

Migration in Pre-Industrial Southern England:

The Example of Odiham

BARRY STAPLETON

In the last twenty five years historical research has increasingly provided evidence, either implicitly or explicitly, of substantial levels of migration in pre-industrial England. In the medieval period new towns and deserted villages, respectively testify to immigration and emigration.¹ In early modern times research into the rapid growth of London² in conjunction with regional studies of sixteenth century East Anglia,³ late sixteenth century and early seventeenth century Kent⁴ and the Midlands from Tudor to Georgian times,⁵ as well as the analysis of a variety of sources at the level of individual communities,⁶ have provided further evidence that large proportions of the population were mobile before the emergence of an industrialised England. Collectively these studies present a picture of high levels of migration in which the majority of migrants moved relatively short distances and indicate that it was the young, between the approximate ages of thirteen and thirty, who were the most mobile members of society.

This article hopes to show how far the analysis of the surviving sources for one community in southern England over three centuries reflects this emergent model.

What follows originates from a study of the 7,350 acre parish of Odiham in north-east Hampshire which lies on the northern scarp of the North Downs some 40 miles south-west of London. The conjunction of the clay of the Thames valley to the north and the chalk of the Downs in the south of the parish lay approximately along the west-east line of the wide high street in which markets were held weekly. A predominantly agricultural community of some 1100 persons in the late seventeenth century rising to over 2000 in 1811 and over 2800 in 1841,⁷ it also possessed related industrial activities of kersey manufacture, of some importance in the sixteenth century, and tanning.

In the last two decades, the study of some local communities has been considerably enhanced by the application of the technique of

family reconstitution developed in France and modified to suit the rather less informative English parish registers.⁸ Since Dr. Wrigley undertook his pioneering work on Colyton⁹ an increasing number of studies based on family reconstitution have been undertaken revealing information comparable with that of the south-east Devon parish,¹⁰ and this article is based in part on an investigation which has utilised the parish registers of Odiham. These form an unbroken series of marriages, baptisms and burials from 1538 to 1851,¹¹ and together with the non-conformist register for Odiham Independent Chapel for baptisms from 1795 to 1837 and burials from 1832 to 1837,¹² have provided evidence from which estimates of gross migration can be obtained. Such estimates will be affected by the inadequacies of parochial registration, and there are those who would argue that these are so serious as to make parish registers of little or no value in providing useful conclusions.¹³ However, not all communities possess poor sets of parish registers and if access to the civil registers can be obtained they can be used, for the period 1837 to 1851, to obtain a measure of the accuracy of the Anglican register. In the case of Odiham cross-matching births with baptisms and deaths with burials indicated that the baptism registers were over 85 per cent complete and the burial registers over 95 per cent complete.¹⁴ If it is assumed that the unregistered proportions contained the same levels of migrants as those who were registered then such results would indicate that whatever migration rates are produced from parish registers alone they will understate the real rates.

In theory those baptised in a parish and for whom no burial entry exists in the registers must have been out-migrants; those who were buried for whom no baptism entry can be traced must have been in-migrants. Enumerating such people is not however as simple as is sometimes implied.¹⁵ Not all those baptised can be linked unambiguously with a named person buried as communities often contained persons with the same first names and surnames alive contemporaneously. Where the number of those baptised equals the number of burials of those with the same names no problem exists. But where numbers are unequal and the evidence in the registers does not allow a firm attribution, then the procedure followed has been to make positive attributions for all those burials for which a matching first and surname baptism exists. Surplus burials are then regarded as in-migrants and any surplus of baptisms as out-migrants.

In the case of baptisms the period examined was 1541 to 1820. Those baptised after 1820 were increasingly unlikely to be found among the burials, which were searched up to 1890. What Table 1 shows from this exercise is that at no time during the period 1541 to

TABLE 1 ESTIMATES OF OUT-MIGRATING PROPORTIONS OF THOSE BAPTISED

	a	b	c	F	M	%F	%M
1541-60	882	612	69.4	302	310	49.3	50.7
1561-80	810	547	67.5	275	272	50.3	49.7
1581-1600	822	535	65.1	279	256	52.1	47.9
1601-20	958	615	64.2	321	294	52.2	47.8
1621-40	843	530	62.8	263	267	49.6	50.4
1641-60	780	501	64.2	268	233	53.5	46.5
1661-80	644	421	65.4	230	191	54.6	45.4
1681-1700	604	398	65.8	211	187	53.0	47.0
1701-20	661	390	59.0	208	182	53.3	46.7
1721-40	638	357	56.0	173	184	48.5	51.5
1741-60	829	498	60.0	246	252	49.4	50.6
1761-80	928	581	62.6	292	289	50.3	49.7
1781-1800	1234	806	65.3	417	389	51.7	48.3
1801-20	1296	836	64.5	426	410	51.0	49.0
Total	11825	7627	64.5	3911	3716	51.3	48.7

a = number of baptisms in parish registers (plus non-conformist registers for 1795-1820).

b = number of baptisms for which no burial was registered.

c = b as percentage of a

F = Female

M = Male

1820 was it possible to recover more than 44 per cent of those baptised from the burial registers, and in fact for the whole period from 1541 to 1700 almost two thirds of those baptised appear to have migrated from the parish. Only in the first half of the eighteenth century do less than 60 per cent of those baptised leave, before the numbers rise once more to 60 per cent and over. Thus never less than 56 per cent of those baptised in Odiham left at some point in their lives, a higher proportion of the baptised population than was the case in the Vale of Trent where between 40 and 50 per cent of the names in the baptism registers could not be traced in the burial registers.¹⁶

When estimating in-migration from those burials which could not

be traced as previous baptisms two groups provided some difficulty. There was the problem of whether to include those specified as wanderers or strangers and their children who had died in Odiham, and secondly, those named as foundlings at burial. Since it is just as possible that wanderers and strangers could have had children baptised but not buried in Odiham before moving on and thus having the baptism recorded as an out-migrant it was decided to include all such persons in the in-migrant totals. Their numbers, in any case, change the 20 year totals only by one or two per cent. The foundlings, however, provided a special case, since from 1758 Odiham became a reception centre for Foundling Hospital children and at least 146 were sent by the Hospital to be nursed in the community in the second half of the eighteenth century.¹⁷ Because these children were not introduced into the parish in the normal course of migration it was decided to omit burials of foundlings from the analysis.

The gross estimates of in-migrants in Table 2 exclude the sixteenth century since some proportion of those buried before 1600 are likely to have been baptised prior to 1538. The statistics for the period 1601 to 1840 show a remarkably steady flow of migrants into Odiham with the early seventeenth and eighteenth centuries having slightly higher levels of in-migration than the later part of those centuries or the early nineteenth. Clearly though, except for the period 1781 to 1800, over 40 per cent of those buried appear to have arrived in the parish during their lifetimes and stayed until death.

Because of the nature of sources such as settlement papers, apprenticeship indentures and church court depositions most studies of migration have concentrated attention on male migrants.¹⁸ The role of women has remained somewhat obscure. It is, therefore, interesting to note that when the totals of those baptised but not buried in Odiham are disaggregated by sex, in ten out of fourteen of the 20 year periods there is an excess of female over male migrants. Moreover, when the fluctuating volumes of out-migration decline into the troughs of 1621 to 1640 and 1721 to 1740, these troughs are primarily the products of lower levels of female migration. This greater propensity of females to migrate was a phenomenon which was indicated almost a century ago.¹⁹ Furthermore, when the sex ratio of those in-migrants buried but not baptised in the parish is examined, a constant surplus of females over males throughout the whole period 1601 to 1840, with particularly high proportions in the late seventeenth century, is found. However, in so far as historical explanations are ever simple, there would appear to be a perfectly natural explanation for these ratios. Since the tradition in pre-industrial England, as in the twentieth century, was for most mar-

TABLE 2 ESTIMATES OF IN-MIGRATING PROPORTIONS OF THOSE BURIED

	a	b	c	F	M	%F	%M
1601-20	673	294	43.7	167	127	56.8	43.2
1621-40	656	284	43.0	152	132	53.5	46.5
1641-60	660	296	44.8	166	128	56.1	43.2
1661-80	593	253	42.6	157	96	62.0	38.0
1681-1700	484	197	40.7	122	75	61.9	38.1
1701-20	477	217	45.5	122	95	56.2	43.8
1721-40	570	256	44.9	152	97	59.4	37.9
1741-60	657	288	43.8	149	130	51.7	45.1
1761-80	651	271	41.6	154	117	56.8	43.2
1781-1800	744	291	39.1	151	140	51.9	48.1
1801-20	680	280	41.1	151	129	53.9	46.1
1821-40	916	374	40.8	193	181	51.6	48.4
Total	7761	3301	42.5	1836	1447	55.6	43.8

a = Burials recorded in parish registers (plus non-conformist register for 1832-37).

b = Burials recorded having no related baptism.

c = b as a percentage of a.

F = Female

M = Male

N.B. Between 1641-60, 1721-40 and 1741-60 the percentages of male and female migrants do not total 100. This results from a small number of wanderers whose sex was unspecified at burial i.e. 2(0.7%) 1641-60; 7(2.7%) 1721-40; 9(3.1%) 1741-60.

riages to take place in the bride's parish, many brides marrying grooms from other parishes often found themselves moving to the husband's parish by virtue of his social, and especially economic, bonds. Thus the event of marriage created an increase in female migration. An analysis of Odiham in 1851 using census birthplace statements gives some supporting evidence to this assertion. What the 1,088 census residents stating non Odiham birthplaces indicate

when tabulated by age and sex is that, whereas the 203 aged under fifteen produced as even a division as possible, 102 males and 101 females, and in the later teens (15 to 19) males accounted for 56 and females 51 of the 107 in-migrants (see Table 21 on page 81), from the age of 20 onwards, females predominated in every five year age group except three, 40 to 44, 70 to 74 and 85 to 89. This resulted in a total of 437 in-migrant females to only 341 in-migrant males, clearly demonstrating that it is in the years during and after marriage that the excess of female migrants materialises. For these figures to be at all comparable with those extracted from the parish register baptisms and burials it is necessary to aggregate in-migrant males and females of all ages. Such an aggregation produces totals of 589 females and 499 males, and results in 54.1 per cent of in-migrants being female in 1851, a percentage not at all at variance with those for the nearest 20 year period 1821-40 in Table 2. Since additionally, the total Odiham 1851 census population of 2,811 was composed of 1,406 males and 1,405 females it is clear that the analysis of parish register baptisms and burials is quite acceptable in indicating that women rather than men normally formed the larger proportion of the migrant population in pre-industrial England. If marriage is the key to this pattern then examination of other communities' parish registers should produce broadly similar results.

Analysis of the reconstituted families allows a further dimension to be added to the gross estimates of migration, though not for the population as a whole. Since family reconstitution forms are 'marriage centred' they do not reveal evidence of those who remained single for their whole lifetimes, but they can be used to reveal information about in-migrant and out-migrant couples and some at least, if not all, their children.

In-migrant families are discovered by virtue of having one or more children baptised, though having no previous marriage recorded in the parish. Clearly infertile in-migrants would not be included nor would those who remained in residence for too short a period for any baptism to be recorded, or those couples where the wife has reached the menopause. Since, in addition those apparent in-migrant spouses for whom a baptism could be traced in Odiham registers have been excluded from these calculations as having simply married outside the parish, the statistics can be said to understate the real rates of in-migration. It must also be added that some in-migrant families may have an unknown number of children on arrival. Furthermore, there are a number of couples who are stated to be of Odiham when marrying, but for whom no baptism can be traced. Some are the children of previous in-migrant parents who had arrived in early

childhood and had remained in the parish ever since. Others arrived in later years to pursue employment and were established in Odiham by the time of marriage. The majority of these tended to remain in the parish after marriage, but technically they are in-migrants.

In the case of out-migrants however, the absence of any further reference to a family after either marriage or baptism, is taken to indicate that the family had left the parish. Burial of either spouse or later marriages of children have been used as evidence of a family's continued residence. In some cases, using the death of a spouse can represent a relatively short stay particularly where a mother has died after the birth of her first registered child in Odiham.²⁰

The most striking feature of the analysis of in-migrant families (Table 3) is the high proportion whose stay in the parish was purely temporary. For the whole period from 1580 to 1840 at least 40 per cent of in-migrants having registered baptisms in Odiham departed, thus recording at least a second move in their lives. However, the proportion departing declined steadily from a peak of over two-thirds in the late sixteenth century to over two-fifths in the late seventeenth century, rising to two thirds once again in the early nineteenth century, a trend remarkably consistent with higher numbers moving at a time when aggregative analysis of baptism and burials indicates that population pressure was greater,²¹ and smaller proportions migrating when population growth was much lower in late seventeenth century Odiham. It is also worth noting the high proportions of those in-migrants who departed after having recorded the baptism of only one child and, except for the early eighteenth century, over 80 per cent of all those in-migrants who left registered only one or two baptisms during their temporary stay in the parish.

Similarly, when examining the structure of out-migrant families, (Table 4) it is noticeable that a high proportion of those who married in Odiham and subsequently left did so before any baptisms had been recorded. At all times, as Table 4 shows, more than half those spouses who had been baptised in the parish had departed without registering the baptism of a single child, and in most periods the proportion was near to or over two-thirds. This evidence, as well as that in Table 3, would seem to corroborate the view that mobility was common among younger adults in the population.²² Even so some migrants clearly moved when older, and after having formed large family units; in the early eighteenth century between 20 and 30 per cent of in-migrants departing did so after having registered three or more baptisms. Thus between 1701 and 1720 some families had registered between four and 13 children before leaving, and it is noticeable that in each twenty year period covered there were

TABLE 3 *IN-MIGRANT FAMILIES – STAYERS AND LEAVERS*

<i>In-Migrant Families</i>		<i>Percentage of total F.R.F.'s</i>	<i>Stayers %</i>	<i>Leavers, plus no. of children baptised before departure</i>								
				1 2 3+								
1581-1600	143	35.6	48	33.6	95	66.4	67	70.5	17	17.9	11	11.6
1601-20	147	37.3	60	40.8	87	59.2	56	64.4	17	19.5	14	16.1
1621-40	114	33.5	54	47.4	60	52.6	38	63.3	14	23.3	8	13.3
1641-60	95	30.4	44	46.3	51	53.7	36	70.6	9	17.6	6	11.8
1661-80	96	38.9	49	51.0	47	49.0	36	76.6	5	10.6	6	12.8
1681-1700	79	35.6	46	58.2	33	41.8	20	60.6	7	21.2	6	18.2
1701-20	85	30.4	44	51.6	42	49.4	24	57.1	9	21.4	9	21.4
1721-40	113	37.0	49	43.4	64	56.6	38	59.3	8	12.5	18	28.1
1741-60	91	26.9	38	41.8	53	58.2	36	67.9	6	11.3	11	20.8
1761-80	107	27.3	40	37.4	67	62.6	46	68.6	8	11.9	12	17.9
1781-1800	150	31.8	58	38.7	92	61.3	60	65.2	17	18.4	15	16.3
1801-20	156	31.4	51	32.7	105	67.3	61	58.1	29	27.6	15	14.3
1821-40	162	29.3	54	33.3	108	66.7	81	75.0	14	13.0	13	12.0

F.R.F. = Family Reconstitution Form

TABLE 4 OUT-MIGRANT FAMILIES

	Total Number of Out-Migrant total FRF's Families	Percentage of Marriage only recorded in Odiham (No baptism of spouses)	baptised before migration.						
			Total	0	1	2	3	4	5+
1581-1600	111	27.4	19	64	14	8	5	0	1
1601-20	85	21.6	32	34	14	2	0	1	2
1621-40	98	28.8	33	44	10	4	3	3	1
1641-60	90	28.8	38	37	8	1	1	2	3
1661-80	50	20.2	21	24	2	2	1	0	0
1681-1700	67	30.2	28	30	6	1	0	1	1
1701-20	75	26.8	31	28	6	1	5	2	2
1721-40	68	22.3	27	26	9	1	2	2	1
1741-60	94	27.8	41	37	5	3	3	1	4
1761-80	99	25.3	40	33	13	10	1	1	1
1781-1800	144	30.6	53	63	20	4	1	1	2
1801-20	153	30.8	57	57	18	11	2	4	4
1821-40	139	25.2	55	55	12	8	8	0	1

families who had up to eight children baptised before migrating from the parish.

Nothing is known about most of these migrants except for their sex and dates of marriage, and in some cases the baptism of those who become out-migrants and burial dates of in-migrants. Most parish registers provide no information either about the ages and occupations of migrants or the distances over which they had travelled, and the registers of Odiham are no exception. However, marriage registers do supply some evidence of migration distance in those cases where the incumbent specified the parish of residence of bride or groom. Unfortunately, it is not always the case that such information was consistently provided, at least before the application of Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act²⁴ in the mid eighteenth century, and the consequent introduction of printed marriage registers.

Thus, for the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries the proportions of those married in Odiham who were stated to be from other parishes varies from 1.2 per cent of the total married between 1601 and 1620 to 18.5 per cent for the first twenty years of the eighteenth century. (See Table 5). However, the inconsistency of the data can be most clearly shown in the mid-seventeenth century by the fortunate survival of the Interregnum register for the years 1653–1661. Marriage entries in that register commence in November 1653 and end in June 1659, during which time 122 persons were married in 61 registered ceremonies. Of these brides and grooms 32 (26.2 per cent) were stated to be from parishes other than Odiham, thus providing a much higher proportion of in-migrant marriage partners than at any other time, including the post-Hardwicke period. It may well be argued that the Cromwellian Commonwealth, following on the heels of a Civil War, was one of unusual mobility, but since only one other person out of a total of 328 was stated to be an in-migrant at marriage in the whole 20 year period 1641–1660, the strong indication is that the Anglican registers understate the scale of migrants marrying in Odiham. The fluctuating proportions of in-migrants marrying also suggest that the understatement is not in itself consistent over time. Furthermore, a statement of residence cannot necessarily be accepted as indicative of the place of baptism of the migrant. For example, almost 450 persons stated at marriage to be from Odiham have been traced in the marriage registers of other parishes in the south of England. However, the baptisms of less than half of these stated residents could be found in Odiham's Anglican registers, thus demonstrating that for those who could not be traced, at least one previous move had been made prior to the marriage ceremony. Hence, for many the distances travelled in order to marry

TABLE 5 MARRIAGE HORIZONS

	<10	<20	<30	<40	<50	<75	<100	100+	Total	% of total Married
1601-20	2			1		2			5	1.2
1621-40	3	1		3		4			11	2.6
1641-60	26	3		1		3			33	10.1
1661-80	1	2	4			1			8	3.4
1681-1700	7		1						8	3.5
1701-20	16	14	6	4		1			41	18.5
1721-40	13	9	4			1			27	9.9
1741-60	14	12	9	4	2	3		1	45	12.5
1761-80	35	11	5	2		4			57	12.7
1781-1800	68	14	1	2	2	6	3	3	99	16.4
1801-20	71	10	7	3	2	9		1	103	17.1
1821-40	50	12	10	3	3	6	1	4	89	13.7
1841-50	9	9	2		1	1			22	7.6
	315	97	49	23	10	41	4	9	548	
1601-1700	39(60%)	6(9.2)	5(7.7)	5(7.7)		10(15.4)			65	100.0
1701-60	43(38.0)	35(31.0)	19(16.8)	8(7.0)	2(1.8)	5(4.4)		1(0.9)	113	99.9
1761-1840	224(64.4)	47(13.5)	23(6.6)	10(2.9)	7(2.0)	25(7.2)	4(1.1)	8(2.3)	348	100.0

Distances in kms.

are an indication only of the latest move in their individual cases and not of their overall movement, a not unsurprising fact since young people were frequently engaged either as servants in husbandry on annual hirings or in domestic service and thus were among the most mobile sections of a community.²⁵

Analysis of the parish register entries shows that the majority of Odiham's in-migrant marriage partners travelled only short distances to be wed. In the seventeenth century 60 per cent came from less than ten kilometres away and only ten individuals had journeyed over 40 kilometres, all of them in fact from a distance of 50 to under 75 kilometres, and eight out of the ten were from London. In the first 60 years of the eighteenth century however, the proportion of brides and grooms travelling less than 10 kilometres to marry fell to under 40 per cent; a fall wholly taken up by the growth of partners coming from ten to less than 20 kilometres away. London also declined as a source of marriage partners, despite its acknowledged growth in importance and population size in the first half of the eighteenth century.²⁶ Since no other relatively distant centre replaced London as a focus for supplying brides or grooms, the proportion travelling less than 40 kilometres to marry (93 per cent) was higher than in the seventeenth century.

Even so, from 1760 to 1840 the short distance migrant marriage partner becomes yet more dominant. Despite such improvements in communications in the Odiham area as turnpike roads from 1737²⁷ and the building of the Basingstoke Canal through the parish in the early 1790s,²⁸ almost two-thirds of those who married away from their parish of residence after 1760 moved less than 10 kilometres to attend the ceremony, and more than three quarters had travelled under 20 kilometres. The remainder, however, demonstrated much wider marriage horizons were becoming more frequent. Apart from London once again being a source of marriage partners, there were a dozen brides and grooms who came from over 75 kilometres distant from Odiham, the farthest being a groom from Lancashire. By comparison, before 1760 only one groom was recorded as having been resident over 75 kilometres from the parish. However, as a proportion of total marriages solemnized in Odiham, the figures bear out previous findings that less than five per cent of the residences of in-migrant marriage partners were beyond a radius of 20 kilometres.²⁹

Except in a few rare cases one major disadvantage of using parish registers as a source for measuring the scale or distance of migration is their paucity of information about individual migrants. Only by taking into account other historical records is it possible, therefore, to

add further dimensions to the rather shadowy migrants revealed by most parish registers. Generally, the most useful records for such purposes are those produced by the administrators of the parish throughout the centuries, the best examples being collections of settlement papers and apprenticeship indentures. However, these usually commence in the seventeenth century and it is uncommon for other sources to survive at the parish level for the sixteenth century except occasionally for Churchwardens' Account Books which, apart from infrequent references to vagrants or soldiers, add little to an understanding of migration. It is, therefore, to the ecclesiastical courts, and especially the archdeacon's court³⁰, that one must turn to discover more detail concerning individual migrants before 1600. Unfortunately, the lack of survival of the records of the archdeacons' courts for the Winchester diocese necessitates dependence on the consistory court records, a less useful source of information for an individual parish,³¹ as is clearly demonstrated by the fact that only seventeen individuals are recorded in the consistory court deposition books as having any connection with Odiham in the sixteenth century. Seven of these were natives of the parish but all were resident elsewhere by the time of their depositions, four having moved less than ten kilometres, two under twenty kilometres and one resided over 40 kilometres from Odiham. A further seven were migrants into Odiham, four of whom had come under ten kilometres, one under 20 kilometres, and two whose place of birth was not specified. Of the remaining three, two were wives for whom no details were given apart from their ages and the third had been an in-migrant to Odiham and after having lived there for 18 years, had left again 18 months before his deposition. Thus this sample is indicative of a probable high level of migration, as not a single individual for whom details are known was a native of Odiham who had remained in the parish for life.

Since, however, this is much too small a sample from which to draw any firm conclusions the Winchester diocesan consistory court books for the sixteenth century have been utilised in order to provide a larger and more acceptable sample of migrants from the Winchester diocese.³² Although statistically the number of deponents involved may be considered acceptable they can hardly claim to be a representative sample of the population as a whole.

Some 1,826 depositions made by individuals between 1532 and 1576 have been examined. (Table 6) Of these, 518 witnesses (28.4%) were stated to be natives of the parish in which they resided when making their depositions, whereas one third (606 = 33.2%) indicated clear evidence of migration by naming one or more parishes in which

TABLE 6 WINCHESTER CONSISTORY COURT DEPONENTS
1532-76

	<i>Natives</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Migrants</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Deduced Migrants</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Unspecified</i>
Males	509	32.7	577	37.0	473	30.3	1559	135
Females	9	13.9	29	44.6	27	41.5	65	67
Total	518	31.9	606	37.3	500	30.8	1624	202

they had lived during their lives in addition to their current place of residence. Of the remaining 702 (38.4%), no specific information on which to determine whether they were natives or not was provided in 202 cases. With the remaining 500 entries it was possible to infer migration from the fact that the person's age exceeded the period of residence or, where no age was given the period of residence was so short that the individual would have been but a child at the time of making the deposition. Thus, of the observable population of 1,624 individuals the real proportion of migrants was 68.1 per cent (606 + 500), while those native to their parish of residence constituted 31.9 per cent. The correlation between the proportion of migrants in the sample and the proportion of out-migrants indicated from the Odiham parish registers for the most closely corresponding period from 1541 to 1580 (see Table 1 p. 00) is striking. Nevertheless it can be regarded as partly accidental since the two sources do not measure the same populations. Whereas the parish registers cover the majority of the population (except for small proportions not being baptised or buried) there are some notable sections of the population either missing or grossly under-represented in the consistory court books. The sample is skewed, since no children appear, only a handful of adolescents, and only 132 (7.2%) women.

Since, as we have seen, there tended to be more female migrants than male, the paucity of female deponents is unfortunate. For the majority of the women who do appear (67), no useful information was provided, and as only five entries afforded occupational information, all as servants, they are excluded from the occupational and migrational analysis. Perhaps it should be pointed out, however, that only 9 (13%) of 65 known cases remained in their parishes of birth,

once again indicating women's greater propensity to migrate. The occupational analysis indicates that very few servants (two natives and three migrants) and even fewer labourers (two natives and one migrant), two of the most important occupational groups, were represented. In addition, the proportion of witnesses who had been residing in their parishes for only short periods of time was low. No doubt the reason for all these groups appearing infrequently was because their testimonies as witnesses would be considered of little or no consequence.

Nevertheless, the occupations of male deponents (Table 7), both natives and migrants, do provide some evidence of most sectors of rural, and occasionally urban, society in sixteenth century Hampshire and analysis indicates that the sample is not by any means as heavily weighted with the upper sections of society as similar exercises using ecclesiastical court records of late sixteenth and early seventeenth

TABLE 7 OCCUPATIONS OF DEPONENTS (MALES ONLY)

	Natives	%	Migrants	%	Total	%
Gentry	9	2.2	11	3.5	20	2.8
Clergy			15	4.7	15	2.1
Agriculture: Yeomen	25	6.1	28	8.8	53	7.3
Husbandmen	267	65.6	147	46.2	414	57.1
Others (Shepherd & Ploughman)			2	0.6	2	0.3
Manufacturing: Textiles	44	10.8	44	13.8	88	12.1
Leather	14	3.4	14	4.4	28	3.6
Misc. Crafts	11	2.7	15	4.7	26	3.6
Building	9	2.2	8	2.5	17	2.3
Dealing	9	2.2	8	2.5	17	2.3
Food & Drink	8	2.0	12	3.8	20	2.8
Transport	1	0.3	6	1.9	7	1.0
Service Trades	6	1.5	4	1.3	10	1.4
Domestic Service	2	0.5	3	0.9	5	0.7
Labourers	2	0.5	1	0.3	3	0.4
Total	407	100.0	318	99.9	725	100.1
Unspecified	102		79			

century Kent or east Sussex have shown.³³ Since the lower sections of the population, labourers and servants, are conspicuous by their absence, the Hampshire material appears more nearly to represent the middle stratum of county society, and since as such it is dominated by agriculture, and in particular by the number of husbandmen who testified in the court, it may be said more accurately to reflect the lower middle stratum. What the occupational analysis suggests is that no group had any greater propensity to migrate than to remain immobile, except for the clergy, who by the nature of their training and subsequent employment, provide an obvious special case and as such are omitted from the analysis of migration. It could be argued perhaps, that since almost two-thirds of those remaining static were husbandmen, who in turn constituted less than half of those who migrated, holding land was something of a disincentive to mobility,³⁴ but the evidence from the admittedly smaller number of yeomen deponents would tend to indicate an opposing view.

Because of the paucity of evidence relating to labourers and servants it is not possible to discover whether the poorer sections of sixteenth century Hampshire society were any more or less mobile than their wealthier contemporaries. It can however, be suggested that the Hampshire gentry seem to move over longer distances than their counterparts in Kent³⁵ since of the eleven gentlemen who migrated, more than half (six) recorded moves which took them over 75 kilometres from their places of birth. But in Hampshire, only eight out of 147 (5%) husbandmen fell into a similar category, whilst 21 per cent of yeomen were found to have moved over a similar distance. On the other hand, 46 per cent of those engaged in the leather trades were residing over 75 kilometres from their birthplaces, though it is not easy to know how poor were this group composed of shoemakers, glovers and tanners, plus one fellmonger.

On the whole however, from a sample of 382 male migrants for whom birthplace and migrational information, and in most cases age, is known almost two-fifths resided within ten kilometres of their parish of birth, over half less than 20 kilometres and two thirds under thirty kilometres from their birthplaces (Table 8). Almost nine out of every ten migrants lived under 100 kilometres from their native parishes demonstrating that Hampshire men for the most part moved shorter distances than those in late sixteenth century Sussex.³⁶ This concentration on short distance migration received further emphasis when the number of places is considered in which migrating witnesses indicated they had resided, assuming of course that the statements given were a complete itinerary of the moves of each individual. Analysis of the frequency of moves of the 364 migrants by age³⁷

TABLE 8 *CONSISTORY COURT DEPONENTS 1532-76*

Distance of stated residence from birthplace of male migrants

<i>Distances (Km)</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Cumulative %</i>
<10	144	37.7	
<20	67	17.5	55.2
<30	44	11.5	66.7
<40	24	6.3	73.0
<50	18	4.7	77.7
<75	26	6.8	84.5
<100	10	2.6	87.1
*100+	49	12.8	99.9
	382	99.9	

* Includes 14 (3.7%) over 200 km & 10 (2.6%) over 300 km.

reveals that nearly three out of every four migrants recorded only one move from their place of birth (see Table 9), and it is clear, since the highest proportion of such migrants are in the over 50 age groups that, unlike the east Sussex evidence, this distribution is not a function of age in the sense that the young would have had less time to move more than once. In any case, it can also be pointed out that of the seven individuals who had resided in four parishes, three were still in their twenties³⁸. Furthermore, more than nine out of ten migrants recorded only two moves before the time of their depositions, and no witness actually recorded more than four places of residence.³⁹ Thus, if it can be assumed that there is no under-registration of the number of moves, Hampshire migrants in the sixteenth century appear to have moved less frequently than was the case of their contemporaries at the end of the century in both Kent and East Sussex, a difference which may of course be a reflection of the different social composition of the sample.⁴⁰ Comparing the age structure of migrant males with that of those who remained in their native parishes demonstrates that there were proportionately more migrants in their twenties than those remaining in their parish of birth, and conversely more immobile males are found in the 40 plus and 50 plus age groups; but the differences are slight, a reflection,

TABLE 9 *CONSISTORY COURT DEPONENTS 1532-76**Number of Residences Recorded by Deponents by Age*

<i>Age</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Total</i> <i>Migrants</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Natives</i>	<i>%</i>
<20	3	75.0	1	25.0	0	—	0	—	4	1.1	5	1.0
20-29	45	75.0	10	16.7	2	3.3	3	5.0	60	16.5	62	12.8
30-39	63	72.4	19	21.8	5	5.8	0	—	87	23.9	108	22.3
40-49	62	68.1	19	20.9	9	9.9	1	1.1	91	25.0	136	28.0
50-59	45	77.6	8	13.8	2	3.4	3	5.2	58	15.9	92	19.0
60-69	40	78.4	4	7.8	7	13.8	0	—	51	14.0	64	13.2
70+	8	61.5	4	30.8	1	7.7	0	—	13	3.6	18	3.7
	266	73.1	65	17.9	26	7.1	7	1.9	364	100.0	485	100.0

In addition 18 natives (3.6 per cent) appear to have been migrants who had returned to their native parishes since their stated length of residence was less than stated ages. However, the number of times they moved during their lifetimes remains unknown. Women are excluded from the above and so are 18 migrants for whom no age was given.

presumably, of the selection of witnesses rather than of migration or stability. It has, however, to be pointed out that the stated ages of migrants are in many cases indicative rather than accurate for there is considerable bunching of numbers at the ages of thirty, forty, fifty and sixty. If these groupings represent migrants who were aged in their thirties, forties, etc. then the table presenting ages will be acceptably accurate, but should witnesses have felt it necessary to state higher ages than their real ones, some discrepancies must occur. Three of the seven Odiham natives who had left the parish gave 'rounded' ages – two stated they were aged thirty and one fifty, and theoretically it should be possible to check their age statements against baptism dates. However, two of the three were born before parish registration began so it was only possible to check the age of Ambrose Knight who on 10th July 1587 stated he was a thirty year old miller of Puttenham, Surrey where he had lived for three years, and before that had been resident at Fordingbridge, Hampshire for eight years, implying he had left Odiham about the year 1576 when aged nineteen or so. The parish register shows that Ambrose was the first of three children baptised in Odiham to Robert and Alice Knight between 1555 and 1568, after which latter date no further reference to the family is made, seemingly because they had departed. Clearly this evidence does not conflict with Ambrose's deposition, but as he was the child born in 1555 and baptised on 28th March, his real age when acting as a witness was 32, hence he does appear in the correct migrant age group.

How accurately the information about migration in Hampshire gleaned from the consistory court depositions reflects the pattern of migration in Odiham itself is debatable. As a small agricultural market town it could be considered representative of rural Hampshire, although it is noticeable that in its small sample of deponents no native born witness remained in the community at a time when the parish registers suggest that about one third of those baptised spent their whole lives in the parish. Such uncertainties emphasise the paucity of useful sixteenth century sources for migration studies.

However, from the late seventeenth century with the generation and survival of an increasing volume of valuable evidence the study of migrants in individual communities becomes somewhat less conjectural. In particular, two groups in the community, the young and the poor, both of which are noticeably absent from the consistory court records, can be examined. Parish apprenticeship indentures provide some coverage of pauper children, although mainly male, and settlement papers shed light on some of the less well off in society.

For Odiham between 1636 and 1828, evidence survives for 87

parish apprentices.⁴¹ Their distribution over time is uneven (Table 10) which may be a simple reflection of the vagaries of survival or, more plausibly, since a disproportionate number of the apprenticeships are to be found before 1670, an indication of the changing levels of either poverty or care in the community, combined with the disappearance after 1740 of female apprentices who made up more than one fifth of the total pre 1740.

What emerges from an analysis of the memorandum book and the indentures is that of the 51 cases which survive prior to 1740 over half were apprenticed in Odiham itself and the rest were found masters either within a radius of 20 kilometres of the town or alternatively in the metropolis. The single exception was one boy whose indentures in 1662 made him the longest distance migrant from Odiham when they took him across the Atlantic to be apprenticed to a planter in Virginia.

After 1740, what clearly emerges from the fewer surviving indentures is the decline in importance both of Odiham and London as centres for placing parish apprentices, London indeed completely disappearing from the apprenticeship records. A new pattern emerges of apprentices being sent to masters at destinations spread almost entirely within a 50 kilometre radius from Odiham.

It is not easy to produce any absolutely acceptable explanations of this change. Certainly, whereas almost one fifth of apprenticeships before 1740 had been in agriculture, none were so after that date, and since half of these had been served in Odiham, their disappearance, along with the decline in the tanning industry, which had provided employment for four apprentices in Odiham before 1740 as opposed to only one afterwards, would explain the decline in the town's relative importance in the provision of employment opportunities for apprentices (Table 11). London's total disappearance as a source of employment is harder to justify. Perhaps it was a reflection of Odiham's overseers becoming more cost conscious; thus higher London premiums and greater transport costs to the capital would act increasingly as a deterrent, or alternatively it could be that London was ceasing to be the magnet for employment which its exceptional growth rate had ensured before 1740.⁴²

Fortunately, the regularisation of attitudes towards settlement by the Acts of 1662⁴³ and 1696-97⁴⁴, resulted in an increase in the issue of settlement papers, the survival of which ensures that a larger sample of Odiham's migrant population than is indicated in the apprenticeship indentures can be examined. Almost 500 references⁴⁵ provide a deeper insight from the late seventeenth century to the early nineteenth century into the propensity to migrate of poorer

TABLE 10 ODIHAM PARISH APPRENTICES - PLACINGS BY DISTANCE

	Odiham	<10	<20	<30	<40	<50	<75	<100	Total
1641-60	21	4	4				1		30
* 1661-70	4	1	3				3		(1) 12 (incl. (1) to Virginia)
1681-1700	1	1					2		4
1701-20						1	2		3
1721-40	2								2
1741-60	3	2						1	6
1761-80	3	4	3	1	1				12
1781-1800	2	2		2					6
1801-20	5	2				1			8 (plus 2 unspecified but not Odiham)
1821-28	2								2
	43	16	10	3	1	2	8	1	(1) 85 (incl. (1) to Virginia)

* 10 yrs only.

% all years	50.6	18.8	11.8	3.5	1.2	2.3	9.4	1.2	1.2	100.0
% 1641-1740	54.9	11.8	13.7			1.9	15.7		(1.9)	99.9
% 1741-1828	44.1	29.4	8.8	8.8	2.9	2.9		2.9		99.8

Distances in kms

TABLE 11 ODIHAM PARISH APPRENTICES –
OCCUPATIONS

	1641–1740	1741–1828
Agriculture	4	0
Manufacturing: Textiles	9	10
Leather	13	9
Misc. Crafts	12	14
Building	4	1
Dealing	2	1
Food & Drink	3	0
Transport	1	0
Service Trades	1	1
Gent	2	0
	—	—
	51	36

TABLE 12 SETTLEMENTS TO ODIHAM – DISTANCES
(KMS)

	<10	<20	<30	<40	<50	<75	<100	100+	Total
1681–1700	4	3	1			1			9
1701–20	12	6	2		1	1	1		23
1721–40	13	8	4	2	2	3		1	33
1741–60	6	7	4	1				1	19
1761–80	9	2	3	1			2	2	19
1781–1800	14	8	1			2			25
1801–20	4	1							5
1821–40	2								2
	64	35	15	4	3	7	3	4	135
% All years	47.4	25.9	11.1	3.0	2.2	5.2	2.2	3.0	100.0
% 1681–1760	41.6	28.6	13.1	3.6	3.6	5.9	1.2	2.4	100.0
% 1761–1840	56.9	21.6	7.8	2.0	–	3.9	3.9	3.9	100.0

sections of the population. The settlement certificates are almost entirely related to migrants into Odiham, only six referring to departing Odiham residents. On the other hand, the more numerous

removal orders are much more evenly divided between those being moved out of Odiham and natives of the parish being returned. The distribution over time of these surviving documents suggests, at first sight, that acquiring a certificate allowing migration was somewhat easier before 1760 than afterwards, since 62 per cent of the in-migrant certificates relate to the period 1681–1760. The remaining 38 per cent are almost wholly distributed over the next 32 years, there being only nine between 1793 and 1832 (Table 12). On the other hand, the distribution of the removal orders follows a distinctly different pattern, since of the 180 surviving orders referring to removals back to Odiham, only 20 are to be found before 1760, (Table 13) and similarly for those removed from the town, only 25 (14.6 per cent) of 171 pre date 1760 (Table 14). The issuing of both sets of orders reached a peak in the first 20 years of the nineteenth century, though closer examination shows that very few of these orders were actually issued in the first decade of that century, (only 14 of a total for the two decades of 113), and it was in the years 1816 to 1820 that 60 per cent (68) of the orders were issued. Thus the Napoleonic war years saw little attempt to remove the poor but the effect of the post war depression is pronounced. What does seem to be the case is that there

TABLE 13 REMOVALS TO ODIHAM – DISTANCES (KMS)

	<10	<20	<30	<40	<50	<75	<100	100+	Total
1661–80	1								1
1681–1700	3					1			4
1701–20	3	3							6
1721–40	1								1
1741–60	3	3			1	1			8
1761–80	10	2	2	4		4			22
1781–1800	23	5	5	2	1	5		3	44
1801–20	11	8	8	5	4	6	3	6	51
1821–32	18	7	3	3	2	5	2	3	43
	73	28	18	14	8	22	5	12	180
% All years	40.5	15.6	10.0	7.8	4.4	12.2	2.8	6.7	100.0
% 1661–1760	55.0	30.0			5.0	10.0			100.0
% 1761–1832	38.8	13.7	11.2	8.8	4.4	12.5	3.1	7.5	100.0

TABLE 14 REMOVALS FROM ODIHAM - DISTANCES (KMS)

	<10	<20	<30	<40	<50	<75	<100	100+	Total
1661-80	1	1							2
1681-1700	3					1			4
1701-20	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		8
1721-40	3					1		1	5
1741-60	2		1	1				2	6
1761-80	5	2	2	1		2		1	13
1781-1800	19	5	1		2	1			28
1801-20	26	9	7	3	6	8	1	1	61
1821-32	23	7	2	5	2	3		1	43
	84	25	14	11	11	17	2	6	170
% All years	49.4	14.7	8.2	6.5	6.5	10.0	1.2	3.5	100.0
% 1661-1760	44.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	4.0	12.0	4.0	12.0	100.0
% 1761-1832	50.3	15.9	8.3	6.2	6.9	9.6	0.7	2.1	100.0

is no necessary relationship between the issue of settlement certificates and subsequent removal orders. At the time when most received their certificates, few removal orders were issued. Yet in the first 30 years of the nineteenth century, when few certificates allowing settlement were issued, a veritable flood of removal orders emanated from the overseers. It seems unlikely that this pattern is an accident of survival. Although the removal orders could be said to fit into the theory of survival by accident, the settlement certificates certainly do not. Hence, it would seem that the certificate system was falling into abeyance in the later eighteenth century and that the poor were increasingly migrating without certification. The consequence of this can be seen in the increased volume of orders referring to those being removed from Odiham although not previously having entered the parish with a settlement certificate.⁴⁶

It could easily be argued that in the late seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth century, when the population of Odiham, like the nation's as a whole,⁴⁷ experienced a relatively slow rate of growth, the lack of population pressure on the local economy meant the arrival of migrants with settlement certificates was considered acceptable. However, in the changed circumstances of the late

eighteenth century, both rising prices and population with concomitant problems of poverty and its increased costs, created a climate less favourable to in-migrants. Hence, the larger body of surviving evidence appears to reflect the generation of a pressure to eject the poor from the community.

Whatever the causes, the settlement papers do shed some further light on marital status and family size as well as the migration distances of those moving both into and out of Odiham. As may be expected, the dominance of short distance migrants is paramount. Almost half those arriving with certificates had travelled under ten kilometres and nearly three quarters had journeyed less than 20 kilometres (see Table 12). Not surprisingly the pattern for those removed was not too dissimilar. Again almost half were returned a distance of under ten kilometres though less than two thirds travelled under 20 kilometres (see Table 13). However, analysis of the distances travelled by those ordered back to Odiham demonstrates that a much smaller proportion, under 40 per cent, had returned from under ten kilometres away and not much more than half from under 20 kilometres away (see Table 14). And whereas under ten per cent of those arriving with certificates had journeyed over 50 kilometres, 22 per cent of those ordered back to Odiham had to make such a journey.

Thus, the settlement papers allow the establishment of a probable migration model. A pattern of migration is revealed in which the small market town acted as a magnet to migrants over a relatively restricted area, whereas a higher proportion of those born, or resident from childhood in the town, who subsequently left had wider horizons and considered that improved prospects lay in more distant and larger centres of population. In this context, although London was a declining centre for the placing of Odiham apprentices in the eighteenth century, the orders removing migrants back to Odiham demonstrate that the capital maintained its attraction to others from the town since 16 of the 23 orders in the 50 to under 75 kilometres band refer to the metropolis.

Since all the surviving settlement papers, as well as the entries in the parish memorandum book, indicate the marital status of the individuals concerned, and in most of the relevant cases the numbers of children involved, it is possible either to estimate or ascertain exactly, the total number of people moving or being moved by the settlement system. The certificates brought by those arriving in Odiham relate to at least 370 people, but since in the case of 21 married couples the number of children remains unspecified, it is not possible to ascertain the actual total. Of the specified individuals 232

TABLE 15 SETTLEMENTS TO ODIHAM - MARITAL STATUS, FAMILY SIZE AND TOTALS ARRIVING

	Single		Wid.	Married				Adults		Children	Total
	M.	F.	Ma	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6+	M.	F.
1681-1700	2	1	2	1	1			1		6	7
1701-20	4		5	10	1	1	1	1		23	19
1721-40	5		10	12	1	3	1	1		32	27
1741-60	3		6	4	3	1	1		1	19	16
1761-80	1	4	5	5	1	2	2			15	19
1781-1800		5	8	1	1	6	1	1		18	24
1801-20		5									5
1821-40		2									2
Total	15	17	3	35	8	13	6	4	1	113	119
%	11.1	12.6	2.2	25.9	5.9	9.6	4.4	3.0	0.7		

M1 includes 21 families with an unspecified number of children, i.e. 1681-1700 = 1, 1701-20 = 10. 1721-40 = 8. 1761-80 = 1. 1781-1800 = 1.

Ma = Married Couple, M1 = Married Couple plus 1 child, M2 = Married Couple plus 2 children, M3 = Married Couple plus 3 children, etc.

Minor discrepancies between numbers of adults in individual cases and the totals of adults reflect the existence of single parent families.

were adults (113 males and 119 females composed of 35 single individuals, 35 married couples, 62 couples with children and three single parents) and at least 138 were children (Table 15).⁴⁸ Essentially, although the system of issuing certificates appears to continue well into the nineteenth century, to all intents and purposes it terminated in 1792. After that date only nine further certificates were received in Odiham and eight of these concerned single pregnant women. Thus it would appear that, except for special cases, the onset of war with France effectively brought to an end the certificate system, thus reducing the cost of parish poor administration.⁴⁹

From the late seventeenth to the late eighteenth century there appears to be no particular change in the composition of the certificated migrants except in the case of the unmarried. Single men predominate before 1760 and single women afterwards. Perhaps implicit in this change is an indication that restrictions on the single man were disappearing in the late eighteenth century whereas those on single women and married couples were retained for a longer period because of the greater probability of their becoming a burden on poor rates following the pregnancy of wives or spinsters. This, however, is no explanation for the virtual absence of single women before 1760 – a phenomenon repeated in the settlement orders, both of those removed back to, and those ordered out of Odiham. But the orders do not relate to the same proportions of single and married migrants as do the certificates, in which the single and widowed represented just over one quarter of, and married couples with children just under half, the total adults. Analysis of the orders, however, indicates that for both those ordered out of and those ordered back to Odiham, the proportion of single and widowed migrants is higher at a little under one half, and the proportion of married with and without children is correspondingly smaller; those with children comprising 36 per cent of both sets of orders. Thus, although almost three quarters of the certificates carried by those arriving in Odiham were issued to the married, almost half the orders removing migrants from Odiham, and exactly half of those returning them to Odiham, referred to the single, and the majority to single men (Tables 16 and 17). Hence, whilst the married were provided with certificates to move, there appears to have been a greater reluctance to remove them than might be expected in view of the greater burden on poor rates that the presence of families would normally create. On the other hand, this picture may simply demonstrate that the single, and especially single men, simply ignored the settlement system and moved as they wished, only coming into observation when their economic condition brought them to the

TABLE 16 REMOVALS TO ODIHAM - MARITAL STATUS, FAMILY SIZE AND TOTALS REMOVED

	Single		Wid.	Ma	M1	M2	Married			M6+	Adults		Children	Total
	M.	F.					M3	M4	M5		M.	F.		
1661-80	1										1			1
1681-1700	2	1			1						3	2	1	6
1701-20	2	1		2	1						5	4	1	10
1721-40					1						1	1	1	3
1741-60	4	3		2	2	2					5	7	12	24
1761-80	4	5		4	6	2			1		15	18	15	48
1781-1800	5	10	2	9	8	5	2	3			29	38	36	103
1801-20	17	9		4	7	8	3		1	2	41	34	52	127
1821-32	13	12	2	5	2	3	2	3		2	30	29	42	101
Total	48	41	4	26	28	20	7	6	2	4	130	133	160	423
%	25.8	22.0	2.2	14.0	15.1	10.6	3.8	3.2	1.1	2.2				

1741-60 includes 6 orphaned children (4 male: 2 female) on one order } hence total
 1821-32 includes 2 orphaned children (1 male: 1 female) on one order } orders = 186

TABLE 17 REMOVALS FROM ODIHAM - MARITAL STATUS, FAMILY SIZE AND TOTALS REMOVED

	Single		Wid.	Ma	M1	M2	Married			M6+	Adults		Children	Total
	M.	F.					M3	M4	M5		M.	F.		
1611-80		1								1	1	2	6	9
1681-1700	2	1						1			3	2	4	9
1701-20	5			1		1	1				7	3	5	15
1721-40	2			1	2						3	3	2	8
1741-60	1			1	1	1	1	1			6	5	10	21
1761-80	1	3		3	2	1	3				10	12	13	35
1781-1800	5		1	9	5	4	1	1	1	1	27	23	31	81
1801-20	19	15		9	13	2	2			2	44	43	41	128
1821-32	13	11		5	9	3	2				32	29	21	82
Total	48	31	1	29	32	12	10	3	1	4	133	122	133	388
%	28.1	18.1	0.6	17.0	18.7	7.0	5.8	1.8	0.6	2.3				

1801-20 Single women includes one with a child.

notice of local overseers, who took action to remove them before they became a charge on the poor rates, and that the married had gained a settlement.

What is of further interest, however, is the distances those involved with the settlement system had moved. On the whole, it would normally be expected that the unmarried would have possessed a relative freedom to move over longer distances than their married contemporaries. The reality shows the opposite to be the case, since the majority of single people with certificates arrived from under ten kilometres away whereas the majority of the married with certificates came from over ten kilometres (Table 18). The differences, however, are even more striking when examining the removal orders, not so much in the case of the shorter distance migrants, but over the longer distances. For instance, of those removed from Odiham who were unmarried only 14 per cent had to make a journey of 50 kilometres or more whereas almost a quarter of the families with two or more children were returned over the same distance (Tables 19 and 20). It has already been shown that a higher proportion of those returned to Odiham came from more distant regions. Twenty per cent of those who were single had migrated 50 kilometres or more. Even so, almost one third of the families of two or more children had returned over similar distances.

It may well be that these differences are merely a function of age in that those married with children were on average older than those who were single, and having lived more years as migrants had simply, in the process, moved farther from Odiham. It is also possible that those who had children were forced to seek employment and economic survival more urgently, hence their greater distances from home represent more desperate attempts to seek adequate earnings to support a growing family. Since, unlike the depositions in the consistory court, no indication of the number of moves made by migrants appear in the settlement papers it is not possible to ascertain the accuracy of this hypothesis. Nevertheless, the settlement papers do confirm the parish register findings that migrants with large families were not uncommon.

What must be remembered about the sources used in addition to the parish registers is that all of them cover particular sections of the population and as such must be inadequate guides to a deeper understanding of migrants as a whole. This is perhaps most clearly demonstrated in the case of women, since not only the consistory court records but also the apprenticeship indentures and the settlement papers all consistently understate the volume of female migration which the analysis of both the parish registers and the census returns of 1851⁵⁰ clearly demonstrate.

TABLE 19 REMOVALS FROM ODIHAM - DISTANCES BY MARITAL STATUS & FAMILY SIZE

Distances: Kms.	Single		%	Ma	M1	M2	Married				M6+	%	Total	%
	M.	F.					M3	M4	M5					
<10	28	14	53.2	17	16	4	2		1	2		46.2	84	49.4
<20	6	5*	13.9	2	7	4	1					15.4	25	14.7
<30	2	3	6.3	3		1	3	1		1	1	9.9	14	8.2
<40	4	0	5.1	1	3	1	1	1				7.7	11	6.5
<50	3	3**	7.6	3	2							5.5	11	6.5
<75	3	4	8.9	3	2	1	2	1		1		11.0	17	10.0
<100	1	1	2.5										2	1.2
100+	1	1	2.5		2	1	1					4.3	6	3.5
	48	31	100.0	29	32	12	10	3	1	4		100.0	170	100.0

* Includes one single woman with a child.

** Includes one widow.

TABLE 20 REMOVED TO ODIHAM - DISTANCES BY MARITAL STATUS & FAMILY SIZE

Distances: Kms.	Single		Wid.										
	M.	F.		%	Ma	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6+	%	Total
<10	+21	17	1	42.4	10	15	*8	2	2	1	1	41.9	78
<20	8	6	2	17.4	4	1	5		2			12.9	28
<30	3	5		8.7	5	2	2	1				10.8	18
<40	5	2		7.6	4	1		2				7.5	14
<50	1	3		4.3		3	1					4.3	8
<75	+4	5	1	12.0	2	5	*2	1	1	1		14.0	23
<100	2			2.2				1	1			3.2	5
100+	4	3		5.4	1	1	2				1	5.4	12
	48	41	4	100.0	26	28	20	7	6	2	4	100.0	186
													100.0

* Includes 1 single parent family.

+ Includes 6 orphans (4 boys, 2 girls on 1 order < 10 km) and 2 orphans (1 boy & 1 girl on another < 75 km).

For instance, from the latter it is possible to discover the proportion of migrants in the community, the ratio of single as opposed to married migrants, how many husbands or wives were married to in-migrant spouses, and even the number of native born parents who had left the parish only to return later with in-migrant children.

Thus the 1,088 migrants into Odiham in 1851 represented 38.7 per cent of the parish's population of 2,811, a proportion which is very little at variance with the level of in-migration (40.8 per cent) estimated from the burial registers for the nearest 20 year period 1821-40.

Of these 1,088 in-migrants, males accounted for 499, some 35.3 per cent of the parish's male census population of 1,406, and females totalled 589 - 41.6 per cent of the census population of 1,405 women. This numerical predominance of female over male migrants has already been demonstrated (p. 52) and linked clearly to married rather than single women, since it is in the marriageable age groups where the surplus of females occurs.⁵¹ (Table 21) Furthermore, the analysis of migrants by marital status and family size (Table 22) supports this view since of the 289 in-migrants stated to be single no closer division could be possible than 145 males and 144 females; whereas of the married migrants in 210 families the husband was stated to be in-migrant, whilst the number of wives were almost one quarter more at 259. Similarly, the number of in-migrant widows outnumbered in-migrant widowers by 60 to 26.

The occupational structure of in-migrant females also lends support to the premise of marriage centred female migration since almost half women migrants are described as wife only. (Table 23). In fact less than one third of all in-migrant females were stated to have any occupation and of those that had, the majority were in domestic service, only 8.6 per cent being otherwise employed. Thus female migration does not appear to be strongly influenced by the search for employment.

For in-migrant males, however, apart from two unspecified cases, seven stated to be paupers and fourteen independent or property owners, the remainder (94.3 per cent) were gainfully employed⁵² (Table 24). The structure of employment is dominated by labourers, both agricultural and general (37.1 per cent), but by no means so heavily weighted in that direction as the occupational structure of native males, in which over half (55.2 per cent) were designated as labourers (Table 25). It is in fact in the fields of manufacturing, dealing and especially professional occupations that the male migrants were dominant, strengthening the case for betterment rather than subsistence being the motivation behind much of the

TABLE 21 1851 CENSUS IN-MIGRANTS BY AGE AND SEX

<i>Age</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>
0-4	25)	24)
5-9	31) 102	42) 101
10-14	46)	35)
15-19	56	51
20-24	57	66
25-29	34	47
30-34	35	43
35-39	39	54
40-44	39	37
45-49	30	35
50-54	25	38
55-59	27	37
60-64	19	27
65-69	10	20
70-74	17	15
75-79	4	9
80-84	2	7
85 +	3	2
Total	499 (45.9%)	589 (54.1%)

migration. Furthermore, much lower proportions of migrants travelled over short distances in these same three categories (Table 26). Whereas in agriculture, domestic service, transport and general labouring over three quarters of the in-migrants had arrived from under 20 kilometres, in manufacturing just over half and in dealing well under half travelled similar distances. As for those in the public service and professional sector only one migrant came from under 20 kilometres and more than half came from a distance of over 100 kilometres. By contrast the occupational or marital status differences between native born and in-migrant adult females are less obvious (Table 27 & 28), which perhaps is not surprising when the primary cause of female migration appears to have been marriage, and over half the in-migrant females were stated to be wives and widows.

Thus the analysis of these disparate sources does tend to confirm

TABLE 23 1851 CENSUS - OCCUPATIONS OR MARITAL STATUS OF IN-MIGRANT FEMALES BY AGE

Age	Wife	Widow	Single	Servant	Domestic Service House- keeper	Others	Lab'r	Pub. Serv. & Prof'l	Manufac- turing	Dealing	Indepen- dent	Total	Percen- tage
10-14				7					1			8	1.6
15-19			21	27						2		50	10.1
20-24	21		12	19		2	4	3		2		63	12.7
25-29	21		7	11	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	50	10.1
30-34	29	1		2		6	1	2			1	42	8.5
35-39	39			5	1	3	1	2	1			52	10.5
40-44	29	1		1		4	1	1	3			40	8.1
45-49	23	2	1	4			2	1			2	35	7.1
50-54	20	2	2	3		5	3				3	38	7.7
55-59	20	5	1	1	1	4		1	1	1	2	37	7.5
60-64	9	2		1	1	4	2	1			7	27	5.5
65-69	11	3		1		1			1		3	20	4.0
70-74	3	7		1							4	15	3.0
75-79		6			2						1	9	1.5
80-84		1									6	7	1.4
85+		1									1	2	0.4
TOTAL	225	31	44	83	6	31	15	12	10	6	32	495	
Percent	45.4	6.3	8.9	16.8	1.2	6.3	3.0	2.4	2.0	1.2	6.5		100.0

TABLE 24 1851 CENSUS - OCCUPATIONS OF IN-MIGRANT MALES BY AGE

Age	Agriculture:		General	Manufac-	Dealing	Pub.Serv.	Domestic	Building	Transport	Ind't &	Total	%
	Lab'rs	Others	Lab'rs	turing		& Prof'l	Service			Prop'y		
										Own.		
10-14	1		2			1	2		3		9	2.3
15-19	17	6	4	13			6		2		54	13.6
20-24	16	4	5	13	6	4	5	3			56	14.1
25-29	7	1	5	6	3	3		6	1	1	33	8.3
30-34	6	2	5	7	6	4	2	1	1	1	35	8.8
35-39	10	7	6	7	1	3	1	1	2		38	9.6
40-44	5	6	9	5	7	2	1	2		2	39	9.9
45-49	2	3	6	8	5	3	2	1	1		31	7.8
50-54	4	1	5	5	3	1	1	3		2	25	6.3
55-59	3	7	7	1		5	1		1	1	26	6.6
60-64	2	1	4	3	3	2		2		1	18	4.6
65-69	1	1	3			1		1		2	9	2.3
70-74	3	3	7		2				1	1	16	4.0
75-79	1						1	1			3	0.8
80-84			1							1	2	0.5
85-89										2	2	0.5
Total	78	42	69	68	42	29	22	21	11	14	396	
%	19.7	10.6	17.4	17.2	10.6	7.3	5.6	5.3	2.8	3.5		100.0

In addition 7 in-migrant males described as paupers and 2 in-migrant males not specified.

TABLE 25 1851 CENSUS - OCCUPATIONS OF NATIVE MALES BY AGE

Age	Agriculture:		General		Manufacturing		Dealing		Pub. Serv. & Prof'l		Domestic Building Service		Transport Ind't & Prop'y Own		%
	Lab'rs	Others	Lab'rs												
10-14	19	2	8	2	1						2	1	3	38	7.9
15-19	27	6	19	13							7	5	3	83	17.4
20-24	15	5	15	8	5		1				1	2	2	55	11.5
25-29	20	3	20	5	3		1				2	6	2	62	13.0
30-34	14	3	11	6	3						1	4		42	8.8
35-39	10	2	5	9	4		2					3	1	36	7.5
40-44	11	1	7	3	1		2					7		33	6.9
45-49	6	1	6	2	3						4	3	1	26	5.4
50-54	10	4	1	3	4		1				1	2		28	5.9
55-59	10	3	4		2						2	2	1	22	4.6
60-64	2	2	5	4	1						2	1		17	3.5
65-69	4	3	4	3	1							3		18	3.8
70-74	4	2											1	8	1.7
75-79			3	1										6	1.3
80-84	2		2						1			1		4	0.8
Total	154	37	110	59	29		8		20		40		12	478	
Percent	32.2	7.7	23.0	12.3	6.1		1.7		4.2		8.4		2.5	100.0	

In addition 7 paupers and 2 unemployed labourers.

TABLE 26 1851 CENSUS – MIGRANT MALES – DISTANCES BY OCCUPATION

<i>Kms.</i>	<i>Lab'rs</i>	<i>Agriculture: Others</i>	<i>Gen'l Lab'rs</i>	<i>Manufac- turing</i>	<i>Dealing</i>	<i>Pub. Serv. & Profl</i>	<i>Domestic Service</i>	<i>Building</i>	<i>Transport</i>	<i>Ind't</i>
<10	56	20	45	21	9	1	14	8	8	5
<20	12	11	8	14	9	0	3	7	1	1
<30	3	4	4	8	5	4	0	2	1	1
<40	0	2	2	8	5	3	0	1	0	1
<50	3	0	1	5	2	1	1	0	1	1
<75	1	3	6	4	3	4	3	1	0	0
<100	1	1	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0
<200	1	0	0	4	6	3	0	1	0	1
<300	1	1	1	3	1	7	1	1	0	1
300+	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
78		42	69	68	42	29	22	21	11	14

TABLE 27 1851 CENSUS - OCCUPATIONS OR MARITAL STATUS OF NATIVE FEMALES BY AGE

Age	Wife	Widow	Single	Servant	Domestic Service House k'p'r	Others	Lab'r	Pub. Serv. & Prof'l	Manufac- turing	Deal- ing	Indep- endent	Total	%
10-14			2	8			1					11	2.8
15-19			30	21			2	1	3			59	14.8
20-24	2		21	9	3	1	5		7			68	17.1
25-29	22		16	1	1	2	2		5			45	11.3
30-34	17	1	2	3	4		3		3			40	10.0
35-39	24	1	2	1	5		2		2			33	8.3
40-44	20	1	1		3	1		2	6			25	6.3
45-49	12		1	1	3	2	2				1	23	5.8
50-54	13	1		1	3	3	1		1		2	26	6.5
55-59	14		1		1	3	2	1		1	4	23	5.8
60-64	10	1		2		3					1	17	4.3
65-69	10	1		2	1	1	1				5	17	4.3
70-74	6	1		2	1							6	1.5
75-79	2	2		1	1						2	3	0.7
80-84		1									1	2	0.5
Total	152	11	75	50	25	16	21	4	27	1	16	398	
%	38.2	2.8	18.8	12.6	6.3	4.0	5.3	1.0	6.8	0.2	4.0		100.0

TABLE 28 1851 CENSUS - MIGRANT FEMALES - DISTANCES BY OCCUPATION & MARITAL STATUS

Kms.	Wife	Widow	Single	Domestic Servants	Service Other	Lab'r	Pub. Serv. & Prof'l	Manufac-turing	Dealing	Independent
<10	91	19	24	49	16	12	2	4	1	8
<20	55	2	11	13	8	2	0	1	2	7
<30	19	4	5	4	2	1	1	2	2	3
<40	10	3	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	0
<50	6	1	1	0	3	0	1	1	1	3
<75	21	2	3	8	3	0	3	2	0	2
<100	2	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	2
<200	10	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
<300	8	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1
300+	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3
	225	31	44	83	37	15	12	10	6	32

that most migration was short distance and that the young did form a substantial proportion of those moving. Yet some important qualifications emerge. Not only do women form the majority of migrants but their mobility appears less connected to employment in domestic service than to marriage. However, although the young predominated among the migrants they were not necessarily the ones who moved farthest, since married couples with families can be seen to be moving greater distances than their single counterparts. Furthermore, the distance migrants moved can be shown to have a relationship with wealth or status since those in professional positions tended to move much greater distances than the poorer members of society as both the census returns and the settlement papers indicate. Finally, a somewhat modified model for smaller towns emerges, that of a population centre which attracts migrants from a smaller area than that over which its own inhabitants become dispersed.

The wisdom of measuring variations in distances travelled by migrants over time from sources which not only do not refer to the same sections of the population but also do not always cover the same period of time is, however, debatable. Even so, perusal of the records indicates that in the sixteenth century (using the Consistory Court Books) the proportion of migrants moving over short distances (under 10 kms. [37.7%] and under 20 kms. [17.5%]) was substantially lower than is demonstrated by the parish register marriages, the settlement papers or the census returns in later centuries. Conversely, the longer distance migrant (50 kms. or more) formed a higher proportion of the total (26.9%) in the sixteenth century than is the case from the seventeenth century to the mid-nineteenth century. The general pattern which emerges is one of the proportion of short distance migrants (under 20 kms) showing a continued increase throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, although the longer distance migrants demonstrate a more general spread and are dispersed over greater distances. Only in the nineteenth century is there some indication of a reversal of this trend towards short distance migration. The 1851 census figures indicate smaller proportions had moved under 10 kilometres. Nevertheless, just over half (51.3%) of the migrants had still moved only that distance and 7 out of every 10 (69.4%) migrants would seem to have moved less than 20 kilometres.

In view of the nature of the sources, however, such considerations must remain tentative, and particularly so since apart from the use of the consistory court records, the sources used all reflect the parish as an administrative or registration unit. Thus the mobile society revealed is not a product of the parish as a unit of settlement. Under such circumstances the spatial area of the parish will inevitably

influence the resulting statistics and therefore, the very large parishes which are more common in the north of England would be expected clearly to provide lower levels of gross migration than the generally smaller ones of southern England particularly when, as the above discussion demonstrates, the majority of those who were mobile remained within reasonable walking distance of their place of birth.⁵³

Notes

¹ M.W. Beresford, *The Lost Villages of England* (1954) and *New Towns of the Middle Ages* (1967).

² E.A. Wrigley, 'A Simple Model of London's Importance in Changing English Society and Economy' 1650-1750, *Past and Present*, 37 (1967), pp. 44-70.

³ R.A. McKinley, *Norfolk Surnames in the Sixteenth Century*, Department of English Local History, Occasional Papers, 2nd Series, 2 (Leicester 1969).

⁴ P. Clark, 'The Migrant in Kentish Towns 1580-1640', in *Crisis and Order in English Towns 1500-1700*, ed. P. Clark and P. Slack, (1972), pp. 117-63.

⁵ S.A. Peyton, 'The Village Population in the Tudor Lay Subsidy Rolls', *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Vol. XXX (1915), pp. 234-50; J.D. Chambers, 'The Vale of Trent 1670-1800', *Econ. Hist. Rev. Supplement*, 3 (1957); E.J. Buckatzsch, 'The Constancy of Local Populations and Migration in England before 1800', *Popul. Stud.* Vol. V (1951), pp. 62-69.

⁶ See for example: P. Laslett, *Family Life and Illicit Love in Earlier Generations* (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 50-101; E.J. Buckatzsch, 'Places of Origin of a Group of Immigrants into Sheffield, 1624-1799', *Econ. Hist. Rev.* 2nd Ser. II (1949-50), pp. 303-6; D.G. Hey, 'An English Rural Community: Myddle under the Tudors and Stuarts' (Leicester, 1974), pp. 200-4; M. Spufford, *Contrasting Communities: English Villagers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 21-2; J.M. Martin, 'The Rich, the Poor and the Migrant in Eighteenth Century Stratford-on-Avon', *Local Pop. Stud.* 20 (1978) pp. 38-48; D. Levine, 'Family Formation in an Age of Nascent Capitalism' (New York and London, 1977), pp. 35-44.

⁷ The population figure for the late seventeenth century is estimated from the Compton Census of 1676, William Salt Library, Stafford, M.S. Salt 33, and also the Hearth Tax of 1665, PRO Exchequer K.R. Lay Subsidy Rolls, E179/176/565; for 1811 PRO C2/49 and 1841, PRO HO/107/395.

⁸ For the technique of family reconstitution see M. Fleury and L. Henry, *Nouveau Manuel de Dépouillement et d'Exploitation de l'Etat Civil Ancien* (Paris, 1965), E.A. Wrigley, 'Family Reconstitution', in E.A. Wrigley (ed.), *An Introduction to English Historical Demography* (1966), pp. 96-159, and as applied in a study of migration David Souden 'Movers and Stayers in Family Reconstitution Populations', *Local Population Studies*, No. 33, (1984), pp. 11-28.

⁹ E.A. Wrigley, 'Family Limitation in Pre-Industrial England', *Econ. Hist. Rev.* 2nd ser., XIX (1966), pp. 82-109 and 'Mortality in Pre-Industrial England: The Example of Colyton, Devon, Over Three Centuries' *Daedalus*, 97 (1968), pp. 546-80, reprinted in D.V. Glass and R. Revell (eds.), *Population and Social Change* (1972) pp. 243-73.

¹⁰ See for example, Levine, *Family Formation*.

¹¹ 15 Vols. in Odiham Parish Chest, Vol. 1, Marriages, Baptisms and Burials,

1538-1740; Vol. 2, Mar. Bap & Bur. 1653-59; Vol. 3, Mar. 1740-54, Bap. & Bur. 1740-83; Vol. 4, Mar. 1754-71; Vol. 5, Mar. 1771-83; Vol. 6, Mar 1783-1812; Vol. 7, Mar. 1813-37; Vol. 8, Mar. 1837-51; Vol. 9, Bap. 1783-93; Vol. 10, Bap. 1793-1812; Vol. 11, Bap. 1813-38; Vol. 12, Bap. 1838-51; Vol. 13, Bur. 1783-1812; Vol. 14, Bur. 1813-37; Vol. 15, Bur. 1837-51.

¹² P.R.O. RG 4/723.

¹³ See for example, R.E. Jones, 'Parish Registers and Population History; North Shropshire 1538-1837' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, London Univ. 1973), Christopher Hill, 'Sex, Marriage and the Family in England', *Econ. Hist. Rev.*, 2nd Ser. Vol. XXXI (1978), pp. 451-5, and the debate between David Souden and Keith Snell in *Local Population Studies*, No. 33 (1984), pp. 11-42.

¹⁴ I am grateful to the Registrar General for granting access to, and the Superintendent Registrar at Aldershot for providing facilities for, the use of the civil registers in question.

¹⁵ T.H. Hollingsworth, 'Historical Studies of Migration', *Annales de Demographie Historique*, (1970), pp. 92-3.

¹⁶ Chambers, *Vale of Trent*, p. 22.

¹⁷ Greater London Record Office, Foundling Hospital Books of Inspections Vols. 1 and 2 and Nursery Book Vol. 4.

¹⁸ See for example, J. Patten, *Rural-Urban Migration in Pre-Industrial England*, Research Papers No. 6., School of Geography, Oxford University 1973 and Clark, *Crisis and Order*, pp. 117-63.

¹⁹ E.C. Ravenstein, 'The Laws of Migration', *Journal of the Statistical Society*, Vol. 48 (1885), pp. 162-235.

²⁰ Keith Snell argues that in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century many elderly people were moved from place of residence to place of settlement (baptism) for burial to allow the parish of residence to avoid payment of the funeral costs should the person die in poverty. Hence, he suggests that parish registers are an inadequate measure of migration since frequently it would seem that a person so buried in the parish of baptism had not been a migrant, thus causing a seeming decline in migration which does not reflect the reality. Snell's view is essentially impressionistic since he gives no supporting quantitative evidence, and certainly in Odiham the operation of the Acts of Settlement does not seem to support his view since few people were either ordered out of Odiham or back to the town in the period 1661-1740 (see tables 13 and 14). Similarly, no real evidence of the movement of aged or corpses has been uncovered. In the only period when it is possible to measure 'in migrants' at burial in the parish registers from 1800 to 1838 less than 5 per cent of those buried were from outside the parish. Snell, L.P.S. 33, pp. 11-42.

²¹ For example, evidence of growing poverty in early seventeenth century Odiham is provided from the establishment of a number of charities and also S.P. Dom. Charles I Jan. 1627.

²² P.R.O. H.O. 107/1680/391.

²³ R.S. Schofield, 'Age - Specific Mobility in an Eighteenth Century English Parish', *Annales de Demographie Historique* 1970 (Paris, 1971), pp. 261-274 and Clark, *Crisis and Order*, p. 124.

²⁴ 26 Geo II, c 33 (1753).

²⁵ Laslett, 'Clayworth & Cogenhoe', and Ann Kussmaul, *Servants in Husbandry in Early Modern England*, (1981), pp. 46-69.

²⁶ Wrigley, 'London's Importance'.

²⁷ 10 Geo II c 12 (1737); 31 Geo II c 74 (1758) and 33 Geo III c 182 (1793).

²⁸ 33 Geo III c 16 (1793).

²⁹ D.E.C. Eversley, 'Population History & Local History' in E.A. Wrigley (ed) *An Introduction to English Historical Demography* (1966), pp 21–22, B. Maltby, 'Easingwold Marriage Horizons', *Local Population Studies* 2, (1969), pp. 36–39, and 'Parish Registers and the Problem of Mobility', *Local Population Studies* 6, (1971), pp. 32–42.

³⁰ J. Cornwall, Evidence of Population Mobility in the Seventeenth Century, *Bull. Inst. Hist. Res.* XL (1967), pp. 143–52, P. Clark, 'The Migrant in Kentish Towns 1580–1640' in P. Clark and P. Slack eds. *Crisis and Order in English Towns 1500–1700* (1972), pp. 117–63 for use of Archdeaconry Court depositions in the study of migration.

³¹ See A. Macfarlane, *Reconstructing Historical Communities* (Cambridge, 1977), pp. 57–60, for frequency of cases in Archdeacon's Court concerning an individual parish.

³² I am greatly indebted to the late Professor F.J. Fisher for allowing me access to his collected information about deponents in the Winchester Consistory Court during the sixteenth century. The Hampshire County Record Office hold the original books and the ones utilised are Consistory Court Book Number 6 (March 1532 – July 1547); Number 13 (July 1561 – July 1562); Number 19 (November 1563 – October 1566); Number 24 (October 1566 – December 1571); Number 37 (December 1571 – March 1574); Number 42 (May 1574 – February 1575) and Number 44 (October 1575 – May 1576).

³³ Cornwall, 'Population Mobility', p. 144; Clark, 'Kentish Towns', pp. 120–121. The latter however, is concerned with urban migration and this selectivity may be a partial explanation of the difference. Clark's later work 'Migration in England During the Late Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries', *Past and Present*, No. 83, (1979), pp. 51–90, dealt with the period 1660–1730 and is not directly comparable.

³⁴ Not all husbandmen were necessarily landholders although the majority were in Odiham.

³⁵ Clark, Kentish Towns, pp. 129–131.

³⁶ Cornwall, 'Population Mobility', p. 150.

³⁷ Eighteen of the sample of 382 provided no indication of age.

³⁸ Cornwall, 'Population Mobility', p. 147.

³⁹ Except two members of the clergy who indicated residence in five parishes.

⁴⁰ Cornwall, 'Population Mobility', pp. 146–48; Clark, Kentish Towns, pp. 123–24.

⁴¹ Odiham Parish Chest, Memorandum Book and indentures.

⁴² Wrigley, 'London's Importance'.

⁴³ 14. Car. II. c 12 (1662).

⁴⁴ 8 & 9 W. & M. c 30 (1696–7).

⁴⁵ Odiham Parish Chest Memorandum Book and settlement certificates – 141 cases (6 of which relate to in-migrants). Memorandum Book and removal orders – 325 cases (167 of which relate to Odiham natives being returned and 158 to removals from Odiham).

H.R.O. Quarter Sessions Order Books QO 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33. (21 cases – 9 returned and 12 removed).

SOM 63 Box 5 Odiham Petty Sessions Book (5 cases – 4 returned and 1 removed).

For the Law of Settlement see P. Styles 'The Evolution of the Law of Settlement', *University of Birmingham, Historical Journal*, IX (1963–4), pp. 33–63.

⁴⁶ It could be argued that if those ordered out of a parish had any settlement certificate which they had brought with them returned on departure, then the emergent pattern simply reflects an administrative procedure. There is, however, only meagre evidence of individuals arriving with certificates who were later removed from Odiham. There are two occasions in which both the original settlement certificate and

the removal order survive (though one was subsequently not removed), and it is noticeable that of all those ordered back to Odiham only one, in 1792, returned to deposit a settlement certificate originally issued by the Odiham overseers along with the removal order. It should be noted that it has recently been argued that the settlement laws remained fully in operation until the late nineteenth century. See K.D.M. Snell, *Annals of the Labouring Poor, Social Change and Agrarian England 1600-1900* (1985), pp. 78-80.

⁴⁷ E.A. Wrigley & R.S. Schofield, *The Population History of England 1541-1871, A Reconstruction* (1981), pp. 207-15.

⁴⁸ Assuming 1 child for each of those families in which the number of children is not stated.

⁴⁹ In Appendix B to the First Report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws the Odiham Overseer, Isaac Coleman, refers to the Settlement Laws as an 'expensive system'. B.P.P. *Poor Laws* 8 (1834) p. 426c. By then the sources suggest he could only have been referring to removal orders.

⁵⁰ P.R.O. HO 107 1680.

⁵¹ A. Armstrong, *Stability & Change in an English County Town* (1974), pp. 87-88, shows higher percentages of immigrant wives in all age groups over 25.

⁵² The occupational tables are based on the allocations into groups given in W.A. Armstrong, 'The Use of Information about Occupation', in E.A. Wrigley (ed). *Nineteenth Century Society: Essays in the use of quantitative methods for the study of social data* (1972), pp. 284-310.

⁵³ This chapter represents part of a research project on Odiham for which the author gratefully acknowledges the support of the Social Science Research Council. (Now E.S.R.C.)