against the national and regional background.

The source material

All occurrences of settlement and removal cases in the surviving Quarter Sessions records for the East Riding of Yorkshire have been abstracted from their effective start in Midsummer 1708 to the end of the century, encompassing 367 quarter sessions, with no appeal cases in 102 of them. Respited cases are ignored where they were later resolved. However, there are eight respited cases which were never brought back for a decision, and these are included in our analysis, as they provide a settlement link between two places as much as the resolved cases. The total number of records of person removals in this period is 1,235, of which 1,017 are usable, relating to 457 different cases. A few families were removed more than once, and so are counted in more than one case. The number of appeal cases in each decade varied from 28 (1730–1739) to 69 (1710–1719), as shown in Table 1. A decline from a peak about 1719 to a minimum about 1737 parallels that recorded by Landau in Kent, as does a trough about 1762.21 Of the 457 cases, sending and receiving locations are known or minimum distances may reasonably be assumed (for instance, distances from an unknown place in the East Riding to Scotland are taken to be from York) for 435 (975 person-removals), which therefore form the basis of this study.22

Geographical and social factors no doubt influenced the distribution of cases, and to determine the extent of this is part of our aim. The data used very rarely show ages, or whether people are actually chargeable or liable to become so, and it is not possible to show how typical these cases are. There could be bias due to such factors as the litigiousness of the parish officials involved and their anxiety to protect their parishes from the costs involved in accepting paupers to their care, but there is little evidence to suggest this.23
There are in fact only nine or ten cases of two moves between the same pair of parishes. There is no evidence in the Quarter Sessions material that certain parishes had peculiarities that led to more complex cases there than elsewhere, though the very fact of appeal to Quarter Sessions implies that the cases involved were not clear-cut, especially as appeals were expensive. But there is no reason to think that appeal cases are in any way atypical of removal cases generally, except that more costly cases (perhaps because of greater distances involved or the involvement of legal advice) are more likely to be disputed. It may be regarded as a limitation on the reliability of the conclusions drawn from the data that the 435 cases are not only scattered over the whole county, but also over a period of over 90 years, during which conditions inevitably changed. Nevertheless, the data are sufficiently indicative of broad patterns for provisional conclusions to be reached.

Apellant cases, as removals generally, deal with people who had fallen on hard times. But many of the ‘working population’ lived on the edge of poverty, and could be precipitated into needing relief by quite small changes in circumstances. So it is a reasonable assumption that those on relief were in general not untypical of the labouring poor. King quotes Daunton as claiming, ‘there was no great discrepancy between the standard of living of those receiving welfare and those dependent on earnings from the late seventeenth century to the early nineteenth century’, a view with which Snell and Song agree.24

The basis of the study is the link between two (or very occasionally more than two) places, normally parishes or townships, though occasionally smaller places are mentioned. At first, it was not considered likely that the type of decision on the appeals would be significant, since this link exists whether or not the original removal order was confirmed. There are 184 confirmed cases, 251 reversed ones, 14 cases with no decision, 7 cases respited but never resolved and one new decision, making 457 cases in all. For the cases for which it can be calculated, the distance removed in the confirmed cases (174 out of the 184) averaged 22.3 kms; in the reversed cases (246 out of the 251) it averaged 16.5 kms. Where distances were greater costs of removal would be higher, and pressure to avoid them greater on the part of potential receiving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1708–1709</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710–1719</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720–1729</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730–1739</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740–1749</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750–1759</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760–1769</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770–1779</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780–1789</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790–1799</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: East Riding Quarter Sessions Order Books; 1801 census (for population); 1831 census (for acreages).
parishes, so leading to appeals even where the chance of success was lower. Although the difference is small, the standard deviation of the first figure is 40.6, and of the second, 17.7, indicating a wider range of distances involved in the confirmed cases.

Migration and removal

Removal is in essence the reversal of a previous migration. It indicates a relationship between two places, but the nature of this relationship will vary. Places to which paupers were removed, or to which an attempt was made to remove them, were places with which they must have had some former link, though this might be very tenuous: for instance, it might be no more than the birthplace of a deceased husband, never visited before by the widow. Again, the appeal could be over either whether they should go or whither they should go. It is normally impossible to say from our data how people came to be where they were. The number of cases among our data mentioning vagrancy (15 cases), or living for some time in a place other than those from or to which the removal was to be made, is so low that the assumption that a removal reverses a migration is valid in the great majority of cases. Ten of the vagrancy cases date from before 1720, and they include five of the longest-distance removals: most are above average in distance.

The sources do not give the places with which people were associated precisely enough to enable exact distances between them to be derived. A removal would be between two parishes or townships, and whereabouts within these people actually lived cannot be ascertained. We have taken the centre of the town, parish, village or hamlet concerned to represent the actual location of the abode, but as East Riding settlements are predominantly nucleated, any distortion caused will be negligible. There are eight long-distance moves involving imprecise places (e.g. Scotland). In these cases, the minimum distances involved (e.g. York to Berwick-on-Tweed) have been taken. The average of these eight minimum distances is 139 kms. The removals vary in distance from the minimal between two parishes within one town (e.g. Frances, wife of Henry Webster and their children John 12, Thomas 9, Henry 5, Ann 4 and Peter 2, from Beverley St Martin to Beverley St Nicholas, Michaelmas Session 1797) to ones probably in excess of 280 kms (e.g. Thomas Neale, from Bewholme to North Britain, Easter Session 1711). The increase in the number of cases with distance drops in two notable steps, at about 18 kms and at 30 kms. But, perhaps more meaningfully, the ratio of the increase in numbers to the increase in area falls markedly (ignoring moves of less than two kms), especially between four and six, and six and eight kms.

The mean distance of the 435 removals for which both sending and receiving locations are known (including the eight long-distance moves above), was 19.1 kms. This may be compared with the figure of 20.2 kms given by Pooley and Turnbull for agricultural labourers, 1750–1879. 48.0 per cent were of a distance up to ten kilometres, 37.0 per cent were from 11 to 30 kilometres and 15.0 per cent were over 30 kilometres (see Figure 1). These figures are comparable to those produced for all migrants by Clark from diocesan court
depositions for parts of the south of England, 1660–1730, though his analysis by occupation shows that for urban deponents ‘the great majority of the occupational groups [had] moved on average between twenty and thirty-five miles’, and for rural deponents ‘there was an obvious concentration of movement on the ten to twenty-five mile range.’

Types of family moved, and distance.

A breakdown of the types of family involved, and their frequency, is given in Table 2.

‘Family’ is used to mean a group of any number from one upwards. It is interesting that there are more than twice as many women removed as men (on their own or with children) though, as we shall see, men tended to have moved further. This no doubt reflects the proportion in the totality of removals, and perhaps a greater likelihood of women becoming dependent on relief, especially if unmarried and pregnant, and also greater difficulty in finding work.

The average distance moved by the different categories of family with significant numbers is given in Table 3. These distances are consistently much less than those given by Pooley and Turnbull, whose figures are 52.3 kms for
Table 3  Distance of removals of different family types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Riding No. of families</th>
<th>East Riding Mean distance (Km.)</th>
<th>Oxfordshire No. and percentage under 9.66 km</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man, wife and child(ren)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>44 44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman alone</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>70 49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man and wife</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>29 44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man alone</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>21 34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother and child(ren)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>27 55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All families</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>199 45.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Oxfordshire figures for appeal removals derived from Song, ‘Agrarian Policies’.

Sources:  East Riding Quarter Sessions Order Books; 1801 census (for population); 1831 census (for acreages).
all single people and 28.6 km for all married people, though women moved shorter distances than men in the eighteenth century. Their data included all social classes, which probably led to greater mean distances. The distance single women were removed was, at 18.3 kms, on average only a little less than that for all people. The average distance of all 435 appeal removals, 19.1 kms, may be compared with the average distance of all 2,345 removals in Oxfordshire from 1751 to 1834 given by Song of 10.6 miles (17.1 kms). This small difference conceals a very different pattern, however, with 45.7 per cent being under six miles, as against 56.9 per cent for appeal removals in Oxfordshire. The difference for men alone is particularly striking, with only 34.4 per cent moving this short distance in the East Riding, as against 61.1 per cent in Oxfordshire. In contrast, for mothers and children a higher proportion moved under six miles in the East Riding. It is possible that the difference in the period covered is partly responsible: analysis of nineteenth century East Riding removal appeals should show this. But the difference could also be largely the result of different agricultural hiring practices.

The total number of long-distance (over 80 kms) moves is too small for meaningful analysis, though 5 of the 14 were vagrants, and there was little
difference in the distances travelled by men and women. In this latter respect, and in the small proportion of long moves, the study corroborates the findings of Pooley and Turnbull, and of Kussmaul. Nevertheless, it is evident that single people, and especially men, migrated greater distances than other types of family. Removals to places outside the East Riding are to the North Riding (30), the West Riding (24), Lincolnshire (12), York (7), Scotland (3), Durham (3), Nottinghamshire (2), and one each to five other counties in the north and west, a total of 86. Perhaps the most interesting movement is that from the North Riding into the northern fringe of East Riding, discussed below.

Local movements, especially of single men, in view of the predominance of agriculture in the East Riding, were probably largely in connection with agricultural work, but the data do not cover occupations. Failure to find work at the Martinmas hiring fairs might be expected to be reflected in appeal cases at the Christmas Quarter Sessions some two months later, and failure to find work after the summer harvest season (if migrant workers sought it) in the Michaelmas Quarter Sessions; but this pattern is not evident. Indeed, there is a preponderance of spring and summer cases, and spring hirings were not significant in the East Riding. Kussmaul states that the dates of 2 out of 24 hirings in the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries in the East and North Ridings were at May Day, but her table of the dates of hiring fairs gives over 30 in the East Riding during the same period, all autumnal. Landau’s partial explanation of seasonality in examinations being related to the relative ease of consulting JP’s in autumn and winter does not apply here.

Movement to and from urban and rural areas

To analyse movement between rural and urban areas it is necessary first to establish which places can be described as towns (see Figure 2). Unfortunately, there is no means of providing accurate figures for the population of parishes, let alone towns or villages, before the 1801 census. One contemporary account is given by Isaac Leatham in his *General View of the Agriculture of the East Riding of Yorkshire* (1794). Leatham identifies the market towns as Hull, Beverley, Driffield, Bridlington, Hunmanby, Patrington, Hedon, Howden, Market Weighton, Pocklington, Kilham, South Cave, and Hornsea. We have taken these places and added Sculcoates, which was already part of the Hull urban area, as urban areas. The data do not include removals from Hull. The number of families (39) removed to these 14 places is less than half those removed from them (87), reflecting the attraction of these areas as centres of employment. The distances of removal to the urban areas (19 kms) is similar to the distances of purely rural moves. It is only the distances of removals from the urban areas that is notably different, and greater, at 23.2 kms Beverley, the largest East Riding town away from the Hull area, is the only one with a substantial number of removals out (34), reflecting its dominant position in East Riding society.

For comparison, the places with over 500 people in 1801 which we have not assumed to be urban are shown in Table 4. The three largest of these, Cottingham, Sutton and Ottringham, show the same pattern of a
preponderance of outward removals as the towns, though the average distance is shorter. The mean distance of removal from the five falls between those for the urban areas and for all non-urban areas, but the mean distance of removal to them is exceptionally low. The number of removals per thousand of 1801 population is higher (though Filey had no cases) than the mean of the 14 urban places (see Table 7, p 44, below), though numbers are too low for inferences to be drawn from this. The proximity of Cottingham and Sutton to Hull may have influenced the patterns of movement there.

Chance would dictate that even if appeal cases are random, some places would have been involved in more cases than others. Of the 14 places with five or more removals out and the 16 places with four or more removals in, only one place other than the urban areas of Beverley and Bridlington occur in both categories, and that is Aldbrough (6 out, 9 in) which was just developing at the end of the eighteenth century as a short-lived seaside resort.34 Other places with between ten and five removals out are Cottingham, Riccal, Sutton on Hull, North Cave, Beeford, Nafferton, North Frodingham and Ottringham; and only one other place, Bishop Burton, had as many as five removals in. Cottingham and Sutton were within the sphere of influence of Hull. There is little indication here of meaningful unexpected concentrations of appeal cases.

Compared to the average of the 435 distances moved, 19.1 kms, the average of the 305 removals not involving towns or their associated non-urban areas is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Families from</th>
<th>Families to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Ave. distance (Km.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottingham</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton on Hull</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottringham</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldbrough</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger non-urban places</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All non-urban places</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Sutton parish extended to the fringe of Hull, and was to some extent suburban in nature. Cottingham adjoins Hull also. Aldbrough was just developing as a short-lived seaside resort (personal communication from David Neave). Filey was a fishing village. All five places have 1801 populations over 500.

Sources: East Riding Quarter Sessions Order Books; 1801 census (for population);1831 census (for acreages).
17.2 kms. The average of the 126 removals involving such towns and their associated non-urban areas at either end of the removal (including those outside the Riding) is 23.8 kms. The average of the 21 urban to urban moves is 28.8 kms. Moves between urban areas are, of course, necessarily longer than many purely rural moves, which could be merely between adjacent parishes. If the three moves within an urban area (within Beverley, and Sculcoates to Hull) are excluded, the average of the remaining 18 moves is 33.3 kms. This agrees with the situation in Essex, where, as Pond says, ‘Movement to and between the towns was at a much greater level and over greater distances than that to or between country parishes.’

Movements within the East Riding

As a basis to assess the extent and nature of movement within the East Riding, districts based on agricultural land use in 1801 have been chosen. The map of ‘Migration movements by regions’ (Figure 3) shows clearly the contrast in movement patterns between these, and this may be compared to the farming patterns as shown by the preponderant crops in Table 6. Table 5 shows the
distribution of the movements involved in the removals being studied, but excludes parishes with an urban element. For these purely rural parishes, where numbers of internal moves reach double figures, between 29.4 per cent and 62.9 per cent of removals are internal to the district. Internal movements dominate Holderness and the Vale of York. Outward removals dominate the

Table 5  Distribution of removal movements (rural parishes only).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural District</th>
<th>Internal No.</th>
<th>Internal %</th>
<th>Out No.</th>
<th>Out %</th>
<th>In No.</th>
<th>In %</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>% of moves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jurassic Hills</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. [betw.] Ouse &amp; Derwent</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. East [of] Derwent</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wolds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vale of Pickering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wold Scarp</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. High Wolds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Low Wolds</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hull Valley</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. North Holderness</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Middle Holderness</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. South Holderness</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td>553</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This excludes all parishes with towns (as defined in the text) in them, within or without the Riding (but includes Cottingham, Sutton, Ottringham, Filey and Aldbrough). It relates only to removals originating within the East Riding, so includes no removals from Hull. Otherwise, Hull is included in Hull Valley. All removals are counted twice (‘where from’ and ‘where to’) except for those for which ‘where to’ is outside the County.

**Sources:** East Riding Quarter Sessions Order Books; 1801 census (for population); 1831 census (for acreages).
High Wolds and their western and northern fringes (including the Wolds Scarp), and also the Hull Valley. The remaining strip of the Low Wolds, between the higher parts of the Wolds and the low-lying flat land of the Hull Valley, is the only district where outward migrations are greatest in number. Oats and wheat farming dominates to the west of the High Wolds, wheat and oats to the east. This clear pattern does not relate closely to the distance of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural district</th>
<th>Predominant crops</th>
<th>Under 24 km.</th>
<th>24 &amp; &lt;80 km.</th>
<th>80+ km</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jurassic Hills</td>
<td>o/w</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. [betw.] Ouse / Derwent</td>
<td>o/w</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. East [of] Derwent</td>
<td>o/w</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vale of Pickering</td>
<td>o/t</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wold Scarp</td>
<td>o/w</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. High Wolds</td>
<td>b/o</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Low Wolds</td>
<td>w/o</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hull Valley</td>
<td>w/o</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. North Holderness</td>
<td>w/o</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Middle Holderness</td>
<td>w/o</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. South Holderness</td>
<td>w/o</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Rural parishes defined as for Table 5. Predominant crops (1801): b - barley, o - oats, t - turnips/rape, w - wheat, from 1801 crop returns as shown by J.E. Crowther, ‘Agricultural land use in 1801’, in Neave & Ellis eds., Atlas, 69.

**Sources:** East Riding Quarter Sessions Order Books; 1801 census (for population); 1831 census (for acreages).
removal. Of removals from one district (including urban parishes) to another, the one with the greatest number of cases (22) is from Hull Valley back to Low Wolds, and the next (14 cases) is Wolds Scarp to Low Wolds (these two are contiguous south of the High Wolds). No other movement within the East Riding has more than eight cases. So the Low Wolds seem to have been a district that was exporting labour.

Of movements beyond the Riding, two are particularly prominent, Jurassic Hills to North Riding (12 cases) and Ouse/Derwent to West Riding (11 cases); Vale of Pickering to North Riding has only 6. Correlating this with the figures for distance moved (see Table 6) emphasises the level of movement into the west and north of the county from the West and North Ridings. Note also that 11 of the 12 removals to Lincolnshire are from Low Wolds, Hull Valley or Holderness. These must reflect original migrations by water across the Humber. The evidence supports the significance of the districts adopted, but the East Riding should not be regarded in isolation. Small sub-regional movements could cross county boundaries, and, as Pond asserted, local patterns reflected local opportunities and needs. The parallels between the conclusions of this section and Kussmaul’s contention of directed mobility is clear.

Distance of removals in rural districts

Table 6 shows that, in percentage terms, rural removals of under 24 kms are generally highest west of the Wolds and in the relatively isolated South Holderness area and somewhat lower in the Wolds. Although the numbers are small, removals of 24 to 80 kms are at their highest in the Wolds, and lower to the east and west. This may be compared with the situation of purely rural parishes in Essex, studied by Pond. Based on 232 removal examinations, in the Essex marshlands, Pond states, ‘a high level of frequency of migration is found, and ... distances moved [were] at a maximum. Dealing with entirely rural parishes, on average, 31 per cent of immigration was from over 15 miles; and over 6 per cent from more than 50 miles distant... The very steady drift of working people to the coastlands was the only genuine long distance flow of labour between rural places detected in a study of the whole of East Anglia.’ On the generally low-lying land east and west of the Yorkshire Wolds the figures are much smaller: 14.7 per cent of the 258 removals are of 15–50 miles and 3.9 per cent over 50 miles.

By way of contrast, ‘in the chalklands of the north-west [of Essex] ... the index of movement into these places was low ... contrasting markedly with the rest of the county. Similarly, the distances moved were very small indeed – of the 499 migrants to this part of Essex only 48, or 9.6 per cent had moved more than 15 miles. This is rather similar to the 8.7 per cent in Suffolk, and 9.7 per cent in Norfolk, but quite dissimilar to the figures for the marshlands, 17.7 per cent and 31.4 per cent respectively.’ This chalkland situation is in marked contrast to the situation on the Yorkshire Wolds, where the figure is 26.7 per cent. These Wolds districts did not have a similar farming pattern to each other, suggesting that, in this part of the East
Riding at least, it is geographical location rather than farming methods that is related to the distance of removal (and hence of original migration). The average distance of the 90 Wolds rural removals was 16.6 kms, a little less than the overall average of 19.1 kms found in the Riding; but for all 116 cases in these districts (that is, including Bridlington, Great Driffield, Hunmanby, Kilham, Market Weighton, Pocklington and South Cave), the figure is 18.4 kms.

**Enclosure and agricultural change**

The most interesting movement affecting the East Riding is that from the North Riding into the north-western fringe of the county, presumably in search of better agricultural employment opportunities. Table 7 shows that the Jurassic Hills had the second highest level of assumed inward migration at 4.98 cases per thousand of the 1801 population. Eleven of the 20 cases of removal from the district were to the North Riding, and these were 11 of the 22 cases of removal from the East Riding as a whole. Indeed, 21 of the 22 were from the western and northern part of the Riding (the High Wolds and west and north of this). This could be in part associated with the enclosure that took place, particularly in the second half of the eighteenth century. While we cannot be precise because of the uncertainty surrounding some enclosure awards, almost 250,000 acres were enclosed in the eighteenth century in the East Riding, out of a total area of 710,400 acres. Of this, 220,000 acres were enclosed between 1760 and 1799. Leatham and Strickland, writing in 1794 and 1812 respectively, argued that enclosure created increased demand for labour and raised wages, features which have been confirmed by Holderness, while Lawler states (though writing of enclosures dating from 1801–4), 'Both population growth and migration rapidly increased after enclosure, contrary to the view that people were driven from the land. Rather, people were drawn to the villages as employment increased.' This evident demand for agricultural labour in this part of the East Riding from the west is again confirmed in the present study.

This movement contrasts with the static situation found by Pond in the chalklands of Essex, where enclosure was insignificant compared to the East Riding. However, one wonders, in the light of the labour situation, why removals out of the area on the scale indicated were required. Perhaps it is a matter of the season when the relevant events took place. 33 per cent of removal appeal cases were heard at the Easter Quarter Sessions, and less than 16 per cent at the Michaelmas Sessions. This Easter dominance was particularly evident west of the Wolds (40 per cent), and in North and Mid Holderness (41 per cent), and for families (40 per cent) and couples (37 per cent). Perhaps the western area was particularly attractive compared to the adjacent parts of the West and North Ridings and attracted in workers of poorer quality who were the first to be dismissed; and families and couples found conditions toughest at the end of winter. Possibly patterns of land ownership affected the situation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Population 1801</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Movement (cases per 1000 population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Towns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley</td>
<td>5,401</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All towns</td>
<td>23,110</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jurassic Hills</td>
<td>4,018</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. [betw.] Ouse &amp; Derwent</td>
<td>6,813</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. East [of] Derwent</td>
<td>10,255</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wolds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vale of Pickering</td>
<td>2,788</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wold Scarp</td>
<td>5,115</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. High Wolds</td>
<td>5,627</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Low Wolds</td>
<td>10,515</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hull Valley</td>
<td>8,902</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. North Holderness</td>
<td>3,373</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Middle Holderness</td>
<td>4,287</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. South Holderness</td>
<td>4,108</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All rural areas</td>
<td>65,801</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>88,911</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger non-urban places</td>
<td>5,168</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The origin of the migrants could be either rural or urban. Towns as in previous tables.

**Sources:** East Riding Quarter Sessions Order Books; 1801 census (for population); 1831 census (for acreages).
The importance of migrants in the population

Another measure of the importance of migrants in the local population is given by the number of appeal cases per thousand of the 1801 population, as shown in Table 7, showing the number of cases of assumed migration into towns from outside them and similarly into the rural areas. It is assumed that the number of appeal cases is proportionate to the total number of removal cases, and that this is proportionate to the migrant families. As expected, the number is higher for the towns at 3.76 per thousand (81 cases) than for the rural areas, though the number of cases is too small to be significant for most of the towns. Beverley, however, with by far the greatest number of cases at 34, and the second highest figure at 6.30 per thousand, stands out as a place which evidently particularly attracted migrants. Only Hedon, at 6.75 per thousand but only four cases, had a higher figure. The figure for Sculcoates, adjacent to the city of Hull, is particularly low at 1.28 per thousand (but only seven cases). Indeed, without Sculcoates, bigger than any town in the East Riding area except Hull in 1801 but probably having grown far more than any of them, the figure for all towns would be 4.53 per thousand.

By contrast, the figures for movements to the rural districts vary from 4.98 per thousand (Jurassic Hills, 20 cases) down to 2.00 per thousand (Low Wolds, 21 cases), averaging 3.25 per thousand over the 214 cases. The Low Wolds and East of Derwent districts (2.00 per thousand, 21 cases and 2.05 per thousand, 21 cases respectively) appear likely to have the most stable rural populations, despite the evident movement out of the Low Wolds. The general implication is clear, and not unexpected: the population of the towns was more mobile than that of the countryside.

Conclusions

The data suggest that the changes in agricultural practices associated with enclosure led to a movement of workers to the Wolds from the North and West Ridings, but that otherwise there was little correlation between farming types and the extent of movement. Overall, there appears to be a significant fall in the drawing capacity of a place at about 12 kms. In general, the broad tripartite geographical division of the Riding into Vale of York, Wolds and Hull Valley/Holderness holds good for the different patterns of removals, and hence of original migration. The towns, especially Beverley, show a predominance of inward migration, and longer distances of movement, while the urban population emerges as more mobile than the rural population. Some districts, such as South Holderness and the Vale of York, show a markedly higher degree of self-containment than others, such as the Wolds group. The rural pattern of movement is very different from that studied by Pond in Essex. The vagrancy removals tend to be early in the period and, not surprisingly, over longer distances than average.
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NOTES

1. Detailed accounts of the operation of the system, and of the conditions under which settlement was obtained, may be found in, for example, S King, Poverty and welfare in England 1700–1850 (Manchester 2000), 22; N Landau, The laws of settlement and the surveillance of immigration in eighteenth-century Kent, Continuity and Change, 3 (1988), 391–420, and N Landau, ‘The regulation of immigration, economic structures and definitions of the poor in eighteenth-century England’, The Historical Journal, 33 (1990), especially 542–5.

2. East Riding of Yorkshire Archives Office, (hereafter ERY) Seaton Ross examinations, PC 7/5 no. 10.


4. Quarter Sessions Files, ERY QSF3 D 1.


6. These documents are now in ERY in Beverley. Hull material, not used in this study, is in the City Record office.


8. In our period, there is only one case relating to settlement, and removal is not specifically mentioned.


removal orders and appeals.


18. This list is a brief selection from the work that has been done. Pooley and Turnbull provide a very useful review of the literature in the first chapter of *Migration and Mobility* (see next endnote).


22. In addition to the 457, in one case a second entry in the Order Book in the same session (Easter 1742) repeated the first, and was presumably made in error. In a second case, a second hearing resulted in a different decision (Midsummer and Michaelmas 1709). In a third, the decision was, effectively, reversed (Easter and Midsummer 1710). In a fourth, the case resulted in different decisions for different people, who may or may not have been related (Easter 1720).

23. Conversely, the costs incurred in instigating a removal were such that it could not have been lightly undertaken. See Snell, *Annals of the Labouring Poor*, 18. The fee charged for examination by the parish clerk ‘could be between 3s. and 7s. for one examination in the late eighteenth century, and would be considerably more for extra copies made and removal orders drawn up, with notices of pending removal sent. The removal itself would usually cost over £8 and if attended by legal expenses would be well over £20. Such a sum would maintain a single pauper for about three years.’


26. P. Clark, ‘Migration in England during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries’, *Past and Present*, 83 (1979), 68–70. Clark’s figures are in miles, <10, >40 and >100 (and 10–40 by implication). The diocesan courts used are of Canterbury, Norwich, Oxford, Salisbury, Gloucester, and Coventry and Lichfield. An analysis by occupation is not possible for the East Riding.

27. King, *Poverty and Welfare*, 6, refers to ‘the disappearance of female labour opportunities’.


34. Personal communication from David Neave.


37. The twelfth is from an unknown place.

38. C.C. Pond, ‘Internal population migration & mobility in eastern England in the 18th century’ (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1980), 73–4, 82, shows that widely accepted generalisations about movement have to be modified in real cases: ‘Whilst it may be possible to point out certain general trends and flows, it cannot be admissible to apply a theory derived, at best, from an awkward mean of very different situations to the whole’.


Michael J. Saxby

Michael Saxby was awarded a PhD in Chemistry in 1958, and spent most of his career in the food industry. More recently he completed his research diploma on marriage licences in Nottingham and Surrey during the mid-eighteenth century.

The interval of time between birth and baptism is of considerable importance to demographers since the accurate calculation of demographic indicators for the past depends on an accurate estimation of this figure. Most parish registers only record baptismal dates so that the number of births in a given period must be estimated. Bradley in his article on the seasonality of baptism notes that there is considerable variation in birth-baptism intervals at different periods and between different parishes and that there is a need for a comprehensive survey of parishes where both dates are recorded. This point is emphasised by Wrigley who states that in a survey for the period 1791–1812, in one parish 25 per cent of children were baptised within one day of birth, whereas in another parish, 48 days elapsed before this figure had been reached.

Berry and Schofield described a method for the presentation of birth-baptism intervals, which has been widely adopted by later authors. According to this procedure, the interval after birth in days by which one quarter, one half and then three-quarters of the sample children had been baptised is calculated. The authors further calculated the semi-interquartile range, which determines the interval in days over which the middle quarter of the sample was baptised. However, this calculation suffers from the disadvantage that it hides the incidence of parents having their baby baptised on the day of birth, which may suggest a local disease epidemic. Furthermore, as will be demonstrated below, Berry and Schofield’s method of presentation may cause misleading conclusions to be drawn.

An alternative method of presentation of the results in this form of analysis was used by Jackson and Laxton who, while following Berry and Schofield’s...
method, graphically displayed the cumulative proportion of baptisms in a given interval of days. In some cases, and at least for the data under consideration for this article, this graphical form of display would be inappropriate. In Jackson and Laxton’s most extreme case, that of three Liverpool parishes between 1765 and 1769, 95 per cent of parents had their children baptised within 40 days of birth. For the Sudbury data, presented below, the cumulative number of baptisms rarely reaches 95 per cent within 150 days, and in some years only 80 per cent of all children were baptised within 375 days. Presenting the Sudbury data by Jackson and Laxton’s method would require a very extended x-axis, and thus the procedure described in this article presents the figures in tabular form.

Sudbury, Suffolk is situated on the River Stour and is 55 miles north-east of London. In the 1820s the town was governed by a mayor, recorder, six aldermen, 24 capital burgesses and a town clerk. In 1821 the combined population of its three parishes, All Saints, St Gregory and St Peter was 3,950 and that of the parish under observation in this study, All Saints, was 1,129. The baptismal register of All Saints includes the dates of both births and baptisms during the period from April 1808 to 1841. For these years there are around 30 to 50 entries per year. This study is based on the 20-year period from 1809–1828.

The data used in this study is almost complete, with very few ‘defective entries’. Berry and Schofield defined ‘defective sample entries’ as ones in which one of the two dates is missing. In their study these were treated as if the baptisms had occurred after the longest recorded interval in the sample. In this study, since there were only three such entries from a total of over 1,000 baptisms, these have been omitted from the analysis, lessening any distortion in the results.

This article presents a different technique for examining the birth-baptismal interval. Here, Berry and Schofield’s calculation is reversed, so that the fixed parameter is the number of days, and the body of the table represents the percentage of couples. For this study, intervals of 75 days up to a maximum of 375 have been selected as the most appropriate for this form of analysis, though other studies may require different intervals. The remainder of this article will present data for the birth-baptismal interval for All Saints, Sudbury according to these two approaches and highlights the differences, noting the benefits of this alternative approach. Finally, this article will suggest some reasons for the particular birth-baptismal interval regime present in All Saints, Sudbury.

Table 1 presents the results according to the Berry and Schofield method. This table should be read as follows: in 1809, 25 per cent of babies were baptised within 26 days of birth. It also shows that around 280 days elapsed after birth before 75 per cent of babies were baptised, giving the impression that parents were particularly slow in taking their children to the church. Table 2 presents the same data in an alternative format and shows that 57 per cent of the children were baptised within 2½ months, (that is, in the 0 and 1–75 day...
The difference is due to 20 per cent of the couples delaying baptism for over a year, which distorts the interpretation by the first method. Furthermore, Table 2 shows that in 1814 nearly 23 per cent of parents delayed baptism of their infants by over a year, a fact which could not be ascertained from Table 1, which shows that 75 per cent of children were baptised within less than four months. Examination of Table 1 suggests that the pattern of baptisms in 1819 and 1822 were very similar, but when these years are compared in Table 2 it is seen that they are very different. It shows that in 1819

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Baptism register of All Saints, Sudbury, Suffolk Record Office, Bury St. Edmunds, FL 633/4/7 and 633/4/9
over 5 per cent of the parents had their children baptised on the day of birth, whereas in 1822 there were none. At the other end of the scale, over 12 per cent of couples delayed having their children baptised for over a year in 1819, whereas in 1822 this figure was less than 4 per cent. The conclusion to be drawn is that Berry and Schofield’s method tends to highlight stability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1–75</th>
<th>76–150</th>
<th>151–225</th>
<th>226–300</th>
<th>300–375</th>
<th>&gt;375</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Baptism register of All Saints, Sudbury, Suffolk Record Office, Bury St. Edmunds, FL 633/4/7 and 633/4/9
whereas the approach presented here highlights the extreme behaviour, and it is the extreme behaviour which warrants further examination.

In terms of birth-baptismal intervals the early nineteenth century has not been widely studied, although Doolittle examined the period 1801–1812 for St Magdalen, Colchester and showed that some 25 per cent of children were baptised within 12 days.9 Similarly McCallum found that at Brunton, Somerset, the same proportion of children were baptised within 23 days of birth in the period 1806–1812. This study has shown that for the period 1809–1812, the mean for 25 per cent of baptisms is 21 days, though by omitting the data for 1812 this is extended to 26 days.10

**Same-day baptisms**

It is notable from Table 2 that while the majority of children were baptised between 1 and 75 days of birth, in a number of years there were a small proportion of children baptised on the same day as birth. Most significantly, in 1811 and 1812, around 11 and 7 per cent respectively of parents had their children baptised on the day of birth, and a figure approaching 7 per cent was also recorded in 1815. These baptisms are particularly significant when considering multipliers for transforming births into baptisms for other purposes, and the cause of this behaviour is instructive. In each of the years 1810 to 1812 inclusive, the summers were wet, the harvests poor and the pea and bean crops failed.11 In 1812, the average price of wheat rose to over 122 shillings per quarter, the highest annual average recorded during the Napoleonic wars.12 It can be concluded that nutrition levels dropped and that mothers may not have been able to provide enough milk for their babies, consequently more same-day baptisms took place, because the parents were more cautious about the salvation of their child. Similarly, in 1821 when over 4 per cent of couples arranged to have their child baptised on the day of birth, there was a particularly poor harvest; snow fell in London on 27 May and there was a frost in June.13 No baptisms were recorded between 20 August and 27 November in All Saints, Sudbury and the vicar recorded that there was an epidemic of smallpox in that period. No doubt the incumbent considered it inadvisable to expose babies unnecessarily to the infection present in the town. There may be further reasons for parents having their child baptised on the day of birth. In 1811 there were four such christenings of which three children died within ten days, suggesting that these babies were indeed sick immediately after birth. However, in 1812 there were also four same-day baptisms, but burials for these named babies could not be found in the parish within the year. The contrary position can be observed in 1822 when no children were christened on the day of birth and the agricultural records reveal that it was a fine summer with an abundant harvest, so that the average price of wheat dropped to just 43 shillings a quarter.14

It cannot be concluded that the relationship between same-day baptism and agricultural conditions or sickness is the only explanation for this behaviour. In 1815 there were just two same day baptisms and in both instances the child was illegitimate (and had the same father, Thomas Dixey). In the first case, the
Table 3  Percentage of children born in the given year and baptised within the stated number of days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1–75</th>
<th>76–150</th>
<th>151–225</th>
<th>226–300</th>
<th>300–375</th>
<th>&gt;375</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Baptism register of All Saints, Sudbury, Suffolk Record Office, Bury St. Edmunds, FL 633/4/7 and 633/4/9

mother was Dixey’s late wife’s sister, Lydia and in the second, the mother was a spinster named Susanna Johnson. Perhaps the parents wanted their children baptised before the scandal broke. The practice of having illegitimate children baptised on the day of birth was repeated in 1816 and 1819 when William Gosling became the father of two children by his wife’s sister, both of whom were christened immediately. This man was the father of a third child by his wife’s sister in 1827, but on this occasion some five months elapsed before the baby was christened.

Occasionally, parents who delayed baptism for a few weeks suddenly realised that they should delay no further when their child became sick. Ann Maria, daughter of James and Susan Strutt, was born 21 September 1822, baptised on 15 October and died the following day. However, this practice does not appear to be very prevalent.

A new approach

As shown above the Berry and Schofield method analyses the data from the point of view of baptism and always looks back in time to the date of birth.
The tables presented above suffer from a potential distortion resulting from this practice, especially where a fair proportion of baptisms take place over one year. It should be obvious that the initial decision on when baptism occurs is made by parents at the time of birth, and the subsequent date of baptism is merely the result of this earlier decision. To illustrate this point, consider parents with a newly born child in a year of good weather and an abundant harvest. The mother is able to satisfy the baby nutritionally, so parents may not have the child baptised soon after birth. On the other hand, during the more difficult times, parents probably had their children baptised soon after birth, fearing the death of their child. As stated above environmental conditions are not the only reason for choosing when to baptise, but they surely play an important role. (Other possibilities, of course are illegitimacy, the presence/absence of a suitably qualified minister, and of course any birth defects or illness.) Whatever the possibilities, however, it should be clear that there is a strong argument for calculating birth-baptism intervals from the date of birth rather than the date of baptism.

Table 3 presents the data used to calculate Table 2 in a different format: here, the year of birth is used as the viewpoint rather than the year of baptism. Calculations beyond 1820 have not been made since there is the chance that a long-delayed baptism would be missed, distorting the results. This table demonstrates that over 90 per cent of parents brought their children for baptism within 255 days in the years 1812, 1817 and 1818. As previously stated, the price of wheat was very high in 1812; the summer of 1817 was very wet and although there was a good harvest in 1818, unemployment in agriculture rose to 60 per cent in the south and east of England. It is argued that parents tended to baptise their children early during hard times.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is suggested that the manner of presentation of these data provide a more detailed and more accurate portrayal of the birth-baptism intervals recorded in the parish registers. In the case of these data this method is also more practical than Jackson and Laxton’s graphical method of presentation in units of single days. Furthermore, it offers an advantage over Berry and Schofield’s procedure by manipulating figures according to the number of baptisms in a given period, rather than calculating the time taken to achieve a given number of baptisms, so that it shows years when parents took their children to church for baptism on the day of birth as well as when exceptional delays took place.

NOTES

4. E. A. Wrigley, ‘Births and baptisms: the use of Anglican baptism registers as a source of


WHAT’S IN A NAME? VICTORIAS IN CANADA AND GREAT BRITAIN
IN 1881

K. Schürer and L. Dillon

In the previous issue of LPS Joan Schneider commented in a letter on the absence of girls named Victoria in the village of Tilsworth, Bedfordshire, in the second half of the nineteenth century, suggesting that one might expect to find more on the assumption that girls would be named in honour of the Queen.1

In recent years the propensity for parents to name their daughters Victoria has been decreasing quite rapidly. Of girls whose birth was registered in 2002, Victoria was the 77th most popular name, having dropped from being ranked 39th only three years earlier.2 Yet, following the line of enquiry suggested by Joan Schneider, how did the name fare during the reign of Queen Victoria, undoubtedly the most famous bearer of the name? To what extent were Britannia’s daughters named after their monarch during the epoch that took her name?

The subsequent Queen Victoria was born on 24 May 1819, the daughter of Edward, Duke of Kent, son of George III, and Victoria Maria Louisa, daughter of Francis Duke of Saxe-Coburg-Saalfeld and former wife of Prince Emich of Leiningen. As it happens the young Princess, the heir to William IV, who had no legitimate children, was never intended to be called Victoria. Prior to her baptism her father intended that she be named Victorie Georgina Alexandrina Charlotte Augusta, and these names were submitted to the Prince Regent (the soon to be George IV, the Duke of Kent’s elder brother), who was to be one of the godfathers, the other being Tsar Alexander I of Russia. However, the Prince Regent, who openly disliked his brother, refused to accept the names proposed, suggesting the name Georgiana should either be used as the child’s first name, or not at all. At the christening in the Cupola Room at Kensington Palace on 24 June when prompted by the Archbishop of Canterbury what the name of the child should be, the Prince Regent simply answered ‘Alexandrina’. The Duke of Kent then urged that another name be added, suggesting this time, Elizabeth. The Prince Regent apparently replied ‘Give
her the mother’s name also then, but it cannot precede that of the Emperor. Thus, ‘Alexandrina Victoria’ was later entered into the baptismal register. As a young child the future Queen was called Drina, an abbreviation of her first name, and it was only after her ascension to the throne in 1837 that she adopted her second name as her ‘primary’ name. If it were not for this quirk of fate we might today refer to the second half of the nineteenth century as the ‘Alexandrinan’ age.

The availability of a computerised version of the complete 1881 census of England and Wales allows a study of the popularity of the name Victoria. In England and Wales in 1881 Victoria was not a particularly popular name. Across both countries together there were only 3,123 Victoria’s recorded in the census. This total accounted for only 0.021 per cent of all females in the country. To put it another way, only about 2 in every 10,000 women had been named Victoria. Yet behind this national mean there lay a wider degree of regional variation. As the accompanying map shows, Victorias were mostly to be found in the ‘southern’ counties of England. In particular the name stands out as being a ‘metropolitan’ one, with some 22 per cent of all Victorias being enumerated in Middlesex. This county also recorded the highest proportion of females named Victoria, accounting for 0.047 per cent of all Middlesex women. Outside of Middlesex, Victoria was found in greatest numbers in East Anglia, where in the counties of Suffolk, Norfolk, Essex and Cambridge
women named Victoria were around twice as common as the national average. In the country as a whole, women named Victoria were rarely found north of a line running from the Bristol Channel to the Wash, a fact that possibly reflects an underlying cultural divide between the ‘north’ and ‘south’ of the country.

The map presented above (Figure 1) deliberately does not illustrate the proportion of females named Victoria in Scotland. The reason for this is quite simple. If Scotland were to be included much of the map for the northern kingdom would be blank. The 1881 census of Scotland recorded just 112 women called Victoria, representing just 0.0057 per cent of the entire female population of the country. Of these, nearly 60 per cent (n=64) were found in either Edinburgh or the county of Lanarkshire. Across large tracts of Scotland there was not a single Victoria to be found.

If Victoria was a relatively uncommon name in late nineteenth-century Britain, and generally became increasingly rare as one moved northwards from the ‘southern’ counties of England, how did this picture compare to the use of the name in other parts of the Queen’s empire colonised by emigrants from the mother country? Some clues in attempting to answer this question are given by an examination of contemporary census data for Canada. As in the case of Great Britain, the complete 1881 census of Canada has been transcribed as a computerised database. This shows that on average Victoria was a much more common name in Canada that it was in England and Wales. Indeed, with the name accounting for 0.259 per cent of the entire female population, the 5,465 Victorias in Canada in 1881 were just over 10 times more numerous, pro rata, than their English and Welsh counterparts. Women in Canada were some 45 times more likely to be christened Victoria than their Scottish cousins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total female population</th>
<th>Victorias as % of all females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>19,520</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>28,132</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>157,029</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>219,855</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>946,591</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>54,147</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>3,648</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>680,273</td>
<td>0.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territories</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4,817</td>
<td>0.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,465</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,110,364</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, analysing the distribution of Victorias in Canada by province of enumeration indicates that the use of the name was not as one might have predicted. Table 1 shows that Victoria was more popular, and by a large margin, in the predominately French-speaking province of Québec rather than the Canadian 'heartlands' of British emigration.

Two-thirds of all Victorias in Canada in 1881 were to be found in Québec, where they accounted for a little over 1 in every 200 women. Moreover, of the 3,635 Victorias in Québec, 90 per cent were recorded in the census as being French in terms of ethnic origin. Thus the name Victoria was much more common among French-Canadians than others. Was the naming of daughters in Québec a means of demonstrating loyalty with the anglo-Canadian elite, or was it just a name that appealed to French speakers? It is perhaps interesting to note that the name Victoria was also relatively common in the Channel Islands in 1881, the islands being not only much closer to France than England in terms of distance, but also having a significant French-speaking population. However, despite the unexpected situation in Québec, it should be noted that with the exception of British Columbia, all of the provinces of Canada recorded, pro rata, at least twice or nearly twice as many Victorias within the female population as the county in England and Wales where the name was at its most popular.

The collective census data also allows the ages of Victorias in Canada and England and Wales in 1881 to be examined and compared. Obviously knowing the name and age of an individual at a given date enables the year when the child was christened with the given name to be calculated, plus or minus a margin of six months. Figure 2 graphs the distribution of Victorias enumerated in Canada and England and Wales in 1881 by year of birth. This displays some interesting features. The difference in the popularity of naming girls Victoria in the two countries can clearly be seen. In England and Wales, the use of the name was most common, unsurprisingly, in 1837, the year of the Victoria's ascension to the throne, and 1838, the year of the coronation. Prior to that Victoria was very rarely used as a girl's name, and thereafter the name's popularity dropped away quite quickly. Of those born in 1837-1838 (and still alive in 1881) some 0.075 per cent of girls were named after their monarch. By 1845 the proportion had dropped to around 0.025 per cent, and generally remained at between 0.025 and 0.03 per cent up until the time of the 1881 census. A slight increase in popularity was shown in 1862, presumably as a result of Prince Albert's death on 14 December 1861. No such rise was witnessed in 1877 when Victoria was pronounced Empress (of India). It would be interesting to discover if the Silver and Golden Jubilee celebrations in 1887 and 1897 witnessed a rise in the popularity of Victoria as a name.

For Canadians 1837 also witnessed a surge in the popularity of Victoria as a name. However, unlike the trend noted for England and Wales, the name continued, with some short-term fluctuations, to rise in popularity, reaching a
peak of 0.425 per cent of all females born in 1872 being named Victoria. Maybe the continued popularity of the name Victoria in Canada resulted, in part, from the ‘Victoria Day’ public holiday, held on 20 June, the anniversary of her accession, initiated in Canada in 1845 and still celebrated today. For those born between 1859 and 1872, with the exception of just a couple of years, over 0.35 per cent of all females living in Canada in 1881 were named Victoria, some five times the level seen in post-coronation England and Wales. Could this delayed popularity of the name in Canada perhaps be related to the development of the colony as a self-governing Dominion, such status being granted in 1867?

The Canadian situation also displays another aspect to the use of the name Victoria. Whereas the name, as noted previously, was hardly known in England and Wales prior to 1837, the same was not true of Canada. In the Canadian case minor peaks were recorded in both 1805 and 1815. Both of these years, of course, saw major British victories over the French on both the sea, at Trafalgar, and on land, at Waterloo. In a colony with such a high proportion of French-speakers this pattern appears rather striking and may, indeed, say much about the national consciousness within the colony.

To return to the question initially posed by Joan Schneider: ‘Are Victorias lacking throughout the country?’ the answer would seem to be yes, and

![Figure 2](image-url)
especially lacking in the north of England, Wales and Scotland. However, the name was used to a much greater extent in at least one of the colonies, namely Canada. But was the Canadian situation reflected in other parts of the Empire? And what about Alberts?

NOTES

3. The proceedings at the christening were recorded in the correspondence of the Duchess of Kent. See C. Woodham-Smith, Queen Victoria. Her life and times. Vol. I 1819–1861 (London, 1972), 34–5. The ‘Emperor’ referred to by the Prince Regent was Tsar Alexander of Russia, the other godfather. Alexander was not present at the christening himself, but was represented by the Duke of York. The godmothers were the Queen of Württemberg (the eldest daughter of George III and the Duke of Kent’s sister) and the Dowager Duchess of Coburg (the Duchess of Kent’s mother). Neither were present.
5. This is includes a small number of variants such as Victorie, Vicktora and Victorine.
6. In line with this finding the name Victoria does not appear at all in any of the seven parishes surveyed by Tom Arkell using the 1851 census enumerators’ books. See, T. Arkell, ‘Forename frequency in 1851’, Local Population Studies, 47 (1991) 65–76. Out of 3,194 females studies, one was recorded with the name Victorie.
7. Respectively accounting for 0.041, 0.041, 0.039 and 0.039 per cent of the female population.
10. In Guernsey in 1881 Victorias accounted for 0.171 per cent of the female population, while in Jersey the figure reached 0.359 per cent.
11. It is perhaps also interesting to note that the name Victoria was recorded, by Canadian standards, in quite low numbers in the province of Prince Edward Island. This island, previously called the Isle St Jean, was renamed in 1798 in honour of Edward, the Duke of Kent (Victoria’s father), who was in Canada commanding the British forces in North America at the time.
12. We are indebted to Matthew Woollard for drawing attention to the Victoria Day public holiday. He also provided useful comments on an initial draft of this text.
THE DEMOGRAPHY OF COASTAL COMMUNITIES

Malcolm Smith

Andrew Blaikie’s stimulating and wide-ranging account of the demographic characteristics of fishing communities on the Moray Firth, published in *LPS* 69, suggests how their particular circumstances of economy, technology and society may have contributed towards a demographic regime distinct from that of agricultural and other communities in Scotland. This note offered as a response to the questions posed by Blaikie in footnotes 46 and 47, in which he asks whether there is evidence about the demographic structure of fishing communities elsewhere, and whether other occupational groups might be demographically isolated in the same way as fishing communities appear to be. The case studies are taken from the North Yorkshire coast, the Ards Peninsula, County Down, and the Durham coalfield.

North Yorkshire coast

In the small coastal parish of Fylingdales, North Yorkshire, parish endogamy was estimated from the Anglican marriage registers at 80 per cent over the period 1654–1916. There were nevertheless both spatial and occupational subdivisions within the parish, and the censuses from 1841–1881 showed a clear tendency toward a distinct and stable distribution of surnames among the families associated with the sea – fishermen, mariners and shipowners – compared to those who were engaged in agriculture and trade. We have no complete data on endogamy by occupation, but an analysis of the occupations of the grooms of all the women bearing the most distinctive (and providence-tempting) fisher surname in Robin Hood’s Bay – Storm – shows that among the 44 Storm women married between 1789–1897, 37 married mariners or fishermen.

A comparison of the birthplaces of fishermen and their children in settlements along the Yorkshire coast (Filey, Scarborough, Robin Hood’s Bay, Whitby, Runswick and Staithes) at the censuses of 1851–1881, showed that with the exception of movement between Scarborough and Filey, there was negligible migration between neighbouring settlements and, as recorded by Blaikie for the Moray Firth, the surname distributions in nearby fishing communities differed markedly along the coast.

There were, however, some important differences between the situation in Fylingdales and that described by Blaikie. The fishing industry in Fylingdales was in decline in the second half of the nineteenth century, and the fishermen
were an aging and diminishing population. At successive censuses the fishermen’s mean ages to the nearest year were 44 (in 1841), 49 (1851), 56 (1861), 61 (1871) and 63 (1881) respectively, and during this period the number of fishermen declined from 41 to 17.6

The Ards Peninsula, County Down

In the post-Famine population of the Ards Peninsula, both the pattern of surname distributions and of marital migration were closely related to geographical distance and religious denomination, the latter itself largely a product of seventeenth century plantation of Scots Presbyterians in the north of the peninsula. The outstanding exception to this broad conformity was the fishing port of Portavogie (almost 100 per cent Presbyterian), whose surnames and marital links were not only strikingly different from the predominantly Roman Catholic parishes to the south, but also from its Presbyterian neighbours to the north and west.7

A contemporary newspaper report noted that:

Little or no emigration or immigration has taken place ... Surnames are scarce; Palmers can be counted by the score; Adairs, Mahoods, Cullys, Hughes, and Coffeys by the dozen: a fact to some extent accounted for by the tendency to intermarry. The young men seldom venture outside the limits of the village in their search for a wife; hence a strong family likeness prevails ...8

The Durham Coalfield

Blaikie raises the question of whether other occupational groups might also have a demographic structure isolating them from their neighbours. One group which acquired a reputation for such distinctiveness were the miners of the Great Northern Coalfield. Among many possible references, two quotations are enough to convey the general impression. Of the early nineteenth century MacKenzie and Ross (1834) observed:

they marry constantly with their own people from generation to generation, family has united with family till their population has become a dense mass of relationship.... The nature of the work contributed to their isolation....9

In the Report of the Commissioners into the State of the Population in the Mining Districts (1846), a colliery agent says of Haswell and Shotton collieries:

The lads allow their parents to receive their wages until within a year or two of their being married; during which time they are saving money to fit up their house. They marry at about 20 on average, and always colliers' daughters; they are very clannish.10

We have recently completed a study of occupational endogamy in four parishes of the Durham coalfield during the period 1837–1876 (when parish
registers record occupation), with a view to testing this received impression of the miners as ‘a peculiar race’. At first sight, the miners’ level of occupational endogamy suggested them to be exceptional among all occupations sampled, with a marked disparity in endogamy levels between the miners (76 per cent) and the other groups – seamen recording 39 per cent endogamy, followed by agricultural labourers (32 per cent), general labourers (28 per cent) and professionals (22 per cent). However, an analysis by loglinear models and odds ratios, devised to take account of the relative sizes of the different occupational groups, showed that while all groups had a tendency toward the preference for a mate from the same occupational background, this was more pronounced among the professionals and agricultural labourers than among the mining community, despite the miners’ higher rate of endogamy.

NOTES

9. E. Mackenzie and M. Ross, An Historical, Topographical, and Descriptive View of the County Palatine of Durham (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1834), 114.
LOCAL POPULATION STUDIES AT THE OPEN UNIVERSITY

From 1974 to 2001 the Open University offered courses with a strong local population studies element. First there was D301 Historical Data and the Social Sciences, then D301 Historical Sources and the Social Scientist and finally DA301 Studying Family and Community History: 19th and 20th centuries. In all some 4,502 students successfully completed these courses. Local Population Studies played a prominent part in the first two, with all students receiving current copies of the journal during their study time. DA301 spawned a new journal, Family and Community History, in which the spirit of the course lives on.

The retirement of key personnel means that it is unlikely that the Open University will mount courses like those from the D301 stable in the near future. But there are a couple of short courses coming on stream which should interest some readers of Local Population Studies. The first of these, A173 Start Writing Family History, begins in May. Its primary purpose is to introduce students to the writing of history. The vehicle chosen is family history with the starter motor being the family tree. It covers a variety of sources – birth, marriage and death certificates; census enumerators’ books; letters; diaries; autobiographies and photographs. The promise and pitfalls of each are explored.

The other course is U130 Get Connected. This is an introduction to computing and covers word processing; e-mailing; the World Wide Web; and spreadsheets. Unlike many such courses, U130 has quite a bit of academic content, with a focus on the Bloomsbury Group. This has given me the opportunity to explore the 1901 CEBs for Gordon Square, to which Virginia Stephen (later Woolf) and her sister Vanessa (later Bell) – two core members of the Bloomsbury Group – came in 1904. This and the introduction to the holdings of international libraries and databases should prove particularly useful for historical demographers. The course starts in April.

Both these courses are being delivered via the internet, with all the paraphernalia of the new medium: CD Roms; audio and video clips; academic chat rooms and so forth. To learn more about them you should log on to www.open.ac.uk and enter the course titles in the Key Words window, or phone 01908 653231.

Finally, mention should be made of the on-going research programme on infant mortality that was generously funded by the Welcome Trust. Under the direction of Peter Razzell and myself some 20 research students have worked
on the project. Seven left it with a BPhil, three with an MPhil and eight are working towards a doctorate. The primary source material has come from the Vaccination (Birth) and Infant Death Registers, a barely used unpublished source held locally. The focus has been on low levels of aggregation – streets, families, days and weeks. The findings to-date suggest that, as an article in the *Lancet* in 1916 about infant mortality itself noted, ‘Not by wide, sweeping generalisations, but by careful local consideration of strictly local conditions will, in time, the problem be solved’. Some findings from the project will appear in *Family and Community History* later this year.

Michael Drake

*The Open University*
BOOK REVIEWS


My father-in-law was apprenticed in 1913 to a dispensing chemist in Halifax for a term of seven years, his mother paying the premium that was demanded. Exploited by his employer, he was glad to be called-up in 1917, and after the war to receive a government funded technical education. The system that evolved over six or seven centuries for training skilled craftsmen has today effectively disappeared, though we can now worry about the future supply of reliable plumbers.

The medieval craft guilds in the towns and cities created the system, probably to protect their members from cowboy competition; from 1344 cities such as Bristol, recognising the municipal value of such controls, made time-served apprentices entitled to freedom of the city. Some uniformity was created in England and Wales by the 1563 Statute of Artificers. Poor Law Acts from 1601 encouraged the compulsory apprenticeship of poor children at the expense of parish rates or public charities.

The Statute of Artificers did not require the indentured contracts between apprentice and master to be recorded. But registers of indentures were used by some councils to control grants of municipal freedom, from 1532 in Bristol and 1554 in Gloucester. These registers record for each apprentice his father’s name, trade and place of residence, the name and trade of his master and mistress, and the term of years (at least seven) he was to serve from a certain date. Such registers are usually matched by separate registers of freemen, and from 1710 to 1811 there were national registers of the duty paid on indentures, preserved at Kew in class IR1.

Jill Barlow’s calendar of the earliest surviving Gloucester registers, from 1595 to a convenient terminus of 1700, is a model of clarity and fully meets the high standards of other volumes of the Gloucestershire Record Series. With 4,280 entries, many with oddly spelt surnames and trades, perfect accuracy is not to be expected; for example, Christopher Kinge (1626 and 1633) becomes Knipe in 1639. There are some unusual occupational names, for example ‘translator’ for shoe-mender; the only identified error is that John Keare (1668) appears as a farmer (agric’), though in fact a pinmaker (apiculator).

Such rare mistakes hardly detract from the usefulness of the calendar or the value of Barlow’s introduction and tables. Apart from their genealogical interest, the registers are particularly useful for investigating changes during the seventeenth century in three areas: Gloucester’s principal trades, the
catchment area for immigrant apprentices, and the numbers of masters and their apprentices.

Measured by numbers of apprentices bound to specific trades in each decade, leather working was dominant throughout the seventeenth century, representing 28 per cent and 20 per cent of indentures in the first and second halves of the period. Metal working came second, chiefly pinmaking, and this increased in importance from 12 per cent to 18 per cent. Food trades remained steady in third place, with 13 per cent. Distribution experienced a significant decline, from 20 per cent to 8 per cent, while textiles, steady at 11 per cent of apprentices, changed from broadweaving to silkweaving, with only two thirds as many masters. It would have been helpful if the index of trades had been annotated with the editor’s chosen occupational categories.

Apprentices came to Gloucester from as far afield as Westmoreland and Ireland, but the proportion coming more than ten miles decreased from 33 per cent in 1595–1600 to 15 per cent in 1691–1700, while those from Gloucester itself increased from 32 per cent to 53 per cent. This growing reliance on local manpower appears to reflect experience elsewhere, for example in London and Bristol.

The number of apprentices taken on by masters each year must have related to Gloucester’s commercial prosperity and the extent of its market. At the beginning of the century there were about 40 new apprentices a year, falling to 19 in 1614; the numbers then increased (excluding the siege year of 1643 and 1648) to nearly 60 in the 1660s. After a quite exceptional peak of 94 in 1669, numbers declined to about 30 by the end of the century. With a population of 5,000 estimated from the 1672 Hearth Tax, about 40 males would have reached the age of 16 each year, of whom about 30 became apprentices, joining an equal number coming from outside Gloucester. It is therefore plausible that a majority of Gloucester’s young men were apprenticed; only three girls were indentured, apart from 21 bound in 1659 to merchants in America.

During the 1660s less than half those indentured became freemen after completing their apprenticeship, and less than half of these freemen are later recorded as taking their own apprentices, though others may still have pursued their trade. This apparently high wastage rate must be caused in part by failure to complete an apprenticeship. Unfortunately, such failure is completely undocumented, though Leonard Schwarz assumed that in London 60 per cent failed (‘London Apprentices in the Seventeenth Century: Some Problems’, *LPS* 38, 18–22). It would be most interesting to have a detailed analysis of the population of Gloucester craftsmen, aided by parish registers, the Hearth Tax and (ideally) a database version of this calendar. *LPS* has published too little on this important aspect of social and economic history.

Martin Ecclestone

The historiography of Irish migration is dominated by studies of the diaspora that followed the Great Irish Famine of 1845–50. Emigration from Ireland was by no means a new feature of the post-famine years, and was occurring on some scale by the 1830s: but it was the famine that marked a key transition in Irish demographic history, turning a hitherto expanding population into a steadily declining one. As reported in *World population and resources* (P.E.P.) in 1955, Ireland ‘is the only country whose population has declined throughout the past century; it has probably the highest fertility rate in the world and the lowest marriage rate; its emigration exceeds that of any other country’ (p. 169). ‘Flight from famine’ is only part of the story, for despite the fact that successive harvest failures at the start of the 1860s, 1870s and 1880s produced new peaks, with net emigration reaching 16.3 per 1,000 in the 1880s, the fact that the wealthier east of Ireland experienced a larger continual drain of population than did the poorer west, while many migrants (particularly to America) were clearly not from the poorest social class, shows that there is far more to the story of the Irish exodus than that. The imposition of strict inheritance patterns after the famine, lack of economic development, perceived opportunities elsewhere, the establishment of kinship and information networks and the development of a tradition of emigration all played their part. Net emigration continued into the twentieth century, falling steadily to around 5–6 per 1,000 by the 1930s, rising again after World War Two to peak at nearly 15 per 1,000 in the late 1950s before a dramatic decline to under 4 per 1,000 by the late 1960s. After the First World War Britain took over from America as the main destination. Given the longevity of these trends, this study of the 26 counties that constituted (from 1921) the Irish Free State and later (from 1949) the Irish Republic through to 1971 is particularly welcome, for during these years approximately 1,500,000 people left Ireland, the vast majority of them destined for Britain.

The story of Irish population history and the role of emigration within it is therefore a fascinating one, and it is one that Delaney tells well. A wide range of published and unpublished sources have been consulted, a particular feature of which is the use of a corpus of unpublished official records generated by the Irish and British governments. Chapter One, ‘Perspectives on Irish migration’, usefully introduces a range of theoretical approaches: those which forefront individual decisions to migrate; those which take a sociological approach, emphasising the wider process of socio-cultural change of which migration formed a part and the impact upon both the sending and the host society; the various global approaches which generally incorporate a core-periphery model; network theory; and the ‘exit-voice’ polarity model as outlined by Hirschman. The conclusion, that there is no one coherent theory of international migration, only a fragmented set of different approaches which tend to be associated with discrete disciplines, comes as no surprise.
Thereafter the study is organised on chronological lines, dealing in turn with the inter-war years, the period of state involvement that was brought about by the Second World War, the post-war exodus (1947–57) and finally the period 1958–71 which witnessed at first a major increase in net emigration in response to economic crisis in Ireland followed by a dramatic downturn in the later 1960s. The continuous flow of emigrants was punctuated by peaks in the mid-1930s, the Second World War years and late 1940s, and throughout the 1950s, followed by a temporary respite in the later 1960s and 1970s, only for large-scale migration to return again in the 1980s in response to renewed economic depression, with the United States regaining some of its former importance as a destination. Most Irish counties were affected, those in the west and north-west most severely, and the result was overall population decline in all decades except for the 1960s and 1970s, when the temporary downturn in emigration allied to rising marriage rates produced a net surplus.

The age profile of migrants conformed to that found in most other studies, with a heavy concentration in the late teens and early adult years, non-migration being explained in terms of family commitments entered upon by those who missed this window of opportunity, as well as the fact that some people had employment with which they were clearly satisfied. Kinship and personal networks were important factors in influencing both the propensity to migrate and the particular destinations chosen. The state, however, only played an important role during World War Two, when restrictions upon freedom of movement co-existed with a policy of active recruitment of labour by the British government. Before and after, however, virtual freedom of movement prevailed: the temporary controls of World War Two were quickly dismantled, and the ‘special relationship’ that existed between Britain and Ireland was underlined by exemption of the Republic from the new controls introduced during the 1960s and 1971. The break with Britain in 1921 and the subsequent hostile cultural environment probably did encourage Protestant emigration, but this was only one aspect of the more general decline of the Protestant community, and after World War Two Protestants emigrated for much the same reasons as did Catholics.

The key reasons for this prolonged exodus closely mirror the established orthodoxy for the nineteenth century, despite the switch to Britain as the main destination which, due to its proximity, naturally rendered the experience qualitatively different and less traumatic. Economic factors, broadly interpreted, provide the key, but again the emphasis is upon aspirations towards higher living standards as well as sheer desperation, particularly in the post Second World War years. Short-term fluctuations, notably the temporary reversal in the 60s and 70s, can be similarly explained. As a ‘push’ factor economic under-development was central throughout, with the differential regional rates explicable in terms of low levels of non-agricultural employment, established traditions of migration, and usually also an under-developed agricultural economy. In terms of
'pull' the overarching factor was the demand for labour in Britain, largely for unskilled labour but with a wider range of employment opportunities opening up after World War Two.

By 1971 the Irish-born population was the largest migrant grouping in Britain. But while emigration from Ireland attracted consistent cross-party disapproval within the Republic, at least prior to the downturn of the 1960s, it is argued that the reaction in Britain was almost negligible compared with the attention focused upon immigration from the New Commonwealth, a topic which clearly warrants further attention. Furthermore, there has been very little attention paid to the actual experience of these migrants in the host country, as either individuals or communities. The story that has been told so well here, therefore, is written largely from the perspective of the donor rather than the recipient nation, leaving another fascinating story yet to be told.

Nigel Goose
University of Hertfordshire


This book is the first in a new series of texts and calendars from Four Courts Press, in association with the Representative Church Body Library, intended to complement the latter’s established parish register series. Raymond Gillespie has edited the early seventeenth century ‘vestry book’ of the parish of St John the Evangelist, Dublin (Representative Church Body Library MS P 328/5/1). The contents of this book suggests that this parish was both unusual, and at the same time representative of urban Irish parishes of the period.

St John’s was unusual in a number of respects: in its very close connections with Christ Church Cathedral; its very high population (the largest in Dublin) which was seemingly amongst the poorest in Dublin (judged by per capita cess assessments); its high proportion of protestant parishioners; and its long standing tradition of formal record keeping (the parish boasted some of the earliest nearly complete series of parochial records in the Church of Ireland). But St John’s also shared similarities with its counterparts in Dublin, as Gillespie points out, and as its vestry book elucidates. The close proximity of rich and poor living within its boundaries, the navigating of religious tensions, the local display of social status and reputation, and the ever increasing problem of how to deal with indigenous (and ‘strange’) poor are all depicted within the folios of this text.

The manuscript that has been edited comprises three distinct types of source: the annual accounts of the churchwardens, the parish cess lists, and the minutes of the vestry. Each of these sources has its own distinct sets of characteristics and potential uses, which will be well known to early modernists, and researchers accustomed to early seventeenth century parochial records will not be disappointed by the St John’s vestry records.
They may, however, be pleasantly surprised at the level of detail that is attained in some of the material, which surpasses that present in many analogous vestry sources, and it is perhaps here that the lineage of record keeping in the parish becomes evident. Thus, for example, a rental of the ‘rents and revenues’ of the parish drawn up in 1650 provides not only topographical descriptions of each building, parcel of land, rent or other source of income, but also provides potted histories of the tenants, terms of leases and so on, clearly drawing on existing archived records. The rental also contains notes and comments from the surveyor regarding future actions that need to be taken, such as those connected with Doctor Usher’s house, inhabited by Mrs Carmock (who had been there for 61 years at a certain rent): ‘It is very necessary to send for her to see the lease for I conceive there is not above 4 yeares to come in the lease.’ (p. 188).

The levels of detail are also high in the more formulaic elements of the vestry book, including the churchwarden’s accounts and the vestry minutes. Descriptions of disbursements paid out for the running of the parish, and notably the maintenance of church and its furniture (particularly in the 1630s and 1650s when large-scale renovations were carried out) are very detailed, with nails often counted exactly over the course of the year. Details about materials, weights, suppliers (local and otherwise), craftsmen, wages and patrons can be drawn out from the accounts, making them a rich source for a variety of studies. There is a certain exactitude in the way St John’s vestry book was written which speaks volumes about the administration of the parish, and at the same time provides significant material to the historian: signatures and personal marks are scrupulously indicated by the parochial officers (p. 26); irregularities in the work (especially accounts) of parochial officers are investigated and reported (p. 82); and even admissions that the formulaic ‘by the consent of the whole parish’ is occasionally nothing more than a euphemism: ‘It was agreed amongst us (Mr Eustace excepted) that the Cook of the Colledge should pay v\n+ per annum.’ (p. 31). This level of precision on the part of the parish officers allows us a clearer picture of events than we might otherwise have from comparable records.

The vestry book of St John’s provides an insight into the workings of an early modern parish that has substantially more clarity than many similar parochial administrative sources. Anyone with an interest in almost any aspect of the social, cultural and economic processes involved in the life of a small urban community will find this book stimulating and useful. Information can be gathered about people, practices and costs of burial, prices of commodities and raw materials, wages of skilled craftsmen and labourers, the adaptation of religious observances, the celebration of holidays (such as ‘triumph day’, and ‘gunpowder day’), the handling of inter-parish disputes, the effects of the onset of plague, and the perception and treatment of the poor. And of course the internal workings of the secular administration of an urban parish are delineated in abundant detail. In other words this is a book which should interest anyone whose research falls into the period covered by the vestry book, as its contents touch upon almost every aspect of parochial life, which in turn reflects and informs our understanding of society more generally. While there may be similar
parochial sources available to the early modernist, the vestry book is a really good example of the kinds of evidence that these records can furnish us with.

Mark Merry
University of Essex


The primary purpose of this book is to draw attention to the sources for Irish demographic history before the nineteenth century. It has a subsidiary purpose, which is ‘to demonstrate the importance of considering the demographic make up of an area when writing its history.’ According to the author, Ireland illustrates ‘the Mathusian dilemma of a traditional agrarian society incapable, over the long run, of preserving a balance between population and food production.’ This interpretation has not gone uncontested. But until we have a fuller understanding of the course of population growth in the pre-census decades (and, indeed, up to the Great Famine) the debate will continue. The value of Gurrin’s slim volume is that he directs us to the evidence.

The difficulty facing historical demographers of Ireland is that there is no reliable official census before 1821 (the attempt in 1813 was never completed). Parish resisters – the great source for English and European demographers before the nineteenth century – either have not survived or relate only to the Church of Ireland, a minority section of the population. Roman Catholic registers do not exist before the late eighteenth century and Presbyterian and other nonconformist population listings are few and far between. Historians, therefore, have to resort to what Gurrin calls ‘census substitutes’. There is a poll tax summary for 1660, but the most important of the substitutes are the hearth-money returns, a form of property tax that operated between 1662 and 1824. Also valuable are the religious censuses taken during the course of the eighteenth century designed to count the numbers of Protestants and Catholics. Finally there are estate surveys, church records, and miscellaneous sources.

All these sources have their limitations. They all relate to restricted geographical areas and often to particular social groups; they may even be fraudulent or carelessly conducted. There is a further difficulty that the explosion in the Four Courts in 1922 destroyed many of the national archives and we have to work with surviving fragments. The Irish historical demographer has to be prepared to spend a lot of time in county libraries and local archives and to be resigned to the prospect that the records he or she is looking for do not exist. This book is valuable in recording what has survived in printed, manuscript or transcript form. Much of this information, though, is contained in the tightly printed footnotes that require close reading.

The core of Gurrin’s book is a careful discussion of the census substitutes. The starting point for serious work (discounting the guesswork of Fynes Moryson
at the beginning of the seventeenth century) is the poll tax summary of 1660. It was the work of Sir William Petty and has been known to historians since 1864. At first it was thought to be a census but it became apparent to later historians that it was a list of tax payers (500,091 of them).

Petty also pioneered the use of the Hearth Tax returns as a source of calculations of population. Historians have used them ever since, up to and beyond K. H. Connell’s seminal work in 1950. There are several problems in using them for this purpose quite apart from the extent of their survival. How efficient was the process of tax gathering? Gurrin sets out the methods of collection, including a discussion of the periods in which the tax was farmed. What was the level of legitimate exemptions? What was the extent of fraud? Connell believed that omissions caused by fraud and exemptions amounted to 50 per cent of the total for much of the eighteenth century and even more in the seventeenth. His estimates of the pre-famine population rested on these assumptions. Later scholars have revised downwards the adjustments for the earlier part of the century, thus making significant changes to the rate of population growth. This rate, in turn, has a bearing on the Malthusian interpretation of Irish social history.

But the big problem when using the Hearth Tax returns is the size of the multipliers required to convert houses (or more precisely hearths) into households. Dr Gurrin provides a comprehensive discussion of the issue, reviewing the various multipliers that have been used by scholars. Some are based on evidence, but many are the products of ‘educated guesses’. Gurrin himself plumps for multipliers in the range of 4.5 – 5.5 for rural areas and 5.5 – 6.0 for towns.

To a limited extent these multipliers may be confirmed by an analysis of the religious censuses. These were produced sometimes on the initiative of the government but sometimes by a local Church of Ireland bishop or clergyman. The best of them list the inhabitants of a parish or diocese arranged in households, distinguishing men, women, and children and perhaps giving ages and occupation. Once again we have to be aware of the accuracy of the document. The rent rolls of landed estates sometimes provide similar demographic information, although often they will list only the head tenants, omitting the under-tenants who were numerous in many parts of Ireland in the eighteenth century.

Brian Gurrin’s book is full of helpful warnings about the pitfalls of the sources and useful hints on methodology – the use of spreadsheets for example. It is comprehensive (though he fails to mention the extremely detailed census of Carrick-on-Suir taken in 1799, which seems to be in origin a military listing) and demonstrates that serious demographic studies of pre-census Ireland are possible. As he says, the sources are most suitable for comparing region with region, but they have their value, too, in establishing the magnitude of population growth in pre-famine Ireland.

L. A. Clarkson

*The Queen’s University, Belfast*

This short book provides a concise history of the Askrigg Friendly Society which served, and still serves, upper Wensleydale in the North Yorkshire dales. Detailed records survive to enable a fairly complete history of this small society’s activities to be given (only 953 members were enrolled from its beginning in 1809 to the present). Hallas devotes individual chapters to the composition of the society’s membership, the articles and finances of the society, sickness benefits, social activities together with a short introduction which places the Askrigg society into a wider national context. For most *LPS* readers the main value of this work is to see how the society evolved from a major provider of social welfare in the nineteenth century to one which nowadays exists to provide a social focus for the region. The book is well written and produced.

Chris Galley
Barnsley College


This short pamphlet is a gem of a study. Based largely on an unusually detailed set of overseers’ accounts that survive for 39 parishes in Kineton Hundred, Warwickshire, in 1638–1639, supplemented by evidence of disputes over welfare claims and entitlements from later in the century, it provides an admirable case study of both the provision of social welfare in the seventeenth century and the local politics of that provision. Paul Slack’s view that perhaps only one third of rural parishes in England were levying poor rates by 1660 is well known (Slack, *Poverty and policy in Tudor and Stuart England*, London, 1988, p. 170), but is here subjected to detailed scrutiny at the local level. Hindle finds that, even before the civil wars, 36 of the 39 parishes in his sample were making either regular provision or collections for the poor, and of the 23 parishes for which evidence survives fully 20 were definitely raising money by levying a poor rate. Levels of generosity varied enormously between parishes, from 3d. to 2s. per head of the population (average 8d.), with weekly doles ranging from 0.5d. to 2s. (mode of 6d.). Most of the provision went on regular maintenance rather than casual payments, and it was the settled poor, particularly elderly widows, that benefited most (as elsewhere). The sums paid were rarely enough to live on, however, forming only the central plank of an economy of makeshifts, but Hindle feels able to conclude that ‘the Elizabethan poor laws were very effectively enforced in the Midlands, and arguably across rural England as a whole’ (p. 22).
The second section of the book tackles the issue of the politics of welfare, using the local material to throw light upon the tension that exists between the view of welfare as social discipline stressed by Keith Wrightson and the emphasis upon a growing appreciation of the right to relief offered by Peter King. Hindle demonstrates how both views contain some truth. Overseers clearly did regard their role as a political one, to govern and to discipline the poor through their discretionary powers. But they did not have it all their own way, for the lists of pensioners were the product of intensive negotiation between paupers, parish officers and the gentry in their role as magistrates, while a further triangle involved the parish, magistracy and the central law courts in the case of appeals by the parish against the magistrate’s decisions. The great majority of ratepayers may well, therefore, have accepted their responsibilities to relieve both the impotent and the (unemployed) labouring poor by 1700, but that had been a gradual process, and elite notions of discipline and reward continued to coexist with popular notions of entitlement. Hence overseers continued to perform their roles with ‘all the severity they could muster’ (p. 31).

Of course this study raises the usual questions: how typical were these 39 parishes, was the evidence influenced by the prevailing high prices of 1638–1639, and how does the emphasis upon severity sit with the wider evidence of philanthropy? If the more extravagant extrapolations Hindle indulges in might be questioned, however, this remains an important addition to the empirical and theoretical literature on poverty and its treatment in the seventeenth century and one that (the hallmark of its author) places human agency at centre stage.

The 32 pages of text of the pamphlet are supplemented by a useful statistical appendix, followed by a full transcript of the overseers’ accounts upon which it is based. It thus provides an excellent tool for teaching as well as a significant contribution to the extant literature on seventeenth century poverty from a local perspective.

Nigel Goose
_University of Hertfordshire_

_Mourholme Local History Society, How it was. A north Lancashire parish in the seventeenth century_ (1988). 212pp+vi. ISBN 0 9534298 0 6. £15.30 (p/b) incl. p&p available from Burnsall, Gaskell Close, Silverdale, Carnforth, Lancs. LA5 0RD.

This book was put together by members of the Mourholme Local History Society, which itself grew out of the Warton History Group. No specific authors or editors are cited but all the people involved in collecting and transcribing the data on which the book is based, as well as the writers of the text itself, are acknowledged in the foreword. The authors have drawn copiously from John Lucas’s _History of Warton Parish_. Lucas was a teacher in
Leeds, who was born in Warton parish in 1685 and lived there until his twenties. His book, written between 1710 & 1745, was largely a memoir of his childhood and youth in his birthplace. It is apt that this book should be dedicated to him.

Warton lies at the north-western extremity of Lancashire, abutting on to the historic county of Westmorland (now sadly subsumed by Cumbria) and limited on its western flank by the sands of Morecambe Bay. The book sets out to describe the seven townships (namely Borwick, Carnforth, Priest Hutton, Silverdale, Warton, Yealand Redmayne and Yealand Conyers) which until the nineteenth century made up the parish of Warton. With the exception of Carnforth, which developed into a small town with the coming of the railways, they are physically little altered today. The authors have attempted to reconstruct the life and appearance of the parish and its people in the seventeenth century, largely using data collected from contemporary records – wills and inventories, manorial records and parish records, as well as the invaluable Lucas.

The geology and topography of the area are discussed, with their bearing on the development of the settlements. The parish stands at an important intersection of north-south and east-west roads, near the starting point of the over-sands route to Cartmel and the Furness area of Lancashire; the limitations on suitable water supplies imposed by the limestone tables, peat mosses and salt marshes, which comprise the local geological features, dictated the locations of the individual townships.

Inventories have been skilfully and imaginatively used to find answers to many and varied questions and, where possible, other documentary evidence has been used to corroborate the findings. For instance, the values of livestock (suggesting pastoral farming) and crops (suggesting arable) were collected from inventories between 1580 and 1680. The ratio between the two was calculated and revealed a probable mixed agriculture with a bias towards the pastoral. This was confirmed by the unlikely evidence of marriage patterns. It has been suggested that people in farming communities tend to marry at their least busy time of year – pastoral farmers in spring after lambing-time and arable farmers in autumn after harvest. In Warton between 1670 and 1700 there was a slight predominance of marriage dates in April, May and June, supporting the result of the inventory evidence.

Although most of the population was involved in farming in one way or another, many had secondary occupations to augment their income. Again, the inventories give an idea of what these might be. The presence of nets, cockle pans, baskets and similar implements suggest fishing on the sands of Morecambe Bay; spinning wheels, looms, joinery and building tools (all in addition to farm implements) indicate other types of supplementary work. It is surprising to find that towards the end of the seventeenth century and into the eighteenth Warton had a shipbuilding industry, at least one of its ships being built for trans-Atlantic trading. This, too, would provide by-employment for the local populace.
The inventories are put to very good use in describing everyday domestic life. Furniture was simple: bedsteads (often with curtains) covered by feather or chaff beds, functional rather than comfortable chairs or stools, tables or trestles. Francis Jackson, the vicar, had ‘an old man’s chair.’ He also had a ‘chamber over the house’ (an upstairs room), a desk, a tankard and a tobacco box, prompting the graphic description ‘One rather sees him settling down comfortably in his “old man’s chair” in “the chamber over the house”, to his drink and his pipe.’ (p. 79).

The chapter headed ‘Dearth, Disease and Demography’ is of particular interest to students of population change. The population level in the parish stayed fairly constant at around 1100–1200 throughout the seventeenth century but analysis of the burial registers reveals two significant peaks, one in 1623, the other in 1670. The different characteristics of the two commonest causes of such ‘crises of mortality’, disease (plague) or famine, are discussed and the conclusion reached that 1623 was probably due to famine (or at least such scarcity of food crops that prices rose beyond the reach of the poorer population), while 1670 was more likely to be caused by the plague.

Other primary sources were used, principally the records of proceedings in the Manor Courts of Warton and Silverdale, and very many secondary sources, all of which are well referenced. There are chapters about the gentry of the parish (the Middletons of Leighton and Bindlosses of Borwick), the ‘middling sort’ and the poor; about women and children, education and religion. Many residents are named in the text and there is a useful list of such names at the back of the book.

There was one jarring note in the book. The references to monetary values in Chapter 10 were confusing and irritating in the extreme to this reviewer, who is old enough to remember and be comfortable with pre-decimal currency. One sentence will suffice as an example, ‘In 1620, with oats at 0.24d a pound the required 11.4lbs would have cost 2.7d a week . . . 9 per cent of a weekly wage of 30 pence.’ (p. 115). Admittedly the arithmetic does work out, once one has stopped seeing 2.7d as 2s.7d.

A vivid picture emerges of a collection of mainly agricultural communities, grazing their livestock on the Town Fields, common grounds and salt marshes, trading their surplus animals and wool at nearby Lancaster or Kendal and growing much of their own food. They still clung to the old, custom-bound way of life which, while tending to curb initiative, did offer much in the way of customary rights and perquisites. The whole is presented in an accessible narrative style, the work of the various authors being knitted together quite seamlessly. Areas for possible further studies are usefully identified throughout the book and the authors hope, ‘that the book, with all its gaps, may stimulate others to carry on the work.’ (p. 193).

Jean Wright

This book forms part of a series on the history of Yorkshire towns with others about Richmond, Scarborough, Driffield and Northallerton having already appeared. It also sets itself an ambitious aim: to provide, in a single readable volume, the standard work on York’s history from its foundations as a legionary fort in about AD 71 until the planning controversies of the present day.

Anyone familiar with York’s history will realise that it already possesses a very rich historiography. Some major studies include: Drake’s *Eboracum* (1736), Knight’s celebrated *History of York* (York, 1944), a volume of the *Victoria County History* specially devoted to the city (1961) and six volumes of the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments published from 1962. Alongside a wealth of articles on various aspects of the city’s history, definitive studies including David Palliser’s *Tudor York* (Oxford, 1979) and Patrick Nuttgens’ own *York the Continuing City* (London, 1976) have also appeared alongside substantial series of volumes published by the Yorkshire Philosophical Society from 1825, the York Civic Trust from 1946 and the York Archaeological Society from 1973.

Given the above, do we need yet another new book chronicling York’s history? The short answer to this question is a definite yes! Nuttgens has assembled a group of ten scholars (including himself) all of whom have strong connections with York. The volume is organised into nine chapters of roughly equal length which cover the main periods in York’s history. The focus is generally on economic and social change, although political and religious developments are considered where appropriate. The interaction between national and local change is also discussed, since one of the book’s themes is that, ‘Every aspect of English history can be found in York’ (backpiece).

Starting with the Roman period Patrick Ottaway charts York’s rise from a military base to become the leading civilian town in northern Britain. The archaeological evidence is rather scanty, but what has survived is examined in detail and Ottaway provides a vivid picture of the Roman city. It is not clear why Roman York subsequently declined, or even if it remained continually occupied during the fifth and sixth centuries, although Richard Hall shows that by 627 a church on the site of the present Minister was in use. Very little can be gleaned about Anglian York, but following the relatively recent discovery of the now famous Viking settlement (Jorvik) the city is once again revealed to be ‘huge, vibrant and thriving’ (p. 65) – a true northern capital. Hall recounts this obscure period in the city’s history with commendable style.

In 1068 William captured York and imposed his authority by a huge building programme which included a castle. Our knowledge about various aspects of city life increases substantially as surviving sources
multiply and Chris Daniell shows how many of the city’s institutions were founded in this period. The highlight of the volume is Barrie Dobson’s masterly examination of York in the later middle ages, 1272–1485, its ‘halcyon years’. In this period York emerged as England’s second city and for a short period during the wars against the Scots it effectively became the capital. By the early fifteenth century York was at its peak, although a period of economic stagnation then followed. Dobson relates these changes with gusto whilst also providing a rich account of everyday life in the medieval city.

By the Tudor period York was no longer at the centre of national events. This is alluded to in Clare Cross’s contribution, but much of the chapter is devoted to a detailed discussion of religious changes. While considerable upheaval occurred, reflecting national events, including the infamous stoning of Margaret Clitheroe, other developments in the city tend to get ignored, with only the final three pages being devoted to the economy. Thus, to obtain a more rounded picture of life in the city in this period it is necessary to consult Palliser’s excellent *Tudor York* and his other publications. Bill Sheils takes over for the seventeenth century. Sheils provides an excellent account of a city in crisis and conflict and recounts how plague and civil war shaped the city’s future. Royalist York came under siege in 1644 with serious consequences and by 1660 the defeated city had been stripped of much of its administrative functions. Consequently, during the late seventeenth century York did not experience rapid growth like its rivals Bristol, Norwich and of course London, although it still managed to retain its roles as market town and regional capital.

The one major disappointment in the volume is Alison Sinclair’s chapter on the eighteenth century which is episodic and lacks narrative thrust. National events are listed, but they are not incorporated into the main body of the chapter and consequently it is difficult to determine how York emerged as an important social centre in this period or why decline occurred towards the end of the century.

As we enter the nineteenth century sources multiply and Edward Royle makes a valiant effort at explaining how and why the city was transformed. Overall the rise of the manufacturing towns ensured that York’s position in the urban hierarchy declined, although its population still managed to treble as the railways and manufacturing, especially in confectionary, brought many jobs to the city. Royle also provides interesting discussions of local government, religion, education, poverty, health and leisure – no mean achievement. The final chapter is left to Patrick and Bridget Nuttgens. It starts with the shocking findings of Seebohm Rowntree, *Poverty, A Study of Town Life* (London, 1901) about levels of poverty in a city which at the time was thought to be relatively prosperous and it relates how throughout the twentieth century York was able to modernise without losing too much of its rich cultural heritage. Those familiar with Nuttgens’ work will not be disappointed by this contribution.
The book is well illustrated, although more care could have been taken with the layout and the typography looks a little amateurish. There is also no consistency in the bibliography with some authors listing references consulted and others providing suggestions for further reading. In spite of these minor quibbles this volume more than lives up to the high ideals it sets for itself. Anyone wanting a well-written, lively introduction to any period in York’s history would do well to start here; however, by doing so there is the danger that it will lead to a desire to explore the city’s history in far greater detail.

Chris Galley
Barnsley College


English local history has a long pedigree stretching back to the Middle Ages, but it was only from the 1930s that it began to be taken seriously as an important academic discipline. This collection of mainly reprinted essays celebrates the rich historiography of the subject. Most of the essays are self-recommending and many with an interest in English local history will no doubt have read them already. Starting with Stuart Piggott’s famous essay on William Camden’s *Britannia* which first appeared in 1957, there follow equally famous essays on other major figures in English local history by Power (on Stow), Barley and Train (on Thoroton) and Thirsk (on Hasted) together with a new one by Richardson on Milner’s Winchester. J. Kidd’s examination of local history in the nineteenth century is then followed by three inaugural lectures delivered at the University of Leicester in 1952, 1966 and 1970 by H. P. R. Finberg, W. G. Hoskins and Alan Everitt which all make important mission statements about the subject and demonstrate that institution’s lead in the field. The next two essays, both published in the 1990s in *The Local Historian*, concern current issues. Pat Hudson examines the role of computers in local and regional history, while Kevin Schürer critically assesses the current boom in local history. The final essay, a new one by Richardson, is a comparison of English and American local history and while interesting in itself, seems out on a limb and adds little to the themes developed previously. There is also a short introductory chapter which provides an overview and a short summary of each of the subsequent essays.

This volume is to be welcomed. I greatly enjoyed reading all the essays and it is useful to have them together, especially those that first appeared as inaugural lectures. However, I suspect that in the age of the photocopier many will already have copies of some of these essays and I am not sure how many will be willing to pay £45 to have them in a single volume.

Chris Galley
Barnsley College

82
It is now almost 40 years since E.A. Wrigley’s ‘Family limitation in pre-industrial England’ (Economic History Review, 2nd series, 19, 1966) first brought the Devonshire parish of Colyton to the attention of the historical public. In doing so, he not only demonstrated the potential for English historical demography of the novel French methodology of ‘family reconstitution’, but also revealed a number of historical phenomena which have continued to preoccupy demographic historians to this day – the long term trajectory of population growth, stabilisation, and renewed growth between the sixteenth and the late-eighteenth centuries; the significance of fluctuations in the mean age at first marriage for women, so dramatically evidenced in the Colyton case; the possibility that Colyton families practiced some form of family limitation in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. This was an historiographical urtext if ever there was one.

Since then the subject has experienced both triumphs and tribulations. But in the face of even the most taxing of methodological or interpretative challenges, historical demographers can still gaze into one another’s eyes and murmur nostalgically, ‘We’ll always have Colyton’. And so indeed we will. Colyton’s demographic record has been returned to repeatedly, explored more fully, placed within a broader comparative context, and interpreted by means of a variety of explanatory hypotheses. Few historical communities have been the object of such persistent attention (the only serious rival being Earls Colne, Essex).

With this study, Pamela Sharpe seeks not only to build upon that legacy of collaborative research by members of the Cambridge Group, but also to greatly extend its range. She does so by means of what she terms a ‘total reconstitution’. This approach, which is fully described in her first chapter and in a helpful methodological appendix, involves the use of some 80 additional sources to ‘enhance’ the family reconstitution analysis of the parish. The creation of a name index based upon such supplementary sources is not in itself new. It is standard practice in community studies utilising the techniques described by Alan Macfarlane and his collaborators in Reconstructing Historical Communities (Cambridge, 1977). What renders Sharpe’s approach distinctive, however, is the fact that she has systematically linked her ‘family index cards’ to Colyton’s family reconstitution forms. This enables her to sort the previously anonymous individuals whose vital events are recorded on the FRFs into both generational cohorts and social status groupings and then to attempt the analysis of ‘status specific demographic behaviour’ (p. 10). The results of this analysis are interpreted in the light of her further research on the society and economy of Colyton and the East Devon region – research which creates a socio-economic context extending over almost three centuries.
This is a formidable undertaking, but the benefits repay the effort involved in many ways. One of the most immediate of these is a clearer sense of the quality of parochial registration in Colyton, the identification socially of the ‘reconstitutable minority’ of families and the assessment of the typicality of their recorded experience. A particularly illuminating aspect of this is her pursuit of Colyton’s ‘missing marryers’ – those families who baptised children and buried their dead in the parish, but eschewed Anglican marriage in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. (She argues with considerable confidence that they were members of Colyton’s large population of Protestant Dissenters). This accomplished, she goes on to explore marital opportunity, remarriage, the evidence for family limitation and a good deal more in a manner that distinguishes the behaviour of four broad social groups. This analysis is placed in the context of an account of Colyton’s economy that challenges David Levine’s suggestion that the changing age at first marriage in the parish can be connected to a conjectured decline of the local woollen industry in the seventeenth century and the rise of lace-making in the later eighteenth century. As she shows, this chronology of economic change simply fails to fit the recoverable facts. Colyton’s involvement in woollen manufacture was never so extensive as Levine supposed, nor did it decline significantly before the eighteenth century. Lace-making, in contrast, was well-established in the parish in the later seventeenth century and was actually in decline in the late eighteenth century. Instead she suggests that the structure of the local economy, and in particular its combination of wood-pasture agriculture and small-town industrial elements which privileged female employment, encouraged gender-specific migration patterns. Colyton had a badly skewed sex ratio, resulting in severely constrained marital opportunities for women. To this extent it was the pattern of women’s employment in the area that exerted the greatest influence on Colyton’s distinctive demographic experience in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

This persuasive reassessment of the relationship between economic and demographic patterns in the parish is supplemented by an excellent chapter tracing the stages of the life course in Colyton from childbirth to old age, with particular attention to the processes of family formation and the maintenance of viable household economies. Here she is able to bring out vividly the extent to which amongst the poor of the parish the nuclear family ‘was often not the abiding schema for life’ (p. 300). In this, as in other respects, her enhancement of the family reconstitution analysis serves to convey powerfully the manner in which social and economic inequalities exercised a determining influence on the fundamental life experiences of Colyton’s people.

As Sharpe fully recognises, there are also aspects of Colyton’s history in this period that remain somewhat obscure. The wartime destruction of Devon’s probate records inevitably means that the economic analysis of the parish is
less full and precise than would be ideal. Here she has had to create a mosaic from sometimes fragmentary material. Again, her methodology is not able to deal equally effectively with every issue she chooses to discuss. Her discussion of religion amply demonstrates the vitality of Puritanism and Dissent in the area, but falls short of providing a real sociology of religious allegiance in the parish, and leaves open to question some of her suggestions concerning religion as a causal influence on both economic and demographic behaviour. If some chapters are less robust than others that is also partly a consequence of a tendency to digress. This is a generous book in the sheer range of information provided, but that quality sometimes entails departures from the principal themes that slacken the pace and loosen the structure of argument.

Nevertheless if ‘much is unknowable’ (p. 2) and if some of what can be known is rather loosely connected to her central themes, Sharpe succeeds in conveying a vivid sense of Colyton, its people, and their relationships to one another, the surrounding area and the larger world. The book is rich in supplementary analyses of such issues as the development of the poor relief system; the apprenticeship of pauper children; the position of the never-married; women in trade; dairying, fishing and the cottage economy; the enterprise and internal conflicts of the Pinney family, and the heavy involvement of Colyton’s men in Monmouth’s rebellion, to specify only a few particularly telling examples. To this extent it is a compendium of valuable findings on this local society. It is rich also in vivid details: the servant Elizabeth Mitchell’s account of the development of her skills from the age of ten; the brief life of the foundling Lazarus Colyton; the ubiquity of pipe-smoking among men, women and children. And Sharpe is persuasive in her contention that within the broad patterns of national trends, it is often the local variations in experience that are the most interesting and the most challenging aspects of the past. The local matters, not only in providing illustration of larger processes, but in its own right. Its particularities illuminate. They also provoke, providing what Patrick Collinson called ‘the irregularities which make the subject interesting and a suitable case for historical treatment’ (P. Collinson, The Birthpangs of Protestant England. Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, London, 1988, p. 83). Pamela Sharpe’s Colyton offers all that and a sense also of the human faces behind the statistics – with pipes in their mouths.

Keith Wrightson
Yale University


This short, well illustrated book outlines the history of the General Register Office for Scotland and the three main forms of records held at the GRO(S) –
the old parochial registers, the post-1854 statutory registers and the census enumerators’ books. The main audience would seem to be the more inquisitive genealogist, but there is much detail of interest to the local and family historian. The volume reminds us that not only was the administrative history of parochial records and latterly the General Register Office in Scotland rather different to that in England and Wales but also that the legal and religious institutions in Scotland meant that the surviving records are often dissimilar to their south of the border counterparts.

We note for instance, that in the old parochial registers married women retained their maiden name, but that the ‘irregular’ forms of marriage make these records a particularly unreliable register for population studies. The census too sometimes differed from its English and Welsh counterpart. A question on the Gaelic language was asked from 1891, though Sinclair’s comment that ‘Irish Gaelic speakers entered in the schedules in Dumbarton had to be removed from the Enumeration Books’ probably means that the response to the language question was not tabulated for these people. Under civil registration Scotland enjoyed a more complete system compared to England, and it may be that the 1855 (that year only) civil registers could be mined with fruitful results. In that year, the birth registers contained the usual details, but also the number of other children of those parents, and the death registers recorded the length of time the deceased had been resident in the district. However, the system was too complicated, and from 1856 a reduced (but still more detailed than in England) system came into practice.

But it is perhaps the work of the examiners who travelled the country inspecting the civil registers and reporting on them which provides the most interest. These reports, Sinclair notes, assist genealogists with naming problems but also provide a vivid, if patchy, view of social life in Scotland.

Matthew Woollard
University of Essex


This is an ‘exceedingly good book’, as Mr Kipling might put it. A product of Oxbridge –11 of the 14 authors hold posts there, most of them professors – it moves smoothly from the dim and distant past to the relative clarity of the here and now. It reads well and though some might balk at the way some of the authors refer to each other’s work –‘illuminating’, ‘magisterial’, ‘expert’, ‘rigorous’, ‘elegant’, ‘eloquent’ – the terms do no more than justice to the book as a whole. The bibliographies occupy 40 of the books 295 pages and are bang up to date. For the chapters covering the years up to 1500 BC some 70 per cent of the works cited were published since 1990, suggesting an enormous proliferation of studies in the field since that date. A more modest 40 per cent of bibliographic entries cover the chapters post-1500 BC. But what does the book tell us?
The opening chapter by Clive Gamble covers the period from 500,000 to 35,000 years ago, and deals with the ‘biological formation’ of our species, a development that took place far from Britain. The dispute between those adhering to the charmingly called ‘Garden of Eden’ hypothesis (that the various types of hominoids originated in one continent, namely Africa) seems currently to enjoy more support than its multi-regional evolution rival. Paul Mellars examines the way *Homo sapiens* finally took over in Europe, some 30 to 40,000 years ago, bringing the story to the point at which culture replaced biology as the determinate change.

Unless I’ve missed it, there is then something of a leap to 4000 BC and the coming of agriculture. Alasdair Whittle’s chapter reviews in detail recent evidence as to the form this took and whilst noting that, since the 1970s, prehistorians have neglected ‘detailed studies of population’, speculates as to its possible role in some of the changes he discusses. Whittle also raises an issue that appears several times in subsequent pages, namely the extent to which landscape change was the product of ‘colonization fuelled by population growth’ or by ‘indigenous acculturation’.

Barry Cunliffe takes up this theme and gives us some numbers; Britain’s population apparently rising from 1 million in 1500 BC to 4 million in 500 AD (but see below). At the latter date he believes only 120,000, or 3 per cent, were foreigners. He also demonstrates how Britain was not just an offshore island in receipt of one set of impulses from the Continent, but two; being part of an Atlantic and Continental system. Thus inhabitants of western Britain looked to the western fringes of France and Spain, whilst those in the east looked to the near continent. The divide had important implications, discussed in detail by Cunliffe.

Heinrich Härke pursues the acculturation versus population transfer argument from the post-Roman to the Norman period. The minimalists argue that no more than 10,000 to 25,000 migrated from the Continent to Britain during the Anglo-Saxon period and a similar number during the Viking invasions. How the former could permanently have shaped the language of several millions of inhabitants and given names to almost every place and field in England is a question Härke poses. Still a few chaps in an office have decided on the names of hundreds of streets where I live over the last 30 years so it can be done! Recent archaeological data, however, suggests that the relationship between immigrant and native populations was between 1:3 and 1:5 in the Saxon heartlands and 1:10 elsewhere, with DNA tests on female populations indicating an upper limit of 20 per cent immigrants. This, however, is predicated on a population that had sunk to between one and two millions by the second half of the fifth century.

There seems to be general agreement that only around 10,000 Normans reached these shores so that if the Domesday Survey suggests a total population of between 1.25 and 2.5 millions their demographic contribution was negligible.
The chapter entitled ‘Plagues and Peoples’ by Richard Smith covers the years 1250 – 1670 and brings us into the intellectual territory that will be very familiar to readers of *LPS*. They will know that population had something of a rollercoaster ride during these years. From Domesday’s 1.25–2.5 millions it rose to 5.5–6.5 millions in 1300 (at which point much of the country had higher population densities than in 1800), only to fall to 2–2.5 millions by 1400. Little progress to the early sixteenth century was followed by a century of growth to 1650, when England’s population had reached 5 millions. A further period of stagnation and slow growth raised that figure to 6 millions in 1750.

Richard Smith deals with the pros and cons of the sources on which the above estimates are based, carries through an analysis of what brought the change about and details the impact on agriculture and settlement patterns. For instance there were 10 million acres of arable in 1300 as against 6 millions at the time of Domesday. Less of this was abandoned than one might have imagined when population fell sharply, whilst once the latter began to recover significant organisational changes occurred. Paul Slack, in a comment on Smith’s chapter notes, for instance, that ‘by 1700 more than two-thirds of England was enclosed by hedges and walls, and a quarter of the country had been enclosed in the course of the seventeenth century’.

Tony Wrigley examines the occupational structure of England in the early modern period and seeks to show that by the early nineteenth century, it was demonstrably different from elsewhere in Europe, most notably in the much smaller proportion of the population engaged in agriculture. In a comment John Langton challenges some of his arguments, notably in their implications for the origins of the Industrial Revolution.

As befits the nature of the sources, Ceri Peach’s chapter which covers the period 1850–2000, is replete with tables, graphs and bar charts, which cover no less than 10½ of its 24 pages. They chart the shifts in population growth, occupational structure, urbanisation and counter-urbanisation and migration. To pick up on a theme of earlier chapters, Peach’s statistics on migration suggest that the Irish accounted for 3½ per cent of Britain’s population in 1851, whilst the ethnic minorities make up 5½ per cent of the country’s population today. Given the size and speed of the migration that brought about the latter, it is apparent that it is quite different from anything that has gone before.

I feel sure that readers of *LPS* will enjoy this book as much as I did, even if a second mortgage is required to buy it. At the very least libraries should be urged to acquire it, on the grounds that so much ‘ties-in’ with many current TV programmes.

Michael Drake
The Open University

Representing the fruits of fully ten years labour on the part of the author, formally supported by a research assistant and an indexer, and informally by many colleagues whose help and advice is most generously acknowledged, this is a wonderfully high quality edition of all of the 758 Essex pauper letters extant from the period of the Old Poor Law, dating from 1731 to 1837. Readers of *LPS* may well be familiar with Thomas Sokoll’s published discussions of these letters (for example ‘Old age in poverty: the record of Essex pauper letters, 1780–1834’, in T. Hitchcock, P. King and P. Sharpe, eds, *Chronicling poverty: the voices and strategies of the English poor, 1640–1840*, Basingstoke, 1997), letters which have done so much to assist historians in understanding the processes by which welfare payments were negotiated between parish officers and the poor.

The volume is prefaced by a handy list of all 758 letters, arranged by place of receipt. This is followed by a 75 page introduction which deals in turn with pauper letters as an historical source, the institutional context, their chronological and geographical distribution and issues of source and textual criticism. Here the value of these letters as a record of the poor law ‘from below’, the lessons they provide concerning the living conditions and expectations of that amorphous group ‘the labouring poor’, and the insights they give into contemporary literacy are clearly explained. The institutional framework that generated this correspondence in the context of a system of relief that was both generous and parochially based is explained in terms of the laws of settlement, which encouraged negotiation between applicant, host parish and parish of settlement in the interests of economy on the part of the parochial authorities, and preference on the part of the pauper.

The sample of letters is highly skewed chronologically, only 13 letters surviving from before 1800, with the vast majority concentrated in the 1820s and early 1830s. Their survival is also erratic geographically across the 40 Essex parishes represented in the sample, and the one variable that consistently equates with their distribution is the relatively high poor rates in these parishes, suggesting that their over-burdened ratepayers were particularly keen to ‘push’ their paupers elsewhere. The three towns of Braintree, Chelmsford and Colchester account for over 70 per cent of the letters, which perhaps testifies to their more painstaking poor law administration as well as to their better ability to preserve this correspondence. Letters were received from over 100 places, predominantly in Essex, East Anglia and the Home Counties, with a heavy concentration in London’s East End. Half were from men, half from women, while the tendency towards serial correspondence on the part of some paupers means that 75 per cent of the letters were ‘penned’ by those who had sent four or more.
Source criticism follows, beginning with an examination of the range of types of correspondence, presented in 20 high quality plates each of which is discussed in the text. The entire sample is drawn upon in the subsequent ‘systematic assessment’ of the physical, graphic, scriptual and literary properties of the records. The majority of the letters followed closely the ‘plain style’ that had become the standard form of letter-writing by the eighteenth century and, perhaps more surprisingly, they more closely resembled the ‘familiar’ letter than they did the petition, unlike similar continental examples. The actual writer of most of the letters is unknown, but it can be presumed that most were written personally or by close friends, an assumption occasionally underlined by a succession of letters written in the same hand, while it is clear that professional scribes were rarely called upon. This involvement of others in the process of literary communication renders what Sokoll calls the scriptual power of the labouring poor as a complex cultural practice which can only be fully appreciated within the social context in which the documents were produced. The credibility of the letters is reflected in the plausibility, attested from other sources, of the situations they describe. Of course they are subjective, and formed part of a process of negotiation, but their authors were themselves subject to scrutiny from a multitude of officials and acquaintances and were hardly in a position to give entirely false testimony, while the frequent convergence of interests between petitioner and the petitioned gave the pauper considerable room for manoeuvre.

Following an explanation of editorial and transcription conventions the letters are reproduced in full, with great attention paid to textual alterations, abbreviations and the like, and the addition of valuable information where available on related correspondence and further evidence. The volume is completed by an appendix which provides further lists of the letters arranged by place of sender, by sender and by date, a bibliography of manuscript and secondary sources, and indexes of persons, places and subjects. This is a most valuable collection, which takes us as close to the ‘voices of the poor’ as we are ever likely to get, and provides an invaluable tool for both teaching and research. One can only look forward with anticipation to the substantive interpretation of the entire body of this correspondence currently being prepared by the author, to be published in due course as Voices of the labouring poor.

Nigel Goose
University of Hertfordshire


This book uses a range of qualitative documentary sources to examine the meanings which family, kinship and friendship had for people in
eighteenth-century England. The sources are, first, the personal diary of Thomas Turner, a shopkeeper from East Hoathly in Sussex; second, three contemporary popular novels: Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela: or, virtue rewarded* and *Clarissa: or, the history of a young lady*, and Eliza Haywood’s *The history of Miss Betsy Thoughtless*; and third, two ‘conduct treatises’ written, by Richardson and Haywood respectively, for male apprentices and maidservants.

Tadmor shows that the word ‘family’ had three distinct meanings in eighteenth-century England. First, there was the concept of the ‘household-family’, or the family as comprising all those persons, related to the head or not, who resided at any one time under the head’s roof. Tadmor shows that Thomas Turner was typical of eighteenth-century people ‘of the middling sort’, in referring to this collectivity as his ‘family’, even when (as was quite frequent in his case) it contained no person related by blood to him. Second, there was the ‘lineage-family’ which, although less frequently mentioned than the ‘household-family’, informed a man’s ‘understanding of his country, its geography, its history, and its national rule’ (p. 101). Third was the ‘kinship-family’.

Tadmor argues that the meanings which kinship had for people in the eighteenth century do not fit some of the simpler models which have been proposed to describe family life in the English past. Kinship ties were neither in general decline (as the nuclear family gradually came to dominate) nor were they maintained in roughly the same form down the centuries. Rather ‘the language of kinship has been subject to changes relating to both the terminology itself, and – not less important – conventions of usage’ (p. 165). Overall, the picture which Tadmor is able to paint from her documentary sources is of individuals maintaining quite a dense network of kinship ties within a local or regional area. The fact that people lived in nuclear family households should not, therefore, be taken to imply that effort was not put into maintaining (and taking advantage of) ties with more distant kin.

The second part of the book deals with the networks of non-kin friends which eighteenth-century people constructed and engaged with in their everyday lives. Tadmor shows very clearly that ‘for people of “the middling sort” such as Turner and his “friends”, “friendship” relationships were indeed crucial, for it was along the lines of “friendship” that these people mobilised many of their social and economic interests, thus forming regional networks well beyond their immediate neighbourhoods’ (p. 214). Tadmor’s conclusion has considerable resonance for local historians, for one recurring theme in local history has been the extent to which a meaningful regional-level economic and social geography of England in the past can be constructed – meaningful in the sense that it accurately reflected the geography of the social and economic networks of which people were part (See, for example, C. Phythian-Adams, ‘Local history and societal history’, *LPS* 51 (1993), 30–45; and J.D. Marshall, *The tyranny of the discrete: a discussion of the problems of local
history in England, Aldershot, 1997). By tracing in detail the web of friendship connexions which Thomas Turner developed during his adult life, Tadmor suggests one potentially fruitful approach to this challenge.

This book should be of interest to many readers of LPS. Its main contribution lies in its emphasis on the complexity of the social and familial relationships which lay behind the apparently simple social and household structure of eighteenth-century England. Though this complexity is increasingly recognised in quantitative historiography, its true extent is revealed even more clearly by the qualitative documents analysed here.

Andrew Hinde
University of Southampton


This is an important and timely book. It brings to prominence an under-researched and neglected area of social life – the history of learning disability. This neglect has been in part because the topic has been regarded as a subsidiary, and marginal, sub-topic of other histories, especially the history of psychiatry. The latter has long held social and medical historians in thrall, whereas the history of learning disability has, until the last few years, attracted relatively little attention. In addressing this erstwhile neglect, David Wright quotes the late Roy Parker: ‘Madness continues to exercise its magic, but mindlessness holds no mystique’ (‘Mother says it done me good’, London Review of Books, 16 April, 1997, p. 6).

There is magic, though, in the history of learning disability, and this book captures it. The magic is in the weaving together of disparate aspects of Victorian social life and ideas to tell the story of a particular institution – the Earlswood Asylum. In telling the story of Earlswood from the perspective of the people whose lives ‘intersected’ with it, and at the same time within the educational and medical discourses of Victorian society, Wright succeeds in constructing the bigger picture of nineteenth century provision for ‘mentally disabled’ people. Although he does not quite achieve the construction of the narrative ‘from below’, as he intended, he does bring together an impressive array of biographical, archival and demographic data to support his account of the origins and development of the Earlswood Asylum.

This is a detailed and scholarly work, meticulous both in its attention to detail and in its mastery of the wider context. It is a potent mix. The book is a closely argued and substantiated history of the first ‘idiot asylum’ in England. It is also very engaging and highly readable. Wright succeeds in
helping bring the history of learning disability from the periphery into the mainstream. This is no mean feat. The book works through interweaving several interconnected stories into its central account of the Earlswood Asylum. The interconnected stories form the backdrop or context in which the asylum took root as a philanthropic initiative and developed alongside and ‘in a dynamic’ with society. It drew its staff, medical personnel, subscribers and inmates from its local population of families and communities.

The book’s chapters trace the main linking, and supporting, stories. Thus Wright covers the growth in numbers of ‘idiots and imbeciles’ inside and outside the nineteenth-century workhouses, and the growing awareness of the ‘plight of idiot children’. The influences of moral treatment of lunacy, and the work of Seguin and others in the moral education of idiot children, were key influences in the movement to found a charitable institution in the London area. Wright charts the origins of the Earlswood Asylum from diverse sources, including fascinating biographical details of the people involved. Other lives are featured in the book too, as subsequent chapters explore the demographic features of staff, and trace their career trajectories; and examine the day-to-day lives of the young inmates of the institution.

The book makes two very interesting, and well-evidenced, claims that add a new dimension to our understanding of the history of learning disability. One claim is the role of the family in the institutional committal of their ‘idiot children’. This is backed by Wright’s study of two key documents in the admission of patients: the Certificate of Insanity and the Order for the Reception of a Private Patient. These documents were cross-referenced with matching household schedules drawn from census returns to tell a complex story of family care outside and alongside the institution. They support Wright’s second claim that the asylum played a part in the family life course, coming into prominence at certain stress points in the family life cycle.

The Earlswood Asylum started out as an optimistic venture in the educability of ‘idiot children’. It aimed to educate the children of the ‘respectable’ or ‘deserving’ poor. And yet, its very provenance and design incorporated a number of anomalies. It took in fee-paying inmates alongside its elected poor children. It was an institution that segregated children from society whilst at the same time aspiring to prepare them for and return them to that same society. It was externally ‘palatial’ with a striking and beautiful façade, but internally incorporated all the features now associated with institutional care. Its centralised structure prevented children from acquiring the domestic and vocational skills that the asylum aspired to provide and which would have proved useful on their return to the community. In time, the moral education model gave way to a medical
model and a sea change in the climate of opinion. By the turn of the
twentieth century the more familiar ‘pessimistic and restrictive ideology of
containment’ prevailed instead.

The book is an invaluable resource for historians, students and
practitioners in the field of learning disability and deserves to be widely
read. It is that rare phenomenon; a scholarly book that is also both
readable and useful.

Dorothy Atkinson

*The Open University*
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.

Naming of Children

Dear Sir

In reply to the letter in LPS 69 about names, I believe that Joan Schneider is quite correct: very few children were called Victoria in the nineteenth century. It may well be true that they were not called by other ‘royal’ names either. There are, for example, very few children called George in Welsh parish registers. However, there is evidence that people named their children after more local people. The village of Hanmer, for example, on the Welsh/English border has a good number of boys called Randall, a name used by the local gentry family.

In Cerrigydrudion, a small Welsh village between Betws y Coed and Llangollen, the church is dedicated to St Mary Magdalen, and a large number of girls are called Magdalen (probably pronounced Modlen), far more than in neighbouring villages. But the next village of Llanfihangel, which means the church of St Michael, reveals not a single Michael in its registers!

Some names were very popular everywhere, such as John, Cadwaladr, David, Edward, Hugh, William, Anne, Catherine, Jane, Mary and Margaret, while others were used only rarely. Towards the end of the nineteenth century a much wider variety of names appear as people travelled more and horizons widened. Indeed, greater variety became necessary in order to distinguish individuals one from another. There were probably a number of John Jones’s in most Welsh villages, easily identified as John Jones Pant y Mel, John Jones Gwerni, and so forth, but the house names became irrelevant away from the village context. Clearly, this is an interesting topic with few very tidy patterns to follow!

Yours faithfully

Sally Brush (Canon), Rector of Cerrigydrudion
‘Persondy’, 1 Tyddyn Terrace
Cerrigydrudion
Corwen
Denbighshire LL21 9TN        Tel. 01490 420313.
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 2003/2004 (*LPS* 70-73).

Adjudication of the award will be by the *LPS* Editorial Board, and will be decided at its January 2005 meeting. 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.