

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.¹ 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)² to detailed accounts of relevant information,³ 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 1707,⁴ and Isabella Clapham, widow, Hedon to Scarborough, 21 August 1795.⁵ 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.⁶ 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.⁷ 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

Table 1 Appeal cases per decade.

1708–1709	3	1750–1759	58
1710–1719	69	1760–1769	33
1720–1729	57	1770–1779	43
1730–1739	28	1780–1789	58
1740–1749	48	1790–1799	60

Sources: East Riding Quarter Sessions Order Books; 1801 census (for population); 1831 census (for acreages).

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.

Appeal 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

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, 1750–1879.²⁵ 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

Figure 1 East Riding



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.’²⁶

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.²⁷

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 2 Family types.

Families	No. of cases	%	No. of people	%
Husband, wife & child(ren)	107	23.4	431	42.6
Husband & wife	67	14.7	134	13.3
Mother & child(ren)	50	10.9	184	18.2
Father & child(ren)	7	1.5	28	2.8
Child(ren) alone	14	3.1	22	2.2
Woman alone	144	31.5	144	14.2
Man alone	68	14.9	68	6.7
Total	457	100.0	1,011	100.0

Note: In the first category above we list 213 parents and 218 children, but the number of children is not always given, and where it is not, we have assumed it to be two. Three cases (six persons) have been omitted because they do not fit any of the above categories.

Sources: East Riding Quarter Sessions Order Books; 1801 census (for population); 1831 census (for acreages).


Table 3 Distance of removals of different family types.

	East Riding		East Riding		Oxfordshire	
	No. of families	Mean distance (Km.)	No. and percentage under 9.66 km		No.	%
Man, wife and child(ren)	100	17.4	44	44.0	312	58.5
Woman alone	141	18.3	70	49.6	121	53.6
Man and wife	65	15.3	29	44.6	178	60.4
Man alone	64	29.6	21	34.4	99	61.1
Mother and child(ren)	49	13.9	27	55.1	63	47.3
All families	435	19.1	199	45.7	793	56.9

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).

Figure 2 East Riding: places mentioned in the text



Key: o Towns and larger urban places.
 • Other places mentioned in the text.

all single people and 28.6 km for all married people, though women moved shorter distances than men in the eighteenth century.²⁸ 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).²⁹ 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 Kusssmaul.³⁰ 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. Kusssmaul 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.³¹ Landau's partial explanation of seasonality in examinations being related to the relative ease of consulting JPs in autumn and winter does not apply here.³²

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).³³ 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

Table 4 Larger non-urban places: removals.

Place	Families from		Families to	
	No.	Ave. distance (Km.)	No.	Ave. distance (Km.)
Cottingham	10	16.5	3	19.3
Sutton on Hull	9	19.1	3	6.5
Ottringham	5	8.5	0	-
Filey	0	-	0	-
Aldbrough	6	32.1	9	13.7
Larger non-urban places	30	20.9	15	13.4
All non-urban places	352	18.1	397	19.1

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).

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

Figure 3 Migration movements by regions.



Note: Rural parishes only by percentage.

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.'³⁵

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.³⁶ 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

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

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

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).

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 6 Distance of removal by agricultural districts (from rural parishes only)

Agricultural district	Predominant crops	Under 24 km.		24 & <80 km.		80+ km .		Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
West									
1. Jurassic Hills	o/w	20	76.9)					
3. [betw.] Ouse / Derwent	o/w	34	81.0)	18	14.6	3	2.4	123
4. East [of] Derwent	o/w	48	87.3)					
Wolds									
2. Vale of Pickering	o/t	6	60.0)					
5. Wold Scarp	o/w	22	75.9)	24	26.7	0	0.0	90
6. High Wolds	b/o	12	75.0)					
7. Low Wolds	w/o	26	76.5)					
East									
8. Hull Valley	w/o	38	77.6)					
9. North Holderness	w/o	24	80.0)	20	14.8	7	5.2	135
10. Middle Holderness	w/o	25	78.1)					
11. South Holderness	w/o	21	87.5)					
Total		276	79.3		62	17.8	10	2.9	348

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).

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

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.³⁷ 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.³⁸ 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.³⁹ 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 1799.⁴⁰ 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.'⁴¹ 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.⁴²

Table 7 Assumed migration to towns and rural areas.

Place	Population 1801	Number of cases	Movement (cases per 1000 population)
Towns			
Beverley	5,401	34	6.30
All towns	23,110	87	3.76
Rural areas			
West			
1. Jurassic Hills	4,018	20	4.98
3. [betw.] Ouse & Derwent	6,813	26	3.82
4. East [of] Derwent	10,255	21	2.05
Wolds			
2. Vale of Pickering	2,788	9	3.23
5. Wold Scarp	5,115	20	3.91
6. High Wolds	5,627	14	2.49
7. Low Wolds	10,515	21	2.00
East			
8. Hull Valley	8,902	35	3.93
9. North Holderness	3,373	18	5.34
10. Middle Holderness	4,287	18	4.20
11. South Holderness	4,108	12	2.92
All rural areas	65,801	214	3.25
Unknown		3	
Total	88,911	304	3.42
Larger non-urban places	5,168	29	5.61

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.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful for help and advice from a number of different people and bodies, and in particular from Roger Bellingham, Jan Crowther, Paul Hughes, Mary Morris, Geoffrey Oxley, the former and present staff of the East Riding of Yorkshire Record Office and the Beverley Local Studies Library, and The Boat Museum at Ellesmere Port; and above all from Dr David Neave, who has provided encouragement and made numerous helpful comments on our drafts, and the editorial board of *Local Population Studies*.

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 542–3.
2. East Riding of Yorkshire Archives Office, (hereafter ERY) Seaton Ross examinations, PC 7/5 no. 10.
3. E.g. John Lynn & Mary his wife. Apprehended as vagrants and brought by the constable of Bessingby, 17.5.1737. J L aged 60+ 'as he believed but does not know where he was born or where his Father or Mother dyed (but as he has been informed his Father dyed in the army) or where they or either of them lived or had any settlement'; from the time he can remember he travelled as a tinker, & about the beginning of Queen Ann's wars was taken up by the constable of Snainton NRY, & was sent by the JPs to be a soldier, where he served 5 years in Brig.-Gen. Whiteman's regiment., & being discharged (on account of his lowness of stature) he hath ever since travelled & never gained legal settlement. Mary Lynn born Hooke near Howden; father was Robert Stoakes. Both say that about 19 years ago they were both employed by Mr John Thompson at Kilham in harvest work, where they first became acquainted, and staid about three weeks, and about then were married by Mr Woodall, minister at Wold Newton; and ever since have travelled, sometimes begging & sometimes working as they could get employment. They have had 8 chn, only 4 now living; 2 in service & 2 with them, one aged about five born at Burnby LIN & one aged about one born at Hunslett near Leeds. They last begged at Reighton. (ERY QSF 116D 9).
4. Quarter Sessions Files, ERY QSF3 D 1.
5. Hedon Removal Orders and Examinations, ERY DDHE 17/11 10.
6. These documents are now in ERY in Beverley. Hull material, not used in this study, is in the City Record office.
7. See N. Landau, 'The laws of settlement'.
8. In our period, there is only one case relating to settlement, and removal is not specifically mentioned.
9. K.D.M. Snell, *Annals of the labouring poor: social change and agrarian England 1660–1900* (Cambridge, 1985); Landau, 'The laws of settlement'; K.D.M. Snell, 'Pauper settlement and the right to poor relief in England and Wales', *Continuity and Change*, 6 (1991), 375–413; N. Landau, 'The eighteenth century context of the laws of settlement', *Continuity and Change*, 6 (1991), 417–439; R. Wells, 'Migration, the law, and parochial policy in eighteenth and early nineteenth-century southern England', *Southern History*, 15 (1993), 86–139.
10. A. Redford, *Labour migration in England 1800–1850* (Manchester 1926, 3rd edn, rev. & ed. W.H. Chaloner, 1976).
11. A.G. Parton, 'Poor law settlement certificates and migration to and from Birmingham 1726–57', *Local Population Studies*, 38 (1987), 23–9; C.C. Pond, 'Eighteenth century migration and mobility in rural Essex', *Essex Journal*, 17 (1982), 15–9; B.K. Song, 'Agrarian policies on pauper settlement and migration. Oxfordshire 1750–1834', *Continuity and Change*, 13 (1998), 363–89. Song uses both

removal orders and appeals.

12. M. Noble, *Change in the small towns of the East riding of Yorkshire c.1750–1850* (Hedon, 1979), 10.
13. B.A. Holderness, 'Personal mobility in some rural parishes of Yorkshire 1777–1822', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, **42** (1970), 444–54.
14. M.F. Pickles, 'Labour migration: Yorkshire, c.1670–1743', *Local Population Studies*, **57** (1996), 30–49.
15. J. Patten, 'Patterns of migration and movement of labour to three pre-industrial East Anglian towns', *Journal of Historical Geography*, **22** (1976), 111–129; C.G. Pooley, 'The mobility of criminals in N.W. England c. 1880–1900', *Local Population Studies*, **53** (1994), 15–28.
16. B. Dackombe, 'A Quaker perspective on migration: Amphill and Hitchin Preparative Meetings, 1811–1840', *Family and Community History*, **3** (2000), 49–64. This paper has been criticised for not acknowledging that the nature of the source means that short distance moves would not be picked up: N. Goose and A. Hinde, 'Review of recent periodical literature', *Local Population Studies*, **67** (2001), 69.
17. A. Kussmaul, *Servants in husbandry in early modern England*, (Cambridge, 1981), 15–19.
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).
19. C. Pooley and J. Turnbull, *Migration and mobility in Britain since the eighteenth century* (London, 1988).
20. See M.M. Gerrish, 'Special industrial migration in 19th century Britain: a case study of the port of Grimsby, 1841–61' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Hull, 1991); C.A. Jackson, 'The migration of Brixham fishermen, and the development of the fishing industry in Hull (1840s to 1860s)' (unpublished certificate essay, University of Hull, 1999).
21. Landau, 'The laws of settlement', 395–6.
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.'
24. King, *Poverty and Welfare*, 56; Song, 'Agrarian policies', 366.
25. Pooley and Turnbull, *Migration and Mobility*, 157.
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'.
28. Pooley and Turnbull, *Migration and Mobility*, 67.
29. Song, 'Agrarian Policies', 378.
30. Pooley and Turnbull, *Migration and Mobility*, 67–9.
31. Kussmaul, *Servants in Husbandry*, 51, 163.
32. Landau, 'Eighteenth Century context', 420.
33. I. Leatham, *A General View of the Agriculture of the East Riding of Yorkshire* (London, 1794); quoted in J. Crowther ed., *Descriptions of East Yorkshire: De La Pryme to Head* (Beverley, 1992), 33–8.
34. Personal communication from David Neave.
35. Pond, 'Eighteenth Century Migration', 18.

36. These are taken from S. Neave and S. Ellis eds, *An Historical Atlas of East Yorkshire* (Hull, 1996), 68–9, Agricultural land use in 1801. These are in turn based on the districts described in A. Harris, *The Rural Landscape of the East Riding of Yorkshire, 1700–1850*, 2nd edition (Wakefield, 1969).
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'.
39. Pond, 'Eighteenth Century Migration', 16–18.
40. Figures compiled from B. English, *Yorkshire Enclosure Awards* (Hull, 1985).
41. Leatham, *A general view*, pp. 31–2, 37; H.E. Strickland, *A General View of the agriculture of the East Riding of Yorkshire* (York, 1812), 288–9; Holderness, 'Personal mobility', 452; J. Lawler, 'The effect of enclosure on four Wolds villages: Weaverthorpe, Helperthorpe, East Lutton and West Lutton', *East Yorkshire Historian*, 3 (2002), 62.
42. See J. Crowther, 'Landownership and parish type, c.1830', in Neave and Ellis, *Atlas*, 62.