



Durham E-Theses

The marital mobility of the spouses in thirteen parishes of county Durham established by the marriage registers up to 1812 and by the baptismal registers of 1798-1812: marital mobility in thirteen parishes of county Durham

Pain, Andrew John

How to cite:

Pain, Andrew John (1984) *The marital mobility of the spouses in thirteen parishes of county Durham established by the marriage registers up to 1812 and by the baptismal registers of 1798-1812: marital mobility in thirteen parishes of county Durham*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/7130/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>

A B S T R A C T

Andrew John Pain : The marital mobility of the spouses in thirteen parishes of County Durham established by the marriage registers up to 1812 and by the baptismal registers of 1798-1812.

The marriage registers of 13 parishes in County Durham are considered in an attempt to establish rates of endogamy, exogamy and a spatial context of mobility. The 13 parishes fall into three broad geographic areas: four parishes are situated in the Pennine uplands, five lie in the centre of the county and four abutt the coast.

The study commences with the earliest suitable marriage register available for each parish and concludes at the end of 1812. In addition in 11 of the parishes the marriage registers of 1795-1812 is annotated with the parish of nativity disclosed in the subsequent baptismal registers of 1798-1812 to enable comparisons to be drawn (in respect of endogamy, exogamy and mobility patterns) with the results obtained in the study from the marriage registers generally and specifically with the marriage register of 1795-1812. Similar comparisons are also made between the three groups of parishes.

The marital mobility of the spouses in thirteen parishes of
County Durham established by the marriage registers up to 1812
and by the baptismal registers of 1798-1812

Marital mobility in thirteen parishes of County Durham

by

Andrew John Pain

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

M.A. thesis submitted to the University of Durham

Department of Anthropology

1984



11. FEB. 1985

Thesis
1984 | PA1

Table of Contents

	Page
1. Introduction	1
(a) The context of the present study	1
(b) Parish registers : generally	3
2. The Upland Parishes : a brief introduction	13
3. Stanhope	14
(a) The state of the registers	14
(b) 1662-1685	14
(c) 1754-1812	19
(d) 1795-1812	24
4. Muggleswick	29
(a) The state of the registers	29
(b) 1785-1812	29
(c) 1795-1812	30
5. Hunstonworth	32
(a) The state of the registers	32
(b) 1785-1812	32
(c) 1795-1812	33
6. Middleton in Teesdale	35
(a) The state of the registers	35
(b) 1754-1812	35
(c) 1795-1812	37
(d) Conception before marriage	40
7. The Central Parishes : a brief introduction	43
8. Kelloe	44
(a) The state of the registers	44
(b) 1693-1705	44
(c) 1734-1812	45
(d) Migrant marriages	47
(e) 1795-1812	48
9. Bishop Middleham	51
(a) The state of the registers	51
(b) 1674-1812	51

	Page
10. Castle Eden	55
(a) The state of the registers	55
(b) 1754-1793	55
11. Trimdon	57
(a) The state of the registers	57
(b) 1754-1812	57
(c) 1795-1812	58
12. Merrington	61
(a) The state of the registers	61
(b) 1795-1812	61
(c) Occupation at time of marriage	63
13. The Coastal Parishes : a brief introduction	66
14. Easington	67
(a) The state of the registers	67
(b) 1694-1812	67
(c) 1795-1812	71
(d) Occupation at time of marriage	74
15. Hart	76
(a) The state of the registers	76
(b) 1694-1812	76
(c) 1795-1812	79
(d) Occupation at time of marriage	82
16. Dalton le Dale	85
(a) The state of the registers	85
(b) 1674-1812	85
(c) 1795-1812	89
17. Seaham	91
(a) The state of the registers	91
(b) 1654-1812	91
(c) 1795-1812	96
18. Post Nuptial Mobility at Seaham and Dalton before 1812	97
19. Conclusion	103
(a) Introduction	103
(b) The degree of mobility	104
(c) A spatial context of mobility	110
(d) The four assumptions	117
(e) Conclusion	120

List of Illustrations

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
Copy extract of the Kelloe marriage register 1734-1739	11

None of the material contained in this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree in the University of Durham or in any other University and is not based upon joint research.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

In preparing for and in writing this thesis I would like to acknowledge the following:

the generous encouragement of my tutor Dr Malcolm Smith,
the unfailing courtesy and assistance of the Durham
County Archivist, David Butler, and his staff,
and the sceptical forbearance of my wife Ruth.

1. Introduction

(a) The context of the present study

The use of Anglican parish registers to investigate the mobility immediately prior to their marriage of the respective partners in the marriage registers is a study that has attracted the attention of both geographers and historians for some time.¹ Little study of the parishes of County Durham has been undertaken however and the reason for this is not altogether clear for there is a considerable amount of material available and a richness of information for the period 1798-1812 (for reasons that will be explained later) that makes the paucity of research into mobility immediately prior to marriage (comprised in the term marriage horizons) of partners marrying in County Durham in this period all the more surprising.²

This present study concentrates upon three groups of parishes within County Durham in an attempt to illuminate and compare the patterns of mobility of the three groups so identified. In general terms the three groups fall within the three broad geographical regions of the County - the Pennine moorlands, the central undulating plain and the coastal margins. A parish such as Easington which abutts the North Sea yet stretches into the parishes that cluster around the City of Durham points to the inherent dangers of classifying parishes merely by reference to one convenient characteristic. Nevertheless when this study began it was anticipated that geography would determine certain trends in mobility. These expectations were:-

(a) that the moorland parishes would tend to be highly endogamous and that exogamy (when it occurred) would be directed broadly along the Pennines rather than westwards into central Durham.



(b) that the central parishes, being small agricultural parishes, would have high rates of exogamy directed along a north-south axis (thus following the line of the Great North Road, the main highway through the County).

(c) that the coastal parishes would be influenced predominantly by the centres of considerable population that lie to their north (Bishopwearmouth and Sunderland) and south (Hartlepool).

(d) that the marriage horizons of spouses in the coastal parishes would but rarely comprise parishes inland.

There is little that is new in these four points: they reflect what might be thought of as a conventional picture of mobility within the County. This study demonstrates however that in reality mobility was far more complex and wide ranging than these four assumptions might on their own suggest.

Geography has influenced this study in another and more subtle way: the parishes selected all fall outside those northern parts of the County (and in the main along the lower reaches of the Wear) studied by Hodgson.³

In these northern areas the parishes were, Hodgson demonstrates, involved in an early industrial revolution the dynamics of which resulted in increased mobility (at local and regional levels) for their populations. The earlier patterns of mobility therefore will have been obliterated. It was anticipated that the southern and western parishes (with the possible exception of Stanhope) would not be significantly affected by the vigour of this early coal based revolution and thus it was thought that the earlier patterns of mobility would be accessible and also seen to be subject to a more gradual variation.

If one studies their demography into the middle of the nineteenth century then the majority of the parishes studied were by then sucked into

a coal based industrial revolution and thus a cut off date has to be established. In this study it is 1812 and here the reasons influencing this decision are not geographic but have to do with the registers themselves and it is to these that consideration must now be given.

(b) Parish registers: generally

Parochial registration was established in 1538 under an order of Thomas Cromwell.⁴ No form was then prescribed and indeed no form was actually prescribed until 1754. Thus until that year the marriage registers (as with burial and baptismal registers which continued without a nationally prescribed format until 1813) were devised by the individual parish clergy. The recorded detail is hence idiosyncratic and not infrequently a sketchy compilation. A further difficulty is that where the name of a parish follows a spouse's name it is almost invariably a matter of conjecture (at least from the marriage register alone) quite what is established thereby. By way of illustration:

"AB of the parish of Seaham."

Is Seaham the parish of AB's nativity, of his baptism, of his residence at the time of marriage or is it the parish wherein he is employed? Most likely here it is the parish in which he resides at the time of his marriage. If that is the case we do not know what residence qualifications would have been imposed by the clergyman and thus AB might have been resident in Seaham for a matter of days rather than months or years.

Another problem arises where no parish name follows a spouse's name. Previous research⁵ has assumed that this indicated that the omitted parish name is the same as that wherein the marriage ceremony is performed. Generally speaking that appears to be a pragmatic and robust approach and it was adopted in this study except where the internal evidence of the register

under scrutiny suggested that the omissions clearly arose from clerical haste or disinterest. In such cases the entries were discounted from the study. Nevertheless even where an entry can be amplified in this robust way the problem still remains: is the parish one of nativity, of baptism, or of residence and if of residence what is the period of residence prior to the marriage?

In 1753 Lord Hardwicke's Marriage Act was passed. It was an Act, as its long title suggests "for the better Preventing of Clandestine marriages." It came into force on 24 March 1754 and provided a much more effective system of registration. The clergy were compelled to enter the details of each marriage in books specially printed for the purpose and in common form. The format of each entry is as follows:

AB of the parish of X and CD of this Parish were
married in this church by Banns this 20th Day of
August 1754 by me EF Curate.

This marriage was solemnized between us.

AB (signature or mark)

CD (signature or mark)

In the presence of

GH (signature or mark)

JK (signature or mark)

Henceforth the omission of a parish name following the name of each spouse is rare (but not unknown). There remains still the difficulty in establishing the precise significance of the word "of" both in the minds of the clergy and indeed in the minds of the parties to the marriage. Evidence suggests however that to be "of" a parish required very little from the claimant.

In the registers of Bishop Middleham⁶ there is a manuscript note headed

The following items may be useful to some of the clergy who are not versed in Acts of Parliament Towards Understanding ye Meaning and Conforming themselves to ye Directions given in Certain Clauses of ye Marriage Act which is to take place Lady Day 1754.

It is a lengthy and complex advice but one point in particular is important for the purposes of this study. The advice emphasises that the period of residence is not specified in the Act and then goes on "...probably a few nights lodging in ye parish before ye notice is given will be deemed sufficient." It is unlikely that these instructions would have been preserved in this manner had they not accorded with the general tradition within the diocese as these registers were inspected on the Bishop's visitation.

At first glance this advice suggests that Durham parishes were conniving at the avoidance of the settlement laws to which are frequently attributed the pages of entries "of this parish."⁷ However Oxley⁸ in reviewing these laws has this to say:

The only major amendment to this structure before 1834 was in 1795 (35 Geo III c101) when parliament generalised two practices which were already normal in some areas. The first gave everyone the status of certification by decreeing that nobody might be removed until actually chargeable; the second prevented the forcible removal of those unfit to travel....

Hence it may be that the advice in the Bishop Middleham registers merely reflects liberalising practices that had grown up not only in that parish but also for the reason above, arguably elsewhere in the County.

The registers maintain the format prescribed under the 1753 Act until 1813 when an Act entitled "An Act for the better regulating and preserving Parish and other registers of Births Marriages and Burials in England" (which was published on 28 July 1812) came into force on 1 January 1813. Henceforth the marriages were to be recorded in "books to be provided by the Kings printer at the expense of the parish" in the following form:

AB of Parish
and CD of Parish
were married in this church/chapel by banns/licence with
the consent of parents/guardians
this Day of in the year

By me EF

This marriage was solemnized between us: AB (signature or mark)

CD (signature or mark)

in the presence of GH (signature or mark)

JK (signature or mark)

The Act of 1812 altered not only the format of the marriage registers but it also prescribed forms of entry for the recording of deaths and births and it is the latter that now must be considered.

Until 1813 there was no nationally prescribed form for the recording of baptisms but as early as 1715⁹ Ralph Thoresby advocated an improved system of registration with the intention of assisting the antiquaries and genealogists of the time (as one register puts it "to afford much clearer intelligence to the researches of posterity").¹⁰ By the mid to late eighteenth century a number of clergy, anxious to preserve sufficient details of parentage and pedigree, were themselves advocating the imposition (by their respective Bishops) upon their colleagues within the diocese of a more detailed and systematic record keeping with regard to baptisms. Much work has been done on the Yorkshire registers that followed Bishop Markham's directive in 1777 and it is important for this study that the difference between these registers and those compiled from 1798 in the diocese of Durham is quite clear. Holderness¹¹ provides an example of what he styles the best of the Yorkshire registers:

Rebecca, 1st dau. of Robert Westwood of Saxton, Taylor, son of Thomas Westwood of Kelfield husbandman, by Rebecca his wife, dau. of John Pallister of Stillingfleet, farmer (and) Frances dau. of Isaac Cawthorne of Micklefield, lab^r by Elizabeth his wife daughter of Samuel Goodall of Milford, collier (born) May 30; (bapt.) June 5 1791.

Clearly, as Holderness recognises, entries in this form provide a rewarding glimpse of late-eighteenth-century short-step mobility. The problem remains that the residence qualifications to establish "of Kelfield" or wherever appears to depend upon the individual parish priest.

Bishop Barrington was translated to Durham in 1791. From his first appointment (as Bishop of Llandaff in 1769) he had interested himself in the improvement of baptismal registers.¹² On the 30 September 1797 he issued the following letter from Auckland Castle.¹³

Reverend Sir,

Having explained to my clergy at the late Visitation, the Motives which influenced me to recommend an improved Form of Parochial Register nothing further is requisite on my part but supplying the forms. They accompany this letter. I wish them to be inserted in your present register books unless nearly filled; in which case new Register Books should be procured; and the Use of the new forms to commence on January 1st 1798.

To preserve the forms and to transmit them to your successors as well as to ascertain the Mode of introducing them into the Register Books, it may be advisable to paste the forms themselves, together with this letter either in the beginning or the end of the Register Books.

To give authenticity to Registers it is necessary that the Bottom of each page be signed by the officiating Minister and the Church Wardens.

I am, Reverend Sir, with much regard
your sincere friend and Brother
S. Dunelm.

There then follows a schedule of completed baptismal registers by way of example. These, together with the notes that go with them provide practical expression of Barrington's intentions and the first three of the eight examples may be usefully set out verbatim.

Mode of Registering Baptisms

Name	Birth	Baptism	Child	Names of Parents
William Jones	28 June	30 June	1st son	William Jones, Esquire* Native** of this Parish by his wife Ann Stephens Native of this Parish.
Thomas James	10 June	2 July	3rd son	Robert James, Surgeon* Native of Bishop Auckland by his wife Mary Evans Native of Yarm, Yorks.
Margaret Davis	15 June	12 July	2nd dau.	David Davis Native of this Parish by his wife Jane Powell dau. of #Joseph Powell Native of Penrith in Cumberland relict of George Green of this Parish.

* The Father's Rank, profession, Trade, etc. is very material.

** Mentioning the Places of Nativity of the Parents, though attended with some little Trouble, may at a future Time be attended with beneficial Effect. Without such information many are the instances where the Descent of Families cannot be Traced.

It is very proper in registers of this kind to name the parents of the Father and Mother of the infant when they can be readily had.

Barrington's directions though onerous in comparison with what had gone before appear to have been complied with by the majority of his clergy. Out of the thirteen parishes studied all save two recorded the baptisms in this new form until 1813.

Immediately following the last entry in the baptismal register of Hart for 1812 there appears:

The new form of register commanded by Act of Parl^t
to commence 1 Jan 1813

Edward Moises Vicar

Geo Metcalf Curate

Whilst one detects tones of smug relief in this entry, nevertheless one's reaction must be to echo the words of Falla:

Thus the printed parish registers introduced in 1813 which for other countries were a great improvement were for the North East a disaster, as they greatly reduced the amount of information which had been recorded for the previous fifteen years.¹⁴

Despite the Act's preamble,¹⁵

....the manner and form of keeping and preserving Registers of Baptisms Marriages and Burials of his Majesties subjects in the several parishes and places in England will greatly facilitate the Proof of Pedigrees of Persons claiming to be entitled to Real or Personal Estate and be otherwise of great public benefit...

the form of entry for baptisms is a poor substitute for the certain detail of Barrington's form:

When bapt.	Childs Name	Parents Name	Abode	Quality Trade or Profession
1813 1 Feb.	X son of	AA BA	Lambeth	

It is these registers therefore which provide the cut off date (i.e. 30 December 1812) for this study. The importance of the baptismal registers from 1798 to 1812 for this study is that by cross referencing the marriages that appear in the subsequent baptismal registers of the parish it is possible to establish the true (or at least a truer) rate for mobility prior to marriage for both sexes. In addition cross referencing will assist in determining the reliability of the relevant marriage register.

It may be thought that the mobility indicated revolves round two fixed points in time - that of nativity and that of marriage - and that the study can say nothing about the mobility between those two events. Nevertheless towards the end of this study it became apparent that the baptismal registers might well repay further study in this region and a brief note of this aspect will be found elsewhere.¹⁶

There is always a danger that the results of demographic study neatly tabulated and expressed in percentages or as subtle mathematical relationships will obscure the fact that the research itself is grounded in frail and fallible sources. Time and again it is evident that the attainments and calibre of the parish clergy were by no means uniform or high within the

County. There are examples to the contrary such as the careful records of Stanhope for 1662-1685 and those of Seaham pre 1754 but the copy of the extract from the marriage register of Kelloe indicates the standard that can be encountered. Historically perhaps this is not surprising. Reid, examining the church establishment after the imposition of the Elizabeth church settlement observes that

....otherwise the prebendaries were incomers to the region and their background together with such distinction as they might possess was academic. In the circumstances of the time they were of necessity pluralists and incumbents of important parishes to which as a rule they could devote but minimal attention leaving the pastoral care of their flocks largely to curates whose qualifications were invariably by no means adequate.¹⁷

By contrast Houston concludes in his recent study of illiteracy within the county that

....we can say that in the late seventeenth century Northumberland and Durham were on a par with the allegedly more advanced areas of Oxfordshire and Gloucestershire and by the mid eighteenth century had forged far ahead at all social levels.¹⁸

Whether such a population would oversee however an adequate record keeping by their own parish clergy is a question outside the scope of this study.

Over and above the lack lustre calibre of the clergy the registers of parishes within the county also suffer from the other well known problems which beset work on parish registers. Broadly, such problems can be said to revolve round "under registration." Eversley however examining this aspect in detail particularly with regard to non-conformist and Methodist marriages concludes that the evidence argues

...convincingly for the idea that down to 1800 at any rate the official church statistics must have comprised all but a very small fraction of the population.¹⁹

Indeed by 1850, according to the figures of the then Register General 86%

1734. Marriages

May 28. Stephen Bulman & Mary Bulman of this parish
 May 2. Robt Wilson of Pot. Houghton Spring & Eliz Smyth of this
 June 11. John Lumsdell & Eliz Shastor
 July 14. Rachel Wanless & Margarett Bellass.
 Oct 6. Joh. Appleby & Mary Carter of a parish of Strarton
 21. Robt Giddon of Gresham & Jane Foster

1735.

Sept. 11. Thomas Giles & Mary Hall of a Parish of Hart.
 23. Anthony Armstrong & Sus. Col. Wood.
 Nov. 18. John White of Lanchester & Anne, Peakey
 Dec. 26. John Ridley & Jane Smyth both of this Parish.
 Jan 19. Andrew Cook & Anne Fox both of this Parish

1736

Feb 24. William Mitchinson & Anne Armstrong both of this Parish

1737.

Robt Hudson and Mary Linton both in this Parish Jan^r 29
 Abuel Shewits and Jane Howden both in this Parish March 5

1738

Joh. Macky and Margarett Hill both in this Parish Nov^r 13
 Anthony Pearson and Mabel Liddel both in this Parish Nov^r 18

1739

Copy extract of the marriage register of Kelloe, by kind permission of the Durham County Archivist

of all marriages were still being solemnized in an Anglican church.²⁰ Nevertheless the question of "under registration" particularly as a result of Methodist marriages is one that deserves consideration here: Methodism was to become a major influence within the county, and speaking of Stanhope one writer observed: "Wesleyanism might fairly be denominated at one time the established religion of the Dale."²¹ This observation was however made in 1855 and the evidence suggests that while there was a Methodist centre at Newcastle by the 1780s Wesley "confined himself to the coal mining area of Newcastle and the industrial region of the North"²² but left "unvisited the greater part of the agricultural population."²³ Such early establishment of Methodism as there was in the Durham Pennines fell away quickly and it was not until the 1820s and 1830s that it achieved a position whereby it could be thought of as the "established religion."

In any event, even if some marriages were celebrated other than in the parish church it can not have been before the 1790s when the breach with the Church of England appears to have come to a theological fore. Such numbers are therefore likely to be slight and it seems unreasonable to suppose that those Methodists who married elsewhere than in a parish church in some way reacted differently than is evidenced by their contemporaries' marriage horizons. In the circumstances therefore it was considered that this study would not be prejudiced by the exclusive concentration upon the parish registers.

2. The upland parishes: a brief introduction

Four upland parishes were studied: Stanhope, Hunstonworth, Muggleswick and Middleton in Teesdale. All these parishes have those "peaty soils" remarked upon by Bailey¹ "generally accompanied with substrata of yellow-orchery clay or white sand: both of them certain indications of unproductiveness." All four however were exploited for their mineral wealth. Bailey for example identified 35 lead mines in Weardale (24 of which being owned by the Bishop of Durham) and 48 in Middleton in Teesdale (47 being owned by the Earl of Darlington). The great expansion of mining came however in the 1820s (reflected in the increase in the 1831 census population for Stanhope and the marked decline in 1841 "a considerable portion of the mining population having removed to the east part of the county"²) and thus while it is reasonable to expect that marriage horizons would be influenced by mining the patterns of earlier marriage horizons should still have some relevance and enable comparison over time to be usefully drawn.

Nevertheless the similarity of geographic situation should not obscure the differences between the four parishes both in surface area and population: factors which may be expected to influence marriage horizons. These differences can be illustrated by tabulating the 1801 and 1811 census totals together with the acreage of each parish "as it existed in 1801 as far as possible."³

	<u>Area(acres)</u>	<u>1801</u>	<u>1811</u>
Hunstonworth	8039	215	411
Muggleswick	13086	201	224
Stanhope	61195	5155	6376
Middleton	81858	3686	4436

3. Stanhope

(a) The state of the registers

The marriage registers begin in 1614 and run to 1636, there is then a gap until 1662 and thereafter the records are broadly complete up to 1812. There are gaps however in this period. In 1724 for example there is a note in the margin that "Thos. Maddison lost the names of those that wants" and only one marriage is recorded for that year. The brevity of the text and the relative isolation of the earliest sequence of records (i.e.1614-1636) resulted in them being rejected for the purposes of this study. Equally well the records from 1685 to 1754 appear unreliable both on the basis of internal evidence (for example lack of care of composition) and because of the marked fluctuation in the recorded marriages which range from one to twenty-six a year.

The records for 1662-1685 by contrast are recorded in a neat and meticulous hand. Quite exceptionally for the registers the subject of this study it is only during this period at Stanhope that lists of ex-communicants are preserved in the registers as well as copies of summons to ecclesiastical courts. The register therefore gives every indication of a thorough and conscientious compilation. This may have been due in part to the stature of the then vicar - Isaac Basire¹ but also the prosperity of the parish must have enabled him to appoint competent curates. Whatever the reasons the resultant quality of the records for these twenty-three years is such that the records merit careful consideration.

(b) 1662-1685

There are 274 marriages recorded in this period: of those only two are identified as migrant (the couples coming from respectively Romaldekirk and Wolsingham). These two marriages have not been discounted from the

analysis that follows. The rate of endogamy is high: 85.0%. A comparison can be made with two other parishes comprised in this study, namely Seaham, a parish on the Durham coast, and Easington, a parish which although bounded on one side by the coast reaches far inland.

Table 3.b.i.

Parish	Period	Population size	Acreage	Rate of Endogamy
Stanhope	1662-1685	2577	61195	85.0%
Seaham	1662-1685	211	5834	44.7%
Easington	1570-1690	944	27048	77.9%

Endogamy is thus obviously, but not exclusively,² linked to size both of the population and of the area of the parish in question. A high rate of endogamy must however tell us something about the pattern of settlement within the parish as, if the settlements are on the fringe of the parish, marriage horizons involving the adjoining parish (and hence giving rise to exogamous marriages) should be more frequent.

It is possible to examine this point further by considering the main line of communication in Weardale which has always been along the floor of the dale following the course of the Wear and thereafter Killhope Burn. The centres of population were, and remain, clustered along what is now the B6293. The parish is thus bisected along an east-west axis and on either side, above the narrow but fertile dale there are whole expanses of upland moor and peat bog. To the south these moors lead to Teesdale, with the Tees like the Wear flowing eastwards towards the North Sea. To the north the moors are cut by the south-north valleys of the East and West Allen. This configuration (though not climate and culture) is reminiscent of the Italian Alpine valley described and studied by Lasker and others.³ In examining their

results they found, as they had anticipated, a high degree of mating between communities along the valley,

...On the other hand, it is only about 14km across the ridge to the floor of the next valley to the south (Val Maria) but only a few marriages between the valleys occurred.

A similar lack of contact with the adjacent dales, in particular with Teesdale, is evident from the records being considered and it is interesting to consider them in some detail. There are 31 spouses recorded as being not of the parish of Stanhope: 22 males and 19 females. The following table illustrates their geographic distribution:

Table 3.b.ii

	Parish Adjoining	Co.Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks.	Unidentified
Male	7	8	2	2	2	1
Gentry	0	3	2	1	0	1
Female	5	5	0	8	1	0

It will be seen that 7 (31.8%) of the exogamous males and 5 (26.3%) of the exogamous females come from a parish adjoining Stanhope. This is of course the experience of much research but the figures repay closer study. If the adjoining parishes are tabulated a useful comparison can be of their respective contribution to the marriage horizons of the people of Stanhope.

Table 3.b.iii

Parish adjoining	Male spouse	Female spouse	% total 548 spouses
Alston	0	0	
Edmundbyers	0	0	
Muggleswick	0	0	
Wolsingham	6	3	1.6
Middleton in Teesdale	1	0	0.2
Allendale	0	0	
Hunstonworth	0	0	

Whilst Wolsingham therefore accounts for 27.2% of the male exogamous spouses and for 15.8% of the female exogamous spouses, Teesdale accounts for only 4.5% of the male exogamous spouses and for none of the female spouses. To some extent the lack of contact between the two dales may be explained by the fact that it was not until the early 1800s that the London Lead Company "proposed and mainly built..." the road running "northwards from Middleton and Eggleston over the fells to Stanhope in neighbouring Weardale (B6278)." ⁴

There is even less reason to explain the exclusion of the north Durham parishes of Edmundbyers and Muggleswick as there was clearly movement southwards from Northumberland. It perhaps suggests that the drift from Northumberland was not direct but that there was movement southwards but to more westerly areas of Durham, for example Lanchester and Wolsingham and thence along the Wear towards Stanhope. There is however no firm evidence to support or illuminate a study of such "short-step mobility" as is here contemplated.

Thus a study of the exogamous spouses encourages the interpretation that the marriage horizons in the parish of Stanhope were orientated east-west along the dale and, given that the parish extends for some thirty miles along that axis this may have had an effect as it were of filtering out intending spouses before they reached the margins of the home parish, Stanhope.

Table 3.b.ii highlighted the mobility of those exogamous male spouses who comprised part of the gentry. It should be explained that the term "gentry" comprises those males identified in these registers as worthy of the title Mr or Esq (and in one case Vicar). In other words they fell within the ranks of the lesser nobility according to the Chart of Rank

and Status in Stuart England.⁵ Of these seven male worthies four married the only four Stanhope females described as Mrs or Miss (i.e. of the lesser nobility themselves). There is only one Stanhope man described as Mr who married a Stanhope girl. For completeness it might be noted that the only exogamous female spouse of the lesser gentry, a Lady Elizabeth Burton of North Bailey, Durham married Isaac Basire junior who was shown as of Stanhope. It is difficult to know how much reliance should be placed upon descriptive terms such as Mr or Mrs particularly in the context of marriage registers and in any event the sample is so very small that it may easily have been distorted. Nevertheless the figures do suggest that both for males and females of the lesser gentry the marriage horizon, even in this isolated part of Durham, was immediately but not exclusively wider than the lower classes in the parish and that they were prepared to contract matrimonial alliances over what would have been in those times considerable distance.

There are two final points to be made with regard to this early material from Stanhope.

First that 42% of the exogamous females come from Northumberland compared with only 9% of the males. Once again, owing to the smallness of the sample it may be merely a statistical quirk for there is no apparent reason why females should evidence a marriage horizon that differs so markedly, in geographic terms, from their male contemporaries. The anomaly is not repeated at Stanhope.

Secondly it will be observed that the number of exogamous spouses of each sex are nearly the same (i.e. 22 as opposed to 19). Subsequently the picture changes dramatically and these early records are one reason for thinking that later registers are inaccurate in recording the rate of female exogamy.

(c) 1754-1812

The most striking feature of this long period is the very low number of exogamous marriages and the complete absence of migrant marriages.

This may be conveniently illustrated as follows:

Table 3.c.i.

Period	No.of marriages	Migrant	Exogamous males %	Exogamous females %
1754-1773	540	0	6.8	2.2
1774-1793	638	0	9.2	0.8
1794-1812	835	0	7.9	1.3

(It will be noted that the third period is one year shorter than the other two periods.)

It is possible to examine the marriage horizon of the exogamous spouses in Table 3.c.ii which draws out a further contrast with the sexes during the period now under review. The first seven parishes in the table are those adjoining Stanhope regardless of whether they are recorded in the three periods examined. This has been done to enable a comparison to be made with the earlier registers (Table 3.b.iii). The first part of Table 3.c.ii deals with the parishes disclosed by female exogamous spouses.

Table 3.c.ii (part one)

1754-1773		1774-1793		1794-1812	
Wolsingham	3	Wolsingham	0	Wolsingham	1
Middleton in Teesdale	2	Middleton in Teesdale	1	Middleton in Teesdale	0
Hunstonworth	0	Hunstonworth	1	Hunstonworth	0
Muggleswick	0	Muggleswick	0	Muggleswick	1
Edmundbyers	0	Edmundbyers	0	Edmundbyers	1
Allendale	2	Allendale	1	Allendale	2
Alston	1	Alston	1	Alston	
Hexham	1	St Andrew Auckland	1	Lanchester	1
Haltwhistle	2			Hamsterly	1
Morpeth	1			St Andrew Auckland	1
				Brancepeth	1
				Shotley	1
				Catterick	1

In contrast with the marriage horizon identified in the period 1662-1685 it will be noted that not only has the relative number of exogamous females declined but with two exceptions (Morpeth and Catterick) their horizons have apparently been reduced dramatically and the adjoining parishes are now far more significant in determining the shape of the horizon. Before examining this aspect further it will be helpful to consider the second part of Table 3.c.ii, which deals with the parishes disclosed by the exogamous males.

Table 3.c.ii (part two)

1754-1773		1774-1793		1794-1812	
Wolsingham	6	Wolsingham	5	Wolsingham	10
Middleton	2	Middleton	2	Middleton	1
Hunstonworth	4	Hunstonworth	1	Hunstonworth	6
Muggleswick	0	Muggleswick	0	Muggleswick	0
Edmundbyers	0	Edmundbyers	1	Edmundbyers	4
Allendale	4	Allendale	0	Allendale	2
Alston	3	Alston	8	Alston	4
Aycliffe	1	Hexham	1	Hexham	1
Hexham	1	Sunderland	1	Chester le Street	1
Chester le Street	1	Bywell St Peter	1	Sunderland	2
Sunderland	1	Lanchester	3	Romaldkirk	1
Romaldkirk	1	Hamsterly	3	Lanchester	5
Merrington	1	St Andrew Auckland	2	Hamsterly	1
Bywell St Peter	1	Egglescliffe	1	Whitfield	1
Lanchester	4	Houghton le Spring	2	St Helens Auckland	1
Hamsterly	1	Garrigill	1	Blanchland	2
Whitfield	1	St George (London)	1	Witton le Wear	1
Cockfield	1	Gainford	1	Shotley	2
Haydon Bridge	1	Barnard Castle	2	Whickham	1
St Andrews Auckland	1	St Helens Auckland	1	Slaley	1
St Nicholas Durham	1	Aydon (Yorks)	1	Medomsley	1
Brancepeth	1	Blanchland	3	Bishopwearmouth	1
		Middleton Tyas	1	St Anns (London)	1
		Ovingham	1	Mary le Bow Durham	1
		Witton le Wear	3	Warrington (Lancs)	1
		Heighington	1	Jarrow	4
		St Johns Ley	1	St Pancras (London)	1
		Brough	1	Bywell St Andrew	1
		Preston (Lancs)	1	St Nicholas Newcastle	2
		All Souls Newcastle	2	Hackness	1
		Shotley	1	Earsdon	1
		Whickham	1	Great Stainton	1
		Slaley	1	Great Aycliffe	1
		Medomsley	1	Ryton	1
		St Johns Newcastle	1	Kirkhough	1
		Brancepeth	1		
		St Nicholas Durham	1		

The first aspect that strikes the observer when examining Table 3.c.ii is the number of parishes from where the exogamous spouses come but once - the impression is of widely scattered irregular marriage horizons. Some form can be given to the three lists of parishes in Table 3.c.ii and this is done in Table 3.c.iii below.

Table 3.c.iii

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
(a) <u>1754-73</u>						
male	19	14	0	3	1	0
female	8	0	0	4	0	0
(b) <u>1774-93</u>						
male	17	24	1	12	3	2
female	4	1	0	0	0	0
(c) <u>1794-1812</u>						
male	27	22	0	11	3	3
female	5	4	0	1	1	0

Two points should be made here. First despite the much greater number of exogamous males there is (apart from the period 1774-1793) some consistency between both sexes in relation to marriage horizons involving parishes adjoining Stanhope. The percentage figures for spouses from adjoining parishes are given in Table 3.c.iv below.

Table 3.c.iv

	male (%)	female (%)
1754-73	51.0	66.6
1774-93	28.8	80.0
1794-1812	40.9	45.4

The contrast with Table 3.b.ii where the figures indicate that only slightly more males than females come from adjoining parishes is a pointer towards questioning the complete reliability of this long sequence of records. The second point is that Table 3.c.iii fails to point up one constraint of geography already alluded to, and that is that mobility northwards (i.e. from Middleton in Teesdale) remains low for males but it appears

to have increased dramatically (compare Table 3.b.iii) but irratically for females. The figures (as percentages of respectively the male and female exogamous spouses) are as follows.

Table 3.c.v

	male (%)	female (%)
1754-73	5.4	16.6
1774-93	3.5	20.0
1794-1812	1.5	0

These tables appear to show that the marriage horizons of males are widening appreciably from 1774, far out into County Durham and Northumberland. It is tempting to ascribe this phenomena to an influx of small farmers and labourers moving up into Weardale when the enclosure of the moors and the prices of corn (particularly during the Napoleonic Wars) encouraged much higher altitude cereal farming than today.

The mobility from Yorkshire remains constant which may be no more than a reflection that movement from Yorkshire took place more easily and frequently in the lowlands and that Yorkshire men would only subsequently move up into Stanhope. In other words it is reasonable to postulate short-step mobility with residence at time of marriage being claimed for the County Durham parish rather than the native parish in Yorkshire.

In this period though not in the one previously considered (Table 3.b.ii) the Pennines clearly act as an almost complete barrier except insofar as short step mobility from other Cumberland parishes to Alston (where there were lead mines) subsequently results in a marriage horizon between Alston and Stanhope.

In contrast with the earlier period the mobility of the females when compared with their male contemporaries either reflects a sudden rigidity in the former's horizons - which seems inexplicable - or that for some reason the parish of origin of the female spouse is being consistently incorrectly recorded.

(d) 1795-1812

It is here that the baptismal records for 1798-1812 in County Durham can be used as a counter check. The Stanhope marriage registers for 1795-1812 were annotated with the parishes subsequently disclosed by the spouses in the baptismal registers. In order to increase the number of marriages studied the annotation began from 1795 rather than 1798. There is of course a risk in incorporating these three extra years. Spouses might marry within that period, baptise their first child, and then quit the parish before 1798. Their marriage would not therefore be annotated although for exactness they should be brought into consideration (as should spouses who marry and produce one child within the period 1795-1798 and then have no more children). It is not possible to capture this information. In any event the numbers are likely to be sufficiently small and sufficiently similar (in terms of marriage horizons) to their contemporaries who do appear in the annotated registers that the concern can be reasonably discounted.

There are 715 marriages entered in the marriage register for the period 1795-1812. There are no migrant marriages recorded but there are 62 (8.6%) exogamous males and 11 (1.5%) exogamous females. If the marriage registers are annotated with the baptismal records for 1798-1812 then 618 marriages appear in both registers. Of those 19 are shown to be migrant and they have been removed from further consideration here (but see Table 3.d.ii following). The number of exogamous male spouses therefore, out

of a total of 599 marriages is 82 (13.6%) and for exogamous female spouses the number rises to 77 (12.8%). It might be comforting if the figures emphasised "more of the same" but this is not the case: the marriage horizons have shifted and this can be best illustrated by the following table which splits the parishes of origin into six (as was done in Table 3.c.iii).

Table 3.d.i (males only)

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
Non-annotated register	23	22	0	12	2	3
Annotated register	34	11	8	22	3	4

Not only is it clear that the links with Cumberland and Westmorland and, to a lesser degree Yorkshire were being maintained but also the marriage register fails to indicate the much greater movement from Northumberland and from the adjoining parishes whilst at the same time the marriage register over emphasises movement from the Durham parishes. This may be explained by short step mobility (i.e. the last parish of residence is given for entry in the marriage register).

As far as Northumberland is concerned if the spouses from Allendale are added to the total number of spouses from that county then exogamous males from Northumberland comprise the largest group of spouses (a total of 11 spouses come from Allendale). The position with regard to Middleton contrasts with that disclosed in Table 3.c.v. Now, by annotating the register the number of male spouses coming from Middleton expressed as a percentage of the total number of spouses coming from adjoining parishes

is 14.7% whilst the corresponding figure for female spouses is 16.1%.

It is in fact the exogamous female spouses that are most dramatically affected by the annotation of the registers. This can be demonstrated by breaking the parishes into six groups, as previously done for the male spouses.

Table 3.d.ii (females only)

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
Non-annotated register	5	4	0	1	1	0
Annotated register	47	10	2	13	3	2

By adding Allendale (20 spouses) to the Northumberland figures then the number of female spouses coming from that county is 42% (as a percentage of the exogamous females) which is reminiscent of the figure obtained in the earlier period for Northumberland but in that case no exogamous female spouses came from Allendale. Incidentally the two 'other parishes' (or rather, in this case places) recorded are the Isle of Wight and Wales. Although only two instances they serve to illustrate that considerable, and what must have been difficult, journeys could be made prior to marriage in these times.

Another contrast between the patterns of mobility of the sexes can be found by considering the numbers of parishes disclosed in the registers, this is done in Table 3.d.iii below. It will be seen from this, for example, that 27 parishes that appear in the annotated registers provided one male spouse during this time whilst in contrast, 17 parishes provided but one female spouse. The females appear to have come from a smaller

number of parishes. The reason for this is not clear unless it can be attributed to a narrower opportunity for mobility generally amongst females of marriageable age.

Table 3.d.iii

No from parish	Number of Parishes			
	male		female	
	non-annotated register	annotated register	non-annotated register	annotated register
1	24	27	9	17
2	4	8	1	2
3	1	0	0	1
4-6	4	2	0	5
7-10	1	2	0	2
over 10	0	1	0	1

The low number of exogamous spouses appearing in the marriage registers particularly from the late eighteenth century is often attributed to the effects of the Poor and Settlement Laws of that time.⁶ The result is that, in particular, males were reluctant to disclose their parish of origin. Here at Stanhope there is clearly a factor inhibiting females, to a far greater degree than males, disclosing their parish of origin. There seems no provision within those laws that would discriminate against female spouses to such a degree. It may be that the explanation is that these women were formerly young children of families moving into and settling within the parish and who at maturity overlooked their place of birth until specifically asked to provide the information on the baptism of their own children. This would be an understandable explanation were it not for the fact that it fails to account for the differences between the number and geographical spread of the parishes disclosed by the male and female spouses respectively.

Indeed whatever the constraints of the Poor Laws, actual mobility within this period must have been at a higher rate than is even demonstrated by the annotated registers. This is because there are 48 exogamous male spouses in the marriage registers who do not appear in an entry in the baptismal registers after their marriage. If the total number of marriages is taken (less the migrant marriages disclosed by the annotated registers, i.e. a total of 696) then a clearer estimate of the exogamous males can be achieved by expressing as a percentage of that figure the aggregate number of exogamous spouses (i.e. 48 plus 82). This indicates 18.6% of the males were exogamous (compare Table 3.c.i.). The corresponding figure for females is (3 plus 77), 11.4%. These two percentage figures represent the best estimate of exogamy for Stanhope in the period 1795-1812. It is a radically different estimate from that which would be obtained from considering the marriage registers alone.

Mention has been made of the 19 migrant marriages that appear once the marriage registers are annotated. The number of parishes is small and there appears to be no significant pattern from these marriages but for completeness they are set out below. In the case of only one marriage do both spouses come from the same parish (Wolsingham).

Table 3.d.iv

male spouse : parish	female spouse : parish
Alston 2	Alston 4
Allendale 2	Allendale 2
Edmundbyers 2	Edmundbyers 1
Wolsingham 2	Wolsingham 2
Hunstonworth 1	Hunstonworth 1
Shotley 1	Middleton 1
Shincliffe 1	St John Ley 1
Earsden 1	Haltwhistle 1
Kirkoswald 1	Hexham 5
Worsley (Lancs) 1	Corbridge 1
Blanchland 1	
Romaldkirk 1	
Barningham (Yorks) 1	
Hexham 1	
Simonburn 1	

4. Muggleswick

(a) The state of the registers

The records back to 1784 were traced, but the records for that year are incomplete so that it was discounted from this study. From 1785 the registers appear complete although there are only fifty marriages recorded in the period to 1812 (an average of 1.78 a year).

(b) 1785-1812

The rates of exogamy differ from those of Stanhope (see Table 3.c.i) in that the rate of exogamous males expressed as a percentage of all marriages is far higher than that in respect of the females. The figures are 44% (22) and 4% (2) respectively. There are no migrant marriages. The exogamous marriages can be broken down into six groups.

Table 4.b.i.

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
male	13	7	0	2	0	0
female	2	0	0	0	0	0

Two points deserve mention. First there is a much greater relationship with the adjoining parishes and secondly that within those parishes Lanchester (abutting the western boundary of Muggleswick) accounts for eight of the exogamous males, whilst the other four parishes account for the rest. All the exogamous females come from Lanchester. This relationship is most probably attributable to the much greater size of Lanchester as against Muggleswick but the fact that Stanhope features so slightly (only one male comes from that parish) suggests that the mining of the upland parishes may be drawing young men eastwards into the parish.

(c) 1795-1812

35 marriages appear in this period in the marriage register but of these only 12 appear in the subsequent baptismal register of 1798-1812. Of those 12 marriages four are shown to be migrant. The remaining eight marriages represent such a small sample that it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions save that the exogamy appears to be at a much higher rate for both sexes than that obtaining in Stanhope over the same period.

Table 4.c.i

	1795-1812 (non-annotated)	1795-1812 (annotated)
Stanhope	8% (male) 1.5% (female)	13.8% (male) 12.8%(female)
Muggleswick	51.4% (male) 2.8% (female)	50% (male) 25% (female)

Table 4.c.ii below lists the parishes appearing in the marriage registers for 1795-1812 and indicates the number of spouses drawn from each parish. For completeness the parishes appearing in the annotated registers are also given. The picture is one of a small parish with an influx of people of marriageable age (presumably drawn by the mining activities within the parish) but who on marriage or shortly thereafter quit the parish. Whether they were lured eastwards to the larger mining enterprises on the Durham coalfield is a question that can only be determined by further research of those regions.

Equally well the migrant marriages are sufficiently few in number (although a high proportion of the annotated marriages, 33%) to preclude any realistic assessment of the results which are tabulated in Table 4.c.iii.

Table 4.c.ii

	<u>male</u>		<u>female</u>	
	non-annotated register	annotated register	non-annotated register	annotated register
Lanchester	6	2	1	0
Medomsley	2	1	0	0
Edmundbyers	2	0	0	0
Stanhope	2	0	0	0
Wolsingham	1	0	0	0
Shotley	1	0	0	0
St Helens Auckland	1	0	0	0
Stamfordham	1	0	0	0
St Nicholas Durham	1	0	0	0
Middleton in Teesdale	1	0	0	0
Chester le Street	0	1	0	0
Appleby	0	0	0	1
Slaley	0	0	0	1

Table 4.c.iii

male spouse : parish	female spouse : parish
Barnard Castle	Wolsingham
Scotland	Lanchester
Martin (Yorks)	Lanchester
Stanhope	Stanhope

5. Hunstonworth

(a) The state of the registers

The records are complete from 1776 up to 1812 although for the sake of a more convenient comparison with the parish of Muggleswick the study began from 1785. There are 55 marriages recorded up to 1812, an average of 1.96 a year, remarkably similar to Muggleswick.

(b) 1785-1812

The rates of exogamy derived from the marriage registers alone are different from the rates for Muggleswick being 29.0% (16) for males and 7.2% (4) for females. Whilst these figures may differ, in fact the much greater importance of the adjoining parishes, already identified at Muggleswick, is confirmed although the direction of the movement into Hunstonworth is mainly southwards from Allendale (three males) and Blanchland (three males and one female). On the other hand, movement northwards from Stanhope is well represented (four males). In this latter regard the contrast with Muggleswick is noteworthy. The parishes concerned can once more be broken into six groups.

Table 5.b.i

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
male	12	2	1	1	0	0
female	1	0	1	2	0	0

(c) 1795-1812

There are 43 marriages recorded in the marriage register for this period. As with the longer period there are no migrant marriages. The rates of exogamy decrease in this period: 25.5% (11) for males, 2.3% (1) for females. Of those 43 marriages only 18 appear in the subsequent baptismal registers between 1798-1812. Once more these registers reveal migrant marriages and the percentage figure, 33% (6) is identical with that obtained in Muggleswick.

The remaining marriages (12) are, like those remaining in the Muggleswick figures, sufficiently small to make conclusions hazardous at best but there is a point of contrast with Muggleswick that is noteworthy. The rates of exogamy indicated from these few marriages are not only relatively high, 41.6%, but also identical as between the sexes. In addition whilst in the case of Muggleswick the parish disclosed in the annotated registers were quite different as between the sexes here there is a much closer relationship. As with Muggleswick the pattern is best illustrated by a table of the parishes concerned (compare Table 4.c.ii).

Table 5.c.i

	male		female	
	non-annotated register	annotated register	non-annotated register	annotated register
Stanhope	3	1	0	1
Allendale	3	1	0	2
Edmundbyers	2	0	0	0
Blanchland	3	0	0	1
Alston	1	0	0	0
Wolsingham	1	1	0	0
Sunderland	1	0	0	0
Shotley	1	0	0	0
Simonburn	0	0	1	0
St John Lee	0	1	0	1
Lanchester	0	1	0	0

In broad terms however a picture appears to be emerging of a mobile and quite rapidly moving population only marginally more stable than that of Muggleswick. From the marriage register alone a contrary view would prevail.

The six migrant marriages are tabulated below for the sake of completeness, they are (even in conjunction with the migrant marriages of Muggleswick) too few usefully to probe further.

Table 5.c.ii

male spouse : parish	female spouse : parish
Allendale	Whitfield
Edmundbyers	Corbridge
Allendale	Stanhope
Stanhope	Stanhope
Allendale	Staindrop
St John Lee	Allendale

6. Middleton-in-Teesdale

(a) The state of the registers

For the purposes of this study a transcript of the register was used.¹ The transcribed registers begin in January 1753 and appear complete. On the other hand baptisms were recorded at the chapelry of Egglestone from 22 September 1795 as well as at Middleton. Clearly on the annotation of the Middleton marriage register these records of Egglestone must be taken into account but after 1808 the baptismal register fails to give the mother's former surname and shows all the spouses as coming from either Egglestone or from within Middleton in Teesdale. That is unlikely and the last four years of the Egglestone baptismal register has therefore been discounted from this study.

(b) 1754-1812

The 12 marriages within the year 1753 have been ignored for the purposes of this study to facilitate a comparison with Stanhope and hence this study commences with the marriages from 1754. The results can be best illustrated in the following table (compare Table 3.c.i).

Table 6.b.i

	No of marriages	Migrant	Exog. males (%)	Exog. females (%)
1754-1773	235	0	16.5	2.2
1774-1793	287	0	19.1	3.4
1794-1812	317	0	12.9	4.1

Once more, it will be noted that there is a complete absence of migrant marriages during this long period. In addition, whilst the rate of male exogamy is higher in this period than at Stanhope it will be observed that

as with Stanhope it is within the second phase (1774-1793) that exogamy appears to peak, at least for the males. This most probably reflects nothing more than the drift towards a uniform "of this parish" that creeps into the majority of the registers from the mid-eighteenth century.

Whilst the movement into Stanhope from Middleton at least in terms of marriage horizons has been demonstrated to be remarkably low yet the converse is not true. The percentages of exogamous spouses coming from Stanhope are tabulated below with the corresponding figures obtained from the Stanhope registers in parentheses.

Table 6.b.ii

	male (%)	female (%)
1754-1773	7.0 (5.4)	20.0 (16.6)
1774-1793	12.6 (3.5)	40.0 (20.0)
1794-1812	21.9 (1.5)	15.3 (0.0)

These results are part of a similar pattern in relation to other adjoining parishes best illustrated in the following table.

Table 6.b.iii

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
(a) <u>1754-73</u>						
male	26	7	4	1	1	0
female	3	0	2	0	0	0
(b) <u>1774-93</u>						
male	34	10	6	0	4	1
female	10	0	0	0	0	0
(c) <u>1794-1812</u>						
male	29	4	1	2	5	0
female	10	1	2	0	0	0

Even allowing for the geographical spread of Middleton and her adjoining parishes, what is striking about these figures is the dominance of those parishes although they are not evenly distributed. In particular, Romaldekirk (to the south and forming part of the then North Riding of Yorkshire) is noteworthy. In the three periods selected exogamous males from Romaldekirk account for respectively 16, 14 and 18 of the total number of exogamous males. Again, for the exogamous females the figures are 1, 6 and 6.

The remainder of the exogamous spouses are predominantly accounted for by movement up the Tees from Barnard Castle (part of Gainford parish, but specifically mentioned in the registers) which accounts for 5, 11, 1 respectively of the exogamous males but only 1, 0, 2 of the exogamous females. In addition the movement from Stanhope already alluded to is of course significant. Given that there was little but a weakly defined marriage horizon northwards into Stanhope it may be that the move southwards into Middleton was encouraged by the activities of the London (Quaker) Lead Company which began to take an interest in Teesdale from 1753.² The Company appears to have been an enlightened employer for those times and it is possible to envisage young people from Weardale seeking employment within the adjoining dale for that reason. Similarly it is not difficult to understand the movement up along the Tees particularly from the nearby market town of Barnard Castle.

(c) 1795-1812

There are 278 marriages in this period and the rates of exogamy are, for males 13.3% (37) and for females 3.9% (11). The corresponding figures for the period 1794-1812 were, it will be recalled, 12.9% (41) and 4.1% (13).

Of those 278 marriages 186 can be cross referenced to the subsequent baptismal registers of 1798-1812, and, when this is done the annotated registers produce quite a different picture from that derived from the marriage registers alone.

The rates of exogamy now become, for males 8.6% (16) and for females 15% (28). To some extent what appears as a dramatic imbalance here between the sexes can be explained by the fact that 21 of the exogamous males shown in the marriage register (out of the total of 32) do not appear in the baptismal registers while only three of the exogamous female spouses fail to appear, or rather reappear in the baptismal registers. The more accurate picture of exogamy might therefore be described as being 37 male and 31 female spouses : a figure nearer the broad equality between the two sexes that has been so much a feature of these annotated records (but see Table 4.c.i).

Nevertheless however an equality might be contrived there are two curious features of these registers that deserve mention. The first is that the Romaldkirk males appear likely to leave the parish after marriage. This can be demonstrated in the following table:

Table 6.c.i

	(a) non-annotated reg. (32 spouses)	(b) annotated reg. (16 spouses)	(c) spouse in (a) but not in (b)
Romaldkirk	14	5	7
Stanhope	7	6	5

It will be noted that column (c) of the above table indicates that Stanhope provided a rich source of marriageable young men almost equally divided between those who left the parish after marriage and those who

remained or if they did not remain at least returned to baptise their issue.

The second feature of these registers is that with the female spouses a much greater number of females come from either Stanhope or Romaldkirk than would be established by considering the marriage register alone.

This may be illustrated in the following table:

Table 6.c.ii

	(a) non-annotated reg. (9 spouses)	(b) annotated reg. (28 spouses)	(c) spouse in (a) but not in (b)
Romaldkirk	4	7	2
Stanhope	2	13	0

It is however evident that the annotation of the registers in this instance not only suggests a greater degree of mobility but also, once more the geographical distribution of the marriage horizons alters, particularly for the females where, as can be seen in the table below, an horizon stretching across the Pennines becomes much more important than the marriage registers would suggest. It may be that these women represent daughters or sisters within families moving from the mining districts in the west into the prosperous dale in the east. Yet if that be so it fails to account for why their (in particular) brothers moved on elsewhere prior to marriage. Once more one is left with the disquieting possibility of different marriage horizons for each sex.

Table 6.c.iii

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
male	13	0	2	1	0	0
female	20	0	8	0	0	0

Again the baptismal register indicates a handful of migrant marriages (it will be recalled that none were disclosed in the marriage register). The four marriages concerned are tabulated below for completeness: they are too few to be considered further.

Table 6.c.iv

male spouse : parish	female spouse : parish
Barnard Castle	East Cowton (Yorks)
Lunedale	Weardale
Scotland	Kirkby Hill (Yorks)
Alston	Duften (W'land)

On the other hand by discounting these migrant marriages one can begin to approach what might be regarded as a truer rate of exogamy. From the total figure of 278 marriages these four marriages should be discounted, leaving 274 marriages. The most accurate indications of exogamy available in these registers (i.e. the total of exogamous spouses appearing in the baptismal register and of the exogamous spouses that appear in the marriage register alone) gives, as mentioned previously, a figure of 37 males and 31 females. Expressed as percentages this represents 13.5% of the males and 11.3% of the females, slightly lower than the figures obtained for Stanhope but again a picture different from that of the marriage registers alone.

(d) Conception before marriage

The results of a small pilot study undertaken on the baptismal register of this parish, but which was, for reasons that will appear, abandoned, might usefully be recorded here.

One of the most significant inaccuracies of the marriage registers of all the parishes examined is the low level of female exogamy recorded. It

is clear when the registers are annotated that the rates of exogamy are generally much higher for females than the marriage registers suggest. It was argued that if, as others have suggested the effect of the Poor Laws was to depress the numbers of males who disclosed a parish of origin outside that of the parish of marriage,³ then might there be particular aspects of these laws that forced females to disclose a false parish of origin at the time of marriage but not, apparently, on baptism of the issue of that marriage? Hampson in her article on settlement and removal under these laws as applied in Cambridge, when identifying the groups of persons who were removed from the parishes and passed on to another, has this to say:

The group of unencumbered women, single and widowed, forms also a markedly important one, constituting one fifth of the total number of appeal cases... One natural result of the discouragement offered by the Settlement Laws to legitimate marriage was a serious increase in immorality, for which few remedies were suggested beyond jeremiads against "the vice and idleness of this present time," combined with frankly brutal efforts to pass on pregnant single women before the birth of the child should settle it upon the parish⁴

In the light of those remarks a study was undertaken of the dates of birth (not baptism) of the first issue born to women who were shown in the baptismal register to have come from outside the parish but who, in the marriage register described themselves as being of Middleton. It was thought that a single pregnant woman about to be married might nevertheless prefer to hide her parish of origin (if it were outside Middleton) at the banns stage in case the actual ceremony fell through when she might then be subject to "frankly brutal efforts" to remove her from the parish.

For this to be an answer than the incidence of conception before marriage in these women must be very high. The figure is high: 68.4% of these women were pregnant at the time of marriage and of those 40.8% were

upwards of six months pregnant at the time of marriage. However, the figure does not appear sufficiently high to substantiate the argument. This is all the more so when a comparison is made with the rate of conception before marriage for endogamous females (it should be noted here that females for the period 1795-1805 inclusive were only studied). 46.4% of these females were pregnant at marriage and of those women 72.7% were upwards of six months pregnant. All these figures are higher than results obtained elsewhere⁵ and rather than illuminating an answer to the problem of a low record of female exogamy in the marriage register rather these results suggest that a system of marriage bonds⁶ might have been customary amongst certain sections of the community. A marriage bond was a device whereby the intended spouses could refuse to enter into the marriage ceremony if the female failed to fall pregnant within a specified time. No documentary evidence is known to the writer to confirm that these arrangements were entered into in Middleton in Teesdale, although such bonds were known in lowland Scotland. The subject generally would repay further study, although it forms no further part of this study.

7. The central parishes : a brief introduction

The group of central parishes comprised within this study lie (with one exception) in a convenient cluster and are bounded on their northern margins by the parishes of St Oswald and Pitlington which in turn almost entirely surround the City of Durham. To the south lies the large parish of Sedgfield with its prosperous market town. The exception is Castle Eden: a small parish wedged between two coastal parishes, but it is an exception of little significance: the parish is sufficiently small and its records so uniformly shorn of detail that its justification for appearing here at all lies not so much as a means of progressing this study but rather for the sake of completeness and as a warning to others.

The character of these central parishes was to change rapidly with the expansion of the coal industry when whole new communities were to be created and vast numbers of migrant workers were to be brought in, in such numbers that the earlier patterns of mobility on marriage must have been totally obscured. All this, for the purposes of this study, is some way off in the future. These parishes are, during the span of this study, medium to small sized agricultural parishes.

As can be seen from the following table there is perhaps more similarity between these parishes, certainly with the first three parishes, than there was between the upland parishes, in terms of geographical size and size of population.

	<u>Area (acres)</u>	<u>1801</u>	<u>1811</u>
Kelloe	22470	1106	1338
Bishop Middleham	16920	1605	1755
Merrington	16328	2136	2196
Trimdon	3138	305	291
Castle Eden	1949	362	257

8. Kelloe

(a) The state of the registers

The registers begin in 1693 and appear to have been compiled with some attention until 1706 with the exception of the period July 1699 to April 1700 which most probably was written up at one sitting. From 1706 until 1730 however the registers are suspect; only five exogamous spouses are disclosed throughout this period, an improbably low number. Whilst the records from 1730 onwards are credible in order to facilitate comparison with previous parishes the second period studied begins in 1734 and is divided into the already familiar twenty year blocks up to 1793 with a final block, as previously, running from 1794 to 1812.

Nevertheless within those blocks of years the period 1754 to 1773 records fewer marriages than might have been expected. In addition, and inexplicably, the more detailed format for baptisms prescribed by Barrington begins from 17 May 1801 rather than 1 January 1798.

(b) 1693-1705

70 marriages are recorded in this period. It is worth noting that migrant marriages appear although usually they are between spouses travelling only short distances particularly from the adjacent extra-parochial place of Garmondsway Moor. One of these migrant marriages however appears to have been between a Robert Summerell of Tynemoor or Tynemouth and Anne Carbray of Sedgefield. If so it represents a stark contrast to the other four migrant marriages of this period but the word 'Tynemoor' is not, it has to be admitted, readily legible. The migrant marriages are further considered in section (c) below.

Of the remaining 66 marriages there are 16 (24.2%) exogamous males and 4 (6%) exogamous females.

Table 8.b.i

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
male	9	7	0	0	0	0
female	3	1	0	0	0	0

These are small figures but one curious factor is that of the exogamous males 6 come from north Durham: the parishes of Houghton le Spring, Seaham, Ryton, Bishop Wearmouth and Monk Wearmouth all of which were, by this time, swept up into the early industrial revolution of north Durham. By contrast the lone female comes from the south of the county (Billingham).

(c) 1734-1812

This long sequence of records disclose similarities with the earlier sequence.

Table 8.c.i

	No of marriages	Migrant	Exog. males (%)	Exog. females (%)
1734-53	88	2	30.2	9.0
1754-73	65	3	24.6	12.0
1774-93	117	7	25.4	12.7
1794-1812	134	11	26.8	20.3

Note: In calculating the percentage figures the migrant marriages have been discounted. The incidence of migrant marriages will be considered later (section d).

It will be seen that these registers themselves demonstrate in the last period a similarity between the rate of exogamy of the sexes which hitherto has only been achieved by annotation of the registers. In addition, with the exception of 1734-53 the rate of male exogamy appears relatively

constant from 1693. The direction of the marriage horizons can be best illustrated in the following format.

Table 8.c.ii

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
(a) <u>1734-53</u>						
male	9	14	0	1	2	0
female	6	2	0	0	0	0
(b) <u>1754-73</u>						
male	6	10	0	0	0	0
female	3	4	0	0	0	0
(c) <u>1774-93</u>						
male	11	14	1	0	0	2
female	10	3	0	0	1	0
(d) <u>1794-1812</u>						
male	11	19	0	1	2	0
female	14	10	0	0	1	0

That this parish, geographically east of centre of the county, should have such faint marriage horizons with areas beyond the county is not in itself surprising, although the anticipated north-south axis of mobility in this regard is hardly borne out. There is however one aspect of a north-south axis that can be discerned.

Table 8.c.iii below totals the number of spouses coming from parishes within the county but not adjoining Kelloe and those parishes are divided into three groups: parishes lying to the north, to the west and to the south. It should be noted that all the parishes to the east of Kelloe in fact adjoin that parish.

Table 8.c.iii

	<u>North</u>	<u>West</u>	<u>South</u>
<u>1734-53</u>			
male	8	2	4
female	0	0	2
<u>1754-73</u>			
male	5	5	0
female	2	0	2
<u>1774-93</u>			
male	8	2	4
female	2	1	0
<u>1794-1812</u>			
male	9	7	3
female	2	3	4

What is remarkable here is the difference in the proportions of males and females coming particularly from the northern and the southern parishes. Proportionately a far higher number of males appear to have come from north Durham whilst very slightly more females come rather from south Durham. Before considering the effect of annotating these registers with the baptismal registers it is worth glancing at the migrant marriages.

(d) Migrant marriages

A total of 27 migrant marriages appear in the two blocks of records considered (i.e. 1693-1705 and 1734-1812). Of this number 18 (three in the period 1693-1705 and 15 during 1734-1812) were marriages contracted between spouses of parishes or extra parochial places adjoining Kelloe in particular Garmondsway accounted for five marriages where the spouses came from the same place and also appeared in a further ten marriages. The impression gathered overall is of very localised contact and of Kelloe church being used as a convenient local centre rather than of a wide ranging influx of migrants.

It will be recalled that the marriage registers suggested that the migrant marriages were mainly concerned with short marriage horizons. The baptismal registers however indicate that migrant marriages involved widely scattered spouses. The main emphasis is on marriages between spouses from within County Durham but not from parishes adjoining Kelloe. The prominence of County Durham is understandable and might have been expected from the marriage registers alone (see Table 8.c.ii) but what remains inexplicable is the lack of contact between the adjoining parishes especially given the emphasis on those parishes in the marriage register.

The second aspect to note regarding these migrant marriages is that the patterns of the marriage horizons for both sexes are broadly the same (that is to say for example that four females came from Yorkshire and three males). Further, the suggestion of a geographic divide within say County Durham where proportionately more males come from the north of the county - on the basis of the evidence of the marriage registers alone - is borne out by the baptismal registers where 52% of the female spouses coming from County Durham come from north Durham (in contrast to the indications derived from the marriage registers) while only 27% of the males come from north Durham. Again 15% of the females come from south Durham as against 33% of the males. Finally 32% of the females come from west Durham as opposed to 60% of the males. These broad and convenient divisions of the county (wherein the adjoining parishes have been discounted, as previously) may have an element of subjectivity within them, nevertheless the broad trend conclusion remains: that marriage horizons within the county differ as between the sexes and, for reasons which are not readily apparent differ markedly as between the marriage registers simpliciter and the annotated registers.

It is interesting to try and establish the most accurate available indicator of exogamy during the period 1795-1812. As with previous parishes this is attempted by aggregating the information from the marriage and baptismal registers during this period. It will be recalled that there were 128 marriages. From both registers 40 migrant marriages can be identified, leaving 94 marriages. Of those remaining there are 32 (34%) with an exogamous male spouse but only 18 (19%) with an exogamous female spouse which are results not for removed from the unannotated marriage registers for this period.

9. Bishop Middleham

(a) The state of the registers

The marriage registers of this parish are available from 1559, however it is not until 1663 that particulars of the parish of residence are given. To enable comparison with other parishes comprised in this study a start date was taken of 1674. Thereafter the marriage registers appear to have been carefully compiled with the exception of the period 1720-23. The disappointment however lies not so much in this period but in the far more serious fact that the baptismal registers for 1798-1812 do not alter from the previous format to accommodate Bishop Barrington's direction.

A new register book was evidently purchased by the parish in 1794 and it was printed to record details of marriages, baptisms and burials.

The baptismal register section begins:

Register Book for Births and Christenings in all Parish churches and chapels conformable to An Act of the twenty third of King George the Third intituled An Act for granting to His Majesty a stamp duty on the Registry of Burials, Marriages, Births and Christenings.

The form of the baptismal register from 1784 until 1813 is therefore either:

Jane daughter of Bernard and Magt Legge was christened Feb. 28th.

or, Hannah daughter of Ralph and Eliz Wheatley was born Jany 31st and christened March ye 12th.

The detail preserved by Bishop Barrington's prescribed format is thus absent here throughout.

(b) 1674-1812

This long sequence of records is best considered by reference to the following table. It should be noted that, in addition to the evident lack of care referred to above, there are two further discrepancies. First, in

the period 1674-1753 there is one place or parish of residence of a male spouse and two of female spouses that could not be identified. The three spouses have been discounted from this study. Secondly, in the period 1774-93 there are two years 1792 and 1793 for which the records are missing although some banns records have survived.

Table 9.b.i

	Parish adjoining	Co Dur	N'bland	Yorks	C'land W'land	Other	No of Marr.	Migrant
<u>1674-93</u>							84	0
male	8	8	1	0	0	0		
female	7	10	0	0	0	0		
<u>1694-1713</u>							65	0
male	10	4	0	1	0	0		
female	2	5	0	0	0	0		
<u>1714-1733</u>							112	2
male	5	5	0	1	0	0		
female	1	2	0	0	0	0		
<u>1734-1753</u>							73	1
male	12	14	0	1	0	0		
female	2	2	0	0	0	0		
<u>1754-1773</u>								
male	12	21	2	2	0	0		
female	4	1	0	0	0	0		
<u>1774-1793</u>							71	0
male	8	17	3	2	0	0		
female	2	1	0	0	0	0		
<u>1794-1812</u>							94	3
male	14	15	2	3	0	1		
female	1	6	0	0	0	0		

The sudden increase in the number of recorded marriages during the period 1714-1733 appears anomalous but can not be explained from the registers alone. Nevertheless the coherence of the residue of the records suggests

that they should not be discounted on the basis of this anomalous total.

It will be seen that the above table demonstrates a similarity between this parish and Kelloe with regard to the geographical distribution of the marriage horizons. Specifically it is the parishes adjoining Bishop Middleham or falling within County Durham which have the clearest marriage horizons. It will be observed that in the middle period (1734-1753) the parishes within the county but not adjoining Bishop Middleham become of increasing importance for the males until 1794-1812 when the distribution is more even. It would have been interesting to illuminate this aspect by the annotation of the registers.

In contrast to Kelloe where there is a remarkable correlation between the numbers of exogamous spouses of either sex coming from an adjoining parish in Bishop Middleham after 1674-93 (and with the possible exception of 1714-1733 already alluded to as anomalous) the figures present more of a contrast. The exogamous females never total more than four from adjoining parishes and indeed when the figure for the males is 14 the corresponding figure for females falls to 1. This is, of course, a pattern seen elsewhere in this study but not, it may be noted, with the marriage registers of the adjoining parish of Kelloe. The contrast between these two parishes can be illuminated further by considering the exogamous spouses coming from County Durham (with the exception of the adjoining parishes). If the total of such exogamous males falling within the last three periods is compared with the numbers of females it will be observed that whilst in Kelloe the figure is 2.5 males for every female at Bishop Middleham the figure rises to 6.6 males for every female. It will be recalled that, unusually, the marriage registers of Kelloe appeared to give a reasonable indication of the degree of exogamous marriages and, in comparison lacking the corroborated

tion of baptismal registers the Bishop Middleham marriage registers appear suspect as to totals of exogamous marriages.

Given a reasonable suspicion towards these registers it is difficult to know what emphasis should be given to a trend, albeit a faint one, that is discernable in the registers. It will have been seen that from both Northumberland and Yorkshire, particularly after 1753, there is a trickle of males coming into Bishop Middleham to marry. The figure is not large: 10.9%, 16.6% and 14.2% respectively of the total number of exogamous males within the three periods. No females come from these counties during this time. By contrast, in the parish of Kelloe it is only during the last period (1794-1812) that the corresponding figure achieves double figures (10.0%). Indeed after 1753 and prior to 1794 no male spouses come from either Northumberland or Yorkshire into Kellow, according to the marriage registers. It is an aspect such as this that makes the absence of corroborative details from the baptismal registers of Bishop Middleham all the more frustrating.

There remains finally one other contrast with the results obtained at Kelloe and that is the very low number of migrant marriages (six during the entire period). Significantly however the registers suggest short distance migration for these marriages. In four marriages both spouses come from a parish adjoining Bishop Middleham, in one both spouses come from Brancepeth whilst in the sixth the male came from Stockton whilst his spouse came from Sedgfield. Despite the lower numbers the trend of the records is similar therefore to that obtaining in Kelloe: a trend which was there, it will be recalled, demonstrated as erroneous once the marriage registers were annotated with the baptismal registers.

10. Castle Eden

(a) The state of the registers

The study of this parish was undertaken using a transcript of the registers prepared by F.G.J. Robinson and published in 1914 by the Durham and Northumberland Parish Register Society. The transcription begins with the registers of 1698 but from then until 1721 there are only six marriages recorded none of which give any indication as to the parishes of origin of the spouses. With gaps (totalling six years to 1738) the registers disclose from 1721 marriages at the rate of one or exceptionally two a year. There is a gap from 1738 to 1748 but thereafter the register continues to 1794 with gaps totalling eleven years. The marriage registers for 1795 to 1812 appear to have been lost.

To make matters worse the baptismal registers retain the same format from 1661 to 1812. Very few details of parishes are provided during these years and none at all between 1797 to 1812.

(b) 1754-1793

The registers of this parish are of such a quality that it seems unwise to rely upon them and perhaps unnecessary to tabulate the results obtained from them. They are, nevertheless set out below. Beyond observing that the trend, if such a word may be used to describe the figures below, disclosed does not depart markedly from results obtained from other central parishes and detailed previously, there is little that can be said of these figures.

The migrant marriage was one contracted between parties both of whom came from the adjoining parish of Easington. One male spouse came from London and another from Berkshire: it is conjectured that these spouses may have been members of the gentry.

Table 10.b.i

	Parish adjoining	Co Dur	N'bland	Yorks	C'land W'land	Other	No of marr.	Migrant
<u>1754-1773</u>							22	0
male	1	4	0	0	0	0		
female	2	0	0	0	0	0		
<u>1774-1793</u>							27	1
male	3	3	0	0	0	2		
female	1	0	0	0	0	0		

11. Trimdon(a) The state of the registers

The records of this small parish are available from 1754. The number of marriages recorded is low (see Table 11.b.i below) and indeed they are sufficiently low as to suggest some under-recording, although it will be noted that during the years 1801 to 1811 the population of this parish was declining (as was the population of Castle Eden nearby) and it may be that decline or at least a stagnation of the population size had set in earlier. On the other hand, Hodgson¹ suggests that there was a slight increase in population here over the period 1674-1801 and thus it is not possible to discount under-recording altogether. Nevertheless the results obtained from the records of this parish demonstrate an underlying unity with that of other parishes in this central areas so that under-recording if it is present is likely to be a question of degree rather than distortion. For this reason these records are examined in a little more detail.

(b) 1754-1812

The results obtained from the marriage registers covering this period are tabulated below.

Table 11.b.i

	No of marriages	Migrant	Exog male (%)	Exog female (%)
1754-73	38	0	47.3	10.5
1774-93	31	0	38.7	3.2
1794-1812	34	0	35.2	2.9

Unlike the figures from Kelloe (Table 8.c.i) the above figures reflect a gradual decline in the rates of exogamy and there is a marked contrast in

the rates as between the sexes. The geographical distribution of the marriage horizons can be best illustrated in the following format.

Table 11.b.ii

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
<u>1754-1773</u>						
male	5	10	0	1	1	0
female	1	3	0	0	0	0
<u>1774-1793</u>						
male	2	9	0	0	1	0
female	1	0	0	0	0	0
<u>1794-1812</u>						
male	5	6	0	1	0	0
female	1	0	0	0	0	0

The above table (Table 11.b.ii) suggests a conventional picture of short range mobility from within the county with only five spouses during these years coming from outside the county. In addition to the adjoining parishes (of which there are three, namely Kelloe, Bishop Middleham and Sedgfield) it is the parish of Sedgfield with its market town which perhaps understandably accounts for 15 of the exogamous spouses in these three periods. It will be seen later that this is in contrast to the results obtained from the annotated registers. Again, it is worth noting that according to these records (and with the exception of the period 1754-1773) the exogamous female spouses came exclusively from parishes adjoining Trimdon.

(c) 1795-1812

In this period there are 31 marriages and the rates of exogamy do not differ significantly with the rates obtained for the years 1794-1812. They are: 35.4% (for males) and 3.2% (for females).

With the exception of the one male from Northumberland (1794) then in this period the geographic distribution of the marriage horizons is not otherwise disturbed. Nothing in these records therefore prepares one for the results obtained when the marriage registers are annotated with the baptismal registers for 1798-1812.

The numbers involved are small: only 15 marriages reappear subsequently in the baptismal registers. There are no endogamous marriages. Six of the marriages have an exogamous spouse whilst the remaining nine marriages are migrant. That there is a difference in the marriage horizons of these six exogamous marriages as against the marriage horizons disclosed in the marriage register is demonstrated in Table 11.c.i below. In particular none of the females appear to have come from a parish adjoining Trimdon. A more curious result is that Sedgefield is not represented at all in these six marriages. It is conceded however that the smallness of the numbers concerned makes it impracticable to go beyond such statements.

Table 11.c.i

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
male	2	1	0	0	1	0
female	0	2	0	0	0	0

The marriage registers disclosed no migrant marriages yet nine are shown from the baptismal register. In addition to the very fact of there being migrant marriages six of the males from these marriages come from the adjoining parish of Bishop Middleham (which is mentioned only once during the entire sequence of marriage registers) yet only one spouse (male) came from Sedgefield (which appeared, it was pointed out, 15 times in the marriage registers).

By contrast all the female spouses of these nine marriages come from parishes which do not adjoin Trimdon and indeed six of the females come from the south of the county (or south of it: Croft, Yorkshire). In other words the migrant marriages apparently disclose quite different marriage horizons within the county for males and for females. It will be recalled that a similar conclusion obtained in the consideration of the registers of Kelloe. It is an area which would evidently merit specific further study.

The parishes comprised within the migrant marriages are detailed below:

Table 11.c.ii

male spouse : parish	female spouse : parish
Bishop Middleham	Auckland, Croft (Yorks), Stranton, Wallsend, Sunderland, Stockton
Stranton	Greatham
Houghton le Spring	Stainton le Street
Sedgefield	Grindon

12. Merrington(a) The state of the registers

The parishes from within the central region and selected for this study were, as a group unsatisfactory with regard to the years 1795-1812 and the annotation of the marriage registers of those years with the baptismal registers of 1798-1812. The parish of Merrington was thus added to the group precisely because annotation was possible although the earlier records were not considered.

(b) 1795-1812

In this period there are 125 marriages, none of which appear to have been migrant on the evidence of the marriage registers alone. Of these marriages 39 (31.2%) have an exogamous male spouse and 7 (5.6%) have an exogamous female spouse. The exogamous marriages can be examined as follows:

Table 12.b.i

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
male	15	17	0	2	3	2
female	3	4	0	0	0	0

This is a picture that is not unfamiliar and thus seems suspect, and indeed it changes markedly when one considers the 60 marriages which appear subsequently in the baptismal registers of 1798-1812. First 22 of those 60 marriages are shown to be migrant marriages. Of the remaining 38 marriages 17 (44.7%) have an exogamous male spouse and 10 (26.3%) have an exogamous female spouse. The patterns of these exogamous marriage horizons should be mentioned before considering the migrant marriages:

Table 12.b.ii

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
male	5	9	0	0	3	0
female	0	7	0	0	3	0

The numbers here are small yet nevertheless it does seem surprising that no female spouse came from an adjoining parish within this period and, in contrast six spouses came from Yorkshire. If there is some slight movement northwards however there appears to be no movement southwards from Northumberland. It will be recalled however that in the unannotated registers of Kelloe (Table 8.c.ii) movement from Northumberland was much less than the small but reasonably constant movement from Yorkshire. On the other hand neither in the case of Kelloe nor of Bishop Middleham do the unannotated registers suggest that females come from Yorkshire or Northumberland. In this respect they correspond with the unannotated registers of Merrington.

The migrant marriages identified from the baptismal registers confirm a point already made in relation to such marriages in the parish of Kelloe: that migrant marriage horizons are not localised (in contrast to the marriage horizons identified from the marriage registers of Kelloe alone). What is perhaps surprising is that the Merrington marriage registers do not prepare one to expect such a number of migrant marriages (33.3%) of the total. The relationship of the respective horizons comprised within these 22 marriages can be illustrated as follows:

Table 12.b.iii

→ female spouses ↓ male spouses	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	N'land	C'land/ W'land	Yorks	Other
Parish adjoining	0	2	0	0	2	0
Co Durham	2	7	2	0	0	0
N'land	0	1	0	0	0	0
C/W'land	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yorks	0	4	0	0	0	0
Other	0	1	0	0	0	1

The above figures support those derived from the registers of Kelloe (Table 8.4.i) with one exception. In Merrington there is no geographic divide of County Durham as between the two sexes.

The annotated registers enable one to arrive at an indicator of exogamy during the period 1795-1812. The technique has been outlined previously, and for Merrington the rates of male and of female exogamy are respectively 43.3% and 14.5%. These are higher than the figures obtained from the marriage register, and, taken in conjunction with the evidence from Kelloe, suggest that mobility of males within these central parishes was greater than that enjoyed by the females. Indeed more females entered Merrington as partners in a migrant marriage than as the exogamous spouse in an exogamous marriage.

(c) Occupation at time of marriage

In none of the marriage registers comprised within this study is the occupation of the male spouse consistently or convincingly given. A short run of such detail which occurs for example at Kelloe between June 1701 and April 1704 (22 entries) has the air of idiosyncratic classification or em-

bellishment. It is reasonable therefore to say that occupation at time of marriage is not given in these registers. Occupation at the time of baptism during 1798 to 1812 is however given, and in most parishes it is given for all baptisms. There are difficulties with such data which go beyond this study but briefly those difficulties may be identified as: (a) uncertainty of knowing whether the occupation recorded at the baptism of an issue would be (were the occupation recorded) the same at the time of the marriage, and (b) the precise meaning intended by the use of the terms employed both within the individual parish and within the county generally. As to the problem associated with meaning two examples will suffice. First the term labourer and husbandman often appear to be interchangeable although not all embracing. Secondly there are a host of trades connected with the mines: banksman, blacksmith, mason, smelter for example which imply gradations of status which are now either lost or obscure. Certainly these baptismal registers provide an opportunity to relate marriage horizons to occupation and status but such a study would require greater concentration upon the baptismal registers themselves than was intended in this study. Nevertheless the data from the Merrington baptismal register relating to the 60 issue the marriage of whose parents appears in the marriage register is given below.

Table 12.c.i

Occupation of male spouse	Endog. marriage	Migrant marriage	Exogamous marriage	
			male	female
Labourer	0	8	8	4
Farmer	2	5	3	3
Shoe/Boot Maker	3	0	3	0
Miner	0	1	0	0
Banksman	0	0	1	0
Schoolmaster	1	0	0	0
Cabinet maker	0	1	0	0
Groom	0	1	0	0
Soldier	1	0	0	0
Papermaker	0	1	1	1
Mason	0	1	0	0
Officer of Excise	0	1	0	0
Butcher	1	0	0	0
Blacksmith	1	0	0	0
Hat manufacturer	0	1	0	0
Innkeeper	0	1	0	0
Carpenter	1	1	0	0
Hind	0	0	1	0
Weaver/tailor	1	0	0	1

Note: In one case the occupation of the male spouse was not given.

Lacking any comparison with the marriage registers and involving such small numbers it is difficult here to do more than tabulate the results (whilst remarking upon the surprisingly high number of migrant or exogamous marriages where the male spouse is described on the baptism of the first issue as "farmer", and the absence of marriages by local labourers) as an indicator of the depth of information that is available to further study.

13. The coastal parishes : a brief introduction

The four parishes comprised within this part of the study are spread along the central and southern coastline of County Durham. At the southern end they abutt the parish of Hartlepool with its port and ancient maritime connections. To the north these parishes abutt the parish of Bishop Wearmouth and the burgeoning economic activity centred on the River Wear. As the nineteenth century progressed three of these four parishes, namely Seaham, Dalton le Dale and Easington would be altered out of all recognition, not least by the construction of Seaham Harbour.¹

During the time covered by this study however these parishes were agricultural parishes lying between what might be called maritime parishes. According to Hodgson² the parishes on the south eastern coast of Durham had experienced a decline in population up to 1801 and the census figures indicate that in the case of Dalton the decline was still continuing after that date whereas Seaham and Easington had by then begun to reverse the trend and to expand. Hart appears to have been unaffected by the decline and is an example of a medium sized stable community.

The following table illustrates that with the exception of the last two parishes it is geography which determines their association here and that these four parishes represent four diverse communities in their individual relation of geographical size to population size.

	Area (acres)	1801	1811
Easington	27048	1888	2120
Hart	14658	1092	1124
Seaham	5834	422	494
Dalton le Dale	8878	370	362

14. Easington

(a) The state of the registers

The registers begin in 1676, but it is not until December 1679 that parish names are specified; thereafter there is reasonably steady recording of this detail but there are years nevertheless that appear to have been a scrappy compilation (1784, for example). The most convenient start date for this parish is 1694 which gives a remarkably long sequence of records to consider. It will be seen at once in Table 14.b.i that questions of text apart the number of events recorded is disturbing. The most charitable explanation is that from the early eighteenth century the population in the parish was either stagnant or, very gradually in decline. Indeed that there was a decline in population is suggested by Hodgson¹ - although not explained. On the other hand the totals in the census of 1801 and in that of 1811 suggest that during this time the population was increasing: a circumstance not evident from the registers (compare the number of marriages in 1774-93 with the number celebrated in 1794-1812). There are, therefore, indicators of if not under registration at least erratic registration but there is no evidence to suggest that this invalidates the conclusions to be derived from the data available.

(b) 1694-1812

This long sequence of records is best considered by reference to the following table.

Table 14.b.i.

	Parish adjoining	Co Dur	C'land/ W'land	N'land	Yorks	Other	No of marr.	Migr.
<u>1694-1713</u>							138	0
male	9	18	0	1	1	0		
female	2	2	0	0	0	0		
<u>1714-1733</u>							150	1
male	10	16	0	1	0	0		
female	3	2	0	0	0	0		
<u>1734-1753</u>							138	3
male	7	23	0	1	1	0		
female	1	3	0	1	0	0		
<u>1754-1773</u>							120	0
male	4	25	0	1	3	1		
female	0	1	0	0	0	0		
<u>1774-1793</u>							128	0
male	8	15	0	0	1	0		
female	2	3	0	0	0	0		
<u>1794-1812</u>							109	0
male	7	30	0	1	2	0		
female	4	0	0	0	0	0		

There are a number of points that can be made about these results. First it will be observed that the parishes adjoining Easington account for a very few number of the spouses of either sex in comparison with parishes elsewhere in County Durham. It is worth while to consider this aspect in more detail and to do this the records must be divided into two periods 1694-1733 and 1734-1812. In the former period the relationship between the two groups is less extreme than the relationship they bear to one another in the latter period.

In the first period there are 24 marriages with one spouse from a parish adjoining Easington and 38 marriages where one spouse comes from elsewhere in the county. There are six parishes adjoining Easington and they are listed below with the number of spouses coming from each parish shown against the parish name.

Table 14.b.ii

Monkheseldon	3	(4)
Castle Eden	2	(6)
Kelloe	1	(1)
Pittington	2	(3)
Houghton le Spring	11	(14)
Dalton le Dale	5	(5)

The figures in brackets indicate the number of spouses coming from each parish in the second period (i.e. 1734-1812). The relative importance in this regard of the large and populous parish of Houghton is made clear here yet overall the impression is of what may be described as static marriage horizons (that is the relationship between the two parishes comprised in the marriage horizon remains constant through time and does not intensify). Part of the explanation here may lie in the fact that two of the adjoining parishes namely Pittington and Kelloe would have had more dynamic marriage horizons pulling away from Easington. In the case of Pittington they are assumed to be towards Durham itself whilst in the case of Kelloe they are towards the western and southern agricultural parishes clustered round Sedgefield. This still requires an explanation for the low numbers from Houghton (the remaining three parishes were small and two - Dalton and Monkheseldon - had declining populations). Before dealing with Houghton it will be convenient to consider what was happening with other parishes elsewhere within the county.

One of the assumptions underlying this study is that the coastal parishes would have strongly defined marriage horizons with the centres of population on the Wear (Bishopwearmouth, Sunderland, Monkwearmouth) and with the port of Hartlepool. In the first period (1694-1733) the Wearside parishes accounted for six of the exogamous spouses whilst Hartlepool accounts for only two spouses.

In the second period (1734-1812) there are (as shown in Table 14.b.ii above) 34 marriages where one spouse came from an adjoining parish. By contrast there are 99 marriages where one spouse comes from elsewhere in County Durham. Hartlepool now accounts for three spouses (as against two in the previous period), the Wearside parishes however account for 30 spouses - indeed Sunderland alone (mentioned only once in the previous period) now accounts for 23 spouses. It is suggested therefore that the vigour of the rapidly expanding parishes on the Wear² had the effect of first increasing the number of potential exogamous spouses adjacent to but not adjoining the boundaries of the parish of Easington. Secondly, these Wearside parishes would also tend to draw away from Easington potential exogamous spouses from parishes adjoining but to the north. The two such northern parishes are Dalton and Houghton le Spring.

Dalton appears for much of this period to have been in decline³ although the census totals of 1801 and 1811 suggest that the population had at least by then stabilised. Houghton on the other hand had a large and expanding population. The evidence suggests that the marriageable populations of these two parishes were more likely to find spouses in north Durham than in the settled coastal and agricultural community which comprised pre-industrial Easington.

The second point that should be made about Table 14.b.i is that once again the marriage registers disclose very few migrant marriages. There are just four recorded: for completeness they are set out below.

Table 14.b.iii

male spouse : parish	female spouse : parish
Sunderland	Yarm
Sunderland	Sunderland
Sherburn (Pittington)	St Oswalds (Durham)
St Giles (Durham)	Stockton

(c) 1795-1812

There are 98 marriages in this period shown in the marriage register none of which are migrant. The geographical distribution of the marriage horizons is not significantly changed from that of 1794-1812 (see Table 14.b.i). Two exogamous males (one from Sunderland the other from Hart and one exogamous female (from Castle Eden) are 'lost'. The rates of exogamy are 38.7% (for the males) and 3.0% (for the females).

If the marriage registers for this period are annotated with the baptismal registers of 1798-1812 a different picture emerges. Of the 98 marriages which appear in the marriage register 45 appear subsequently in the baptismal register. These latter registers indicate that 18 of the marriages are migrant leaving 27 potentially exogamous or endogamous. In fact only 22.2% are endogamous, whilst in contrast 22.2% have an exogamous female spouse and 55.5% have a male exogamous spouse.

Once again therefore it is the exogamous females who, along with migrant marriages, are significantly under recorded in the marriage registers.

On the other hand the geographical distribution of the marriage horizons retains similarities with the marriage horizons identified in the marriage register.

Table 14.c.i

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
<u>1795-1812</u>						
male	7	28	0	1	2	0
female	3	0	0	0	0	0
<u>1795-1812*</u>						
male	1	11	1	1	1	0
female	3	3	0	0	0	0

* annotated marriages

Yet within this broad similarity there are changes, two of which may be mentioned. First in the unannotated registers the Wearside parishes (as previously defined) account for 19.5% of the exogamous partners. In the annotated registers the figure falls to 13.0%. Secondly, and even more dramatically the figures for Houghton le Spring fall from 17.0% in the unannotated registers to 5% in the annotated register. The significance of these two results, it is suggested, is that they demonstrate that it was residence at time of marriage that was being recorded at time of marriage and that both the Wearside parishes and Houghton le Spring had large numbers of immigrant families drawn in by the economic activity and energy of the early industrial revolution of north Durham. The marriageable issue of those immigrant families will have disclosed their place of nativity only on the baptism of their own issue.

The Easington marriage registers provide no suggestion as to the extent of the migrant marriages being solemnised within the parish. The annotated

registers point to a large number of migrant marriages (40% of the total number of marriages) involving wide ranging marriage horizons - indeed only one migrant marriage involved both spouses coming from parishes adjoining Easington. For ease of reference the migrant marriages are first listed in the following table.

Table 14.c.ii

male spouse : parish	female spouse : parish
Houghton le Spring	Houghton le Spr. Ch-le-St
Boldon	Kirk Merrington
Washington	Houghton le Spring
Whitworth	Lanchester
Castle Eden	Ovingham (N'bland)
Stranton	Dalton
Guisborough	Bishop Wearmouth
Yorkshire	Elton
Stockton	Kelloe
Romaldkirk	Bishop Auckland
Hart	Pittington
Scotland	Kelloe
Northumberland	Houghton le Spring
Berwick on Tweed	Monkheseldon
Monkheseldon	Hart
Greatham	Gainford

The above list can now be considered in the following format.

Table 14.c.iii

→ female spouses ↓ male spouses Parish adjoining	Parish adjoining	Co Dur	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
Parish adjoining	1	1	0	2	0	0
Co Durham	4	4	0	0	0	0
C'land/W'land	0	0	0	0	0	0
N'bland	2	0	0	0	0	0
Yorks	0	3	0	0	0	0
Other	1	0	0	0	0	0

Here it becomes clear that whilst there is only one marriage in which both spouses came from an adjoining parish, nevertheless there was a strong link between those parishes and others in County Durham just as there was between parishes generally within the county: the pattern of distribution here is, for example, not dissimilar to that of Merrington (Table 12.b.iii).

(d) Occupation at time of marriage

The marriage registers provide very little information about occupation at time of marriage. There is what appears to be a quite random scattering of this type of information during the years 1701 and 1714 but it amounts to 17 entries. As with Merrington it is not until the baptismal registers of 1798-1812 that this information is given in anything like a consistent record. The limitations of what is recorded have already been outlined with the results from the Merrington records. In two instances the occupation of the father is not provided but the following table gives an analysis of the occupation of the male parent with reference to the marriage type.

Table 14.c.iv

Occupation	Endog. marr.	Migr. marr.	Exog. marr.	
			male	female
Labourer	0	9	5	1
Farmer	1	4	2	2
Weaver	2	0	0	0
Cabinet maker	0	1	0	0
Joiner	0	0	1	0
Mason	0	0	1	0
Blacksmith	1	1	1	1
Mariner	0	1	0	0
Butcher	0	1	1	0
Shoemaker	1	0	0	2
Common brewer	0	1	0	0
Coachman	0	0	1	0
Clerk	0	0	1	0
Schoolmaster	0	0	1	0

The point has to be made that it would be wrong to ascribe to a spouse an identical social standing with a spouse in another parish merely because the officiating clergy used identical descriptive terms when compiling their individual registers. It will be seen however that the above results serve as a useful comparison with those recorded at Merrington (Table 12.c.i) and in particular with regard to the occupations of farmer and of labourer, (if only because they appear to be the most numerous).

15. Hart(a) The state of the registers

The registers begin in 1577 and although completed in what appears to have been a very thorough manner no details of parishes are given until 1676. From that year however until 1686 publication of the banns and marriage are intermixed in such a way that it is difficult to say what an entry relates to; after 1686 the registers seem reasonably reliable although the period 1733-1734 is certainly suspect and, as will be seen from Table 15.b.i below the numbers of marriages recorded in the period 1754-1773 seems too low to be regarded as reliable.

In 1721 there were two marriages recorded of "travellers", no details were given and hence both marriages were discounted for the purposes of this study.

(b) 1694-1812

Before considering this set of marriage records in some detail it is perhaps worth while to tabulate the totals of the marriages concerned as follows:

Table 15.b.i

	No. of marriages	Migrant
1694-1713	97	7
1714-1733	98	4
1734-1753	83	11
1754-1773	62	6
1774-1793	111	0
1794-1812	106	2

The point has already been made that the middle set of records, 1754-1773 seem in context to be suspect and it may be that similar remarks apply to the records of 1734-1753. In addition the erratic number of migrant marriages recorded is another ground upon which to question the compilation of the registers generally.

Before tabulating the detail from the marriage registers four points should be made regarding the exclusion of four exogamous spouses. First a male spouse described "of ye Nightingale" (1694-1713) was ignored for the purposes of this study. Secondly in the same sequence of records a female spouse who was shown as coming from outside Hart but not from which parish was likewise ignored. In the registers for 1774-1793 are two further males discounted from this study: one described as a soldier "in the North Royal Lincolnshire militia" and one where the place or parish referred to remains unidentified.

Table 15.b.ii

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
<u>1694-1713</u>						
male	6	11	0	0	0	0
female	2	3	0	0	0	0
<u>1714-1733</u>						
male	8	20	0	0	2	0
female	2	8	0	0	0	0
<u>1734-1753</u>						
male	7	4	0	0	0	0
female	0	1	0	0	0	0
<u>1754-1773</u>						
male	7	9	0	1	2	0
female	1	3	0	0	1	0
<u>1774-1793</u>						
male	17	15	0	0	3	2
female	6	1	0	0	0	0
<u>1794-1812</u>						
male	9	19	0	1	9	0
female	2	4	0	0	0	0

With the exception of Yorkshire there is little movement from other counties into Hart, by contrast the contribution of Yorkshire particularly in the period 1794-1812 is marked, although it will be noted that the movement from Yorkshire is almost exclusively amongst male spouses. This movement northwards is part of a northwards drift from the parishes of south Durham and abutting the River Tees. Of the 98 spouses coming from County Durham but not from a parish adjoining Hart 35 come from that cluster of small parishes bounded to the north by the parishes of Stranton, Elwick Hall and Sedgefield and to the south by the River Tees. It is the parish of Billingham which accounts for nearly half of this total: 13 males and two females.

The relationship of Hart to the two centres of shipping activity: Wearmouth and Hartlepool produces a result that in the case of Wearmouth is not dissimilar to that of Billingham. Hartlepool is a parish adjoining Hart and over the 119 years now reviewed nine male spouses and six female spouses came from Hartlepool. It is not clear why there should be proportionately more females coming from Hartlepool but it may be attributable to the fact that a port would be more likely to draw males into its parish bounds and for the immigrant males to find a spouse within the urban communities within the parish. Until detailed work is undertaken on the records of Hartlepool such a possible explanation remains speculative and, to some extent not supported by the results obtained from Hart in relation to Wearmouth. Fourteen male spouses and one female spouse came from Wearmouth. It may be however that these figures illustrate nothing more than that females tended to travel shorter distances. It would also be interesting to have an indication of the occupation of the male spouses moving southwards from Wearmouth: were they mariners or dock workers or were they more generally spread throughout the trades? This information

however is not available.

The migrant marriages are relatively high during certain of the six blocks of years. What is surprising about them is the high number of migrant spouses coming from the same parish, as illustrated in the following table.

Table 15.b.iii

→ female ↓ male	Billingham	Dalton	Hartlepool	Castle Eden	St Giles Durham	Other
Billingham	1	0	0	0	0	0
Dalton	1	6	0	0	0	1
Hartlepool	0	0	10	1	0	3
Castle Eden	0	0	0	1	0	0
St Giles (Durham)	0	0	0	0	2	0
Other	0	0	2	0	0	1

The numbers from Dalton are difficult to account for but it may be that a convenience motive applies to the Hartlepool spouses marrying in Hart. It has to be said however that the pattern of migrant marriages illustrated above bears little relation to the pattern which emerges from the annotated marriage registers, and it is to these that attention is turned.

(c) 1795-1812

In this period there are 100 marriages, 37% of which have an exogamous male spouse and 5% having a female exogamous spouse. There is one migrant marriage: both spouses came from Hartlepool. Only 39 of the marriages appear subsequently in the baptismal registers but of these (according to the baptismal register) 54.2% have an exogamous male spouse whilst 33.3% have an exogamous female spouse. The distribution is conveniently illustrated in

the following table.

Table 15.c.i

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
<u>1795-1812</u>						
male	9	19	0	1	8	0
female	2	3	0	0	0	0
<u>1795-1812*</u>						
male	2	9	0	1	1	0
female	1	6	0	0	0	1

* annotated marriages

It will be seen that whilst for both sexes there is a change in the relationship between Hart and parishes adjoining and parishes elsewhere in County Durham; and that this change is most marked in the totals for the female spouses yet nevertheless the broad picture remains. Marriage horizons are confined to the county with only slight contact with adjoining counties and indeed for the females none (save for one exception where the female evidently was a member of a family who moved from Long Preston in Lancashire and whose (presumably) brother married in Hart a woman from Yorkshire. The brother it might be noted was described at the time of his marriage as a husbandman).

Once again however it is the wide ranging extent of the migrant marriages that causes the surprise: 38.4% of the marriages cross referenced in the baptismal register appear there as migrant. Moreover unlike the pattern of migrant marriages at Hart examined previously in not one case is there a migrant marriage between spouses of the same parish nor does Hartlepool feature at all. Both sexes appear to have come from widely

scattered areas as the following table shows.

Table 15.c.ii

male spouse : parish	female spouse : parish
Witton Gilbert	Whorlton (Yorks)
Castle Eden	Billingham
Aycliffe	Chester le Street
Gainford	Lanchester
Newton-in-Cleveland (Yorks)	Aycliffe
Bolton-penny (Yorks)	Castle Eden
Sedgefield	Houghton le Spring
Stranton	Lanchester
Bishop Middleham	Denton (Northumberland)
Easington	Billingham
Monkheseldon	Lyth (Yorks)
Whorlton (Yorks)	Bishopwearmouth
Aycliffe	Sedgefield
Long Preston (Lancs)	Wilton (Yorks)
Monkheseldon	Greatham

It is curious that in the case of migrant marriages more females come from the north of the county than males and also that an equal number of males and females come from Yorkshire. As in the case of the woman from Long Preston mentioned above it may be that in many of these cases the migrant is not an individual but rather is part of a family group moving into the county in search of work. The migrant marriages can be considered in the following format to identify the broad geographic trends of the marriage horizons involved.

Table 15.c.iii

→ female spouse ↓ male spouse	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
Parish adjoining	0	3	0	0	1	0
Co Durham	1	4	0	1	1	0
C'land/W'land	0	0	0	0	0	0
N'bland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yorks	0	3	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	1	0

This table emphasises that the main links in the marriage horizons do not involve parishes adjoining Hart but involved instead parishes within the county. It will also be noted that more males than females come from adjoining parishes when these are involved.

(d) Occupation at time of marriage

No indication of occupation is given in the marriage registers of Hart until December 1806 when the occupation of the male spouse is given until the end of 1812. Equally the occupation of the father on the baptism of the issue is given in the baptismal registers of 1798-1812.

First therefore it is possible to check the detail in the marriage register with that appearing subsequently in the baptismal register, for those marriages celebrated after December 1806 and appearing subsequently in the baptismal register. In fact only 12 marriages are involved, and in one case the occupation is not given in the marriage register. Of the remaining 11 marriages then in only three cases does the description remain the same in both registers. The three trades concerned are: farmer, butcher and husbandman. Most of the descriptions that change might be

expected or most probably represent the same trade. In three cases "servant" became "hind" (married servants not living in); in two cases "servant" became "husbandman" which might be a little surprising were it not for the fact that in one case "husbandman" becomes "labourer". There is probably little difference between describing oneself in one register as a "blacksmith" and in a later register as "journeyman blacksmith", but the entrepreneur who marries as a "pitowner" yet as a father is described as a "pig jobber" points a warning against a too rigid acceptance of the baptismal register information. Nevertheless the information regarding occupation that can be gleaned for 38 male spouses from the baptismal registers is presented below.

Table 15.d.i

Occupation	Endog. marr.	Migr. marr.	Exog. marr.	
			male	female
Labourer	0	3	2	0
Husbandman	1	6	5	2
Farmer	1	1	2	2
Blacksmith (and journeyman blacksmith)	1	1	0	0
Innkeeper	0	1	0	0
Miller	0	0	0	1
Servant	0	1	0	0
Tailor	0	0	1	0
Butcher	0	1	1	1
Hind	0	0	2	1
Pig jobber	0	0	0	1

It remains the case that those trades associated with the land: labourer, husbandman and farmer in particular, far from being settled occupations, at least within an area delineated by a parish, appear to

be occupations which resulted instead in considerable movement if not at marriage then at least during the selection of a spouse. In contrast it is perhaps not surprising that the miller and the pig jobber were endogamous males as they were presumably men of account and property within the parish and in marrying outside the parish they may have been seeking to increase their standing within it.

16. Dalton le Dale

(a) The state of the registers

The registers of this parish are available back to 1653 and from the first there is an indication of exogamy when it occurs. There is however a break in all records between 1657 and 1664 but thereafter the registers are complete. According to Hodgson¹ the population of the parish contracted between 1674 and 1801 and this is confirmed by the decline in recorded marriages (a circumstance which might otherwise attract the criticism of under registration) and indeed by the 1801 and 1811 census returns.

Overall (apart from the years 1808 to 1812) the registers give the impression of reasonably careful compilation and more detailed work forming part of this study and dealt with below² suggests that from the earliest times the registers of this parish can support some attempt at partial family re-constitution.

(b) 1674-1812

The disappointment felt in regard to this parish is the evident decline in the population: whatever the coherence of the text this aspect alone limits the usefulness of the records. The decline is illustrated below.

Table 16.b.i

	No. of marriages	Migrant
1674-1693	32	0
1694-1713	40	2
1714-1733	52	5
1734-1753	51	3
1754-1773	41	0
1774-1793	44	0
1794-1812	35	0

It is difficult to know whether patterns of marriage horizons which emerge in response to such a decline can be relevant to communities which are expanding; indeed it will be seen later that out of 33 marriages that were available for annotation with the baptismal registers of 1798-1812 only eight actually appear within those registers.

The following table illustrates the broad geographic spread of the marriage horizons during the 139 years being considered. It will be seen that with the exception of three marriages in these years all the exogamous spouses came from within County Durham.

Table 16.b.ii

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
<u>1674-93</u>						
male	1	5	0	0	0	0
female	0	1	0	0	0	0
<u>1694-1713</u>						
male	4	5	0	0	0	0
female	0	1	0	0	0	0
<u>1714-33</u>						
male	6	8	0	1	0	0
female	2	1	0	0	0	0
<u>1734-53</u>						
male	5	12	0	0	0	0
female	2	3	0	0	0	0
<u>1754-73</u>						
male	2	10	0	1	0	0
female	1	2	0	0	0	0
<u>1774-93</u>						
male	2	11	0	0	0	0
female	2	1	0	0	0	0
<u>1794-1812</u>						
male	4	9	0	0	1	0
female	2	4	0	0	0	0

Out of the 73 spouses who come from a parish within the county of Durham but not adjoining Dalton 20 males and four females come from the parishes of Sunderland, Bishopwearmouth and Monkwearmouth. At first glance this may seem as if more males came from north Durham into the parish, but in relation to the total number of exogamous spouses of the sex concerned (i.e. 20 out of 60 for the males and four out of 12 for the females) the frequency of this marriage horizon is similar for both sexes.

The two other parishes which have strongly developed marriage horizons with Dalton are Easington and Houghton le Spring. Both abutt Dalton: the former to the south the latter to the north west. In the case of Easington out of a total number of 39 spouses 13 male and three female come from that parish; in other words 13 out of 30 males and three out of nine females. The number of marriages involved would not have been suggested by considering the figures for Easington (Table 14.b.ii and text thereto) but this will be explained by the fact that the Easington males will have moved into Dalton and married in that parish and it seems that for some females this must have happened too. It does seem therefore that some sort of selective barrier (certainly not complete: consider Hart) is identified with the northern boundary of the parish of Easington. This is made all the more a stark boundary when one considers that during the entire period in review there is only one exogamous spouse (a female) from Hartlepool.

Houghton le Spring accounts for 12 male spouses and one female spouse during this time. These figures are most probably attributable to the fact that Houghton was an expanding community, being part of the north Durham early industrial revolution. It would be interesting to compare

the movement out of Houghton and into Dalton but this could only be done by drawing in the parish of Houghton le Spring to this study. This has not been done as by the very fact of the decline in the population of Dalton it is reasonable to assume that movement into the parish certainly for long-term settlement was restricted.

It will have already been noted that Dalton had strongly developed marriage horizons with the Wearmouth parishes and that in contrast there appears to have been practically no contact with Hartlepool. What remains inexplicable however is the relatively high number of migrant marriages celebrated in Hart where both spouses came from Dalton (see Table 15.b.iii).

The migrant marriages disclosed in the marriage register are curious for two reasons. First, as with Hart many of the marriages are between spouses of the same parish and secondly some considerable distances are implied in some of the marriages (although all the parishes are within County Durham), for example a marriage between a man from Sunderland and a woman from Stanhope. It may be however that some of these marriages were between servants of local gentry. Certainly some of the entries relating to marriages between 1731 and May 1738 indicate marriages of servants of Dalton Park House and it is possible that the servants had been brought into the parish from a much wider area as their employers presumably had property scattered across the county.

Table 16.b.iii

→ female ↓ male	Ch le St	Kelloe	W'mouth	Houghton le Spr.	St Nicholas (Durham)	Other
Chester le St	0	1	0	0	0	0
Kelloe	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wearmouth	0	0	3	0	0	1
Houghton le Sp.	0	0	0	1	1	0
St Nicholas (Durham)	0	0	0	0	2	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0

Over time of course the numbers of migrant marriages decline yet this is something which should not be expected given the decline in the population of the parish and, further is not supported once one turns to the annotated registers. It should be remembered however that after the Hardwicke Marriage Act 1753 at least one spouse had to have as a "usual place or abode" the parish in which the marriage was to take place.

(c) 1795-1812

There are 33 marriages within this period, 13 of which have an exogamous male spouse and a further six having an exogamous female spouse. There are no migrant marriages. The fragility of the community is illustrated by the fact that only eight of those marriages appear subsequently in the baptismal registers of 1798-1812. Moreover seven of those marriages are migrant and of the 14 parishes involved only two (in both cases Easington) adjoin Dalton. There are no exogamous males but one exogamous female. The figures are so small that little more can be usefully said of the results but they are tabulated below for completeness.

Table 16.c.i

<u>Exogamous marriage</u>		<u>Migrant marriage</u>		<u>Occupation</u>
<u>male (parish)</u>	<u>female (parish)</u>	<u>male (parish)</u>	<u>female (parish)</u>	<u>male</u>
0	Heddon on the Wall			Farmer
		Brancepeth	Witton le Wear	Labourer
		Brancepeth	Easington	Shoe maker
		Kelloe	Monkwearmouth	Farmer
		St Andrews Auckland	Chester le St	Farmer
		Hamsterly	Co. Durham	Farmer
		Dublin	Bishop Auckland	Servant
		Chester le St	Easington	Husbandman

It should be noted that of the 13 exogamous male spouses only two are now shown to be part of a migrant marriage. In addition only one exogamous female spouse is now shown to be part of a migrant marriage. It is questionable however in the light of the above results how far one can safely assume that those marriages which prima facie remain exogamous were in fact exogamous and were not migrant.

17. Seaham(a) The state of the registers

For this study a transcript was used.¹ The transcribed registers begin in 1652 with remarkably detailed entries for that time, for example the first entry records the marriage of John Morgan of Seaham, widower, and Anne Litster of "Trimden in the parish of Kelloe" (sic). There are some gaps: 1693-95 and 1712-15 for example, but the gaps appear to be attributable to the fact that there were no events to record rather than any under registration. The quality of the entries overall is such that they can be related from the earliest times one to another in the different registers. Problems certainly arise from the registers but paucity of detail or lax compilation are not evident problems here.

(b) 1654-1812

The problem with these registers is that from 1658 to 1747 there are no less than 50 migrant marriages recorded. These marriages are not regular in occurrence. In 1658 there were seven (leaving one other marriage that year). On the other hand between 1667 and 1675 there was only one migrant marriage recorded. The totals of all marriages within the 20 year blocks are as follows:

Table 17.b.i

	No. of marriages	Migrant
1654-73	70 ✓	27 ✓
1674-93	39 ✓	5 ✓
1694-1713	21 ✓	5 ✓
1714-33	41 ✓	6 ✓
1734-53	34 ✓	7 ✓
1754-73	23 ✓	0 ✓
1774-93	19 ✓	0 ✓
1794-1812	27 ✓	0 ✓

Even when the migrant marriages are discounted the resultant totals of marriages are sufficiently erratic to suggest that other migrant marriages remain undisclosed. Nevertheless the very high total for the period 1654-73 is quite exceptional and doubtless the explanation must lie in part in circumstances outside the parish and with which this study is not concerned.

It is clear however that a number of these migrant marriages were celebrated in Seaham for convenience of the parties or for other social reasons. Indeed there are instances of parents living outside the parish and not married at Seaham nevertheless baptising their issue at Seaham:

11.3.1690 Maria filia Thomae et Janae Surrat. Ryop.

The parishes concerned in these migrant marriages can be considered in the following table.

Table 17.b.ii

→ female	Bp Wearmouth	Houghton	Easington	S'land	Durham	Other
↓ male						
Bp Wearmouth	15	1	1	1	1	1
Houghton	1	3	0	0	1	1
Easington	0	0	2	0	0	0
Sunderland	0	0	2	3	0	2
Durham	0	0	0	0	3	0
Other	4	1	0	1	0	6

Many of the spouses from Bishop Wearmouth come from identified communities within that parish, particularly Ryhope which is only two miles away from Seaham and the proximity to Seaham may therefore be part of the explanation why Bishop Wearmouth features so prominently. Other migrant marriages between spouses from widely separated parishes (such as Monkheseldon and

Sunderland or Sunderland and Easington or Hartlepool and Bishopwearmouth) have most probably been celebrated at Seaham as representing a 'compromise parish' at a time when travel was more time consuming than it is now. That is not to say that all the migrant marriages can be discounted in this way; some must represent 'genuine' migrant marriages of people working in Seaham parish, for example a marriage between parties from Stranton and Hartlepool or Teesdale and Teesdale. The problem is that it is difficult to establish which migrant marriage is "true" and which is one of social or geographic convenience. One way to determine this point is to discover how many of these marriages result in an issue baptised at Seaham. The results of such a study give rise to wider questions than appear here and are dealt with in a separate chapter.²

If the migrant marriages are laid aside and attention is focused upon the exogamous marriages the following table can be prepared.

Table 17.b.iii

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	C'land/ W'land	N'bland	Yorks	Other
<u>1654-73</u>						
male	5	1	0	0	0	0
female	3	6	0	1	0	0
<u>1674-93</u>						
male	4	1	0	0	1	0 ^(a)
female	1	6	0	0	1	0 ^(b)
<u>1694-1713</u>						
male	1	1	0	0	0	0 ^(c)
female	1	2	0	1	0	0
<u>1714-1733</u>						
male	7	10	0	0	0	0
female	2	0	0	0	0	0
<u>1734-53</u>						
male	5	2	0	0	0	0
female	1	0	0	0	0	0
<u>1754-73</u>						
male	2	2	0	0	0	0
female	0	3	0	0	0	0
<u>1774-93</u>						
male	3	4	0	0	1	0
female	1	0	0	0	0	0
<u>1794-1812</u>						
male	5	4	0	0	0	0
female	2	1	0	0	0	0

Note: (a) a male spouse described merely as "a mariner" has been excluded;

(b) one female spouse is said to have come from "Fenkallo"; this has not been identified and the spouse has been excluded;

(c) one male spouse is said to have come from "Stgston"; this has not been identified and the spouse has been excluded.

The above table demonstrates what little contact there was, apparently, outside the county of Durham. Indeed as the female spouse from Yorkshire (Brompton) married the then Rector of Seaham (who described himself as "of Seaham") and only two years later one William Cayley of Brompton, "gent."

married Hannah Wood of Seaham it can be said that the above figures to some extent over-inflate the contact with Yorkshire.

Such a tenuous link with Yorkshire accords well with the fact that well over half of the exogamous spouses come from north Durham. The following table illustrates this point.

Table 17.b.iv

Parish	Exogamous spouses 1654-1812
Bishop Wearmouth	19 (female : 9)
Sunderland	15 (female : 6)
Houghton le Spring	17 (female : 4)
Dalton	6 (female : 0)
Easington	6 (female : 4)
Hart	1 (female : 0)
Hartlepool	0

Of 85 exogamous spouses from County Durham 51 come from the first three parishes all part of north Durham. There is little to suggest however that there is contact with Northumberland which is curious because it is at least likely that the influx into north Durham following the expansion of the economy there came not only from the south but equally well from the north. Certainly Table 17.b.iii indicates that the marriage horizons were more limited here than elsewhere, for example Hart, because if the marriages involving exogamous spouses from adjoining parishes are added to the total of exogamous spouses from Sunderland - (58 spouses in all) it means that 28 spouses alone during the years 1654-1812 came from elsewhere within the county. In a real sense these communities on the edge of north Durham appear to have been more isolated than communities further away.

(c) 1795-1812

There are 27 marriages in this period (none were celebrated in 1794) and no migrant marriages are recorded. Very much like Dalton however few of the marriages appear in the subsequent baptismal registers of 1798-1812. There are eight and in one of those cases the place of residence of the male exogamous spouse is not given so that in effect only seven marriages can be considered. There are three migrant marriages.

Table 17.c.i

male spouse : parish	female spouse : parish
Sherburn (Durham)	Brampton (N'bland)
Haltwhistle (N'bland)	Ellingham (N'bland)
Sherburn (Durham)	Witton Gilbert (Durham)

These migrant marriages appear to suggest that there was in fact greater contact with Northumberland than appears from the marriage registers alone. On the other hand the exogamous marriages, of which there are three have the exogamous spouse (in all cases male) coming from three parishes within the county, two of which being in north Durham, Bishopwearmouth, Chester-le-Street and Kelloe. The fact that no females appear as exogamous serves well to remind one that from such a small sample it is unsafe to draw any firm conclusions.

18. Post Nuptial Mobility at Seaham and Dalton Before 1812

The incidence of migrant marriages recorded at Seaham prior to 1748 raises the question whether the partners of these marriages had any subsequent connection with the parish. This aspect of this study began by concentrating on those 50 marriages identified as migrant during the period 1652 to 1748. It must be accepted that not all the migrant marriages were in fact identified when the register was compiled but this study was only concerned with those 50 marriages.

A subsequent connection with the parish of Seaham was established for the purposes of this study when a migrant marriage gave rise to an issue subsequently baptised at Seaham. For this purpose a period of 20 years after the date of the celebration of each marriage was searched in the baptismal register in an attempt to trace issue. Of those 50 marriages only one gives rise to a baptism:

- 19.10.1658 George Fell of Ryhope married Mary Huntlie of Burden;
- son, John Fell born 9.8.1659 and baptised at Seaham;
- daughter, Jane Fell born 6.1.1662 and baptised at Seaham.

It might be noted in passing that only Jane Fell appears thereafter in the records:

- 20.6.1683 Thomas Roxby of Ryhope married Jane Fell of Ryhope.

A comparison can now be made with the endogamous marriages. For this purpose only the marriages which were identified in the register as being between parties of Seaham or places within the parish were comprised within the study group. 54 marriages are so identified as being endogamous. It has to be recognised that of those marriages a certain proportion (estimated here at about 8%) will remain childless, yet even so, in theory, about 50 marriages should each give rise to at least one baptised issue. In practice

of course this theoretical target figure does not take account of still births¹ and some degree of other under registration. To compensate a little for these two detractors a period of 20 years from the date of each marriage was again searched in the baptismal registers to see if an issue (assumed to be and hereinafterwards called the "first issue") had been baptised. 36 marriages gave rise to a first issue baptised within that period. Whilst the contrast with the migrant marriages seems complete it was decided to advance the study a little further by considering those 36 first issue.

A period of 20 years after the baptism of each first issue was searched in the burial register: 11 of the first issue were there found leaving 25 apparently surviving first issue. A further period of 20 years beginning with the twentieth anniversary of the baptism (or birth if given in the register) of each of these surviving first issue was then searched in the marriage registers again to try and determine which ones married within the parish. Five children appeared in the marriage register, and of these four were males and four (including the one female) married exogamous spouses. In only two of these five marriages were issue baptised within Seaham (in both cases the mother was incidentally an exogamous spouse). Whilst the subsequent marriage of one of those baptised issue can be traced no issue of that marriage were subsequently baptised at Seaham. This can be illustrated in the following table (Table 18.i, line 1). A similar exercise was then undertaken for the second issue of the 36 marriages which had baptised their first issue and the results are set out below (Table 18.i, line 2). Thereafter the exercise was repeated for the first and second issue of exogamous marriages celebrated between 1652 and 1748 (Table 18.i, lines 3 and 4).

Table 18.i

	A ⁽¹⁾	B ⁽²⁾	C ⁽³⁾	D ⁽⁴⁾	E ⁽⁵⁾	D ⁽⁶⁾	G ⁽⁷⁾	H ⁽⁸⁾
1.	54	36	11	25	5	2	1	0
2.		20	5	15	3	2	0	0
3.	62	25	8	17	4	1	0	0
4.		15	3	12	2	0	0	0

- Note:
- (1) Column A indicates number of marriages in study group.
 - (2) Column B indicates number of baptised issue.
 - (3) Column C indicates number of baptised issue subsequently appearing in burial register.
 - (4) Column D indicates number of surviving issue.
 - (5) Column E indicates number of issue marrying.
 - (6) Column F indicates number of marriages in column E which give rise to baptised issue.
 - (7) Column G indicates the number of baptised issue from column E who appear subsequently in the marriage register.
 - (8) Column H indicates the number of marriages in column G which give rise to baptised issue.

Before considering one further point which arises with regard to the figures at Seaham it is worthwhile to compare the figures above (Table 18.i) with those that can be derived from a similar study of the records of Dalton (a parish which adjoins Seaham to the south). Two points should be noted however. First in this instance all endogamous marriages were included. Secondly whilst the records of Dalton go back to 1653 there is a gap in the marriage registers between 1657 and 1668 and rather than 1652 a start date of 1668 had therefore to be taken.

The following table shows the results derived from the registers of Dalton thus considered; the columns in the table correspond to those in Table 18.i.

Table 18.ii

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		
1.	103	64	24	40	6	2	1	0)	endogamous
2.		47	15	32	7	1	1	0)	
3.	53	10	4	6	0	0	0	0)	exogamous
4.		7	4	3	0	0	0	0)	

The lack of continuity of contact at Dalton is more marked than at Seaham yet in both cases it would appear at least from the parish registers that within two generations the vast majority of families have removed from the parish. In the absence of further and wider study it is not possible to say where these rootless families from these two parishes went but it seems reasonable to surmise that they helped to fuel the increase in population in the economically active parishes of north Durham.

The data from the Seaham registers which was required to prepare Table 18.i above was also used to examine whether it was more usual for female spouses to baptise their issue at their former home parish rather than that of their husbands (then being the parish where the matrimonial home was located). At an elementary level it might be assumed that in all cases where an issue is baptised within two years of the date of the marriage it is in fact the first issue; using that test then three issue regarded as first issue for the purposes of the earlier study should properly be regarded as second issue rather than first. However to examine this aspect in more detail it is possible to divide the marriages into three groups and compare the times that elapse after the date of each marriage and the baptism of the first issue. One would be entitled to expect that the patterns would be similar here between endogamous marriages and exogamous marriages where the male spouse was the exogamous partner. On the other hand where the female spouse was the exogamous spouse baptism of the first issue might be

expected to take place in the wife's former parish and hence the pattern of these marriages would be different as what was being baptised at Seaham was a second issue. It is possible that all the issue of a particular marriage were baptised in the wife's former parish in which case the marriage would not be caught by this analysis, and it would be an interesting though laborious study to check the baptismal register of the former parish of each exogamous female spouse to see whether this actually occurred. This study however concentrated upon what is a relatively small sample of marriages, indeed it is a sufficiently small sample that it can do little more than outline apparent trends, although it has to be said that the results do maintain a certain coherence.

Table 18.iii

(a) Endogamous spouses

Months after marriage	1-8	8½	9	10	11	12	over 12
Number of issue baptised	<u>7</u>	—	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>54.4%</u>
Aggregated (%)	20		25.7	37.1	42.8	45.6	

(b) (i) Exogamous spouses; male exogamous

Months after marriage	1-8	8½	9	10	11	12	over 12
Number of issue baptised	<u>2</u>	—	<u>1</u>	—	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>54.5%</u>
Aggregated (%)	18		27		36	45	

(b) (ii) Exogamous spouses; female exogamous

Months after marriage	1-8	8½	9	10	11	12	over 12
Number of issue baptised	<u>2</u>	—	—	—	<u>3</u>	—	<u>64.5%</u>
Aggregated (%)	14.2				35.5		

The above table does suggest that there are differences between the marriages with exogamous female spouses and other marriages but it does not suggest that baptism within the former parish of the wife was particularly deeply ingrained within the social fabric of the community. Nevertheless



it is possible to approach the problem a little differently by comparing the exogamous marriages which gave rise to two baptised issue at Seaham, as in the following table.

Table 18.iv

<u>Spouse</u>	1st baptism		2nd baptism		Total No. of Spouses	1st child	2nd child
	Son	Daughter	Son	Daughter			
exogamous male	5	6	2	3	35	11	5
exogamous female	5	9	5	5	24	14	10

It will be observed that the fastest fall away of second baptisms is where the female spouse came from Seaham (and this is without any marked differentiation between the sex of the child). Presumably therefore the first child was baptised in Seaham (the wife's former parish) but thereafter the issue would tend to be baptised in the husband's parish - in which it is assumed the matrimonial home would have been established. By contrast the figure of 14 for first child baptisms where the female is the exogamous spouse is most probably inflated with some second issue. Such spouses might baptise their first issue in their former home parish but thereafter the issue would be baptised in the parish in which the matrimonial home was established (it is conjectured here Seaham). This would account for the more gradual decline in the numbers of first and second issue baptisms. These two small sampling exercises carried out to illuminate the question of where baptisms were carried out can not be conclusive but they do emphasise that further and detailed study of this area particularly using the more detailed baptismal registers of 1798-1812 (which were not used in these two exercises) could provide a valuable insight into social traditions within the county of Durham.

19. Conclusion

(a) Introduction

In dealing with parish registers it is essential to be clear what the data derived from the registers is actually measuring. It has been frequently and correctly recognised¹ that such data will generally² illuminate two aspects of mobility:

(1) a spatial context of mobility (both horizontally and vertically) and (2) the degree of mobility (the rate of endogamy as opposed to the rate of exogamy³).

The registers do not however provide conclusive data regarding the outflow of population - that is migration out of the parish, although this can be indicated at least in outline by a full or partial family reconstitution project (as for example was undertaken in this study for the parishes of Seaham and Dalton). In addition the registers can only provide a spatial context not the spatial context of mobility. They can not for example reveal the detail of seasonal or short step mobility that was common in agricultural communities.⁴ Indeed Laslett⁵ has suggested that mobility at or on marriage accounted for only a small part of the mobility centred upon the parish of Clayworth. Other research⁶ has suggested that "migration was not the exception but the social and demographic norm ... in early modern England" and the marriage register can only indirectly touch upon this ceaseless tramping after work. Nevertheless this part of the marriage register data has been taken in many studies to exemplify the outline of a mobility network in relation to the parish in question.⁷

The degree of mobility identified by the marriage registers is again subject to limitations⁸ but this element of the data available is nevertheless the one most generally used in studies of parish register material.⁹

It remains therefore to be considered whether this present study disturbs the underlying broad acceptance of the information generally available in the marriage registers. To do this it is perhaps easiest to concentrate first upon the degree of mobility disclosed in the marriage registers.

(b) The degree of mobility

The results of this study impinge upon questions revolving around the degree of mobility in two ways. First with regard to under representation and secondly in respect of migrant marriages.

Under representation is intended here to mean that the marriage registers fail to disclose the degree of exogamous marriages as identified by annotating those registers by the subsequent baptismal registers. Were this under representation spread evenly as it were between the two sexes there would be less cause for concern, but this is not the case as the following table demonstrates.

Table 19.b.i

Parish	% exog. females 1795-1812	% exog. females 1795-1812 annotated
Stanhope	1.5 (11)	12.8 (77)
Muggleswick	2.8 (1)	25.0 (2)
Hunstonworth	2.3 (1)	41.6 (5)
Middleton	3.9 (11)	15.0 (28)
Kelloe	19.4 (23)	37.5 (3)
Bp. Middleham	7.1 (7)	-
Castle Eden	-	-
Trimdon	3.2 (1)	33.0 (2)
Merrington	5.6 (7)	26.3 (10)
Easington	3.0 (3)	22.2 (6)
Hart	5.0 (5)	33.3 (8)
Dalton	18.1 (6)	100.0 (1)
Seaham	11.1 (3)	0

Note: the numbers in brackets indicate the actual totals

A similar table below reflecting the rates of male exogamy shows that there is a closer correlation between the two sets of figures here than in the table above.

Table 19.b.ii

Parish	% exog. males 1795-1812	% exog. males 1795-1812 annotated
Stanhope	8.6 (62)	13.6 (82)
Muggleswick	51.4 (18)	50.0 (4)
Hunstonworth	25.5 (11)	41.6 (5)
Middleton	13.3 (37)	8.6 (16)
Kelloe	27.9 (33)	25.0 (2)
Bp. Middleham	38.4 (35)	-
Castle Eden	-	-
Trimdon	35.4 (11)	66.0 (4)
Merrington	31.2 (39)	44.7 (17)
Easington	38.7 (38)	55.5 (15)
Hart	37.0 (37)	54.2 (13)
Dalton	39.3 (13)	0
Seaham	33.3 (9)	37.5 (3)

Note: the numbers in brackets indicate actual totals.

Dobson and Roberts in their study of Northumberland parishes¹⁰ produce the following percentage figures for exogamy within the parishes comprised in their study for the period 1762-1811. The information was based upon the marriage registers alone.

Warkworth	25.6)		3.8)	
Felton	28.1)		3.6)	
Rothbury	21.6)	male	3.2)	female
Alwinton	22.9)		11.1)	

Whilst the figures for the males does not correspond closely with the figures in Table 19.b.ii above those for the females do and it now seems possible that these figures for Northumberland exhibit the same features as the Durham registers and that the figures should be higher. An exception

may be made in the case of Alwinton but there Dobson and Roberts draw attention to the fact that one of the main lines of communication between England and Scotland (the former Roman road of Watling Street) runs through the parish although there appears to have been little contact with the parishes over the border.

Research on other records would independently suggest that such wide ranging differences between exogamous males and females and reflected in the Durham registers were suspect. In particular Clark's work¹¹ in studying the biographical detail of witnesses in certain diocesan courts (not Durham) between 1660-1730 demonstrates that women were more likely to move within their home county than their male contemporaries and only slightly less likely to move beyond their home county than them. The females generally moved shorter distances however than the males, possibly reflecting a move into a neighbouring parish after marriage; to this point we must return later.

This study has also demonstrated that migrant marriages were more frequent than might have been believed from the marriage registers alone.

Clearly part of the explanation for the scarcity of migrant marriages recorded in the marriage registers after 1753 is the effect of the Hardwick Marriage Act and this effect is twofold. First at least one of the intending spouses had to be resident in the parish where the marriage was to be celebrated. Secondly it is certain that the marriage registers after the passing of the Act were not intended to record parish of nativity of each spouse but residence at time of marriage. Hence, if the subsequent baptismal register indicates that one spouse came from Dublin whilst the other came from Bishop Auckland yet they married at Dalton it is perhaps unrealistic to claim that this represents a precise marriage horizon. More significantly

in the case being considered the Dublin born spouse represented himself as of Houghton le Spring whilst his consort claimed to be of Dalton at the time of the marriage. The marriage horizon should be seen as Houghton le Spring and Dalton therefore whilst the points on the map marking Dublin and Bishop Auckland must represent the entry points along a short step mobility continuum. Short step mobility in the sense used by Redford¹² where the long-term objective was a gradual townward drift is not demonstrated here, rather it is more likely to have been the sort of inter-generational drift recorded in some of the Yorkshire registers.¹³ Indeed it is reasonable to suppose that within a parish the migrant marriages recorded in the marriage register will more often indicate nearby parishes (i.e. the place of residence at the time of marriage) rather than more distant parishes (i.e. the parish of nativity) whilst the baptismal register will record the more dispersed places of nativity. This indeed appears to be the case (see for example Kelloe¹⁴) which supports the idea of steps on a continuum concept rather than regarding the original entry points on the continuum as being the marriage horizon. The exception to this concept however are those migrant marriages celebrated in another parish for the convenience of the parties (Ryhope's link with Seaham comes to mind here¹⁵).

It has to be conceded however that whilst there is some indication of short step mobility to be derived from these registers it remains incomplete. Nevertheless failure to take into account these migrant marriages will distort any assessment of the degree of mobility and indeed of any spatial context of mobility. The following table records the position with regard to migrant marriages.

Table 19.b.iii

Parish	Migrant 1795-1812	Migrant 1795-1812 annotated
Stanhope	0	19 (618)
Muggleswick	0	4 (12)
Hunstonworth	0	6 (12)
Middleton	0	4 (186)
Kelloe	10	34 (42)
Bp. Middleham	3	-
Castle Eden	-	-
Trimdon	0	9 (15)
Merrington	0	60 (22)
Easington	0	18 (45)
Hart	1	15 (39)
Dalton	0	7 (8)
Seaham	0	3 (8)

Note: the numbers in brackets indicate the number of annotated marriages

The far wider ranging mobility disclosed in the rates of exogamy and in the migrant marriages obtained when the marriage registers are annotated is confirmed by the additional study made of the registers of Seaham and Dalton for the period 1652-1748. It will be recalled that within the space of two generations none of the families in the study group appeared to have a connection with the parish of their ancestors. This is not new. Laslett reports that,

The turnover of population in these settled agricultural, traditional communities was remarkably high. No less than 61.8 per cent of the people living at Clayworth in 1688 had not been there in 1676 and something like 50 per cent of those living in Cogenhoe in 1628 were not there in 1618. Most of the movement was clearly local and larger areas would show much less. In these two communities people were moving to and fro, society was changing, whole households were coming and going and both villages were in perpetual exchange with their neighbours.¹⁶

It is probable that in the case of Seaham and Dalton these "rootless families" were sucked into the Wearside parishes that were already experienc-

ing an early economic expansion. Yet in all studies of mobility based upon marriage records this shifting framework should be borne in mind. It would be interesting to undertake similar work to that undertaken at Seaham and Dalton in other parishes within the county but further away from north Durham: it might be noted in passing that the parish of Hart seems ripe for such a study.

Before moving away from the use of these registers to illuminate questions concerning the degree of mobility it has to be said that there is little data available in these records to enable comparisons to be made between social groups and their relative mobility. It is perhaps significant that Long and Maltby's study of this question in three West Riding parishes¹⁷ was based upon the detail of baptismal registers rather than the marriage registers themselves. Clark as has already been observed used diocesan court records and concluded that in the

....case of urban migrants....it was professional men - lawyers, clergy, physicians - who had travelled furthest (on average over 60 miles). Next came those claiming gentle status among them perhaps numerous pseudo-gentry and small landowners.....¹⁸

There are no urban migrants comprised within this present study but it should be noted that within the period 1662-1685 the evidence at Stanhope suggests that matrimonial alliances were contracted by the lesser gentry of that parish over a wider area than was the case apparently for the lower classes and moreover the lesser gentry appear less likely to contract an endogamous marriage. The sample here is however small, isolated and frozen in time. Further study to investigate this problem would have to deploy other records to supplement the marriage registers for example applications for marriage licences and a wide sample of the 1798-1812 baptismal records.

(c) A spatial context of mobility

The point has been made that the spatial dimension here is both horizontal (i.e. geographic) and vertical (i.e. social). The marriage registers provide insufficient evidence to make any conclusions about vertical mobility. Further, the data available in some of the baptismal registers provides no indication of the mother's father's occupation so that whilst the detail of occupation can be linked to questions of mobility of the former bridegroom it can not be used to explore questions of vertical mobility. Nevertheless it might be noted that Holderness¹⁹ in his study claims that "the vertical social mobility of rural society is outweighed by horizontal movements" and it is to these that we must now turn. Horizontal mobility of necessity raises a question faced by Long and Maltby²⁰ which is that the size of the Pennine parishes makes otiose comparisons based upon distances of five or ten miles. In Long and Maltby's case they were able to divide their upland parish into two parts but this was not possible in the case of the registers comprised within this study. Instead the wider concept of 'an adjoining parish' was used to facilitate comparison across the county.

It has been suggested that the size of the parish can be correlated to the rate of endogamy:

The correlation between the size of villages and the degree of endogamy within the parish is clearly shown in the Vallage..... At Rouvray (216 inhabitants) 31% of the marriages were endogamous..... At Mussey (511 inhabitants) 68% of the marriages were endogamous.²¹

Thus the smaller the community the lower the rate of endogamy because of the "density of their networks of kinship." The study material here is French and it would be surprising perhaps to find endogamy at 93% between 1661 and 1700 as it was at Roziers-sur-Loire. Nevertheless Constable²² detected such a broad correlation in her work on Pocklington

but concluded

...this is probably not a simple relationship and new models or new applications of models may be necessary to pursue this problem. Thus the irregularities noted in this study may have more significance than a local disturbance of a simple pattern and may be an indication of some other pattern.

The following table which compares the three largest parishes (in terms of population) comprised within this study with three of the smallest parishes (excluding Castle Eden and Dalton). If Flandrin is right the smaller the parish the greater the rate of exogamy.

Table 19.c.i

Parish	Exogamous males %		Exogamous females %	
	Marr. register	Ann. register	Marr. register	Ann. register
Stanhope	8.6	13.6	1.5	12.8
Middleton	13.3	8.6	3.9	15.0
Merrington	31.2	44.7	5.6	26.3
Hunstonworth	25.5	41.6	2.3	41.6
Trimdon	35.4	66.0	3.2	33.0
Muggleswick	51.4	50.0	2.8	25.0

There is clearly some correlation but Constable is right to draw attention to subtle variations which refute any concept of a simple relationship. Instead of attempting to devise models to fit the facts of the individual size of a parish and its rate of endogamy and exogamy it is probably more useful to consider Coleman's²³ concept of demographic patterns being the result of the circumstances of living; that the countryside is a series of diverse and competing centres of influence with the result that the influence of one single centre can be distorted by the influence of a collection of centres of which the single centre forms part.

At this conceptual level migration creates its own contour map and the results of this study support such a view. Two examples may be given.

First the Stanhope registers suggest that there is little contact northwards into the parish. Yet, the parish records of Middleton to the south of Stanhope suggest that there was a significant degree of movement into the parish from Stanhope.²⁴ Whether it is right to ascribe to the London (Quaker) Lead Company this asymmetrical reciprocal migration the fact remains that a spatial context of mobility of Stanhope has to take account of the migration into and indeed, out of the surrounding parishes. This corresponds to Millard's regional scale of interaction which (in contrast to a lack of directional bias at a local (i.e. under 20 kilometres) scale of interaction exhibited a strong directional bias. Within such a region each parish is in the centre of its own migrational network yet that network responds to and is part of the regional migrational contours.²⁵ Dobson and Roberts²⁶ for example point out that there was surprisingly little contact between Alwinton and Scottish parishes lying close to the border. At an immediate level this is demonstrably so but the specific influence of the border can only be assessed by considering the parishes on the Scottish side of the border.²⁷

The second example is the complex relationship between Dalton and the adjoining parish of Easington. Whilst Dalton became more closely identified with the Wearside parishes its relationship with the southern parish of Easington remained static, to judge from the Easington records, yet the contact expanded if one considers the records of Dalton. During the period 1674-1812 13 spouses out of 39 spouses from adjoining parishes to Dalton come from Easington. On the other hand during the period 1694-1812 out of 57 spouses from parishes adjoining Easington only ten came from Dalton.

Any spatial context of mobility must take into account the movement towards the conurbations.²⁸ This study certainly identified the influence of north Durham not only upon the parishes close to that region and comprised within that study but also, on the basis of the migrant marriages celebrated in those parishes, further afield in the county and Northumberland. Further study however might usefully avoid north Durham where the sheer scale of the population increase and the warnings given by Hodgson²⁹ about the reliability of the north Durham registers presents a prospect of unnecessary complication and instead the surrounding parishes of the larger market town: Bishop Auckland for example might present a neater subject for study.

Studies³⁰ have drawn attention to the fact that whilst the mobility of females might be greater than that of the males (and it will be noted that with the apparent exception of Middleton in Teesdale this has not been demonstrated in this study) yet the females tended to travel shorter distances. "When women did come from outside the parish they were more likely to come from the next nearest group than a more distant place."³¹ To examine this point the following table compares the numbers of male or female exogamous spouses coming from an adjoining parish with the total number of male or female exogamous spouses identified within the period 1795-1812 first in the marriage register and secondly in the annotated register.

Table 19.c.ii

Parish	1795-1812		1795-1812 (ann.)	
	male	female	male	female
Stanhope	23 (62)	5 (11)	34 (82)	47 (77)
Muggleswick	9 (18)	1 (1)	2 (4)	0 (2)
Hunstonworth	6 (15)	0 (1)	2 (5)	3 (5)
Middleton	27 (37)	9 (11)	13 (16)	20 (28)
Kelloe	7 (33)	10 (23)	0 (2)	0 (3)
Bp Middleham	14 (35)	1 (7)	no records	
Trimdon	5 (11)	1 (1)	2 (4)	0 (2)
Merrington	15 (39)	3 (7)	5 (17)	0 (10)
Easington	7 (38)	3 (3)	1 (15)	3 (6)
Hart	9 (37)	2 (5)	2 (13)	1 (8)
Dalton	4 (13)	2 (6)	0 (0)	0 (1)
Seaham	5 (9)	2 (3)	0 (3)	0 (0)

The above table demonstrates that whilst in general females appear to have had a narrower migrational range on a consideration of the marriage registers alone (and even here the general conclusion is by no means of universal application) the differences between the sexes of migrational distances can not be sustained once the registers are annotated.

This study has also identified some variation in the geographic patterns of mobility as between the sexes. At an early date at Stanhope (1662-1685) for example 42% of the exogamous females came from Northumberland whereas only 9% of the exogamous males did so. It would be unwise to press this point too far but certainly in the case of three other parishes on the annotation of the registers a similar variation is discernable. First in Middleton in Teesdale where out of 28 exogamous female spouses eight came from Cumberland or Westmoreland whereas only two out of 16 exogamous males came from those counties. Again, when the

marriage registers of Kelloe and Hart are annotated then in the case of migrant marriages more females than males come from north Durham (52% and 27% respectively at Kelloe, 33.3% and 6.6% at Hart). It is unlikely that a general model can be devised here to account for these results and they should perhaps be seen as an aspect of mobility for which explanations must be looked for locally.

In addition to determining the contours of mobility studies have also drawn attention to the fact that marriage distance increases generally through time.³² The following table indicates that the results of this study confirm previous studies in this regard. On the other hand tabulations such as the one that follows gloss over the fact that each parish will develop individually in this respect.³³ Further, it must be recognised that the cut off date of 1812 excludes those years in the nineteenth century when the increase in marriage distance became significantly enhanced and hence what is illustrated here is only a gradual increase over time.

Table 19.c.iii

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	N'bland	Yorks	C'land/ W'land	Other
<u>1674-93</u>						
Bp. Middleham	15	18	1			
Dalton	1	6				
Seaham	5	7		2		
<u>1694-1713</u>						
Bp. Middleham	12	9		1		
Easington	11	20	1	1		
Hart	8	14				
Dalton	4	6				
Seaham	2	3	1			

Table 19.c.iii (continued)

	Parish adjoining	Co Durham	N'bland	Yorks	C'land/ W'land	Other
<u>1714-33</u>						
Bp. Middleham	6	7		1		
Easington	13	18	1			
Hart	10	28		2		
Dalton	8	9	1			
Seaham	9	10				
<u>1734-53</u>						
Bp. Middleham	14	16		1		
Kelloe	15	16	1	2		
Easington	8	26	2	1		
Hart	7	5				
Dalton	7	15				
Seaham	6	2				
<u>1754-73</u>						
Stanhope	27	14	6	1		
Middleton	29	7	1	1	6	
Kelloe	9	14				
Bp. Middleham	16	22	2	2		
Trimdon	6	13	1	1		
Easington	4	26	1	3		
Hart	8	12	1	2		
Dalton	3	12	1			
Seaham	2	5				
<u>1773-93</u>						
Stanhope	21	25	12	3	1	2
Middleton	44	10		4	6	1
Kelloe	21	17		1	1	2
Bp. Middleham	10	18	3	2		
Trimdon	3	9		1		
Easington	10	18		1		
Hart	23	16		3		2
Dalton	4	12				
Seaham	4	4		1		
<u>1794-1812</u>						
Stanhope	32	26	11	3		3
Middleton	39	5	2	5	3	
Kelloe	25	29	1		3	
Bp. Middleham	15	21	2	3		1
Trimdon	6	6	1			
Easington	11	30	1	2		
Hart	11	23	1	9		
Dalton	6	13		1		
Seaham	7	5				

Note: The totals are of male and female spouses. The figures are derived

(d) The four assumptions

It is now necessary to review the results of this study within the framework of the four assumptions which together comprised the broad expectations informing this study.

The first underlying assumption was that the moorland (or upland) parishes would tend to be highly endogamous and that exogamy, when it occurred, would be directed broadly along the Pennines rather than westwards into central Durham.

It certainly appears to be the case that the two sprawling upland parishes of Stanhope and Middleton in Teesdale protected by their moorland vastness have the lowest rates of exogamy amongst the parishes studied. On the other hand the two small parishes to the north of Stanhope had rates of exogamy similar to the rates obtaining in the central and coastal parishes. What comes out clearly is that movement across the Pennines was not precluded although it is significant that in the case of Stanhope the movement southwards and westwards into the parish becomes evident when the registers are annotated. This strongly suggests that there was movement elsewhere into Durham from Northumberland and Cumberland and thereafter marriage horizons established with Stanhope. Indeed it is annotation which provides a framework for the directional basis here: working on the marriage registers alone the impression is of marriage horizons involving widely scattered parishes within the county.

The asymmetrical relationship between Stanhope and Middleton has already been explored³⁴ but it should be noted that whilst there clearly was movement across the Pennines yet in the case of Middleton in Teesdale the movement appears to have been selective.

In many ways Middleton represents the typical (and hence ironically atypical) upland parish. The marriage horizons are very well developed with the Pennine parishes to the north (Stanhope) and south (Romaldkirk) and with some movement up the Tees from Barnard Castle. Even after annotation however the rate of exogamy especially for the males is very low.³⁵ Indeed the number of migrant marriages is the second lowest whilst the number of annotated marriages is the second largest of the parishes comprised in this study.

The second assumption was that there would be high exogamy directed along a north-south axis in the central parishes. In fact exogamy was lower here than in the coastal parishes. The words 'lower' and 'high' imply some standard of comparison and it is instructive to look outside the studied parishes to do this and a convenient comparison can be made with the Yorkshire parishes featured in Constable's study of Pocklington,³⁶ comparing therefore the figures in Table 19.c.iv with the figures tabulated in Tables 19.b.i and b.ii.

Table 19.c.iv

Parish	Exogmy %	Period
Pocklington (males)	26	1798-1844
Pocklington (females)	3	1798-1844
Millington (males)	28	1798-1844
Millington (females)	10	1798-1844
Thornton (males)	23	1798-1844
Thornton (females)	2	1798-1844

On this comparison it can be said that the exogamy of the central parishes (and indeed of the coastal parishes of County Durham) as disclosed in the marriage registers is slightly higher than the rates obtaining in certain parts of Yorkshire. In these central parishes there is little

evidence of any north-south movement but instead the mobility is generally short range and confined within the bounds of County Durham. The demographic barrier of north Durham probably accounts for the scarcity of Northumberland spouses whilst it may be spouses from Yorkshire

tended to marry within the Durham parishes abutting the Tees (that is the study group was a little too central). The striking thing about these parishes however is the numbers of migrant marriages which are identified once the marriage registers are annotated, and in particular the wide ranging horizons implied. The central parishes evidently were comprised of a diverse and highly mobile population - a mobility which had begun for many prior to marriage.

The last two assumptions concern the coastal parishes and the model they gave rise to was one of strong links with the parish of Hartlepool and those parishes at the mouth of the Wear and of limited contact with the central parishes. The model however failed to take account of two facts which became clear as the study progressed. First, two of the coastal parishes studied were sufficiently small and gave internal evidence of demographic stagnation such that they were perhaps inevitably thrown into a closer relation with their adjoining parishes than might otherwise have been the case. This leads to the second point which is that the vibrant economy of the Wear had already begun to predominate in and to distort the relationships of the coastal parishes amongst themselves. By contrast there are few exogamous spouses shown to have come from Hartlepool and this applies to Hart which abutts Hartlepool just as much as to the other parishes. Indeed, Hart had clearer marriage horizons with the south Durham parishes bordering the Tees and with north Yorkshire - a circumstance which tends to confirm the point made earlier with regard to the centrality of the central

parishes. When the registers of all the coastal parishes are annotated with the baptismal registers they disclose significant numbers of migrant marriages with widely scattered parishes of nativity which suggests once more a highly mobile population in which marriage represented only one further step along a mobility continuum.

(e) Conclusion

The population of County Durham as represented by the parishes within this study was evidently mobile and intermixed: it is not clear how long such trends had been developing but it seems unnecessary to ascribe them to special factors or exclusively to economic activity along the Wear - although that clearly had a part to play. It seems that a model implying a settled and inbred pre-industrial society in County Durham is inappropriate. There was considerable mobility in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (and, where the records are available evidence of such mobility at earlier periods too). It may be therefore that the popular images of the markedly endogamous communities relate more to the communities of the later nineteenth century rather than the pre-industrial communities of the county.³⁷

If the marriage registers of the county have in this study been shown to be unreliable it is hoped that the scope of the short sequence of baptismal records of 1798-1812 has been made clear and that further studies will examine the rich source of data they provide.

Notes

Chapter 1 : Introduction

1. See for example:

D.E.C. Eversley (1957) "A survey of Population in an Area of Worcestershire From 1660 to 1850 on the basis of parish registers", Population Studies Vol.X, pp.253-79.

J.D. Chambers (1957) "The Vale of Trent 1670-1800 : A regional study of Economic Change", Economic History Review Supplement No.3.

C.F. Kuchemann, A.J. Boyce and G.A. Harrison (1967) "A demographic and genetic study of a group of Oxfordshire villages", Human Biology 39 pp.251-276.

T. Dobson and D.F. Roberts (1971) "Historical population movement and gene flow in Northumberland parishes". J Biosocial Science 3, pp.193-208.

M. Long and B. Maltby (1980) "Personal mobility in three West Riding parishes 1777-1812", L.P.S. 24, pp.13-25.

J. Millard (1982) "A new approach to the study of marriage horizons", L.P.S. 28, pp.10-31.

2. For a recent study see:

M.T. Smith and M.J. Purvis (1981) "Marital Mobility in Four Parishes of County Durham", Bulletin of the Durham County Local History Society No.28.

3. R.I. Hodgson (1978) "Demographic Trends in County Durham 1560-1801 : Data Sources and Preliminary Findings with particular reference to North Durham", University of Manchester School of Geography Research Paper No.5.

4. The text of the Order is published in J.C. Cox (1910) "The Parish Registers of England", pp.2-3.

5. B. Maltby "Easingwold Marriage Horizons", L.P.S. 2, pp.36-9.

6. The registers of Bishop Middleham are available on microfilm at the Durham County Record Office, reference EP/BM1, EP/BM2 et seq., the quote is extracted from reel EP/BM3.

7. D.E.C. Eversley (1966) "Population History and Local History" in An Introduction to English Historical Demography (edited by E.A.Wrigley (London 1966), p.64.

8. G.W. Oxley (1974) "Poor Relief in England and Wales 1601-1834" (David and Charles).

9. W.J. Sheils "Mobility and Registration in the North in the Late Eighteenth Century", L.P.S. 23, pp.41-4.

10. In the registers of the parish of Husthwaite near Thirsk, cited in W.J. Sheils op.cit.
11. B.A. Holderness (1970) "Personal mobility in some rural parishes of Yorkshire", Yorkshire Archaeological Journal Vol.42, pp.444-454.
12. T.J. Falla (1981) "Further material for Eighteenth-Century mobility" L.P.S. 26, pp.46-7.
13. The text of the letter and enclosures appears in a number of parish registers, e.g.: Hamsterley Durham Record Office reference EP/Ham 4 and Middleton in Teesdale Durham Record Office reference D/Ph 189.30.
14. T.J. Falla, op.cit., p.46.
15. Parish Register Act of 1812 52.Geo.III c146.
16. See post Chapter 19, Conclusion section (b).
17. D.S. Reid (1978) "The Durham Church Establishment: The Gentry and the Recusants 1570-1640", Bulletin of the Durham County Local History Society No.22.
18. R.A. Houston (1982) "Illiteracy in the Diocese of Durham 1663-89 and 1750-62 : The evidence of Marriage Bonds", Northern History Vol.XVIII.
19. D.E.C. Eversley (1966) op.cit., p.52.
20. The figures are cited by D.E.C. Eversley (1966) op.cit., p.52.
21. Fordyce (1855) History of Durham.
22. M. Edwards (1965) "John Wesley" in A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain (edited by R. Davies and G. Rupp) p.57.
23. M. Edwards (1965) op.cit., p.57.

Chapter 2 : The Upland Parishes : a brief introduction

1. J. Bailey (1810) Agriculture in Durham. (The report was written "for the consideration of the Board of Agriculture and Internal Improvement").
2. Fordyce (1855) History of Durham. An observation in his section on Stanhope.
3. Victoria County History Vol.2, p.262.

Chapter 3 : Stanhope

1. W.N. Darnell (1831) "The Correspondence of Isaac Basire, with Memoir" (London).
2. See post Chapter 19, Conclusion section (c).

3. G.W. Lasker, B. Chiarelli, M. Masali, F. Fedele and B.A. Kaplan (1972) "Degree of Human Genetic Isolation Measured by Isonymy and Marital Distances in Two Communities in an Italian Alpine Valley", Human Biology Vol.44, No.3, pp.351-360.
4. "Lead Mining and Smelting in Swaledale and Teesdale" Research Report No.2 of the Cleveland Industrial Archaeology Society.
5. P. Laslett (1965) The World We Have Lost, Methuen & Co.Ltd., second edition (1971), p.38.
6. See for example:
P. Styles (1963) "The Evolution of the Law of Settlement"
The University of Birmingham Historical Journal 9, No.1, pp.33-63.

Chapter 6 : Middleton in Teesdale

1. The transcription is that by Major L.M. Kenyon-Fuller, 1978.
2. "Lead Mining and Smelting in Swaledale and Teesdale", Research Report No.2 of the Cleveland Industrial Archaeology Society.
3. P. Styles (1963) op.cit.
4. E.M. Hampson (1926-8) "Settlement and Removal in Cambridgeshire 1662-1834", p.281, Cambridge Historical Journal 2, No.3, pp.273-289.
5. P. Laslett (1965) op.cit., p.148. See also, post Chapter 18 Post Nuptial Mobility at Seaham and Dalton before 1812, Table 18.iii.
6. Evidence of contracts to marry can be found in England, see P. Laslett (1965), op.cit., pp.150-154.

Chapter 11 : Trimdon

1. R.I. Hodgson (1978) op.cit., Figure 6, page 19.

Chapter 13 : The Coastal Parishes : a brief introduction

1. R.W. Sturgess (1975) "Aristocrat in Business. The Third Marquis of Londonderry as Coalowner and Portbuilder", Durham County Local History Society.
2. R.I. Hodgson (1978) op.cit., Figure 6, page 19.

Chapter 14 : Easington

1. R.I. Hodgson (1978) op.cit., Figure 6, page 19 and page 20.
2. R.I. Hodgson (1978) op.cit., page 18.
3. R.I. Hodgson (1978) op.cit., Figure 6, page 19.

Chapter 16 : Dalton le Dale

1. R.I. Hodgson (1978) op.cit., Figure 6, page 19.
2. See post Chapter 18 Post Nuptial Mobility at Seaham and Dalton before 1812.

Chapter 17 : Seaham

1. The transcription is that by H.W. Wood B.A., published in 1910 for the Durham and Northumberland Parish Register Society.
2. See post Chapter 18 Post Nuptial Mobility at Seaham and Dalton before 1812.

Chapter 18 : Post Nuptial Mobility at Seaham and Dalton before 1812

1. Still births were generally not recorded in the burial register.

Chapter 19 : Conclusion

1. See for example:

C.F. Kuchemann, A.J. Boyce, G.A. Harrison (1967) op.cit.

H. Constable (1980) "Migration and Relatedness, A Study of Pocklington 1798-1844". Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis, University of Durham.

2. But short step mobility can sometimes be identified, see B.A. Holderness (1970) op.cit. (although the registers here are baptismal registers).
3. C.F. Kuchemann and G.A. Harrison (1972) "Historical Demography in Relation to Human Biology", p.9, DYN Vol.2, pp.1-22.
4. P. Clark (1979) "Migration in England during the late 17th and early 18th centuries" Past and Present No.83, pp.88-9.
5. P. Laslett (1977) "Family Life and Illicit Love in Earlier Generations", p.70.
6. P. Clark (1979), op.cit., p.72.
7. See ante Chapter 1 Introduction, note 1 and the authorities cited there.
8. See ante Chapter 1 Introduction section (b) and E.A. Wrigley (ed.) "An Introduction to English Historical Demography", London, 1966.
9. See ante, note 7 above.

10. T. Dobson and D.F. Roberts (1971) op.cit.
11. P. Clark (1979) op.cit., p.74.
12. A. Redford (1926) Labour Migration in England 1800-1850.
13. B.A. Holderness (1970) op.cit., and see also M. Long and B. Maltby (1980) op.cit.
14. See ante Chapter 8 Kelloe section (d).
15. See ante Chapter 18 Post Nuptial Mobility at Seaham and Dalton before 1812.
16. P. Laslett (1965) op.cit., p.156.
17. M. Long and B. Maltby (1980) op.cit.
18. P. Clark (1979) op.cit., pp.68-9.
19. B.A. Holderness (1970) op.cit., p.448.
20. M. Long and B. Maltby (1980) op.cit.
21. J-L. Flandrin (1976) "Families in Former Times", trans. Richard Southern, Cambridge University Press, 1979, p.34.
22. H. Constable (1980) op.cit.
23. D.A. Coleman (1977) "Marriage and Mobility in Britain - secular trends in a nationwide sample", Annals of Human Biology 4, pp.309-330.
24. The comparison is made in Table 6.b.ii, ante.
25. J. Millard (1982) op.cit.
26. T. Dobson and D.F. Roberts (1971) op.cit., at p.207.
27. For an indication of the complications in respect of the border see The Journal of the Northumberland and Durham Family History Society Vol.7, No.2, pp.34-5.
28. See for example:

D.A. Coleman (1977) op.cit.

B.A. Holderness (1970) op.cit., especially p.451 with regard to "the widely diffused" effects of industrial development.
29. R.I. Hodgson (1978) op.cit., at, inter alia, p.22.
30. For example P. Clark (1979) op.cit.
31. H. Constable (1980) op.cit.

32. For example M.T. Smith and M.J. Purvis (1981) op.cit.
33. This point is emphasised by Figure 2 in M.T. Smith and M.J. Purvis (1981) op.cit.
34. See ante Table 6.b.ii.
35. See ante Table 19.b.i.
36. H. Constable (1980) op.cit.
37. Yet perhaps markedly endogamous communities are a chimaera, see M. Sill (1979) "Mid-Nineteenth-Century Labour Mobility : The Case of the Coal Miners of Hetton-le-Hole, Co. Durham" L.P.S. 22.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Manuscript Sources

Stanhope	Durham County Record Office (DCRO) EP/St 1/1, 1/3, 1/4, 1/6, 1/10, 1/12, M42/358 and EP/SJ2
Muggleswick	DCRO M24/1
Hunstonworth	DCRO M20/2
Middleton in Teesdale	DCRO D/Ph 188/1 29, D/Ph 189/1 30 (Transcript: see below) and EP/egn 1/1
Kelloe	DCRO EP/Ke 1/1, 1/2, 1/3 and 1/12
Bishop Middleham	DCRO EP/BM 1/1, 1/2 and 1/3
Castle Eden	Transcript: see below
Trimdon	DCRO EP/Tr 1/1, 1/2 and 1/3
Merrington	DCRO M42/483, M42/475 and M42/150
Easington	DCRO EP/Ea 1/2, 1/3, 1/4 and 1/16
Hart	DCRO EP/Ha 1/1 and 1/2
Dalton le Dale	DCRO EP/DD 1/1, 1/2 and 1/7
Seaham	Transcript: see below

2. Transcripts

Middleton in Teesdale	Major L.M. Kenyon-Fuller (trans.) 1978, privately published (DCRO D/Ph 188/1 29 and 30).
Castle Eden	F.G.J. Robinson (trans.) 1914, published by the Durham and Northumberland Parish Register Society.
Seaham	H.W. Wood (trans.) 1910, published by the Durham and Northumberland Parish Register Society.

3. Text Books

- Bailey, J., Agriculture in Durham, 1810.
- Cox, J.C., The Parish Registers of England, London, 1910.
- Davies, R. and Rupp, G. (eds.) A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain, London, 1965.
- Flandrin, Jean-Louis, Families in Former Times (trans. Richard Southern), Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Gough, R., The History of Myddle, Caliban Books, 1979.
- Harrison, G.A. and Boyce, A.J., The Structure of Human Populations, Oxford University Press, 1972.

- Eversley, D.E.C., (1957) A survey of population in an area of Worcestershire from 1660 to 1850 on the basis of parish registers, *Population Studies* Vol,X, pp.253-79.
- Falla, T.J., (1981) Further material for eighteenth century mobility, *L.P.S.* 26, pp.46-7.
- Hampson, E.M., (1926-8), Settlement and Removal in Cambridgeshire 1662-1834, *Cambridge Historical Journal* 2, No.3, pp.273-289.
- Holderness, B.A., (1970) Personal mobility in some rural parishes of Yorkshire, *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, Vol.42, pp.444-454.
- Houston, R.A., (1982) Illiteracy in the Diocese of Durham 1663-89 and 1750-62: The evidence of Marriage Bonds, *Northern History*, Vol.XVIII.
- Kuchemann, C.F., Boyce, A.J. and Harrison, G.A. (1967), A demographic and genetic study of a group of Oxfordshire villages. *Human Biology* 39, pp.251-276.
- _____, and Harrison, G.A., (1972) Historical Demography in Relation to Human Biology, *Dyn.* Vol.2, pp.1-22.
- Lasker, G.W., Chiarelli, B., Masali, M., Fedele, F., Kaplan, B.A., (1972) Degree of Human Genetic Isolation Measured by Isonymy and Marital Distances in Two Communities in an Italian Alpine Valley, *Human Biology* Vol.44, No.3, pp.351-360.
- Long, M. and Maltby, B., (1971) Personal mobility in three West Riding parishes 1777-1812, *L.P.S.*, 24, pp.13-25.
- Maltby, B., *Easingwold Marriage Horizons*, *L.P.S.* 2, pp.36-9.
- Millard, J., (1982) A new approach to the study of marriage horizons, *L.P.S.* 28, pp.10-31.
- Reid, D.S., (1978) The Durham Church Establishment: The Gentry and the Recusants 1570-1640, *Bulletin of the Durham County Local History Society* No.22, pp.18-42.
- Sheils, W.J., *Mobility and Registration in the North in the Late Eighteenth Century*, *L.P.S.* 23, pp.41-44.
- Sill, M., (1979) Mid-Nineteenth Century Labour Mobility: The Case of the Coal Miners of Hetton le Hole, Co.Durham, *L.P.S.* 22, pp.44-50.
- Smith, M.T. and Purvis, M.J., (1981), Marital Mobility in Four Parishes of County Durham, *Bulletin of the Durham County Local History Society* No.28, pp.3-15.
- Styles, P., (1963) The Evolution of the Law of Settlement, *The University of Birmingham Historical Journal* 9, No.1, pp.33-63.
- Wrigley, E.A., A note on the life time mobility of married women in a parish population in the later eighteenth century, *L.P.S.*, 18, pp.22-29.

Laslett, P., *The World We have Lost*, Second edition, Methuen, 1971.

_____, *Family Life and Illicit Love in Earlier Generations*,
Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Oxley, G.W., *Poor Relief in England and Wales 1601-1834*, David and Charles,
1974.

Redford, A., *Labour Migration in England 1800-1850*, London, 1926.

Taylor, G., *The Problem of Poverty 1600-1834*, Longman, 1969.

Wrigley, E.A. (ed.) *An Introduction to English Historical Demography*,
London, 1966.

Note: Useful histories of the individual parishes are to be found in the
Victoria County History and *Fordyce's History of Durham* (1855).

4. Monographs

Chambers, J.D., (1957) *The Vale of Trent 1679-1800: A regional study of
Economic Change*, *Economic History Review Supplement*, No.3.

Sturgess, R.W., (1975) *Aristocrat in Business, The Third Marquis of London-
derry as Coalowner and Portbuilder*, *Durham County Local
History Society*.

Hodgson, R.I., (1978) *Demographic Trends in County Durham 1560-1801.
Data Sources and Preliminary Findings with particular reference
to North Durham*. University of Manchester School of Geography
Research Paper No.5.

_____, *Lead Mining and Smelting in Swaledale and Teesdale*. Research
Report No.2 of the *Cleveland Industrial Archaeology Society*.

5. Unpublished thesis

Constable, H., (1980) *Migration and Relatedness, A Study of Pocklington
1798-1844*, M.Sc. Thesis, University of Durham.

6. Periodical Articles

Clark, P., (1979) *Migration in England during the late 17th and early 18th
centuries*, *Past and Present* No.83, pp.57-90.

Coleman, D.A., (1977) *Marriage and Mobility in Britain - secular trends in
a nationwide sample*, *Annals of Human Biology* 4, pp.309-330.

Dobson, T., Roberts, D.F., (1971) *Historical population movement and gene
flow in Northumberland parishes*, *J. Biosocial Science* 3,
pp.193-208.

