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Abstract

From Ravenstein\(^1\) onwards, historians considering the causes of migration have stressed the importance of economic factors. Whilst work related issues have been shown to prompt the majority of migrations, the role of extended kin deserves further attention. Plakans and Wetherell found that, the ‘placing [of the] domestic group within a larger kin context’, seen as the next logical research step as long ago as the 1970s, was an issue that remained largely unaddressed in 2003.\(^2\) Here the impact of the extended family, on migration decisions and the likelihood of residential persistence, is investigated.

Evidence for community cohesion has been sought and kinship links have been investigated; both have been found to influence the residential patterns of individuals. This research has revealed that, whilst economics may provide the impetus for a move, cultural factors and the role of non-resident kin played a far greater part in the decision to migrate, or not, than most previous studies have acknowledged. It has been shown that, although kinship impacted upon both, reasons for emigration were very different from those for migration. The substantial role played by religious belief, not only as a motivation for the emigration of extended family groups, but also as an issue influencing the choice of destination, is a particular feature of the findings of this study.

In 1994, Pryce and Drake were ‘making a strong plea for the adoption of rigorous intellectual approaches in migration research’\(^3\) and the methods used here address this appeal. A technique of total reconstruction and longitudinal tracing has been employed in order to investigate the inhabitants of three small areas of North Devon.\(^4\) A comprehensive range of sources has been used and an in-depth examination of exemplar migrants and the residentially persistent, has allowed possible motivations to be scrutinised. In this way, the details of the structures and processes observed become

---

4. Bucks Mills, Bulkworthy and Conduit Street, Hatherleigh.
clearer. In the context of family reconstitution, Barry Reay wrote of ‘a dearth of such studies of nineteenth-century England’ and it is intended that the methods used in this research will facilitate a wider understanding of the factors that motivated migrants in Victorian rural England.

Whilst considering the influences of kin and community on migration patterns in the three study areas, the relative roles of other factors have been taken into account. It has been necessary to look at economic patterns and to investigate how, for example, farming and fishing, and any nineteenth century changes therein, affected the lives of the inhabitants. In an area where, and at a time when, non-conformist religion took a particular hold, the effect that the faith of these individuals had on their decisions to move, or stay put, has been assessed. Thus, the issues of faith, fish, farm and family are all borne in mind when studying the motivations for the migration decisions of the inhabitants of the three settlements.

---
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Introduction

Throughout history the basic human need for shelter has required individuals to make decisions about where they settle and whether or not they should remain in a locality. For those who do migrate, either from necessity or choice, the additional matter of selecting a destination is involved; a process in which personal preference may have only a very small part to play. As Shepherd writes, ‘migration involves a complicated web of networks of communications, kinship and family links, the circulation of information and, crucially, the need to make the decision whether to go or stay.’\(^1\) A bibliography, by Mills and Pearce,\(^2\) contains references to many migration studies. Some of these, such as Anderson’s influential work on migration and kinship in Preston, do consider the relevance of kin,\(^3\) however, this is rarely the main focus of the research. A great deal of further work has been carried out since this bibliography was published, yet the relevance of kinship links to migration decisions remains under-investigated. Whilst conceding that the role of the family was acknowledged in studies of emigration, Schürer pointed out that ‘in the large and growing literature on internal migration, kinship and family often go undiscussed.’\(^4\)

The traditional view of nineteenth century kinship is that industrialisation weakened kinship ties and that, beyond the nuclear domestic group, kin were largely unrecognised and were not looked to for support. This being the case, it was deemed that any consideration of the role of non-residential kin was unlikely to enhance understanding. ‘Since research has not demonstrated that there was a strong existential link between household kin and external kin, we continue to assume that the investigation of the

---

domestic group itself is sufficiently difficult and complex to stand on its own.\(^5\) Plakans and Wetherell continue,

‘the concreteness of the domestic group and its demonstrably superior documentary record are strong arguments for the relative un-importance of the larger kinship group. Genealogical reconstructions for the purposes of contextualisation constitute, in this view, a kind of optical illusion, which promise configurations and broad-based social support from kin ties that were never delivered in real life.’\(^6\)

They do however, go on to concur that major life events, such as migration, may be occasions when wider kin are acknowledged.

Wrightson, working on the village of Terling, commented that, ‘the nuclear family was very important indeed. Beyond it, there is little evidence that kinship was an important independent element in the structuring of social relations.’\(^7\) Revisionists, such as Zhao, cite demographic conditions, including factors such as fertility, as the reason for the demise of support by extended kin, particularly towards the end of the nineteenth century when the pool of available kin was declining.\(^8\) Bogue\(^9\) does recognise personal dependency as one of the migratory pull factors but this refers to dependents moving with a breadwinner, rather than the issue of individuals or family groups moving to be near kin with whom they do not share a home; this latter aspect is investigated in this research.

Reay describes the revisionists’ view that kin were unnecessary in the provision of social welfare because the community supplied this through the poor law. He expresses doubts about these interpretations and challenges the revisionists’ ‘assumptions on the inexorability and isolation of the nuclear household.’\(^10\) Reay felt that, ‘the dominance of family forms in the historical agenda, the concentration upon household

size and structure - as several critics have pointed out - has meant that relations between households, kinship links, have been neglected.\textsuperscript{11} In this research these deficiencies are compensated for, and the framework of the community, and the families within that community, have been fully examined in order to assess the impact of kin on residential decisions.

Whilst economics may provide the impetus for a move, it is important to consider the part played by wider kinship links in migration decisions. Clark and Souden describe a process ‘where individuals move, one after another, along a fairly determined path, taking advantage of established structures and contacts’\textsuperscript{12}. Shepherd also alludes to this process of chain migration at work in her\textsuperscript{13} of nine Cumbrian parishes. Extended family members constituted vital links in these information chains, making a study of kinship links crucial. In the same way, membership of a community, be it geographical or ideological, created pathways for encouraging, or discouraging, migration.

The motives of those who relocated are examined as part of this research, as is the extent to which the reasons for moving were the same for both emigrants and migrants. This distinction was important as the distances involved, the hazardous nature of the journey and the difficulty of maintaining links with home, were all factors that helped to make emigration a different experience from internal migration. Initially this study sought to focus upon the role that non-resident kin played in the decision to move, or not, and in the choice of destination. As a corollary, the relative significances of economic, social and religious factors needed to be assessed. As research progressed it became clear that, particularly in the case of emigration, cultural features of the sending and receiving settlements had a crucial part to play. The emphasis therefore shifted in order to give more prominence to the effects that the settlements had on those who left and also the impact of the movements that took place upon the study areas.

There are several issues that make this research stand out from the plethora of other migration studies; not least of which is the methodology. Halfacree and Boyle point out

\textsuperscript{11} Reay (1996a) p. 89.
\textsuperscript{12} Peter Clark and David Souden, \textit{Migration and Society in Early Modern England} (1987) p. 17.
that reasons for migration ‘bear some relation to the individual’s past and to their predicted and projected future.’\textsuperscript{14} By focussing down to look at all the inhabitants of very small settlements, and by the detailed researching of the life histories of every sample member, it is possible to better understand motivations for moving to, or from, a specific area; or indeed for failing to move. Pooley and Turnbull feel that ‘a perennial problem with [historical] migration studies is that few sources … provide full migration histories for individuals.’\textsuperscript{15} The research methods and case study approach adopted in this research help to address this issue. A technique of total reconstruction\textsuperscript{16} has been employed, using a comprehensive variety of sources. This involved researching the patriarchal and matriarchal kin, occupation, and residential changes of every inhabitant of the three study areas. Reconstruction, vital to an understanding of the processes of migration and residential persistence within the study areas, also necessitates tracing the occupancy of each dwelling and a consideration of land use and employment opportunities within the area.

Through reconstruction, a technique that will be justified more fully in Chapter 1, this research attempts to establish whether the in- and out-migrants had kinship links with any existing inhabitants of their receiving settlements. It is accepted that the presence of close kin does not necessarily suggest that the relatives provided encouragement or assistance; however, their absence will mean that there was no opportunity for such support networks to be used. Although efforts have been made to establish kinship networks of the widest kind, it is acknowledged that only close relationships\textsuperscript{17} can be expected to have had a positive influence on decisions to migrate, or remain as residents. It is unlikely that the inhabitants would have been aware of relationships beyond second cousinships, especially if the surnames were not the same.\textsuperscript{18}

Pooley and Whyte consider that ‘it is necessary for researchers to utilize and compare a

\textsuperscript{16} This technique is described in detail in Chapter 1.
\textsuperscript{17} Those of the first, second and third degree.
\textsuperscript{18} This issue is discussed further in Chapter 3.1.
much wider range of sources than has often been used in the past."\(^19\) The use of a comprehensive array of records, and linkages that result from meticulous genealogical research rather than computer reliant algorithms mean that the methods adopted here are much more exacting than those involved in most reconstitution studies. These have proved to be particularly significant when pursuing out-migrants and, by restricting the investigation to a small number of individuals and the use of exceptionally rigorous reconstruction techniques, 75·6\(^20\) of these have been traced, thus greatly enhancing the validity of these findings.

Notwithstanding work such as that of Brayshay and Pointon on migration in Plymouth,\(^21\) when compared to neighbouring Cornwall and Dorset,\(^22\) Devon in general and North Devon in particular is poorly served as regards migration studies. Only during the progress of this research have a group of family historians, with the help of the author, begun to establish the ‘North Devon Exodus’ database\(^23\) which, at this stage, merely lists individual emigrants and does not include any information concerning internal migration. In this regard then, the research undertaken here begins to fill a gap in the overall picture of migration and emigration in the south-west peninsula.

A micro-study of three small areas of North Devon\(^24\) has been carried out, in order to establish the impact of kinship on migration decisions and residential persistence. It is only by looking at those who remain, as well as migrants, that the influences on those who move can truly be assessed. As one aspect of this work was to investigate the extent to which the traditional rural-urban pattern of movement could be discerned, large urban districts were excluded from consideration as possible study areas. Three

---

\(^{19}\) Pooley & Whyte (1991) p. 12.
\(^{20}\) This is the overall percentage of those who disappear from the communities studied and who have been located in new areas or identified as having died. The breakdown by study area is as follows:- Bucks Mills 85·5%, Bulkworthy 69·5%, Conduit Street 76·2%.
\(^{22}\) For example the work begun by the Cornish Global Migration Programme in 1998 and that undertaken by those working on the Dorset migration database.
\(^{23}\) <http://genuki.cs.ncl.ac.uk/DEV/DevonMisc/NDevonExodus.html> accessed 12 May 2009. This project has recently been sponsored by the Bideford and District Community Archive Council.
\(^{24}\) Bucks Mills, Bulkworthy and Conduit Street, Hatherleigh. These communities are described in more detail in Chapter 2.2.
similar sized neighbourhoods were chosen in order to provide examples of representative nineteenth century North Devonshire localities that differed in function: a fishing village, an agricultural parish and a street in a small market town. All three of the settlements were affected, to a greater or lesser extent, by the upsurge of the Bible Christian movement in this part of the West Country and the influence of religious denomination on residential decisions was to become a key issue in this research.
Figure I.1 Map Showing the Location of the Three Study Areas
Table I.1 A Comparison of the Three Study Areas in 1841

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Native Born</th>
<th>% Born in Devon</th>
<th>% Employed In Agriculture</th>
<th>% Of Household Heads Related to another in the Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bucks Mills</td>
<td>64·4&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>98·4</td>
<td>45·7</td>
<td>66·7&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkworthy</td>
<td>46·4</td>
<td>94·4</td>
<td>51·1</td>
<td>52·6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit Street</td>
<td>51·3&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>15·2</td>
<td>62·9&lt;sup&gt;30&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bucks Mills was a fishing hamlet of some thirty cottages, with a population of 120 (plus or minus ten) throughout the period of study. Situated on the North Devon coast, between the better known Bideford and Clovelly, Bucks Mills is in an isolated position, accessible by sea, the coastal footpath and a single road which joins the main Bideford to Bude highway (now the A39) about a mile from the hamlet. In the nineteenth century, the main occupations were fishing, agriculture and lime burning; many inhabitants undertaking more than one of these roles concurrently.

With very few exceptions, the cottages in Bucks Mills were constructed between 1812 and 1835, thus most adults appearing in the 1841 census returns were in-migrants. An ever-tightening web of intermarriages, during the nineteenth century, resulted in Bucks Mills being referred to as ‘the village of a single surname.’<sup>31</sup> Kinship links were pronounced and research into patriarchal and matriarchal lines has shown that 89·2% of

---

<sup>25</sup> This is discussed fully in Chapter 2.3.
<sup>26</sup> This is the percentage of all those, both male and female, with a listed occupation.
<sup>27</sup> In order to be more accurately comparable with the figures for the other communities this percentage includes all those born in the parent parishes of Parkham and Woolfardisworthy.
<sup>28</sup> This is restricted to households within Bucks Mills.
<sup>29</sup> This includes all those born in the parish of Hatherleigh.
<sup>30</sup> This figure refers to all those who are related to another head of household within the parish of Hatherleigh. As it has not been possible to trace the genealogy of all Hatherleigh inhabitants in depth, this should be regarded as a minimum figure. In 1841, 28·6% of Conduit Street household heads were related to another within the street itself.
<sup>31</sup> The Evening Standard 1 March 1928.
the nineteenth century residents were related,\textsuperscript{32} thus Bucks Mills was particularly enclosed and stable, even for a fishing village.

It was felt that it was important to include a non-rural location in this research. The methodology precluded the use of a whole town, however small. Although not wholly satisfactory as a settlement, it was decided to use a single street within a town as a study area. The methodological problems that ensued\textsuperscript{33} were felt to be outweighed by the benefits of an urban perspective. The second study area therefore is Conduit Street (also known as High Street)\textsuperscript{34} in Hatherleigh. Nineteenth century Hatherleigh was a small but busy, inland market town, some fifteen miles from Bucks Mills as the crow flies. It is situated twelve miles south of Torrington and eight miles north of Okehampton, the nearest towns. According to the 1841 census, there were 1882 people in the parish of Hatherleigh, which included the town and its rural hinterland. Despite becoming known as High Street, Conduit Street was not the main thoroughfare in Hatherleigh but nonetheless occupied a central position within the town and was primarily the home of tradesmen. Conduit Street was only slightly larger than Bucks Mills, having thirty six dwellings\textsuperscript{35} containing 144 people (plus or minus twenty). The dwellings were, in general, slightly larger than the labourers’ cottages in Bucks Mills.

Bulkworthy, the final settlement, has the advantage of being a complete parish, thus making the detection of in-migrants and out-migrants much easier. It was selected for its location, between Bucks Mills and Hatherleigh, its rural nature, and its manageable size. Unlike the other study areas, the extent of Bulkworthy’s total population changed during the period under investigation and this was another reason for its choice as a sample area. In 1841 Bulkworthy had one more household than Conduit Street, although rather more inhabitants (196). As early as 1871, this had fallen to 114 persons contained in

\textsuperscript{32} That is to say, they can be connected, by blood or marriage, on a single family tree.

\textsuperscript{33} These are discussed in Chapter 1.2.ii and 1.2.iii.

\textsuperscript{34} Conduit Street is recorded as Tailor’s Street and part of the High Street in 1841, Conduit Street in 1851 and 1861, then reverts to High Street. The road known as High Street in the 1851 and 1861 censuses became Higher Street when Conduit Street changed its name back to High Street in the 1860s. For clarity, the street will normally be referred to as Conduit Street throughout this study.

\textsuperscript{35} For the greater part of the study period.
twenty two occupied dwellings. Bulkworthy, a parish of 1115 acres,\textsuperscript{36} consists of the hamlet of Haytown and a handful of outlying farms; the reduction in size was largely accounted for by the contraction of Haytown.

In contrast to the other settlements, the homes in Bulkworthy were less uniform, varying from the small labourers’ cottages of Haytown, to sizable farms of up to 450 acres. Whatever their status, the inhabitants of Bulkworthy were almost exclusively employed in agriculture. Over 75\% of males with listed occupations in 1841, were employed on farms and, of the remainder, several were in support trades such as milling, thatching or smithing. In 1841, 46-4\% of Bulkworthy residents were native born but most of the remainder were short distance migrants, with only 3-6\% being born outside Devon. Bulkworthy has no distinct physical boundaries and there was a very high level of migration into and out from the neighbouring parishes throughout the Victorian era. Despite a decrease in population as the century progressed, the proportion of in-migrants increased,\textsuperscript{37} providing sufficient migrants to investigate.

1841 was chosen as a starting date partly because of the availability of records but mainly for the reason that ‘in many rural districts peak populations were recorded in the early 1840s.’\textsuperscript{38} It might have been expected that this research would support the findings of Adair, Melling and Forsythe, who found that, ‘the second half of the nineteenth century was a period of considerable migration within Devon, with a predominant flow of people from the inner, rural heartland of the county to the urban and coastal areas.’\textsuperscript{39} The likelihood was that increasing numbers of out-migrants from the three settlements studied here would be found in larger urban areas. Ravenstein\textsuperscript{40} identified Devon as a

\textsuperscript{36} Morris and Co.’s Commercial Directory and Gazetteer (1870) p. 366.
\textsuperscript{37} In 1851 51-7\% of the population had migrated into Bulkworthy since 1841. By 1891, 70-6\% were incomers in the previous decade.
county of dispersal and Schürer,\textsuperscript{41} in his study of Dengie and Hatfield, found far fewer rural-rural migrations than rural-urban moves as the century progressed. Schürer points out that rural depopulation was not so much a result of an increasing number of out-migrants leaving the countryside, but due to the fact that they were moving to towns, rather than to other rural areas.

Once the base populations, those of 1841, of the three study areas were established, subsequent incomers were identified from succeeding census returns. Data was collected concerning the place of origin, age, religion, occupation and migration companions of those who moved into and out from the study areas. Likely motives for leaving the settlements were sought, using sources such as diaries, letters and memoirs. It was necessary to set the influences of kinship and community on the migratory patterns found within the context of other factors, such as the significance of geography and economic change. The demographic impact of in- and out-migrations and the extent to which the populations became more, or less, diverse, has also been considered. Thus, it is hoped that, by following up as many out-migrants as possible, Reay’s criticism, ‘one of the weaknesses of family reconstitution is that it misses the mobile sections of the population’,\textsuperscript{42} has been addressed.

Pooley and Turnbull felt that ‘individual migration experiences were important, and are therefore worth a considerable investment of effort to study’,\textsuperscript{43} thus certain individuals or family groups have been used as case studies for each aspect of this research. This in-depth examination of exemplar migrants and the residentially persistent allows possible motivations to be scrutinised and enhances the view of the structures observed. Bowden defends her use of a single probate document as a case study for her research into perceptions of kinship in Medieval New Romney.

‘A close examination of a single will provides an insight into, and suggests a greater potential for imagining, the range of networks of relatedness with which people are located, within which they live their lives. When set against the framework of broader patterns of significant relations, it enables

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Schürer (1991) p. 114.
\item Colin G. Pooley and Jean Turnbull, \textit{Migration and Mobility in Britain since the 18\textsuperscript{th} century} UCL Press, London (1998) p. vii.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
‘core domains’ to show through, without obscuring personal strategies.”

In a similar way, the specific examples described in the case studies included here are designed to illuminate the overall situation.

To summarise, the aim of this research was to investigate the motivations for movement or residential persistence of the inhabitants of three small areas of North Devon between 1841 and 1901. This was to be achieved through the use of intensive reconstruction techniques and a comprehensive range of sources. The following chapters address the issue of the role of non-resident kin in the decision to migrate, or not, and in the choice of destination. Economic and cultural motivations for moving are studied and any reasons that are specific to emigration, as opposed to migration, are considered. The extent to which migrations from the three study areas formed part of the nineteenth century process of urbanisation is also addressed.

The findings of this research reveal that the three study areas, whilst geographically close and in some ways similar, exhibited very different patterns of migration. In all three settlements, more short distance rural-to-rural moves were found than might have been anticipated when considering research by those such as Adair, Melling and Forsythe. The value of researching extended kin has been vindicated and their role in influencing migration decisions has been established. It has also become clear that factors impacting upon decisions to move overseas were not the same as those influencing internal migrants. With regard to emigration, the economic motive has been seen to be far less important than other issues, most notably that of religious belief.

This research contributes to existing work in the field of migration studies by looking in depth at the situation in a geographical area that has not yet been investigated. It adopts a micro-historical approach and thus uses individual migration experiences that can be set within the context of more generalised theories and findings. Rather than concentrating on economic motives for movement, this work highlights the under-researched issue of the role of extended kin. New ground is also broken by the

assessment of the key role that faith played in the emigration decision making process.

Rather than adopting the more traditional approach of a single chapter forming the literature review, the first section of each of Chapters 2 to 5 reappraises the historiography associated with the topics of community, kinship, residential persistence and migration respectively.
Chapter 1 Reconstruction or Reconstitution?: Reconstruction Techniques

1.1 The Case for Reconstruction

‘When we examine something in great detail and at close range, do we understand it better? It depends on what we want to know: if examined too closely, the blotches of blended pigment in a painting obscure its coherence as a work of art. Still, brushstrokes enlighten us about the artist’s technique.’

1.1.i Why Reconstruction?

Much has been written about the advantages and disadvantages of both family reconstitution and the more rigorous methods which have been described variously by terms such as ‘life cycle-reconstruction’ and ‘micro history’. It has already been stated that the methodology here employed differs from the more traditional techniques of family reconstitution. This research favours both the terminology, and the process, of reconstruction, which the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary defines as ‘restoring something past’; surely an admirable aim for an historian. Reconstitution however is ‘a fresh constitution’ and conjures visions of reconstituted mashed potato; involving the addition of something, such as water, in the instance of the potato, which is from a different source than the original ingredients. Although there has been some critique, by postmodernist critics, of the extent to which a true restoration can be achieved, the reconstruction technique remains the method by which the most accurate impression of the past can be achieved.

As Blaikie says, ‘individually, each source provides the basis for a different and frequently flawed set of suppositions. However the combination of qualitative and

3 See the Introduction.
quantitative sources through multiple-source linkage can considerably enrich our comprehension of the detailed patterning of family lives.\(^5\) In this research therefore the key has been to access as many different sources as possible in order to amass a body of biographical detail about each individual who resided in the chosen areas during the period under investigation. This is comparable to the German technique of ‘Alltagsgeschichte’, which attempts to ‘identify and integrate everything - all relevant material - …that permits the fullest possible reconstruction of ordinary life.’\(^6\) There are subtle differences between ‘Alltagsgeschichte’ and the similar, Italian, ‘microistoria’, which involves ‘beginning from a precise and complete delineation of all observable social behaviours in a given context of competition or conflict at the level of individual interactions’ thus ‘one sees a ‘generative model’ capable of accounting for the processes that produced every manifestation.’\(^7\) The latter is more concerned with relationships between the individuals, rather than their lived experiences.\(^8\) In either case, it is necessary to keep samples very small, thus leaving the research open to the criticism that a more general application is lacking. As Blaikie acknowledges, ‘individuals are only relevant in so far as they exemplify generic behaviour.’\(^9\)

As life-cycle reconstructions, and similar techniques, are, by their nature, restricted to small samples, the extent to which the findings of microhistory can be applied to the macro have been examined, in what has become known as the exceptional-typical debate.\(^10\) Writing of ‘Alltagsgeschichte’ and ‘microistoria’, Gregory says that both techniques are justified by ‘a sufficiently close, detailed examination of a very restricted subject of research [that] calls into question conventional, long-term views of historical development and associated conceptualisations of change.’\(^11\) Critics would doubt that small-scale studies can reveal much about anything beyond their boundaries. The advantages of micro history, however, are inherent in their limited scales. For example,

---


\(^7\) Gregory (1999) p. 103.


Baines felt that, ‘we could only explain differential emigration if we had data that referred to individual communities, or perhaps to individual families.’ Pooley and Whyte also believed that large scale studies could produce the meaningless mean, saying that ‘heavily quantitative studies using large data sets tend to produce an impersonal, dehumanised approach in which flows replace individual people and the motives for migration are assumed rather than proven, often being interpreted in a simplistic and generalized way to a point where they have little meaning.’

By permitting a detailed examination of people, processes and the context in which they functioned, research at the micro level can reveal unexpected findings. ‘By focussing on clues, margins, and monads historians show the way in concrete detail how actual entities, personal experiences, or events can relate the micro to the macro.’ Gregory states that it is possible to ‘reconstruct and explain the reciprocal relationship between individual actions and experiences on the one hand, and material life, institutions, and processes on the other [by] capturing the lived experience of individuals within dense, complex networks of social and political relations.’

There are dangers associated with the small samples that are inherent in micro-studies. Bryant felt that this was particularly apparent in rural areas where the populations could be so small that ‘insignificant events attain disproportionate importance.’ Of course, in order to establish the fullest understanding of the past, studies at a range of levels are required. Migration, for example,

‘can be analysed at national, regional, or local scales. Indeed each scale of analysis or level of generalisation provides its own insight into the migration process. At the local scale, an investigator can focus on small communities, social classes and, most importantly, the behaviour of individuals. The latter is most important since voluntary migration and emigration are essentially

---

14 From the ideas of the C17th philosopher Leibniz; a monad being, for him, something small that reflects the world beyond.
features of individual choices and of personal motivations and struggles.'

This research set out to seek the rationale behind decisions of migrants and the residentially persistent; thus techniques that enabled individual actions to be examined were essential. Halfacree and Boyle agree that, ‘we need to undertake in-depth investigation of the biographies of migrants in order to gain appreciation of the intentions implicated in the migration decision.’ Reay cites similar advantages of small-scale studies for those investigating another important aspect of this research, issues of kinship; ‘we can only effectively examine kin and family by detailed work at the local level.’ In any analysis of motivation it is always a risk that the authorial voice will make incorrect attributions. The authorial voice does however have its place and where it has been impossible to avoid, it has been acknowledged.

Focussing as it does on small settlements, and each person within those settlements, this study is at one end of the continuum. Elliott, writing of research concerning nineteenth century social change, made a case for work at the individual level.

‘Starting our examination from the biographical perspective can lead to more radical criticism, can help us to keep the image of social structures as ‘precipitates’ of social action in the centre of our field of vision, and should encourage us constantly to look for the connections between big changes and the distinctive experiences of particular social milieux.’ Indeed, for Blaikie, it is biographies that are the bridge between micro-studies and large-scale processes. Work at the individual level also helps to counter Pooley and Turnbull’s fear that ‘the analysis of aggregate characteristics may mask the voices of individual people.’ Overall then, focussing as it does on community and kinship networks, this research not only justifies but necessitates a microhistorical, reconstructive approach.

---

1.1.ii The Strengths and Weaknesses of Reconstruction and Reconstitution

The techniques of reconstruction and reconstitution both have their adherents and detractors. The inclusion of spurious connections led to criticism of links derived from reconstituted data. Tilley, working in Kingston-on-Thames, found that, when checked, 44% of the links identified using an automated record system were false. In his case, he addressed the problem by involving a high degree of human input and using multiple algorithms, which, he claims, resulted in 35-40% linkage at the 100% confidence level. Tilley’s algorithmically identified links, between the individuals in the 1861 and 1871 censuses, were subject to checks if the computer identified possible grounds for confusion. After manual checks such as these, 8778 links, made using the algorithms, were reduced to 4900, but an additional 1899 links were made manually that had not been picked up by the computer.\textsuperscript{24} The optimum degree of automation required, when attempting record linkage, is a matter of debate. Adman, Baskerville and Beedham, for example, advocate a high level of human intervention because ‘the optimal number of true links will only result from an interactive process that permits the researcher to bring his or her expertise directly to bear on the sources in question.’\textsuperscript{25} There are those, such as Harvey, Green and Corfield, however, who feel that systems should be fully automated.\textsuperscript{26}

In company with Tilley, King\textsuperscript{27} encountered problems of same named individuals being ascribed to the wrong parents and therefore condemned the ‘conventional linkage in family reconstitution [that] has a tendency to generate spurious links because of the way in which the process accepts a link between records where there is no obvious competition.’\textsuperscript{28} The issue of homonymy, confusion between two persons of the same

\textsuperscript{26}C. Harvey, E. Green and P. Corfield, ‘Record Linkage Theory and Practice: an experiment in the application of multiple pass linkage algorithms’, \textit{History and Computing} 8.2 (1996) 78-89.
\textsuperscript{27}King (1996) pp. 62-77.
\textsuperscript{28}King (1996) p. 63.
name, is highlighted by the case of Bucks Mills. The 1851 census\textsuperscript{29} for the hamlet reveals, amongst a population of only 121, two Elizabeth Braunds aged nine, two John Braunds aged three, and two eleven year olds\textsuperscript{30} also named John Braund. There were several other instances of same named individuals with ages that were only two or three years apart. To add to the confusion, the village contained both Braunds and Brends; totally separate families with similar sounding surnames which might easily have been linked by the unwary, or by a computer relying on Soundex techniques. These difficulties are exacerbated in fairly static settlements, such as Bucks Mills, where one or two surnames dominate. Even within the more fluid settlement of Conduit Street, the 1841 census includes two Ann Abells aged thirteen and two John Edwards, both of whom had been born in Hatherleigh in 1807. As kinship is a key issue in this study, it was felt that any claims for relationship between individuals should be backed by rigorous research, rather than by the employment of algorithmic methods. By focussing down on very small areas, it has been possible to ensure an exceptionally high degree of genealogical accuracy, and also to trace successfully the residential histories of a large proportion of the sample populations.

Life-cycle reconstruction using a variety of sources, as advocated by Steve King, has, he says, often been disregarded as being impractical and is less well thought of than more traditional reconstitution techniques. Halfacree and Boyle also wrote of ‘the relative neglect of micro approaches.’\textsuperscript{31} Some of the objections to life cycle reconstruction relate to the paucity of sources; this is not, however, so relevant when researching in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{32} The advantage claimed for reconstitution is that it allows different populations to be compared, because, in theory, the data is collected in a similar way. King refutes this and maintains that ‘in comparing different reconstitutions we are essentially comparing data which relate to likely reality in very different ways. This is not really comparability at all and family reconstitution can be seen to generate samples which are themselves inherently biased, and not simply in terms of the mobile and

\textsuperscript{29} HO107 1895 folios 425-427 and 470-471.
\textsuperscript{30} Two further John Braunds had been born within five miles of Bucks Mills in the same year (1839).
\textsuperscript{31} Halfacree & Boyle (1993) p. 333.
\textsuperscript{32} King (1996) pp. 62-77.
King asserts that reconstitution studies do not deal adequately with the mobile sections of the population, whose very mobility, and consequent lack of full life-cycle data, necessitates their exclusion from reconstitution samples. He also feels that settlements chosen for such research tend to be those for which a good run of records survive and that such settlements may not necessarily provide a representative cross section of the wider population. He does acknowledge, however, that life-cycle reconstruction’s use of a wide range of records may lead to bias, as record survival will not be the same in all areas. Comparability is thus reduced, especially where the extant sources relate specifically to one social class.

One of the disadvantages of reconstitution lies in its ineffectiveness when seeking information on mobile sections of the population. ‘The major feature which reconstitution samples have in common,’ says King, ‘is that they represent the experience of the least mobile elements of a local community.’ Clearly this has implications for migration studies, and is one reason why this research adopts a more exacting technique. As King has stated, ‘the more mobile the population, the more important and beneficial multiple source linkage becomes in retrieving people from the obscurity imposed on them by linkage rules.’ Therefore the approach used here is not typical, combining as it does family reconstitution with life history methods.

1.2 Sources and Methods

‘It has been said that though God cannot alter the past, historians can; it is perhaps because they can be useful to Him in this respect that He tolerates their existence’

---

33 King (1996) p. 66.
34 King (1996) p. 66.
35 King (1996) p. 64.
36 King (1996) p. 76.
1.2.i The Strengths and Weaknesses of the Sources

A wide variety of primary sources have been used in order to assemble the biographical and statistical information that forms the backbone of this research. None of these records were designed for the purpose for which they have been utilised and thus all have their limitations and possible biases, as well as their strengths. In order to make the best use of these sources, it is necessary to be aware of any likely instances of partiality, incompleteness or unreliability.

One of the principal sources employed has been the decennial census returns. Their advantage is that they, in theory, include complete listings of all inhabitants, arranged by geographical area. The fact that, from 1851 onwards, the information includes relationship to head of household and birthplace makes them very useful when considering migration and kinship. Several of the drawbacks associated with the use of census enumerators’ returns will be discussed in detail later in this chapter. These include the degree of accuracy of the birthplaces and ages recorded in the census, the problem of relating entries to specific dwellings, and the number of temporary absentees in coastal settlements. Particularly when seeking the destinations of out-migrants, census indexes\textsuperscript{38} have been used. These vary greatly in their accuracy, the on-line index for 1901 being notorious for its idiosyncratic transcriptions. Deacon used the Ancestry database\textsuperscript{39} when investigating Cornish migrants and found misspelling of 22\% of Cornish parish names. Fortunately, in many cases, the location was still recognisable.\textsuperscript{40} In most cases it has been possible to check the presence of an individual in an index by using online images or microform versions of the enumerators’ books. For the most part, appearance in an index was a sign of inclusion in the original, but non-appearance in a census transcript might be the result of inaccurate indexing, rather than a genuine

\textsuperscript{38} These include the 1851 census index for Devon and the National 1881 census index produced by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints; on-line indices made available at <<www.findmypast.com>> and Ancestry <<www.ancestry.co.uk>>, the 1901 census index at <<www.1901censusonline.com>>, indices available through <<www.familysearch.org>> <<freecen.rootsweb.com/cgi/search.pl>> and a variety of indices produced by county family history societies.

\textsuperscript{39} <<www.ancestry.co.uk>>.

\textsuperscript{40} Bernard Deacon, ‘Communities, Families and Migration: Some Evidence from Cornwall’, \textit{Family and Community History} 10.1 (2007) 49-60 (p. 51).
absence from the settlement.

The census returns have also been used to create occupational profiles of the study areas. It is acknowledged that, especially in 1841, the recording of occupations, particularly for women and children, was not always precise.\textsuperscript{41} It remains, however, the best way of obtaining a picture for the study areas at the same moment in time and the weakness of the source in this respect applies equally to all three settlements.

The indices to the Registrar Generals’ records of birth, marriage and death have been used. Despite the advantage that these, supposedly, record all events, there were some minor problems with the under registration of births, particularly in the period up to 1876.\textsuperscript{42} There were also difficulties associated with identifying the correct entries in the death indexes, especially before 1866, prior to which date the age at death was not included. Church of England and non-conformist registers of baptism, marriage and burial, where available, were used in their original form.\textsuperscript{43} When transcripts, including the International Genealogical Index,\textsuperscript{44} have been used, this has been done with caution, and supporting evidence has been sought if possible. Regard has been paid to the sources of the transcribed information and patron submitted entries\textsuperscript{45} in the International Genealogical Index have been treated with suspicion. The possible discrepancies between place and date of birth and baptism have been addressed,\textsuperscript{46} and again, verification has been sought from other sources.

First-hand reminiscences of those who lived in the three settlements in the nineteenth

\begin{itemize}
\item At this date a penalty for failing to register was introduced, thus decreasing under-registration rates.
\item Normally filmed versions of the original registers.
\item Accessed via <<www.familysearch.org>>.
\item Records, normally of baptism or marriage, which have been submitted by individual members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, or by family historians. These differ from the remaining entries, which appear as a result of extractions from original registers. There is usually no way of verifying the record source for the patron submitted entries and some are speculative in the extreme.
\item See Chapter 1.2.iii.
\end{itemize}
century have been difficult, but not impossible, to obtain. These include taped\textsuperscript{47} and written memoirs, diaries and letters. Pooley and Turnbull note that these sources should be used with caution because ‘it can be suggested that those who left a written record of their life, or who responded to requests for oral informants, are by definition atypical’\textsuperscript{48} and this needs to be borne in mind. Although it is likely that contemporary reminiscences will have recorded facts, such as the date of a migration, accurately, some of the opinions may have been adjusted to take account of the sensibilities of the audience. This can apply both to material that was intended for family eyes only and that which was designed to have a wider audience. As Erickson states, ‘while one immigrant might write for the press a letter calculated to assist his own economic interest, another might justify his emigration to an unsympathetic family with similarly selected and garnished facts.’\textsuperscript{49} Sources such as this have been taken largely at face value, but the originators have been considered and a caveat as to their possible bias is needed. Erickson’s note of caution has been heeded; that ‘in assessing motives for emigration from emigrant letters one must be careful not to infer reasons which were \textit{ex post} justifications, made from the point of view of the migrant in America.’\textsuperscript{50}

The isolation and intermarriage in the settlements, Bucks Mills in particular, has meant that there is a persistent oral tradition concerning life in the area in the nineteenth century. Hearsay evidence it may be, yet many of the reminiscences corroborate and can help to enhance the picture of life during the period of study. The presence of possible myth, rumour and exaggeration has been carefully considered and information derived solely from such sources has been used sparingly and with extreme caution. In some cases, the constraints of time and the accessibility of records have made it necessary to draw on genealogical work undertaken by others. An assessment has had to be made about the experience and level of skill of those providing the information, the sources they have used, and thus the potential degree of accuracy of the information that has been provided.

\textsuperscript{47} Oral evidence for Bucks Mills was collected from 1982 onwards and includes an interview taped in the 1960s.
\textsuperscript{48} Pooley & Turnbull (1998) p. 27.
\textsuperscript{49} Charlotte Erickson, \textit{Invisible Immigrants} Weidenfield and Nicolson, London (1972) p. 4.
\textsuperscript{50} Erickson (1972) p. 22.
Tithe maps and schedules were used, in conjunction with the 1841 census, in order to try to associate households with specific dwellings. This was particularly important in the case of Bucks Mills, where the Woolfardisworthy enumerator adopted a random approach to his route. There was no reason to doubt the accuracy of the schedules, although they did have their limitations. The dates of the schedules varied, some being compiled closer to the 1841 census than others.\textsuperscript{51} One disadvantage of these records was the instances where the occupier of a block of cottages was listed as ‘Richard Found and others’, for example. Although Land Tax Returns were only available up until 1832, in Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy they were of value in helping to establish birthplaces of the children listed in the 1841 census returns. There were, however, constraints associated with their use. None of the dwellings which were known, from other sources, to exist, on the Parkham side of Bucks Mills were listed; almost certainly because the Pine Coffin Estate had paid a lump sum in order to exonerate the tax. In Bulkworthy none of the Haytown cottages were recorded as they had insufficient land to warrant taxation. The Land Tax Returns for Hatherleigh do not identify any properties that appear to have been located in Conduit Street.

The Valuation Office Field Books, drawn up in 1910, were very useful for confirming occupants at the end of the period of study. They also provided interesting information about the size and construction of each property. As these were compiled for taxation purposes, the level of accuracy of the information was likely to be high but again, not all dwellings were included and none could be positively identified for Conduit Street.

The date parameters of this research have meant that the paucity of surviving pre-1858 probate material for Devon has not been a serious hindrance. The social status of the residents of the study areas means that few residents left wills but where available, they have been helpful in establishing genealogical links. Identifying wills for inhabitants of the three settlements has been time consuming. With the exception of those held at The

\textsuperscript{51} Parkham Tithe Schedule 1840 IR29/9/317; Parkham Tithe Map 1840 IR30/9/317; Woolfardisworthy Tithe Schedule 1838 IR29/9/459; Woolfardisworthy Tithe Map 1841 IR30/9/459; Bulkworthy Tithe Schedule 1843 IR29/9/87; Bulkworthy Tithe Map 1843 IR30/9/87; Hatherleigh Tithe Schedule 1842 IR 29/9/199; Hatherleigh Tithe Map 1839 IR 30/9/199.
National Archives, which can be searched by place name,\textsuperscript{52} each will had to be sought out individually, starting from the date of death of an individual deemed likely to have had sufficient property to generate probate material.

Leases were useful for establishing property ownership and the dates of construction of particular dwellings. Unfortunately, other sources make it clear that, due to sub-tenancies, the lessees were not always the occupants and thus confusion can be caused. Although place indexes in the Devon Record Offices were used, it is apparent that leases are not always identified in this way. Documents that form part of estate archives were less well indexed. In the case of Bucks Mills, the records of the Pine Coffin Estate were subject to a closure order; fortunately, it was possible to obtain special permission to access these.

Newspaper reports, both English and colonial, have provided important information. Of particular value have been the obituaries in North American newspapers; these are often very detailed, giving dates of emigration and travelling companions as well as genealogical information. The content of obituaries can be inaccurate as it is largely hearsay and compiled many years after the event; this needs to be taken into account. Although the indexing of the North Devon Journal has enabled relevant local articles to be found with comparative ease, overseas items have been accessed largely through contacting emigrants’ descendants or by serendipity. Sadly, this means many relevant articles will not have been located but this does not diminish the value of those that have been found.

Mills makes a good case for the use of directories when studying the history of rural communities and they can be an important tool in when investigating occupation structure.\textsuperscript{53} Unfortunately, street and trade directories have been of limited use for this research because very few entries appear for the study areas. Only Hatherleigh is covered with any regularity and then the residence is often the town alone, rather than a specific street, and coverage is far from being comprehensive.

\textsuperscript{52} <<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/documentsonline>> accessed 10 August 2007.
\textsuperscript{53} Dennis R. Mills, \textit{Rural Community History from Trade Directories} Local Population Studies, Aldenham (2001).
As Pooley and Turnbull aver, ‘data collected from multiple sources, and compiled into life-time residential histories, allows the event of migration to be set within a broader context.’\textsuperscript{54} Blaikie too writes of, ‘the value of multiple-source methods in interpreting the complex relationships between individuals, households, work and welfare.’\textsuperscript{55} In general, the pitfalls associated with the use of any one of the record sources used for this research has been minimised, and in many cases eliminated, by the employment of other sources.

1.2.ii Establishing the Sample Populations

Initially, for each study area, the population as listed in the 1841 census return formed the base sample from which to work. To those actually enumerated were added any individuals who were known, from other sources,\textsuperscript{56} to have been normally resident in the study area on the 6\textsuperscript{th} June 1841 but who were, for some reason, not included in the census return. No such adjustments were necessary for Bulkworthy or Conduit Street but, in Bucks Mills, three additions were made, as they involved individuals who could be considered to form part of the usual population. These were two sailors\textsuperscript{57} who were away at sea, but whose families were in the village, and who had no other observable place of residence, and Charlotte Pennington, by 1841, a three year old girl, who was the daughter of a couple living in Bucks Mills. She was back with her family by 1851 but was with her maternal grandparents in Clovelly in 1841.\textsuperscript{58}

Individuals who formed part of the 1841 enumeration for a study area, but who were apparently not full time residents, were excluded from the base populations. In Conduit Street, these included fifteen peddlers or hawkers, most of whom were partially named or unnamed, who were staying in the lodging house. Mary Deacon and her two daughters, who were, seemingly, temporary visitors in Conduit Street, were also

\textsuperscript{55} Blaikie (2001) p. 85.
\textsuperscript{56} For example later census returns, the tithe schedule, baptism registers, birth certificates or family papers.
\textsuperscript{57} Thomas Sanders and Thomas Braund (born 1824).
\textsuperscript{58} She was enumerated with her mother’s maiden surname of Hamlyn and may have been born out of wedlock. Her birth and her parent’s marriage both occurred in 1838. As she was with her parents in 1851, her presence in Clovelly has been assumed to be temporary, although there is no way of being certain that this was the case.
discounted. Mary’s husband and son were in Exeter, where the two girls had been born and Mary returned there to have another child shortly afterwards. In Bucks Mills, one child, David Dunn, was theoretically living with his grandparents. He was however enumerated twice; he also appeared with his parents, just outside the village. He was therefore assumed to be visiting his grandparents and was omitted from the sample, as he was not a genuine villager. Teenaged servants and agricultural labourers, who had been born in the study area and were away working in 1841, but were to return at a later date, were not included as they were deemed to have an alternative address of a semi-permanent nature and thus to have migrated.

The village of Bucks Mills was enumerated within the two parent parishes of Parkham and Woolfardisworthy West. Although the 1841 census return for the Parkham portion is straightforward, the Woolfardisworthy enumerator listed the households in his parish in a random order. It is only by comparison with the tithe schedule and the 1851 census that it is possible to identify the Bucks Mills’ residents. Henstock advocates combining the tithe apportionments with the 1841 census enumerators’ books in order to follow house repopulation techniques.

‘Providing a high degree of correlation can be achieved between the two sources, a house repopulation project can shed significant new light on a particular community. Any census study achieves a new perspective when the households can be linked with buildings on a map, especially in small towns and rural areas where many of the actual buildings may exist….. it gives a geographical and spatial basis to census analysis.’

Henstock cites the difficulty of following this technique when full addresses are not given in the census. This process was made easier in Bucks Mills because other sources were also used, and because of the lack of change between 1841 and 1851.

There were also some difficulties in deciding which households, in later censuses, were to form part of the sample. Three properties which were enumerated with Bulkworthy in 1891 and 1901 were, due to a boundary change, in Frithelstock parish in the earlier


60 Eastcott, Bower and Muddipit.
censuses; they were therefore excluded. In addition, Collins Down, a property in the
parish of Buckland Brewer, was incorrectly listed as being in Bulkworthy in 1901; this
too was omitted. The fact that Conduit Street changed its name also caused problems
when trying to establish which households to include. The street is clearly identifiable as
Conduit Street in the 1851 and 1861 censuses. In 1841, it consisted of Tailors Street and
part of the High Street. By 1871, the name had reverted to High Street but this name
also applies to an extension of Conduit Street which was discounted. In the later
censuses ‘High Street’ applied to the old Conduit Street, with the extension being
known as ‘Higher Street’, as it is today.

Subsequent incomers to the study areas were identified from succeeding census returns
and added to the sample. As for the base population, temporary visitors were excluded
and those who could be classified as normal residents, who were absent on enumeration
night, often those at sea, were added to those under research. These adjustments proved
particularly vital for Bucks Mills, a coastal village where many young men were
fishermen or seamen who spent nights away from home. Ignoring these individuals, as
would happen in conventional family reconstruction studies, markedly distorts the data.
This is less of a problem in the inland settlements but, in 1881 for example, nine Bucks
Mills men, whose only place of residence was the village, were away at sea on census
night. Thus the enumerated population does not take account of 13-6% of the males
normally resident in the village. Throughout the period of study, forty absentees have
been found for Bucks Mills, twenty nine of whom were men in the 15-35 age group;
thus the enumerations significantly under-represent a particular section of the
population. Given that the number of absentees identified may be an underestimate; this
has serious implications for the reliability of data that does not take account of those
temporarily missing from home. Blaikie’s study of fishing villages in north east
Scotland also found a depletion of adult males. He assumed that this was due to the
temporary absence of fishermen but the extent of the under representation was not
analysed in any detail.61

61 A. Blaikie, ‘Coastal Communities in Victorian Scotland: What Makes North-east Fisher
The base populations, and subsequent arrivals and leavers, are summarised in the tables below. In total, 1743 individuals were studied, 407 in Bucks Mills, 627 in Bulkworthy and 709 in Conduit Street. In all three areas there were more departees than there were arrivals; this was particularly noticeable in Bulkworthy. The number of moves per head of population was similar for Bulkworthy (1.26) and Conduit Street (1.34). In Bucks Mills however there were only 0.87 moves per head of population, reflecting a much more stable settlement.

Table 1.1 The Populations of the Three Study Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bucks Mills</th>
<th>Bulkworthy</th>
<th>Conduit Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Population</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>407</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2 Bucks Mills - Population Changes 1841-1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Additions in Last Decade</th>
<th>Departees in Last Decade</th>
<th>Remainers in Last Decade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.3 Bulkworthy - Population Changes 1841-1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Additions in Last Decade</th>
<th>Departees in Last Decade</th>
<th>Remainers in Last Decade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

62 i.e. all additions and subtractions from those enumerated, thus including those who have been born or died as well as in- and out-migrants.

63 The base population plus the total number of incomers does not equal the sample size because some individuals left and later returned.

64 This has been calculated by adding the number of leavers (excluding deaths) to the total number of in-migrants and dividing this by the sample for that community.
Table 1.4 Conduit Street - Population Changes 1841-1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ADDITIONS IN LAST DECADE</th>
<th>DEPARTEES IN LAST DECADE</th>
<th>REMAINERS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.iii Establishing Birthplaces and Origins

Unfortunately, before 1841, it is not possible to trace the location of many in-migrants to the three settlements immediately prior to their arrival in those locations. In the absence of suitable sources enabling this to be done, when comparing the inhabitants of 1841, birthplaces have been used as an alternative. It is acknowledged that there may well have been, for a number of these in-migrants, an intervening place of residence between birth and their enumeration in the settlements in 1841.

It was necessary to establish birthplaces for those living in the three settlements in 1841. This was straightforward for persons who could be located, either in the study areas or elsewhere, in a census for 1851-1901. Except in instances where there was compelling evidence to suggest that this was incorrect, the place of birth, as stated in these later censuses, was used as the birthplace for that individual. For those who had died by 1851, or could not be traced, this was more difficult. If baptisms could be established, then these were utilized. For those baptised after 1812, the abode at baptism could be employed to confirm residence at that time; thus minimising any discrepancy between place of baptism and place of birth. For those baptised before 1813, whose place of birth could not be verified from another source, unless there were good reasons for assuming otherwise, it was necessary to presume that they had been born in the parish in

---

65 In some instances, the birthplace evidence from succeeding censuses conflicted. In these cases alternative sources, such as birth certificates or baptismal records, were used.
66 This would not reveal the birthplace of those who had moved between birth and baptism but the likely numbers involved are so small that it was felt this would not have a significant effect on the findings of this research.
which they were baptised. The likely correlation between birthplace and parish of baptism is discussed below. The substitution of a pre 1813 place of baptism for a place of birth was less straightforward in the case of Bulkworthy. Not only did its status as a chapelry of Buckland Brewer mean that many Bulkworthy residents were baptised there but Bulkworthy inhabitants were baptised in the adjacent parish of Abbots Bickington on a not infrequent basis. Forty five individuals, living in Bulkworthy in 1841, failed to survive to record their birthplace or could not be found, in the 1851 census. Baptisms were located for fourteen individuals and for them, place of baptism was substituted for birthplace. For the remainder, it could only be established whether or not they had been born in Devon.

A perceived problem was the difficulty of identifying precise places of birth in the cases of Bucks Mills and Hatherleigh. ‘Abode’, in the Hatherleigh baptism registers, was merely given as ‘Hatherleigh’. Until 1862, Bucks Mills was divided between the parishes of Woolfardisworthy West and Parkham and, even after the creation of Bucks Mills as an ecclesiastical parish, it is often not given as a place of birth in the census returns or post 1812 baptismal registers. Even when the enumerator or clerk attempted to be more precise than ‘Woolfardisworthy’ or ‘Parkham’, the records may say merely ‘Bucks’ or ‘Buckish’. When Bucks Mills is specified, there is clearly confusion between this hamlet and the adjacent hamlets of Bucks Cross and West Bucks, particularly in the records of the earlier nineteenth century. In no instance was such baptismal register evidence assumed to equate with Bucks Mills without supporting data. If the parents of a child, with the enumerated birthplace of Parkham or Woolfardisworthy, were documented as being resident in Bucks Mills itself either side of the birth, and there was no conflicting evidence, then that child was assumed to have been born in Bucks Mills; a similar procedure was applied for Conduit Street.

The study of census returns, leases, tithe maps, land tax records, birth certificates, estate archives and the use of oral tradition helped to establish whether or not the birthplace was Bucks Mills or Conduit Street itself. The lack of a birthplace in the pre 1813 baptismal registers mattered less for Bucks Mills because very little of the village

---

67 This may indicate Bucks Mills itself or the nearby hamlets of Bucks Cross or West Bucks.
existed before this time. There remains the fact that, in some cases, those whose birthplaces appeared to be Woolfardisworthy or Parkham may have been born in Bucks Mills. For this reason, it is likely that the number of Bucks Mills natives has been slightly underestimated, as it has been, in some instances, impossible to be more precise than ‘Parkham’ or ‘Woolfardisworthy’. This problem occurred to a greater extent when examining those born in Hatherleigh, where a place of birth quoted in a census return does not establish whether or not an individual was born in Conduit Street itself. Post 1812 baptism registers and even birth certificates do not normally specify a street within the town. Directories were more readily available for Hatherleigh than for the other study areas but these provided minimal assistance.

Two factors have a potential influence on the validity of the birthplace data. The first is the likely accuracy of places of birth, as recorded in the censuses from 1851 onwards. Edward Higgs\(^69\) refers to several studies that have considered the precision of census birthplaces. Anderson’s work on Preston\(^70\) revealed a 14% discrepancy, when comparing stated birthplaces in two succeeding censuses. This does not indicate an error rate of 14%, as this merely suggests that the enumerated birthplaces were not identical. Some of the differences were accounted for by spelling or transcription errors. In other instances, the birthplaces may be different but not incompatible; a hamlet might be given in one census and the parent parish in the succeeding one, for example. A more meaningful assessment of the extent of birthplace inaccuracy can be found in the work on six Kent parishes by Perkyns. Comparing enumerated birthplaces with abodes in the baptismal registers, she found only seventy nine individuals (3.4%) with birthplace errors. Further investigation suggested that seventy one of these might have recorded a correct birthplace, even though it was not the place of baptism.\(^71\) Given that, wherever possible, this present study uses a combination of sources in order to establish each birthplace, it seems likely that the level of birthplace accuracy would exceed that indicated by Perkyns’ figures.

---

\(^68\) Particularly until the later C19\(^th\).
\(^69\) Higgs (1989) pp. 72-73.
There is a second issue to take into account. As baptismal information has been used to establish some birthplaces, it is necessary to consider the extent of the correlation between places of baptism and places of birth in the period prior to 1813, when places of residence are not normally given. Jarvis\textsuperscript{72} investigated the percentage of those found in the census whose baptisms were not found in the parish register of the enumerated place of birth. She uses this as measure of the completeness of parish registers, but it also allows inferences about the degree of correlation between birthplace and parish of baptism to be made. By looking at three Essex parishes, Jarvis discovered that 9\% of her sample were not found in the baptism registers for the enumerated birthplace. This suggests that substituting place of baptism for place of birth would result in an accuracy rate in excess of 91\%. Some of the missing 9\% would have no baptism record because they were baptised out-with the Church of England, they were not baptised at all, or because their baptism record does not survive. Thus, a proportion of those whose baptism was not found by Jarvis would not necessarily have had a baptism record that conflicted with the enumerated place of birth.

In the samples used for the purposes of this research, the number of individuals who were both baptised before 1813 and who were dead or untraceable in 1851, and thus whose place of baptism was substituted for birthplace, was small.\textsuperscript{73} Using Jarvis’ figure of 91\% accuracy, itself probably an under estimate, means that, in the samples for all three study areas, of the thirty three individuals for whom parish of baptism has been used as a birthplace,\textsuperscript{74} only three will be incorrect.\textsuperscript{75} When viewed in the context of a total sample of 1743 individuals, this is negligible.

It was also necessary to establish the origins of the in-migrants, that is to say, their place of residence prior to their entering the study areas. This was normally done by locating

\textsuperscript{73} 4 individuals for Bucks Mills, 14 for Bulkworthy and 15 for Conduit Street.
\textsuperscript{74} And for whom no abode at baptism appears in the baptismal register.
\textsuperscript{75} Although there is an acknowledged problem with Bulkworthy residents being known to use the churches of Buckland Brewer and Abbotts Bickington for baptism, there were only 4 individuals baptised in these parishes, for whom places of baptism were substituted for birthplaces.
them in the preceding census. Census indexes proved useful for this, as did the work of family historians who had researched the individuals concerned. Occasionally other sources, such as the birth or baptism records of their children were used. In the absence of other information, the origin was left as unknown. Birthplace was not substituted for origin as the parish of birth was checked in an attempt to locate the in-migrant in the census that pre-dated their arrival in one of the three settlements. Absence from the birthplace location indicated that they had already moved on and the replacement of place of birth for origin would be spurious. It is acknowledged that there may have been intercensal moves that would not be revealed by equating the location in the census, immediately prior to arrival in a study area, with ‘origin’. This difficulty applied equally to all three study areas and again, the detailed biographical research using sources beyond the census returns helped to minimise the number of moves that went undetected.

1.2.iv Establishing Birth Years

A starting point for the calculation of birth year was usually the age given in the census returns. The procedure was to use the formula \( \text{census year minus enumerated age minus one} \). From 1851 onwards, the census was taken in March/April, a quarter of the way through the year. It is thus probable that 75% of those enumerated would not yet have had their birthday in that year, making the simple equation, \( \text{census year minus enumerated age} = \text{birth year} \), incorrect in three cases out of four. Even using any exact ages in the 1841 census, taken on the 6th of June, it is slightly more likely that \( \text{census year minus enumerated age minus one} \) will give a correct year of birth. Ideally, several censuses were used in order to minimise the problems created by the inaccurate recording of ages. Ages given in the 1841 census were frequently rounded down, as was consistent with the instructions to the enumerator; however, the enumerators of the 1841 census for Parkham, Woolfardisworthy and Bulkworthy have all recorded some exact ages.

---

76 The work of others was normally checked in original sources.
77 It is acknowledged that birth seasonality means that births are not necessarily spread out evenly throughout the year.
Much has been written about the accuracy of ages given in censuses. Higgs referred to the recording of ages in the census as ‘one of the most problematic features of the manuscript census returns.’\textsuperscript{78} Anderson’s findings, that only 53%, of those enumerated in Preston, in both 1851 and 1861, recorded ages that were ten years apart, would imply high rates of census age inaccuracy. It is more comforting to note that discrepancies of more than two years were found in only 4% of Anderson’s cases;\textsuperscript{79} this is consistent with the rate cited by Tillott.\textsuperscript{80} Yasumoto however in her similar study of Methley, Yorkshire, found that 9% of those native born and 21.5% of migrants were inconsistent about their age to the extent of two years or more.\textsuperscript{81} There are suggestions that ages, as reported in the census, may be falsified; perhaps in order to establish an ‘acceptable’ gap between husband and wife, or to allow a teenager to take up employment. In many cases, age inaccuracy is likely to be the result of a genuine uncertainty on the part of the person providing the information. The methodology employed by this research was designed to minimise the effect of such mis-recording. Where possible, several censuses and a combination of other evidence, such as birth registrations, baptism records\textsuperscript{82} and ages at marriage and burial/death were used, in order to establish the highest possible level of accuracy for birth years for the sample populations.

1.3 Creating Kinship Networks

In order to investigate community, ‘we need to move beyond individual people or families to study relationships between them.’\textsuperscript{83}

As the thrust of this research relates to the impact of kinship, it was essential to

\textsuperscript{78} Higgs (1989) p. 67.
\textsuperscript{79} Anderson (1972) p. 75.
\textsuperscript{81} Minoru Yasumoto, ‘How Accurate is the Methley Baptismal Registration?’, \textit{Local Population Studies} 35 (1985) 19-24 (p. 19-21).
\textsuperscript{82} Unless there was evidence to the contrary, or the baptism took place early in January, baptism years were taken as birth years.
investigate both patriarchal and matriarchal kin as extensively as possible. Meticulous record linkage was used, covering a wide variety of sources, resulting in total reconstruction of the nineteenth century populations. This enabled the production of kinship webs for all three study areas. It was important to decide what was to constitute kin. In comparatively enclosed, rural settlements, it is probable that many residents would be related to some degree. The extent of the research was based on likely nineteenth century perceptions of kin, and family links that might have a potential influence on migration decisions. Contemporary letters and memoirs\textsuperscript{84} suggest that relationships beyond the third degree\textsuperscript{85} would be very unlikely to be recognised as such. Those with the same surname might be categorised as ‘a relation’ but it is doubtful that individuals would have been aware of these more distant connections through maternal lines; thus relationships up to, and including, the third degree were considered.

Using the censuses of 1841, 1871 and 1901 for each settlement, the relationships between the heads of every occupied household were examined.\textsuperscript{86} Relationships were categorised as being of the first, second or third degree.\textsuperscript{87} When considering kinship at a specific date, only relationships that were extant at that time were included. The fact that, in the future, the household heads would be linked by marriage was ignored. Relationships that had existed in the past, but had been broken by the death of a spouse were treated as being still in force. For example, Matilda Braund was widowed shortly after marriage. In 1871, she had not yet remarried; therefore her relationship with her late husband’s father and siblings was treated as if her husband was still alive. After her remarriage, however, the relationship with her previous in-laws was deemed to have been superseded. This procedure was adopted because it seems probable that a widow would maintain close family links with her husband’s family, and that these might fade once she was considered to be the responsibility of the subsequent husband.

In several cases, two individuals were related in more than one way, through their mother and their father for example. In these instances, only the closest relationship has

---

\textsuperscript{84} For example the scrapbook compiled by Ralph Colwill Braund (1869-1958) c. 1930-1940.
\textsuperscript{85} i.e. more distant than second cousins, great uncles-great nephews or 1\textsuperscript{st} cousins once removed.
\textsuperscript{86} See Chapter 2.3.iv and Chapter 3.
\textsuperscript{87} 1\textsuperscript{st} degree: siblings or parent/child; 2\textsuperscript{nd} degree: uncle/nephew or grandparent/grandchild, 1\textsuperscript{st} cousins; 3\textsuperscript{rd} degree: 1\textsuperscript{st} cousin once removed, great uncle/great nephew, 2\textsuperscript{nd} cousins.
been considered. In-law relationships have been classified along with those of the household heads, i.e. ‘niece of wife’ was categorised as an uncle/niece relationship. The extent of kinship is likely to be greater than the results suggest; links will be under represented because there may be connections that have not been discovered. In cases where a relationship has been identified, it may be that there was a closer relationship that has yet to be revealed. Diagrams were constructed to show which households were connected, and by what degree of relationship.\(^88\) Tables, showing the number of households with kinship links to others, were drawn up, the degree of kinship being indicated.\(^89\)

An important issue to be considered is that the existence of a relationship may not have been the motivation for migration or persistence, merely co-incidental. As Reay points out, ‘it is a giant step from structure to sentiment, and some will argue that even if kinship ties were “dense” there is no guarantee that people made use of them. Indeed, the fact that they were all around may have meant that they were taken for granted and rarely exploited.’ He continues however,

‘this is unlikely. In a convincing study, the American historian Nancy Grey Osterud\(^90\) has mapped out networks of kin-based reciprocity in nineteenth-century rural New York; the people of this valley farming community certainly did not ignore their family connections. There is some evidence that a similar situation prevailed in Hernhill.’\(^91\)

In order to uncover the influences of relatives, qualitative analysis of the kind referred to by Harevan is required, ‘while quantitative analysis identifies the composition or extensiveness of a kinship network, qualitative analysis reveals patterns of assistance or areas of conflict amongst kin.’\(^92\) Sources such as letters, oral accounts, memoirs and obituaries have been used in order to seek concrete evidence of kinship influencing migration decisions. The absence of such verification does not mean that there were no

---

88 See Figures 2.32, 2.33, 2.34, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11.
89 See Tables 2.14, 2.15, 2.16, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8.
91 Reay (1996a) p. 96.
such influences. The lack of kin, however, means that their presence could not have been a motivation for moving to, or remaining within, an area.

1.4 Researching Movers and Stayers

1.4.i Establishing the Degree of Residential Persistence

If those who move, and their motivations for so doing, are to be investigated, it is also necessary to consider those who chose to remain living within the same settlement. Therefore residential persistence and the impact of kinship links on length of stay have been considered. If those who move, and their motivations for so doing, are to be investigated, it is also necessary to consider those who chose to remain living within the same settlement. Therefore residential persistence and the impact of kinship links on length of stay have been considered. Using the biographical information that has been collected, persistence was assessed by looking at the time that each individual spent in the study areas and also by examining the continuity of surnames throughout the period 1841-1901. In many instances, it was possible to assess persistence out-with this time span. The results have been tabulated and analysed in order to compare the experiences in the three study areas, to observe any changes during the period under review, and to assess any correlation between length of stay and the presence of kin.

1.4.ii Determining the Destinations of Out-Migrants

Migration studies are often criticised for failing to pursue out-migrants; Reay’s feelings on this matter have already been quoted. Indeed this aspect of migration research may well have been shunned because of the perceived difficulties in tracking down sufficient out-migrants to make a meaningful sample. The recent increase in the availability of census indexes, national, international and county based, many of which are searchable by birthplace, has made the tracking down of those who leave a study area a more practical proposition. In some instances, descendants of the out-migrants have been traced through the family history network and thus the details of destinations have been obtained.

---

93 See Chapter 4.
94 See Chapter 4.
95 Introduction p. 28.
In every case, the location of the out-migrant has been sought within ten years of their leaving the area, usually by identification in the succeeding decennial census. Birthplaces of children, or family information, may suggest that there were intermediate moves, in which case the first known place of residence, following departure from the settlement, is used as the destination. Sometimes it has been possible to find an out-migrant in a census that was taken more than ten years after leaving the area. For example, William Avery left Bulkworthy in the 1860s; by 1881 he was living in Hackney. He has not been located in the 1871 census, when he was neither in Bulkworthy nor Hackney, thus there was almost certainly an intervening move, therefore he has been classified as having an unknown destination.

Even with these limitations, 85.5% of those who disappear from the censuses of Bucks Mills between 1841 and 1901, have been accounted for, either by finding a death or burial, or by establishing a destination within ten years of their departure. In no single decade are more than 22% of those who either leave or die untraced and in one decade this figure is less than 4%. The residents of Bulkworthy proved to be more difficult to locate with 69.5% of all leavers being traced in a new location, or identified as having died, within a decade of departure. This lower percentage is due largely to the high levels of emigration in the 1850s; only 52.7% of those who disappear from Bulkworthy in this decade can be found. As these individuals do not appear in a subsequent census for England or Wales and their deaths or burials cannot be located, it seems probable that the majority had gone overseas. The trace rates in other decades are much higher with 86.8% of those who leave in the 1870s being located. The overall detection rate for Conduit Street lies somewhere between those for Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy, with 76.2% of leavers being identified. It is noticeable that, as with those from Bulkworthy, it more likely that those who left the street after 1861 would be traced. Between the 1841 and 1861 censuses, 63.9% of Conduit Street departees have been located, compared to 83.2% in the last forty years of the study period.

1.4.iii Determining the Motivations for Migration

---

96 Trace rates are discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.2.i.
97 1891-1901.
Unless those who migrate have left diaries or memoirs, it is difficult to establish indisputable motives for moving, or indeed for not doing so. Even when stated reasons for migration survive, these may not be wholly accurate, especially if they take the form of a letter that could have been contrived, for example, to portray a favourable picture to non-migrants. As Jackson says,

‘there are … specific methodological difficulties involved in exploring motivation. … if we are to rely on the migrant’s responses we must assume that his motives are apparent to him, and the ‘stated’ motives are the ‘real’ ones. In general these difficulties lead to some imputation of motives based on the structural factors using an elaborated set of push and pull variables.’

By examining the history of the sending and receiving areas, and by reconstructing the life histories of the individuals involved, it is possible to establish likely incentives for changing residence, either within or beyond the three settlements. Potential reasons, such as changes in life stage: marriage, increasing numbers of children or widowhood, for example, can be identified from the biographical information collected. In a similar way, economic explanations are suggested by the altered occupations of the individuals concerned, or by variations in the employment opportunities in the sending or receiving settlement. Religion was a significant factor for those who chose to emigrate; a very high proportion of emigrants from the study areas having been members of the Bible Christian movement. Affiliation to the Bible Christian Church has been identified in a variety of ways including: the baptism of children in Bible Christian services, designation as ‘Bible Christian’ in the Canadian censuses, mention in Bible Christian magazines or the quarterly minutes of Bible Christian circuits and references in obituaries, memoirs or histories of the Bible Christian movement.

According to Halfacree and Boyle, reasons for migration ‘bear some relation to the individual’s past and to their predicted and projected future.’ To enable the examination of personal motivations in some detail, the use of case studies has been employed in this research. In all three study areas, the residential histories of certain individuals have been examined in depth.

---

individuals, or small family groups, have been described in depth\(^\text{100}\) so that their reasons for migrating, emigrating, or remaining can be analysed. In order to understand the processes involved it has been necessary to scrutinise the three settlements carefully, setting them in their wider North Devonian context and paying particular attention to the situation at the beginning of the period under consideration. Chapter 2 provides this background information on Bucks Mills, Bulkworthy and Conduit Street and looks at the age and sex structure, occupational patterns and origins of the inhabitants of 1841. Of special relevance are the kinship networks in place in the three study areas at this date and these too are described.

\(^{100}\) See Chapters 4.4, 5.4 and 6.3.
Chapter 2 Considering Community

2.1 Concepts of Community

This research is rooted at community level and focuses upon three very small areas. It was felt that this approach was the most appropriate for the examination of the themes herein addressed. As Reay points out, ‘the local is the site for exploring significant social change and for teasing out important historiographical issues.’ Deacon and Donald also advocate methodologically distinct community history based on the micro-historical approach. Phythian-Adams felt that, ‘a concern for unravelling localised realities on the ground […] is thus not unworthy scholarly ambition and it is certainly not of the secondary importance to which it is so frequently relegated.’ Having decided upon a study at community level, it is necessary to consider what can be meant by ‘community’ in general and ‘community history’ in particular.

When seeking a definition for ‘community’ the only consensus appears to be that arriving at such a definition is problematical. As Bell and Newby averred, in 1971, ‘a satisfactory definition of [community] in sociological terms is as remote as ever;’ there has been little clarification since. This long-standing lack of accord sits alongside the question as to whether a locational basis is an essential concomitant of ‘community’. Williams summaries the issue,

‘the complexity of community thus relates to the difficult interaction between the tendencies originally distinguished in the historical development: on the one hand the sense of direct common concern; on the other hand the materialisation of various forms of common organisation, which may or may not adequately express this.’

The meaning of the word ‘community’ has changed over time and it is no longer seen as requiring attachment to a specific place. Dennis and Daniels’ opinion is that community

---

1 See Chapter 1.1 for a discussion of the merits and demerits of small scale studies.
6 Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* Fontana, London (1976) p. 76.
can be either descriptive, a geographical entity, or evaluative, indicating a ‘quality of social relationships.’\(^7\) Raymond Williams’ definition encompasses ‘the quality of holding something in common […] a sense of common identity and characteristics.’\(^8\)

Ideas that challenged the very existence of community began circulating in the late nineteenth century. The belief of those such as Tonnies was that, subsequent to industrialisation, the concept of community was lost.\(^9\) If this were so, it would make community studies in the post-industrial era an impossibility. This suggestion has now been overturned. Snell is of the opinion that, ‘industrialisation or ‘modernisation’ did little to dent or destroy [the parish’s] significance.’\(^10\) Shepard and Withington acknowledge that, ‘the word [community] remains an emotive and explicitly ideological term in contemporary political discourse, as well as a term with particular connotations in contemporary historiography’ and refer to George A Hillery’s ninety four definitions of community.\(^11\) They nonetheless identify six elements of community: institutional arrangements, the practices and roles that structured it; people; acts and artefacts; geographical location; time frame; and ‘the rhetoric by which it was legitimated, represented, discussed, used and turned into ideology.’\(^12\) Community then, as Frankenberg says, ‘implies having something in common;’\(^13\) the exact nature of that commonality remains imprecise.

MacIver and Page wrote of an ‘area of social living marked by some degree of social coherence.’\(^14\) They described community as

> ‘the term we apply to a pioneer settlement, a village, a city, a tribe, or a nation. Wherever the members of any group, small or large, live together in such a way that they share, not this or that particular interest, but the basic conditions of a common life, we call that group


\(^{8}\) Williams, (1976) p. 75.


Although communities can be synonymous with a geographical area, this alone does not constitute ‘community’; community implies interaction between people.

There remains some benefit in considering Tonnies’ concept of Gemeinschaft, his idea that blood, locality and common goals intermingled to create a network of kinship, neighbourhood and friendship that, together, constituted community. Phythian-Adams takes up the idea of blood ties when distinguishing between ‘community’ and ‘society’,

‘It is the lineage, not the community, which perpetuates the local social structure via the grid of inheritance only therefore at community cores - comprising the longest established local families - may ‘society’ and ‘community’ be said properly to meet at fixed points.’

This suggests that kinship networks, a major concern of this research, are key to the creation of community. Others feel that it is the quality of social relationships, rather than family ties, that are crucial. Shepard and Withington point out that, ‘communities exist on two levels: first, that of the relations between the members of the community and the hierarchies that obtain within it; and second, that of the perceptions and imaginations of those involved.’ Thus communities are considered as both discernible networks and less tangible feelings. MacIver and Page outline three ‘feelings’, integral to community sentiment, which echo Tonnies’ idea of common goals. Firstly, there is a sense of group interest, ‘we-feeling’. Then there is ‘role-feeling’; each member of the community must have a part to play. Finally, there is ‘dependency-feeling’, which is both physical and psychological.

Religious belief, a major factor in the settlements under review here, was seen by some, including MacIver and Page, as a possible influence for disunity. This, they felt was particularly likely in the case of ‘strongly dogmatic religions’, such as those found in the three study areas that form the backbone of this research. This theory that ‘the social function of the traditional church (or traditionalist churches) was to embody traditional

community, so the role of innovating forms of Christianity, like Puritanism, was to
dissolve it,"\textsuperscript{22} has been overturned by those such as John Bossy, who cites the
importance of the religious bond and sees it as a force for cohesion.\textsuperscript{23} Similarly, Obelkevitch, researching in nineteenth century rural Lincolnshire, felt that Methodism
generated not only a religious but also a social entity that might be called a community.\textsuperscript{24} Methodism, being circuit based, created communities that transcended the traditional parish boundaries. Although communities, in the geographical sense, provided the sample parameters for this research, it was the ideological communities, the sense of shared values and beliefs, that were to become the key influence for many of the inhabitants.

What then comprises ‘Community History’? Dennis Mills compares local history, the study of a locality, with community history, which, he says, involves the study of the people within that locality.\textsuperscript{25} As Deacon and Donald state, community history is
‘both contextual, setting local places and communities in the context of wider political, economic and cultural processes, and theoretical, relating local details to more general theories of how communities are constrained, how they function and how they change over time.’\textsuperscript{26}

What remains is to decide upon a definition of community for the purposes of this research. When going beyond the physical to what Dennis and Daniels\textsuperscript{27} would call the evaluative elements of community, different aspects of belonging take precedence in each of the areas studied here. The extent to which the physical entities were bound by common goals, kinship or shared values and the relative strength of these ties will be discussed below.\textsuperscript{28} The concept of community will be revisited in Chapter 7, in the light of the findings of this research, and thus a tentative definition of what constituted ‘community’ in each study area may be arrived at. Having discussed some of the

\textsuperscript{23} Bossy (1973) p. 135.
\textsuperscript{26} Deacon & Donald (2004) p. 15.
\textsuperscript{28} See, in particular, Chapter 2.4, Chapter 3.3 and Chapter 7.
theories behind the concept of community, it is time to turn to the three settlements themselves, to set them in their wider North Devonian context, and to examine them in detail at the commencement of the study period.

2.2 Communities in Context

2.2.i Environment, Economy and Evangelism: Victorian North Devon

This research centres on three specific localities in North West Devon. As will be seen later in this chapter, they were very different in nature, yet all were influenced by their surrounding area. In order to set these settlements in their local historical context, an overview of early Victorian North Devon is appropriate. Comments on agriculture, maritime matters, the economy, religion and migration have been included; all aspects that were of significance to the region and to this research.

Climate and Agriculture

With the exception of Barnstaple, North Devon was devoid of towns of any notable size. The great majority of the population were rural dwellers, reliant on agriculture for their income. The climate of North West Devon is warmer and more equable than that of much of England but it is wet; the average annual rainfall being fifty nine inches. With the exceptions of Exmoor and Dartmoor, this is higher than any other area of the West Country and more than twice that experienced in Yorkshire, East Anglia or Kent. Even in South Devon, the rainfall is normally only thirty five inches a year. As a consequence of the climate, the soil in North Devon tends to become very soggy, this is exacerbated by the heavy clay, culm measures. The region’s soil, along with its climate and relief, make it more suited to pastoral, rather than arable farming. Sheep predominated; thus, in the medieval period, Devon became one of the principal centres of the wool trade. Traces of this wealth were to linger into the eighteenth century.

29 See Chapter 2.2.ii, 2.2.iii and 2.2.iv.
30 According to N. Hicks, Farming in the West Country David Rendel Limited, London (1968) p. 7, the average January temperature is 44°F and that of July 61°F.
31 Hicks (1968) p. 7.
The blockades of the Napoleonic Wars and the attendant inability to import foodstuffs, led to more marginal land being brought under cultivation. The high grain prices of the time resulted in prosperity for farmers. The slump following this conflict was felt deeply in North Devon; with the fall in the prices they could charge for their produce being accompanied by a rise in the cost of living. At this time, wages for the agricultural labourer remained at seven or eight shillings a week, similar to those of the eighteenth century. Devon also suffered from the agricultural depression of the 1870s and 1880s but the impact was less severe than that which was felt in northern and eastern England.

Hoskins comments that, ‘farms were generally small; large holdings were very rare. Often these farms had been rented by the same families for generations.’\(^\text{32}\) This was, in the main, a corollary of the system of land tenure, which favoured smaller holdings. There were still landowners with vast tracts of land, for North Devon these were in the hands of the Rolle and Clinton families, yet most held much more modest acreages. Vancouver,\(^\text{33}\) writing in 1808, reported no enclosures in North West Devon. This was to change as the nineteenth century progressed, with a wave of awards being granted. For the tenant, land was customarily held on a lease for three lives, giving security of tenure and encouraging occupants to improve their farms.\(^\text{34}\) It may be that this sense of continuity and certainty diminished the incentive for migration. By the early nineteenth century, there was a tendency towards shorter leases, of fourteen or twenty one years, accompanied by rack-renting. Yet, in 1992, Hoskins was still able to write,

‘as to the size of farms, there is little significant change in the past two or three generations. The average Devon farm is small, round about sixty-five acres, and scarcely any bigger than it was back in the 1860s. In 1944 more than half the farms of Devon were fifty acres or less and only one farm in a hundred exceeded 300 acres, as compared with five per hundred in England and Wales as a whole.’\(^\text{35}\)

\(^{34}\) Hoskins (1992) p. 91.
Fishing and Ship-building

Apart from Cornwall, Devon has the greatest proportion of coastline to area of any English county and the sea has played a major role in its history. For those living within reach of the coast, ship owning, shipbuilding, mercantile trade and fishing were features of everyday life. Traditionally, the ports and fishing villages of South Devon enjoyed more prosperity than those on the less hospitable north coast. The exception was during the eighteenth century, when ports such as Barnstaple and Bideford had a prominent role in the, then flourishing, Newfoundland cod trade. With the decline of cod fishing, the industry in North Devon was increasingly at the mercy of the vagaries of the herring shoals. The early 1800s saw several years when the fish failed to appear at all.

Although improved transport links heralded a widening market for their produce, as the nineteenth century progressed, the role of the fisherman in the economy of North Devon saw a steady decline. What remained was, in the main, small scale and local, with family-owned boats drift netting, trawling or potting in an effort to catch herring, pilchards and shellfish. In addition there were the subsistence, often part-time, fishermen who caught fish to feed their families and combined fishing with another occupation. As early as 1904, Aflalo was to write,
'North Devon, however beautiful to the tourist, is practically negligible in respect of its fisheries. The paltry hooking and drift-net fishing of Clovelly, Ilfracombe, or Lynmouth are an insignificant source of revenue when compared with the entertainment of the summer visitors.'

*Figure 2.2 Fishing at Clovelly*

‘By the nineteenth century the growth of British trade, both coastal and overseas, meant an increasing number of ships off the coasts of Devon.’ Much of this activity consisted of ships bound for Bristol, who had to cope with the notorious weather conditions off the North Devon coast; loss of life and, perhaps what mattered more to the owners, cargo, was not infrequent. The North Devon ports of Bideford and Barnstaple, were engaged largely in more local trade, notably in the transporting of coal and culm from South Wales. The ports and smaller quays, at places such as Ilfracombe and Hartland,
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37 Paul Gauci, Title: Clovelly/Captn. H..Strong, delt.; M.& N. Hanhart, lith.printers; P. Gauci, Imprint: [Ilfracombe] ; [J.Banfield] Date: [1837?] Format: Lithograph; 195x272mm Ref. no.: C0385
40 Culm was a vital ingredient for the burning of limestone in the kilns that dotted the North Devon coast and estuary of the River Torridge.
exported agricultural produce from the rural hinterland.

Shipbuilding in North Devon weathered the decline, following the drop in demand after the Napoleonic Wars. Post Napoleonic revival centred on Bideford, rather than Barnstaple. Largely due to the efforts of the Burnard, Chanter and Yeo families, who were key players in ship-owning and ship-building in Bideford and Appledore, this aspect of the maritime economy continued to prosper into the mid-nineteenth century. In addition, it was the Canadian business interests and connections of these families that were to influence the migration patterns of many North Devonians. According to Greenhill and Nix, rural ship-owning and seafaring survived longer in North Devon than most other places. Although providing a convenient means of transport, this business might be expected to have a negative effect on migration; the sustained trade providing less incentive to move away. There were, however, other aspects of the economy to be taken into consideration.

**Industry**

From Tudor times, natural resources and an ability to utilise the population rise to their advantage, had meant prosperity for Devon. The shores of Bideford Bay and the Torridge estuary were peppered with lime kilns; the lime being used principally for whitewash and manure. Reverend Thomas Moore felt that this had resulted in ‘a rich increase of agricultural produce, and [was] consequently of general benefit.’ There were thriving potteries in Bideford and Barnstaple, which, together with tin mining and the quarrying of building stone, supported the booming woollen cloth industry to make Devon one of England’s most prosperous counties. Devon’s economy was, however, like that of most counties, subject to the impact of industrialisation. In the case of Devon, it was a signal for economic decline.

By the middle of the nineteenth century, it was difficult for most Devon towns to

---


prosper unless they were able to benefit from the newly emerging tourist trade.\(^{43}\) The decay of the inland towns was, according to Hoskins,\(^ {44}\) mainly due to the death of the wool trade that had previously supported them. ‘The Napoleonic Wars were the death-blow of the dwindling Devonshire woollen industry, though an artificial monopoly - exercised through the East India Company - kept the Chinese market open until the Company’s monopoly of the trade ended in 1833.’\(^ {45}\) Towns, such as Tavistock, had experienced a mining boom after the emergence of Devon Great Consuls in 1844 but, by the 1870s, they were affected by the collapse of West Country mining. The declining numbers of copper and tin lodes that could be mined economically, and the upsurge of foreign competition, meant that many West Country mines closed and miners sought work elsewhere. Although the railway boom did see some economic revitalisation, especially whilst the railways were being constructed, the resulting improvements in transport links meant that smaller Devon towns were neglected in favour of larger centres.

**Religion**

From the early days of dissent ‘the religious geography of the South West was fundamentally Anglican.’\(^ {46}\) In Devon, old dissent was to be found principally in the south and east of the county; the more economically fruitful areas that had benefited from the wool trade. Historically, the religious landscape of North-west Devon did not align with the rest of the county. In 1676, Compton’s census of Protestant dissenters recorded very small numbers in the towns of Bideford, Torrington and Holsworthy and none in rural North Devon. As Bruce Coleman suggests, ‘the most significant frontier for religious practice in the South West ran not along the Tamar but down through mid-Devon.’\(^ {47}\) In the geographically harsher, and agriculturally less productive, north-west of Devon the situation was more akin to that of Cornwall. The tendency for eastern Devon,

\(^{43}\) There were exceptions, such as Plymouth, whose dockyard insured prosperity.
\(^{44}\) Hoskins (1992) p. 120.
\(^{45}\) Hoskins (1992) p. 66.
however, was ‘to identify itself with the dominant national culture further east rather than with the dissidence of the region’s western parts.’

In the second quarter of the eighteenth century, into a prevailing atmosphere of declining non-conformity, came Methodism. Its founder, John Wesley, himself a curate of the Church of England, sought to reform the established church and was not intent upon creating a rival denomination. His insistence that adherents should remain communicant members of the Church of England meant that it was not until 1784 that the Methodists broke with Anglicanism. Although Methodism’s roots were within the Church of England, evangelical fervour had made it impossible for it to remain so. In parts of the South West, such as western Cornwall, Methodism’s moral tone, circuit-based structure and use of itinerant preachers, strongly appealed. Following Wesley’s death, Methodism was to become increasingly fragmented and these ‘Methodist variants […] were more self-consciously nonconformist than the Original Connexion.’ By the nineteenth century, the hub of industry in the South West was no longer the textile areas of eastern Devon but the mines of Cornwall and western Devon; the epicentre of non-conformity had experienced a similar geographical shift.

The national wave of Anglican church building in the first half of the nineteenth century was largely an urban phenomenon and, apart from the construction of two churches in Barnstable in the 1840s, it passed North Devon by. At this time, the Church of England was under pressure from the two pronged attack of non-conformity on the one hand, and the ‘Papal Aggression’ of the Catholic Church on the other. In addition, the new Puseyite doctrines, advocated by the Oxford Movement, created division in the established church. As Webb points out,

‘in the early nineteenth century High Churchmanship began to regain prominence and impetus, partly because of an intellectual

49 In 1784, Wesley gave the Methodist Conference legal status, which paved the way for the break with Anglicanism, a break that became absolute after Wesley’s death in 1791.
52 This followed the New Churches Act of 1818 (58 Geo. III, c. 45) and the Church Building Acts of the 1840s and 1850s.
reaction against eighteenth-century modes of thought and feeling, partly through the reassertion of an old Anglican tradition against the emotional and doctrinally suspect appeal of Methodists and Evangelicals.\textsuperscript{53}

The new Anglican doctrines were not universally popular. Isaac Lang, completing the 1851 religious census return for St Olave’s, Exeter, remarked, ‘this church used to be crowded previous to the introduction of Puseyite Doctrines, since then it has fallen off to the present number and still decreasing.’\textsuperscript{54}

By the time of the 1851 religious census, church attendance in Devon and Cornwall was at a similar level to that of other, primarily rural, southern counties. Non-conformity had a firm hold in Cornwall but in Devon non-conformist attendances were slightly below the national average. The situation was not, however, uniform throughout Devon. Anglicanism remained the predominant form of worship in the east of the county, where there was still evidence of old dissent and an unremarkable level of Methodism. In the registration districts on Devon’s western boundary, Holsworthy, Tavistock and Bideford, the various branches of Methodism accounted for a much larger proportion of attendances. With 39·6-55·4\textsuperscript{55} of all attendances attributable to one of Methodism’s branches, levels of non-conformity in general and Methodism in particular were approaching those experienced further west.


\textsuperscript{54} Michael J. L. Wickes (ed.) \textit{Devon in the Religious Census of 1851} Michael Wickes, Appledore (1990) p. 36.

\textsuperscript{55} Figures taken from a table based on the 1851 religious census in Coleman (1991) p. 141.
It is tempting to associate the rise of non-conformity with areas in which the Church of England was weakened. Wickes believed that the success of non-conformity in the South West was due to a reaction to the influence of the High Anglican, Henry Phillpotts, who became the Bishop of Exeter in 1831. Andrews referred to ‘the low state of the Church [of England] at this time’ and widely held opinions that ‘nowhere […] was it lower than in North Devon.’ This view was based on an alleged lack of communion services, plurality, neglected church fabric, and the ‘hunting parsons’ of the area. Andrews found a lack of concrete, unbiased, contemporary, evidence that this was so. In 1815, William O’Bryan, founder of the Bible Christians, wrote of ‘more than twenty parishes, destitute of any Methodist preaching’ in the triangle between Stratton, Bideford and Okehampton. Nonetheless, Shaw, historian of the Bible Christian movement, felt that ‘the alleged spiritual and moral destitution can be, and has been

56 Figures taken from the table based on the 1851 religious census in Coleman (1991) p. 141.
overstated.’

Barry too considers the idea that dissent compensated for inadequate Anglican provision an over simplification. He feels that ‘dissenting groups owed their original geography to the power within that Church of a puritan tradition;’ a tradition fuelled by proximity to, and a perceived threat from, the Catholicism of France, Spain and Ireland. Nonetheless, nineteenth century non-conformity was to flourish in areas of the South West that were furthest from the Episcopal influences, deep-seated Anglicanism and professional classes of Exeter. As Barry says, ‘ironically, the new dissent’s massive success, largely in Methodist form, in Cornwall and West Devon may owe something to the complacency of an establishment which had defeated the challenge of old dissent.’ Wickes states that, ‘Methodism in Devon was never able to compete with Anglicanism, except in the north and west where the Bible Christians had made such an impact upon the rural areas.’

---

61 Shaw p. 36.
64 Wickes (1990) p. 7.
The Bible Christians were an offshoot of the Methodist Church, formed in 1815 by William O’Bryan. The first two circuits were established at Shebbear and Kilkhampton and, by 1817, each circuit had in excess of 500 members, with many more who had not yet joined also attending their services. Writing of the Wesleyan Methodists in 1815, Thorne says, ‘in sparsely-populated rural areas they were continuing missionary activities in the face of opposition, and here the Bible Christians’ rural background and ability to endure gave them an advantage.’ Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy were just such areas. The sect quickly reached Bucks Mills. In November 1816, the diary of James Thorne, in whose family farm the initial Bible Christian meetings had been held, reads, ‘this morning at Bucks there was a shaking; many wet eyes. I exhorted them not to spend their Sabbath at their fishing concerns. Oh when shall Sabbath breaking come to an end for ever!’ There was also a strong Bible Christian following in Bulkworthy and

---

65 Based on the 1851 religious census returns transcribed in Wickes (1990).
66 Christened William Bryant, he took the name O’Bryan because he believed himself to be of Irish extraction.
its parent parish Buckland Brewer, from the earliest days. Hatherleigh too had a Bible Christian presence, although here this competed with a Baptist influence.

**Figure 2.5 The Number of Bible Christian Chapel and Sunday School Attendances in Devon 30th March 1851**

**Migration**

James-Korany referred to the region in which the three study areas lie as one that

‘made a geographically and in certain respects socio-culturally homogenous area, a relatively poor and isolated district that also provided […] the birth-place of the Bible Christian movement which was to play such an important role in encouraging and funnelling networks of emigrants into Canada and the Maritime provinces of British North America.’

Of all the non-conformist denominations, it was Bible Christianity that had a considerable impact on North Devon in general and to a greater or lesser extent, on the three settlements under review. As will be seen, this, in turn, had implications for migration patterns. Devon’s population was in relative decline in the nineteenth

---


70 Margaret James-Korany, “Blue Books” as Sources for Cornish Emigration History’, in Philip Payton (ed.), *Cornish Studies 1* University of Exeter Press, Exeter (1993) pp. 31-45 (pp. 34-36.)

71 See Chapter 6.
century. In 1831 Devon had the fourth largest population of all counties in England and Wales; its ranking was to drop steadily between then and 1901. This was, Hoskins believes, accompanied by ‘the steady depopulation of the rural parishes.’

Bryant, writing of South Devon, found that, between 1841 and 1851, many Devon rural parishes lost population to large towns. The smaller parishes, with populations of less than 500 and lacking in craft industries, were particularly vulnerable. Hoskins commented that, ‘from 1841 onwards, each census showed large tracts of deep country losing people to the towns, especially the relatively poor and isolated west Devon parishes.’

The unique nature of each of the three study areas will now be examined in order to ascertain how they sat within the wider context of Victorian North Devon.

2.2.ii The Settlement of Bucks Mills

Until 1862, when it became an ecclesiastical parish in its own right, Bucks Mills was a hamlet that straddled the boundary between the parishes of Parkham and West Woolfardisworthy, on the coast of North Devon. The Parkham side of the village marked the western extremity of the Goldsworthy estate, owned by the Pine Coffin family. The western side of Bucks Mills, in Woolfardisworthy parish, was owned by the Elwes family, and formed part of the Walland Carey estate. Further west still is the, much larger, fishing village of Clovelly, with whom Bucks Mills’ residents entertained a healthy rivalry. The nearest market town, of Bideford, lies some eight miles to the east, and was a busy port until the 1920s.

---

Throughout the nineteenth century, Bucks Mills contained no more than thirty dwellings, the majority of which were on the Parkham side of the stream. This runs alongside the central street in the hamlet and formed the boundary between the two parent parishes. Only the mill and a block of cottages, now named John’s and William’s, can be shown to have existed before 1800. Originally known as ‘Buckish’, the settlement is still referred to by this name in some mid-nineteenth century documents. The mill, from which the hamlet first took its current name in the early 1800s, appears in the Woolfardisworthy Land Tax Returns for 1780, at which time it seems there was no accompanying village. Benjamin Donn’s map of North Devon, drawn in 1765, shows buildings at West Bucks and East Bucks, but no settlement on the coast at Bucks Mills, merely a track from the inland hamlets to the sea. This suggests that the mill was less than fifteen years old in 1780. The mill’s siting can be explained by the position of the stream, from which it derived its power, and its accessibility from the sea. Corn from the Walland Carey estate, to which the mill belonged, and from nearby Lundy Island, would have been brought in by boat and
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76 This block was, at various times during the nineteenth century, divided into either two or three cottages.
77 1780 Land Tax Return for West Woolfardisworthy, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
78 Benjamin Donn and W. L. D. Ravenhill, A Map of the County of Devon 1765 University of Exeter and Devon and Cornwall Record Society, Exeter (1965) sheet 1b.
79 Now known as Bucks Cross.
ground at Bucks’ mill. The four\textsuperscript{80} other dwellings on the Woolfardisworthy side\textsuperscript{81} of Bucks Mills are all included in the tithe schedule of 1838\textsuperscript{82} but not in the Land Tax Return of 1831.\textsuperscript{83} This appears to be an accurate reflection of when they were built.

\textbf{Figure 2.7 Bucks Mills - Location}

Although the Land Tax Return of 1830\textsuperscript{84} suggests that there were no dwellings on the Parkham side of Bucks Mills at that time, this can be shown to be incorrect. It may be that the properties were too small to attract tax, or that the Goldsworthy estate had paid a lump sum in order to redeem the Land Tax on their property, and thus individual occupiers for Bucks Mills are not shown in the returns. A Survey of the Manor of Goldsworthy,\textsuperscript{85} dated 1796, includes only a single block of cottages in Bucks Mills, Parkham, described as being ‘near Bucks’. These are believed to be a row of three

\textsuperscript{80} These buildings, which represent four households in 1838 and in the 1841 census, were subsequently extended and sub-divided to house ten distinct households by 1891.

\textsuperscript{81} Great difficulty is created by Whyte Cottage which, owing to the boundary stream passing under the street, is on the Woolfardisworthy side of the stream, thus in Woolfardisworthy parish, yet is on the Parkham side of the road. Although census enumerators were inconsistent about the parish of enumeration, for the purpose of this research, it is judged to be in Woolfardisworthy.

\textsuperscript{82} Woolfardisworthy West Tithe Schedule 1838 IR29/9/459, held at The National Archives, Kew.

\textsuperscript{83} 1831 Land Tax Return for Woolfardisworthy West, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.

\textsuperscript{84} 1830 Land Tax Return for Parkham, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.

\textsuperscript{85} Survey of the Manor of Goldsworthy 63/4/5/4, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
cottages\textsuperscript{86} sited near the sea, opposite the mill. No evidence has been found to suggest that there were any other dwellings on the Parkham side of the stream at this time. Leases confirm that at least six of the remaining cottages\textsuperscript{87} on this side were ‘newly erected’ or ‘lately erected’ in 1815 and this coincides with the arrival in the village of two masons, John Metherell and Robert Davey. With the exception of King’s Cottage, which was built in 1845,\textsuperscript{88} the Parkham portion of the village had reached its full extent by the time of the 1840 tithe schedule.\textsuperscript{89}

Cottages in Bucks Mills were, with few exceptions, stone built with thatched roofs.\textsuperscript{90} The walls, constructed from rubble, are nearly two feet thick\textsuperscript{91} and would have been lime-washed using lime from the village kilns. Cob, a mixture of hardened clay, dung and straw, was also used in the construction of many of the smaller cottages. Using the censuses of 1891 and 1901,\textsuperscript{92} descriptions in the Valuation Office Field Books of 1910\textsuperscript{93} and sale details of various dates, together with field archaeology, it has been possible to discover the size of all but five of the dwellings in the village. The geography of the village means that it is virtually impossible to extend the cottages and it is likely that the early twentieth century sizes are an accurate reflection of their original dimensions. The majority of cottages consisted of a living room and ‘back kitchen’ downstairs and two rooms on the upper floor, one of which would have been open to the stairs and, whilst being used as the children’s bedroom, also served as the landing. Two thirds of the dwellings had less than five rooms, two having only two.\textsuperscript{94} The four households\textsuperscript{95} that

\textsuperscript{86} From the 1870s, amalgamated into two cottages.
\textsuperscript{87} Those now known as 4, 5 and 6 Forest Garden, Mark’s, Emily’s and Coastguard Cottage. Leases 63/4/5/10 and 63/4/5/12 held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple. Lease 38517 held at Devon Record Office, Exeter.
\textsuperscript{88} Pine Coffin Estate Records lease 1845 held at North Devon Record Office (not on open access).
\textsuperscript{89} Parkham Tithe Schedule 1840 IR29/9/317, held at The National Archives, Kew.
\textsuperscript{90} Several of the thatches were replaced with slate during the twentieth century.
\textsuperscript{92} RG12 1789 folio 54, RG12 1788 folios 72-73, RG13 2165 folios 59-60, RG13 2164 folios 75-76. Originals held at The National Archives.
\textsuperscript{93} Valuation Office Field Books for Parkham IR58 4850 and Valuation Office Field Books for Woolfardisworthy IR58 5012 held at The National Archives, Kew.
\textsuperscript{94} Number 12 and Middle Look-out certainly only had two rooms. There were probably two more two-roomed cottages. Northernmost and William’s, separate until the 1860s, were combined by 1891 and even then had only 4 rooms.
\textsuperscript{95} Whyte Cottage, Bucks Cliff, Bucks Cottage and The Old Mill.
had more than five rooms were all on the Woolfardisworthy side of the village. Services were primitive throughout the nineteenth century. There was no piped water supply or sewage disposal system, electricity did not reach the majority of the village until the mid-twentieth century and there is still no gas. In 1841, more than half of the cottages contained at least five people and, in some, overcrowding was intense. For example, Thomas and Mary Harris reared six children in the two rooms that constituted number twelve.

Apart from the erection of King’s Cottage, and a block of three cottages,\textsuperscript{96} which appear to have been lost to the sea in the 1860s, the fluctuation in the number of dwellings during the period studied is accounted for by amalgamation and sub-division and not by new building or demolition. The geography of the village, which is set in a steep-sided valley, means that it was difficult for Bucks Mills to expand beyond its nineteenth century limits. As children left the family home they were often forced to move out of the hamlet, due to lack of available accommodation. The high degree of residential persistence found in the village may well have been higher still, had there been the opportunity to create more housing within the village.

\textbf{Figure 2.8 Bucks Mills’ Main Street}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{96} Known, for the purposes of this research, as 1138, from their number on the Tithe Schedule.}
The fact that, with very few exceptions, the cottages in Bucks Mills were constructed between 1812 and 1835 has implications when studying the population of the later nineteenth century. It means, for example, that many adults appearing in the 1841 census returns are migrants, albeit often only very short distance ones. It seems likely that the creation of the hamlet at this time was related to the need to increase agricultural yields; a result of population increase and the effects of the Napoleonic Wars. The cottages in Bucks Mills provided accommodation for additional estate workers. Bringing land of a more marginal nature under cultivation required the use of lime as a fertilizer and lime burning was undertaken at Bucks Mills. Lime kilns are common along the North Devon coast from Hartland to Bideford, and there is some debate about the date of the kilns at Bucks Mills. Hubbard Fielder’s belief, that one kiln is Elizabethan,\(^{97}\) seems unlikely as ‘until the middle of the eighteenth century limekilns were often temporary structures built solely to meet immediate demand and then allowed to collapse.’\(^{98}\) A more realistic theory is that the eastern kiln was erected around 1780,\(^{99}\) in which case it would have used labour from nearby settlements. The Manor Court Roll for Goldsworthy Manor, dated 23 April 1807,\(^{100}\) includes a complaint concerning the damage caused by the erection of lime kilns and an associated road, which might suggest that at least one of the three kilns was later still.

Apart from lime burning, the predominant occupations in Bucks Mills were that of fishing and agriculture. Most inhabitants adopted a self-sufficient lifestyle, fishing in season and cultivating the slopes behind the village when time allowed. Agricultural labourers tilled their own plots and worked for one of the two large estates that owned most of the village. Villagers kept goats, chickens and the occasional pig on the terraces that ran behind the cottages. In keeping with the size of their dwellings, the Woolfardisworthy residents tended to have more space for cultivation than those on the Parkham side. Occasionally, residents found employment in the nearby quarry, or landing sand for building work. Throughout the nineteenth century, the village provided
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\(^{100}\) Extract from the Manor Court Roll for Goldsworthy Manor, included in documents relating to rights of salvage, held at The National Archives BT243/221.
many of its own services and shopkeepers, shoemakers, beer house keepers, masons, school mistresses and dressmakers can all be found. A particular feature of the village is that many of its residents held dual occupations; frequently agricultural labourers were also fishermen or mariners. Written records, such as census returns and baptismal registers, indicate that many individuals assumed different occupations during their lifetime. Records of baptisms that occurred close to census dates, often give the father’s occupation as something other than that enumerated in the census. Oral evidence substantiates that this did not reflect rapid changes of occupation but that, for many, these jobs were held concurrently.

Migration into, and out of, Bucks Mills was largely short distance in nature; with many in-migrants and most out-migrants coming from, or going to, neighbouring parishes. Links with parishes to the west of Bucks Mills have been found to be much stronger than those to the east. Of those who did leave the area, a high proportion went abroad. These emigrations were almost all conducted as extended family groups and prompted by affiliation to the Bible Christian Church.

Although Bible Christianity was established in Bucks Mills from its earliest years, there is no indication that there was ever a designated chapel in the village. Adherents may have met in homes within Bucks Mills or attended a nearby chapel, perhaps the one at Dyke, in Upper Clovelly. The 1851 religious census records 141 Wesleyan Methodist attendances at ‘Bucks Chapel’ yet, in 1852, the inhabitants were described as possessing ‘very little mental culture, and no moral instruction.’ The 1850s and 1860s saw a Wesleyan Methodist revival in the village but Bible Christianity had all but gone from Bucks Mills by the mid-nineteenth century. Nonetheless, in the years when the movement held sway, it had a considerable impact on the inhabitants. The resurgence of non-conformity in the 1850s was encouraged by the fact that the two Anglican churches of the parent parishes were several miles from Bucks Mills; the journey would have been difficult for the very young or infirm, particularly in bad weather. It was the plans

---

101 Memories of the late Leonard Braund and the late John Annis.
for building a new Methodist Chapel, in the early 1860s that prompted the local landowner, Mrs Elwes, to donate land for an Anglican Church in Bucks Mills itself, with the aim of weaning her tenants away from non-conformity by providing easy access to an established church.

Its geographical isolation, and perhaps the personality of its inhabitants, made Bucks Mills a very self-contained and enclosed settlement; oral history suggesting that the residents were intolerant of incomers.\textsuperscript{104} As a result, increasing intermarriage during the nineteenth century, culminated in Bucks Mills being referred to as ‘the village of a single surname.’\textsuperscript{105} This claim does have a basis in truth, as the twenty three different surnames found in the village in 1841, reduced to thirteen in the space of two generations.\textsuperscript{106}

\textsuperscript{104} Memories of Mr. Hockin and the late Grenville Braund.
\textsuperscript{105} The Evening Standard 1 March 1928.
2.2.iii The Settlement of Bulkworthy

Bulkworthy is a small parish, both in terms of area and of population. Estimates of its size vary from 6050 acres, in a directory of 1850, to a more accurate, 1115 acres. The parish lies between the towns of Torrington and Bideford, with its south-western boundary formed by the River Torridge and that to the south-east by the main Holsworthy to Bideford road, now the A388. Bulkworthy is exclusively rural, consisting of several scattered, outlying farms. The only semblance of a village is the group of cottages surrounding Town Farm, known collectively as ‘Church Town’ and a slightly larger hamlet, of never more than nineteen dwellings, at Haytown. In contrast to the other settlements being studied here, the homes in Bulkworthy were less uniform, varying from the small labourers’ cottages of Haytown, to sizable farms of up to 450 acres. The farm houses are built in the Devon cross-passage house style, and most date from the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries.

Figure 2.10 Town Farm, Bulkworthy

107 W. White, History, Gazetteer, and Directory of Devonshire White, Sheffield (1850). It may be that this acreage includes Buckland Brewer.
109 In the period under review.
110 By 1881, Hankford, which contained 240 acres in the mid-nineteenth century, had gained land from Waldrons and Blakes and Squires so that it consisted of 450 acres.
The farms in Bulkworthy were, in general, larger than those in much of Devon, certainly bigger than those in the rural hinterland of Hatherleigh. Bulkworthy contained four large and four small land holdings and there appears to have been plenty of employment for agricultural labourers within the parish. There was a steady stream of young farm workers coming into the parish throughout the century. Some of these lived within the larger farm houses, others occupied cottages of their own in Church Town or Haytown. The soil in Bulkworthy is loam overlying clay, which holds moisture and is suitable for grain. It is less appropriate for root crops, such as mangolds and swedes, as these are harvested in the late autumn or early winter and thus suffer in the damp sub-soil. The Tithe Schedule suggests that the farmland in Bulkworthy was primarily arable.  

Bulkworthy holds appeal for researchers of nineteenth century migration because, unlike the other study areas, Bulkworthy’s total population changed significantly during the period under investigation. The population was 110 in 1801, a similar 103 in 1904 and eighty three in 2001. What this disguises is the wide fluctuations of the nineteenth century. In line with the national population, that of Bulkworthy doubled between 1801 and 1851. This was followed by a sharp decline, most notably in the 1850s, when Bulkworthy lost nearly 30% of its inhabitants. It was the hamlet of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blakes and Squires</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blights</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkworthy Moor</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hankford</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrifield</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stowford</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waffapool</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldrons/Town Farm</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 Acreages of Bulkworthy Farms in 1851

---

111 These acreages are taken from the 1851 census returns HO 107 1895 folios 688-692.
112 Bulkworthy Tithe Schedule 1843 IR29/9/87, held at The National Archives, Kew.
113 British Parliamentary Papers Abstract of the Answers and Returns Enumeration MDCCCL p.74
114 This figure is quoted in Bartholomew’s Gazetteer of 1904. It is unclear what the source was for this figure as the 1901 census has eighty eight individuals in the parish. It is possible that Bartholomew’s figure includes an outlying part of Frithlestock that was incorporated into Bulkworthy.
Haytown that saw the most significant losses, with a population decrease of over 40% in this decade alone. This may suggest that those who were leaving the parish were the labourers, rather than the farmers who either owned their farms or had security of tenure. Thus Bulkworthy has a much more fluid population than that of Conduit Street or Bucks Mills. In 1841, 46·4% of Bulkworthy residents were native born, a percentage that was to decrease slightly as the century progressed. It was rare for incomers to have travelled far and there was a regular interchange of agricultural labourers and young adult females between Bulkworthy and its neighbours.

Figure 2.11  Bethel Bible Christian Chapel, Haytown

Bulkworthy, although considered to be an historic parish in its own right, was formerly a chapelry of Buckland Brewer. The church itself seems to have been under-used, with many baptisms and marriages of parishioners taking place in neighbouring Abbots Bickington or in Buckland Brewer. The 1851 religious census records just eight attendees at the Anglican service on 31st March 1851.\textsuperscript{116} This may not be an accurate reflection of support for the Church of England within Bulkworthy as Anglicans may have attended the parent church at Buckland Brewer. Of the 196 inhabitants of Bulkworthy, in 1851, 102 attended the afternoon service at the Bible Christian Chapel.

\textsuperscript{116} Wickes (1990) p. 136.
A further eighty had attended the morning service; however it is likely that many people were present at both services, so this does not constitute a Bible Christian following of 182. Nonetheless, these figures suggest that more than half the inhabitants of the parish were adherents of Bible Christianity.\textsuperscript{117} The chapel that was standing in 1851 had been built eight years previously, with 140 seats and standing room for a further fifty. There are however earlier references\textsuperscript{118} to baptisms of Bulkworthy residents taking place in the Bethel Bible Christian Chapel at Haytown, as well as in private homes, so it seems that the 1843 chapel was a replacement. The religious allegiance of the inhabitants of Bulkworthy was to have a significant effect on the population, particularly in the 1850s.

\section*{2.2.iv The Settlement of Conduit Street, Hatherleigh}

Hatherleigh is situated between the larger towns of Okehampton, eight miles to the south, and Torrington, twelve miles to the north. The parish consists of 7041 acres\textsuperscript{119} and is bounded by three rivers, the Lew, the Torridge and the Okement. The main road from Torrington to Okehampton and thence to Tavistock, now the A386, runs through the town. This gave Hatherleigh importance as a staging post for coaches; the ‘George and Dragon’ being the principal stage on the route from Bideford to Plymouth or Exeter. In an era of inferior transport links, Hatherleigh was an important market town in its own right, with a weekly market\textsuperscript{120} and four cattle fairs each year. The land that makes up the surrounding parish of Hatherleigh is mainly inferior agricultural land or moorland, best suited to rough grazing. The presence of a number of ‘drainers’, in the 1851 census for Hatherleigh, is an indication that the agricultural land was inadequate. ‘Potboilers’, householders, both owners and tenants, within the borough,\textsuperscript{121} had grazing rights on the 430 acres which made up Hatherleigh Moor.

\begin{itemize}
\item It is acknowledged that some of those attending chapel in Bulkworthy may have lived elsewhere but this is unlikely as the surrounding parishes of Buckland Brewer, Shebbear, Newton St Petrock, West Putford and Milton Damerel all had Bible Christian chapels of their own by this time.
\item The earliest mention of the Haytown Chapel, in the registers of the Shebbear Bible Christian Circuit, is in 1829.
\item British Parliamentary Papers \textit{Census of England and Wales 1901: County of Devon} Cd. 1271 (1902).
\item The weekly market ceased at some point in the early C19\textsuperscript{th}, to be revived in 1840.
\item A slightly smaller area than that covered by the ecclesiastical parish.
\end{itemize}
From medieval times until the mid-eighteenth century, Hatherleigh prospered as a centre for the wool trade. Not only was Hatherleigh’s affluence affected by the demise of this industry, in the wake of competition from cotton imports, but the town suffered from a severe smallpox epidemic in 1741, which may well have exacerbated the economic decline. In 1830, the serge weaving business was described as being ‘at one time much more beneficial to the town than at the present period’ and by 1868, a directory stated that ‘the woollen manufacture, which formerly flourished here, is extinct.’ Despite this, the population of the parish continued to grow during the early nineteenth century; rising from 1218 in 1801, to 1499 in 1821 and reaching a peak of 1882 by 1841. From this point, falling numbers reflected the rural nature of the parish as a whole; the population being 1710 in 1851 and 1513 in 1881.

---

122 This particular epidemic was so severe that it is mentioned in the burial register of 1741: ‘after this the smallpox reigned’. Burial Registers for St. John the Baptist, Hatherleigh 1841-1872 fiche of original registers held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
123 Pigot and Co.’s National and Commercial Directory 1830 p. 81.
124 The National Gazetteer of Great Britain and Ireland 1868.
125 Population figures taken from the Census of England and Wales 1801-1881.
The Victorian parish of Hatherleigh was largely dependent on agriculture and its supporting trades. Although the Corn Laws, which prevented foreign imports during times of low prices, benefited arable farmers, poor soil meant that Hatherleigh was primarily pastoral and poverty was rife. Nearly all those who lived beyond the town of Hatherleigh itself were directly employed in husbandry, either as agricultural labourers or farmers. In 1851, there were forty five farms within the parish, many of which were very small, some comprising only ten acres. Eighteen contained no more than fifty acres.

---

126 Donn & Ravenhill (1965) Sheet 6a.
and only three of the farms in the parish, Langabee, Groves and Upcot, exceeded 200 acres.\(^{128}\) It is clear that the farmers went in to the town for goods and services, as very few tradesmen lived in the rural part of the parish. There were however several described as ‘farmer’ or ‘agricultural labourer’ who lived within the streets of the town.

\[\text{Figure 2.14 Aerial View of Hatherleigh c. 1930}\]

Despite the decline of the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the Victorian town was still busy, with a variety of trades, shops and small workshops; some of these, such as the miller, directly servicing the farming community. Construction was well represented with plumbers, glaziers, carpenters and masons all being available within the town. This may be a legacy of the brick and tile making that was once a thriving industry in the area. Many of the townsfolk worked in food related trades and butchers, maltsters, bakers and inn keepers were all present. The inhabitants would rarely have needed to venture to Okehampton or Torrington for their needs as the shopkeepers and tradesmen included druggists, drapers, tailors, shoemakers, ironmongers, cooper, saddlers, blacksmiths and watchmakers. In addition there was a tin plate works and machine making workshop within Conduit Street itself.\(^ {129}\) Education was provided from 1838, in which year Hatherleigh’s National School was opened.\(^ {130}\)

\(^{128}\) 1851 census for Hatherleigh HO 107 1885 folios 1-167.
\(^{129}\) 1841 census for Hatherleigh HO 107 257 enumeration districts 6-8.
\(^{130}\) Foundation stone on school building.
Apart from the parish church, the religious needs of the inhabitants of Hatherleigh were catered for by a Baptist Chapel, which was built in Conduit Street in 1833. 232 people attended afternoon worship there on 31 March 1851 compared to fifty nine who worshipped at the Bible Christian Chapel in South Street. 131 Although the Methodist Church was not opened until 1880, Hatherleigh was not free from Methodist influences in the early nineteenth century. The Reverend Cradock Glascott, vicar of Hatherleigh from 1781 to 1831, was an associate of Wesley and had for some years previously been a member of The Countess of Huntingdon’s Connexion. 132 Glascott, known for his Methodist sympathies and evangelical approach, was described by Bourne, president of the Bible Christian Conference, as ‘a shining light’. 133

In 1796, Marshall described Hatherleigh as ‘a mean market town; mostly or wholly built with red earth and thatch,’ 134 however, the town suffered two fires in 1840 and much rebuilding followed. The new market house, which was re-erected at this time, encouraged the re-opening of the weekly market that had lapsed earlier in the century. It seems that Conduit Street pre-dates 1841 and, being away from the centre of the town, it is unlikely that it was affected by the fire; thus it may well have been familiar to Marshall.

---

131 Wickes (1990) p. 93.
The presence of the spring, from which Conduit Street gets its name, suggests that there were dwellings in this part of Hatherleigh from the earliest times. It is difficult to date the houses in Conduit Street, some of those that now exist being replacements for those of the early nineteenth century. In 1841, the six properties in the lower part of the street under review appear in the census as Tailors’ Street. Those beyond the side street, Buddle Lane, are designated as ‘High Street’. The dwellings are mostly white-washed, terraced cottages of typical, Devonshire cob construction. In general, these were slightly larger than the rural labourers’ cottages. According to the 1891 census, more than half those in Conduit Street had five rooms or more.

135 RG12 1754 folios 32-34.
It is now time to consider the inhabitants of the three settlements and to examine the occupational patterns and kinship links apparent in 1841, at the start of the period under review.

### 2.3 The Settlements in 1841

In order to provide grounds for comparison, the fixed point of 6 June 1841\(^\text{136}\) was taken and the inhabitants of the study areas at this time were analysed.\(^\text{137}\) The census returns were used, in conjunction with tithe maps and schedules, in order to establish base populations for the three settlements. Minor adjustments were made to those actually enumerated, in order to eliminate visitors and to include normal residents who were away from home.\(^\text{138}\) This revealed twenty six\(^\text{139}\) dwellings in Bucks Mills, containing 121 people, 80% of whom lived in the parish of Parkham. At this point, the population of Bulkworthy was much larger, with 196 residents and thirty eight\(^\text{140}\) dwellings. Eighteen

---

136 The date of the 1841 census enumeration.
137 The settlements of 1901 are examined in Chapter 5.5 in order to assess the impact of in- and out-migrations during the study period.
138 This process is described in detail in Chapter 1.2.ii.
139 Two of which were unoccupied.
140 No unoccupied dwellings were recorded.
of these households, with seventy one inhabitants, were in the hamlet of Haytown. In Conduit Street, Hatherleigh, there were 148 individuals, housed in thirty six cottages.141

2.3.i Age-Sex Structure

The age and sex structures of the three base populations were examined; birth years being calculated according to the method described in Chapter 1.2.iv.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BORN</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1771 or earlier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772-1781</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782-1791</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792-1801</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802-1811</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812-1821</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822-1831</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-1841</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At 92:100, the male:female ratio in Bucks Mills indicates a higher proportion of women, when compared to that for the country as a whole.142 It is, however, lower than that for the county of Devon, which was 90:100. It must be remembered that many of Devon’s women would have been found in large towns, such as Exeter and Plymouth, where opportunities for employment were greatest. It is therefore to be expected that the ratio in Bucks Mills would be lower than the county average. With such a small total population, the addition or subtraction of just one Bucks Mills individual makes a noticeable difference to these ratios and it is thus not possible to draw firm conclusions.143 Given its location, in rural Devon, Bucks Mills does not appear to be untypical in its ratio of men to women in 1841.

---

141 One of which was unoccupied.
143 See Chapter 1.2.ii for a discussion on the impact of temporary absentees on the populations of coastal communities.
The percentage of Bucks Mills males in each age group does not follow the pattern for Devon, which is broadly similar to that for the whole of England. Nearly a quarter (23.9%) of all Bucks Mills males were aged fifty or over, whereas the county and country figures were 15.5% and 13.2% respectively. It was the 30-49 age group that are noticeably underrepresented amongst the Bucks Mills male residents of 1841; forming only 13.8% of the total male population, compared to 21.2% in Devon and 22.6% in England. In neighbouring Clovelly 940 people were enumerated in 1841 but there were an additional fifty absent seamen.\footnote{W. White, *History, Gazetteer, and Directory of Devonshire* White, Sheffield (1850) p. 598.} If the proportions were similar in Bucks Mills, then six or seven absentee males might be expected, who would almost certainly have fallen in the 30-49 age group. The families have been scrutinised carefully to try and identify, and allow for, any absent males. Only two such seamen,\footnote{One aged 17 and one aged 25.} whose normal residence was Bucks Mills, have been added to the sample as a result of this. Although it is difficult to see to which households any additional seamen could have belonged, it is accepted that some of the discrepancy may be accounted for by other such absentee who have not been recognized.

The figures for the females are harder to interpret. There is still a slightly higher
percentage of those over the age of fifty (19%), than that found in Devon (17.5%) or England (13.9%). This is compensated for by lower percentages of women between the ages of ten and thirty nine. This is almost certainly a result of the total absence of female domestic servants in the village of Bucks Mills. As will be seen, the village lacked those of suitable social status to employ servants. The 1851 census for Yorkshire suggests that 40% of females in the 15-19 age group would have been domestic servants. If this was the case in Bucks Mills a decade earlier, it might be expected that six or seven village girls would have left the area to seek work, a number that would restore the Bucks Mills figures to something much more like the county and country norm. The 1841 census statistics for Devon indicate however, that the impact would probably not have been this significant as, in this county, the number of females who were domestic servants was the much lower (10.3%).

When looking for reasons for the disproportionate number of Bucks Mills’ inhabitants in each age group, the evolution of the hamlet needs to be taken into consideration. The majority of Bucks Mills was built in the 1810s and most of those who took up residence were young couples in their twenties and thirties, who went on to have children shortly after establishing themselves in the village. By the time of the 1841 census, these couples had become the 50-70 year old cohort, which is particularly highly represented by Bucks Mills women, and even more so by men. Their children, by 1841 in their teens and twenties, were of an age to be leaving the hamlet to find work and homes of their own.

Table 2.3 Bulkworthy - The Age-Sex Structure in 1841

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BORN</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1771 or earlier</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772-1781</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782-1791</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792-1801</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802-1811</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812-1821</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822-1831</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-1841</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

147 1841 census vol. 27 (1844).
With a male:female ratio of 94:100 Bulkworthy had a slightly higher proportion of men compared to Bucks Mills and one that is greater than that for Devon. It does quite reach the national proportions of 95:100. As is the case for Bucks Mills, the small sample size makes conclusive comment difficult; however, there is nothing particularly unusual about the Bulkworthy ratio.

2.18 Bulkworthy – 1841 Population Pyramid

The percentages of female Bulkworthy residents in each age group were not dissimilar to those for the county and country. There were, however, more females between the ages of twenty and forty in Bulkworthy than might be expected for a rural area. This is almost certainly a reflection of the employment opportunities in Bulkworthy. Not only was there a thriving gloving industry, employing seven women, but the existence of several large farms allowed sixteen female servants to find work within the village. This is in stark contrast to Bucks Mills where there were no households of sufficient status to employ live-in female servants.148

---

148 The occupational structures of the three study areas are discussed in more detail in chapter 2.3.ii.
There seems to have been an unusually large number of very elderly men in Bulkworthy. This anomaly is probably a reflection of the small sample size as, if all those over fifty are considered, the percentage (12.7%) was much closer to those of Devon (15.5%) and England (13.2%). What is noticeable is the apparent shortage of males between the ages of twenty and forty. Bulkworthy appears to have been a flourishing agricultural area at this time, with several large farms and sufficient work to attract labourers from outside the village. There were plenty of women in this age group so men would not have needed to move elsewhere in order to find marriage partners. This suggests that young men were leaving in order to find work in towns or overseas. Nevertheless, a search of the 1851 census index for Devon for all males born in Bulkworthy between 1802 and 1821 but living in urban areas in the county finds no entries. There are only three Bulkworthy born residents, of any age or gender, living in Devon towns in 1851, all of whom are in Bideford. Thus, if the ‘missing’ Bulkworthy men were indeed in urban areas, they had gone much further afield. The possibility of a drop in the Bulkworthy birth rate between 1801 and 1821 was considered and discounted. There was no corresponding fall in the percentage of females and the baptism register does not suggest a reduction in the number of baptisms during this twenty year period.

Table 2.4 Conduit Street - The Age-Sex Structure in 1841

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BORN</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1771 or earlier</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772-1781</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782-1791</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792-1801</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802-1811</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812-1821</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822-1831</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-1841</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With a ratio of 87:100 the number of females in Conduit Street far outweighed the

149 Those over the age of 70.
150 This is the age group who are apparently missing from their home parish in 1841.
151 James Gread, born 1771; James Hern born 1799, a blacksmith and Ann Champion born 1818, the wife of a blacksmith.
152 The migration patterns and destinations of those leaving Bulkworthy between 1841 and 1901 are discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.
number of males. This was not accounted for by large numbers of female domestic servants as there were only two. This situation was not reflected in Hatherleigh as a whole, where there was a slightly higher than average number of males; the ratio being 97:100. This may be a result of the number of farm workers in the rural parts of the parish. Almost all of the discrepancy in Conduit Street is created by the unusually small number of young boys.

Like Bucks Mills, the number of Conduit Street inhabitants who were over the age of fifty was rather higher than the Devon percentage, with 20.4% of males and 22.6% of females falling in to this age group. Apart from an insignificant dip in the percentage of women in their thirties and forties, the proportions of women in the younger age groups were broadly in line with national and county averages. As might be expected in a street where there were craftsmen employing journeymen, the number of men in their twenties and thirties was higher than average but the noticeable incongruity is the lack of boys under the age of ten. There were nearly twice as many girls in this age group than boys and the percentage of all males who were under ten (14.5%) is much less than the Devon figure (26.1%). Anomalies in this age group are particularly difficult to explain, as it would be expected that young children would be likely to remain with their parents. The sample is however, very small and this may therefore not be significant.

The age and sex of the inhabitants that an area can support is, to a great extent,
determined by the occupational opportunities available and these will now be examined.

2.3.ii Occupational Patterns

When examining the occupational structures of the three settlements, in order to make comparisons valid, the percentage of the residents who can be considered to be economically active needs to be taken into account. Although it is acknowledged that there can be economically active inhabitants outside this age band, for the purposes of comparison, those aged between fifteen and sixty nine were considered. Those who fell within this age range constituted similar proportions of the total populations in all three areas. Bucks Mills had the lowest percentage (52.8%) and Conduit Street the highest with 62.1%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Economically active as a % of the total population</th>
<th>% of total population with an enumerated occupation</th>
<th>% of economically active with an enumerated occupation +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bucks Mills</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkworthy</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit Street</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ This does not include those in each settlement with a stated occupation who were under 15 or over 69

Comments have been included on those with enumerated occupations outside this age range within the narrative.

These percentages do not include those listed as ‘Independent’ as having an occupation.
### Table 2.6 Bucks Mills - The Occupational Structure in 1841

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Labourer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Includes 2 absent from home on census night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman's Assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Includes 1 female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lime Burner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milliner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Both female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamekeeper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glovemaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Almost certainly a farm servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 2.20 Bucks Mills - Occupational Categories in 1841

![Pie chart showing occupational categories in 1841](image)
Thirty five\textsuperscript{155} residents of Bucks Mills (28.9\%) had entries in the occupation column of the 1841 census. Of those who did not, forty nine were under the age of sixteen. Two under sixteens\textsuperscript{156} did have stated occupations and many others in this age group would have been undertaking paid work of some kind, if only seasonal. Another thirty, with no designated occupation, were females who were co-resident with, and presumably dependent upon, a husband or father. One woman, living with two young daughters, was described as ‘independent’. The only other females who did not appear to have a male breadwinner were Susan Chidsley and her co-resident mother Mary; Susan was one of four females credited with an occupation, that of glovemaker. The Chidsleys also had a male lodger who presumably contributed towards the household economy. The other working women consisted of a fisherman’s assistant, whose father owned fishing boats, and two milliners.

The only Bucks Mills resident with any real claim to social status, in 1841, was Mary Loggin; she was the widow of the perpetual curate of Woolfardisworthy and of independent means.\textsuperscript{157} The predominant occupation was that of agricultural labourer; a source of employment for twelve individuals. In related trades were one gamekeeper and William Braund, who was described as a farmer. ‘Farmer’ here is a relative term and was certainly not a sign of landownership. William’s cottage and adjoining land were owned by the Pine Coffin estate and William sub-let the property from Smale’s solicitors, who were the lessees.\textsuperscript{158} William’s apparently elevated status may relate solely to the fact that he was employing an assistant. William was the only Bucks Mills resident to have a servant, fifteen year old Richard Dark, and he was almost certainly an outdoor, rather than a house, servant. Thus Richard too could be designated as an agricultural labourer. In 1841 William Braund and his wife were running the local beer shop, ‘The Coffin Arms’,\textsuperscript{159} from their cottage and William’s ‘farm’ would have consisted of the land around this dwelling; there is nothing to suggest that William’s holding was any greater than that of his neighbours. At the baptisms of his children, in

\textsuperscript{155} This includes the two sailors, who were absent from home on census night and one individual described as ‘Independent’.

\textsuperscript{156} A fifteen year old servant, almost certainly a farm servant, and an eleven year old fisherman’s assistant who was working with his grandfather.

\textsuperscript{157} As this is not strictly an occupation, she has been discounted from further analysis.

\textsuperscript{158} Parkham Tithe Schedule 1840 IR29/9/317, held at The National Archives, Kew.

\textsuperscript{159} Parkham Church Rate Book 1892A-3 held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
1838 and 1842, William described himself as a fisherman. It was almost certainly William’s multiple occupations, rather than his acreage, that necessitated the employment of Richard Dark.

As ever, in 1841, the sea provided a living for several male villagers and three fishermen can be found together with one male fisherman’s assistant and one sailor. To this must be added the two absent seamen who form part of the initial sample. Throughout the history of Bucks Mills, the residents combined small scale agriculture with fishing and it is highly likely that many of those designated ‘agricultural labourer’ or ‘fisherman’ in fact did both. The other local trade, represented in the 1841 sample, was that of lime burner. Two residents worked in the village kilns and it is probable that others would have come from further afield to share this work. The working of the kiln, and its seasonal nature, meant that this too was an occupation that was often combined with other work. The two masons in the village, John Metherell and Robert Davey, were both long term residents of Bucks Mills who had been responsible for much of its construction. The remaining male workers in the village provided services, such as that of miller, butcher, cooper and shoemaker.

Six adult males did not have an occupation, five of these were still living in the family home and the sixth, seventy six year old John Phillips, was lodging with the Chidsleys. Of those still with their fathers, two were in their twenties and the sons of masons, and two sixteen year olds were the sons of agricultural labourers, leaving Thomas Braund. It is possible that Thomas, at the age of thirty six, was genuinely unemployed or unemployable. Although no handicap was stated, he again had no occupation in the 1851 census, after which he cannot be traced.

160 Both arrived in the village in the early 1810s.
161 Those, known from other sources, to be aged sixteen or over.
Table 2.7 Bulkworthy - The Occupational Structure in 1841

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Labourer</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Servant</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>All female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glovemaker</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>All female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressmaker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Apprentice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All male and in households of farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journeyman Blacksmith</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Keeper</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Both female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.21 Bulkworthy - Occupational Categories in 1841

When compared to Bucks Mills, a far higher percentage of Bulkworthy’s inhabitants (44.9%)^{162} were listed as having an occupation in 1841. This is very similar to the

^{162} Compared to 28.9% in Bucks Mills.
percentage found in the less rural environment of Conduit Street. In fact, if those designated as ‘Independent’ are excluded, the percentage of Bulkworthy residents with a named occupation, 44.4%, was noticeably in excess of that in Conduit Street with 37.2%.\footnote{163} As twenty nine of the eighty eight inhabitants of Bulkworthy who were given an occupation were women, the possibility that the high total in Bulkworthy was a result of differing practices by the enumerators was considered. As Higgs says, the under enumeration of female occupations is an acknowledged weakness of the census records. ‘There is a growing body of evidence which indicates problems with the recording of the work of women in the censuses.’\footnote{164} There does not, however, appear to have been an under recording of female occupations by the 1841 enumerators for Bucks Mills or Conduit Street, as the proportion of women in these areas with stated occupations is similar in later enumerations. Undoubtedly almost all of the females in all three settlements would have carried out unpaid work helping farming, fishing and tradesmen husbands. If females are ignored, Bulkworthy still had a higher percentage of working men (62.1%) than Bucks Mills (51.7%).

Of those living in Bulkworthy with no stated occupation, all except three were wives, children under sixteen or older daughters who were apparently dependent on a male household head who was in work. Two of the exceptions were the widowed Sarah Short aged seventy three and her thirty year old mentally disabled son, who were lodging with the, apparently unrelated, Bridgeman family. Sarah and Thomas’ source of income is unknown; none of the inhabitants were enumerated as ‘Pauper’ so it is possible that Sarah was in receipt of relief but that the enumerator did not record this. The third individual with no obvious means of financial support was Mary Leach, who was sharing a household with William Braddon and his wife. The Bradfords had a small baby and Mary may have been assisting with its care in return for board. Also in the household was Mary’s daughter Grace who was generating an income as a glove maker. Again there appears to have been no blood tie between lodger and landlord.

In 1841, Bulkworthy contained the expected service providers associated with a

\footnote{163} This is partly a result of the very high proportion of females in Conduit Street.  
relatively self sufficient settlement, shopkeepers, carpenters, coopers, a shoemaker, thatcher, blacksmith, miller, butcher and mason. As in Bucks Mills, the principal source of employment was the land, providing work for seven farmers and thirty five agricultural labourers. The three males, one aged twenty and two aged fifteen\textsuperscript{165} who were designated as ‘parish apprentices’, were all in the households of farmers and would undoubtedly also have been working on the farms, whilst being supported through the Poor Law system. Thus, three quarters of all working men in Bulkworthy were employed in agriculture making it far more significant to the area than it was in Bucks Mills, where half the working population had an occupation unrelated to farming. This is understandable, given the location of the two study areas.

Nineteen Bulkworthy under sixteens were credited with occupations, ten agricultural labourers, five female servants, two journeymen blacksmiths, a dressmaker and a glove maker. This apparently buoyant employment market is in contrast to the situation in Bucks Mills and is, no doubt, a result of the continuing agricultural opportunities in Bulkworthy at this time.

\textsuperscript{165} These are ages which have been rounded down to the nearest five years.
Table 2.8 Conduit Street - The Occupational Structure in 1841

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independant</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8 female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Labourer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiner</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Servant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milliner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiner's Apprentice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist Minister</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engraver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feltmonger (sic)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Almost certainly meant to be Fellmonger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat Maker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging House Keeper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason's Apprentice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch Maker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool Sorter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.22 Conduit Street - Occupational Categories in 1841
44.6% of the residents of Conduit Street in 1841 had an entry in the ‘occupation’ column. Eleven of these were listed as ‘Independent’; if these are ignored, the percentage with employment is reduced to 37.2%. The inclusion of so many of independent means, most of whom were women, needs consideration. In a street of tradesmen and craftsmen this is a higher figure than might be expected. This may be due to the enumerator’s interpretation of the term, as there were none so listed ten years later. The percentage of residents with a named occupation exceeds that for Bucks Mills; this is not surprising as Bucks Mills would not be expected to have the range of tradesmen that are found in a small market town. Despite Conduit Street having the highest proportion of residents in the economically active age group, the percentage with a listed occupation is noticeably lower than that of Bulkworthy. This is a reflection of the female employment opportunities in Bulkworthy, which were much greater than those in the other two study areas. Nine women in Conduit Street had occupations, three milliners, a shopkeeper, a lodging-house keeper, a wool sorter and three domestic servants.

Only three individuals in Conduit Street in 1841 who were definitely under the age of sixteen were listed as having an occupation. There were two female domestic servants, aged twelve and fourteen, and fifteen year old John Petherick, who was described as a smith. Two further males, an engraver and a joiner’s apprentice, were listed as fifteen but because of the rounding down of ages in 1841, may in fact have been as old as nineteen.166

There were four individuals in Conduit Street with no obvious source of income, Susan Berry aged sixty and her two year old co-habitee Susanna Berry, eighty year old Sarah Chudley who was living with and was presumably dependent upon her son, and William Smale aged twenty five. William was living with his elderly father, who was a hat maker and William was almost certainly working as such himself; he was listed as a hat maker ten years later. Apart from these, all the residents either had an occupation, were

166 The remaining individuals with occupations in Conduit Street, who were listed as fifteen, are known from other sources to have been at least sixteen years old.
the wives, older daughters or children of a male householder or were listed as being ‘Independent’.

Conduit Street was part of the town of Hatherleigh and as such, did not need to achieve the level of self-sufficiency of the other two areas. Nevertheless, a wide variety of occupations were represented within the street. Despite the decline in textile production in the area by 1841, there were still ten individuals who were employed in related trades. The construction industry was also well represented with joiners, carpenters and masons all being present. What was perhaps surprising for a market town was the presence of nine agricultural labourers living in the street. They comprised 16·4% of all those listed as being in employment and were presumably working on the surrounding farms.

Those seeking to move into an area need to fit into the existing occupational structure, therefore the level and range of employment opportunities will have an influence on the sphere of influence of that settlement. It is to be expected that an area with a thriving economy and jobs available, will attract incomers from a wider area than a neighbourhood with little to offer in the way of work. By examining the origins of the inhabitants of the three study areas, it is possible to assess the distances that in-migrants were prepared to travel in order to take up residence there; this aspect will now be considered.

2.3.iii The Birthplaces\textsuperscript{167} of the Inhabitants of 1841

In order to provide a base line for comparison, the birthplaces of those resident in the three settlements in 1841 were analysed and the results depicted in Figures 2.20, 2.24 and 2.28.

\textsuperscript{167} See Chapter 1.2.iii for details of how birthplaces were established.
It has not been possible to trace the precise birthplace of five of the 121 1841 residents of Bucks Mills, although all of these claimed to have been born in Devon. In most cases, likely origins are known and it is probable that the majority had come only a short distance. At least 31-4% of the Bucks Mills inhabitants of 1841 had been born in the village. A further 33% were recorded as being from the parent parishes of Woolfardisworthy or Parkham, and it is quite possible that some of these were also born in Bucks Mills itself. Thus, considering that the bulk of Bucks Mills had only been in existence for a generation, a very large proportion of its inhabitants were not immigrants. As might be expected, all of these were under the age of thirty and those of definite Bucks Mills origin formed half the village population in this age group.

---

168 Ann Slee - probably from Bradford, Mary Chidsley - probably from Buckland Brewer, Hester Loggin - possibly from Starcross, Mary Jolliffe and John Phillips.
Table 2.9 Bucks Mills - Birth Years of the Inhabitants of 1841 Born in Bucks Mills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BORN</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pre 1812</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812-1821</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822-1831</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-1841</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.24 Bucks Mills - Contiguous Parishes

Twenty five individuals entered Bucks Mills from contiguous parishes. It is very likely that at least one of the five whose birthplace has not been confirmed also came from these parishes. Of those who came from the parishes adjoining Parkham and Woolfardisworthy, twenty one (84%) had come in from the west. Four had come from the south, but none at all from the parishes of Alwington and Littleham, to the east of Parkham.

169 Alwington, Bradworthy, Buckland Brewer, Clovelly, East Putford, Hartland, Littleham or West Putford.
170 From Clovelly or Hartland.
Although the western parishes are the more populous, this is not sufficient to fully explain this trend. If the twenty five migrants from contiguous parishes had arrived at Bucks Mills in numbers proportional to the 1841 census populations of those sending parishes, the expected number of migrants from each parish should be as shown in Table 2.10. This reveals that there were more migrants than expected from the westerly parishes of Hartland and Clovelly. As will be seen, this imbalance was two-way, with more short distance out-migrants from Bucks Mills heading west, rather than east.
Table 2.10 Bucks Mills Actual Birthplaces of Inhabitants, Compared with Expected Birthplaces, according to 1841 Census Populations of Sending Parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sending Parish</th>
<th>In-Migrants</th>
<th>Expected Number</th>
<th>Actual Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Westerly Parishes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clovelly</td>
<td>3-5 (14%)</td>
<td>9 (36%)</td>
<td>more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartland</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>12 (48%)</td>
<td>more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southerly Parishes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradworthy</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckland Brewer</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Putford</td>
<td>1-75 (7%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Putford</td>
<td>0-75 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easterly Parishes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alwington</td>
<td>1-5 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleham</td>
<td>1-5 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is to be expected that agricultural labourers, whilst still working for the same estate, might move within its boundaries. Yet, although the Pine Coffin Estate extended from the most populous, Parkham, side of Bucks Mills, eastwards into Alwington, no more than three people can be shown to have moved west from Alwington into Bucks Mills during the study period. Samuel Bagelhole arrived from Alwington following his marriage in 1843 but he had only been a short-term resident of Alwington, having been born in Bucks Mills. Richard Pennington, a native of Alwington, married a Bucks Mills’ girl in 1844. Mary Jane Hamlyn, who was also born in Alwington, married into the village in 1863; Mary’s step-mother had grown up in Bucks Mills.

As the parish of Hartland is bounded on two sides by sea, migrants from Hartland had no choice but to head south, into Bradworthy or Cornwall, or eastwards, into Clovelly and Woolfardisworthy. It might be thought that the drift between Bucks Mills and its western neighbours of Clovelly and Hartland, could be explained by the lime burning and fishing; occupations that were common to all three. Indeed the two Bucks Mills lime burners in 1841 were both from Hartland. The other male heads of household from these parishes were an agricultural labourer, a mason, a miller and a shoemaker. Fishing and lime burning were however also found in the hamlet of Peppercombe, part of the parish of Alwington to the east of Bucks Mills and, as has been seen, there was no

---

171 The sample size is too small to employ a test for statistical significance.
regular exchange in this direction.

It is likely that occupation did play a significant role in some of the in-migrations. Robert Davey and John Metherell, both masons, had arrived in Bucks Mills at the time it was being built, and were responsible for most of the houses in the village. John had only moved from Clovelly. Robert had come slightly further, from Weare Giffard, seven miles to the east. He had, however, married in Hartland, and may have been there in the interim. Although his wife had been born thirteen miles from Bucks Mills, Robert’s father in law was one of the very few eighteenth century Bucks Mills’ residents, which may well account for Davey’s involvement in the building of the village. Thus, in this case, a couple who had apparently moved slightly further than most, with an occupational motive, in fact had strong family ties with Bucks Mills; links which are only discernible by tracing matriarchal lines.

Less than 10% of the inhabitants enumerated in Bucks Mills in 1841 had been born further away than a neighbouring parish. Of these, only three had travelled more than fifteen miles from their birthplace and only one had come further than fifty miles. The latter was Mary Loggin, widow of the perpetual curate of Woolfardisworthy, who had been born in Kings Lynn, Norfolk. It is of significance that this was the only professional, Class 1, family in the village in 1841. It was one of Mary Loggin’s daughters who also came from slightly further away from Bucks Mills. She was born in Starcross, just outside Exeter, where her mother had been taking refuge with a chief coastguard officer and former Royal Marine, by whom she appears to have had three children, during the lifetime of her mentally unstable husband. After her husband’s death Mary Loggin returned to Bucks Mills with two of these children, in somewhat straightened circumstances, and tried to claim her entitlement to some of her husband’s estate.

Of the five males and seven females who had arrived in Bucks Mills by 1841, having been born in a location more distant than a neighbouring parish, the majority seem to
have travelled alone. Apart from Mary Loggin and her daughter, who were returning to Bucks Mills after a time away, only the Risdon family arrived as a group. The father, William, was a gamekeeper and as such may have possessed skills that were not available more locally. He had moved about twelve miles, from Petrockstow, together with his wife, who had migrated an additional twenty miles before their marriage, and three children. Thus the majority of these longer distance migrants were adults who moved to the hamlet and began married life, at a time when the settlement was just starting to grow; five of the eight adult migrants having associations with Bucks Mills before 1820.

Mary actually returned to Bucks Mills with two daughters but the birthplace of the younger, Hester Maria, has not been established so she is not included in these calculations.

The fourth Risdon child, Jane, almost certainly made a similar move from Petrockstow but her birthplace has not been confirmed.
The 1841 census figures for Devon\textsuperscript{175} show that 90-4\% of Devon residents were born in the county, with very little difference between males and females. It might be expected that more migrants would be found in towns and thus Bucks Mills would have a smaller number of out of county residents. The village was, however, only six miles from the Cornish border, which means that even very short distance migrants would be classified as out of county. The fact that only 1-6\% of Bucks Mills inhabitants came from beyond the county boundary, one of whom was born only thirteen miles away in Poughill, Cornwall, suggests that Bucks Mills was attracting noticeably fewer out of county migrants than Devon as a whole.

\textsuperscript{174} This map does not include Mary Loggin née Marshall from Kings Lynn, Norfolk.

The geographical origins of the residents of Bulkworthy in 1841 were harder to trace than those of the inhabitants of Bucks Mills. This is primarily because such a large number of those in Bulkworthy disappear between 1841 and the 1851 census, which would have given a precise birthplace. Of a total base population of 196, 85.2% have an identifiable birthplace which can be established from a later census return or a baptism record. 46.4% of all residents, in 1841, were born within Bulkworthy itself and a further 16.8% came from adjacent parishes. It is highly likely that the majority of those whose Devon birthplace is unknown, also originated in the area close to Bulkworthy. Only seven individuals had arrived in Bulkworthy from beyond Devon. Two came from

---

176 Only 14 of those, whose place of baptism was used as a substitute for birthplace, were baptised before 1813. The remainder had an ‘abode’ recorded in the baptism register and this was assumed to be the place of birth unless there was compelling evidence to the contrary. See Chapter 1.2.iii for full details of how birthplaces were established.
Morwenstow, Cornwall, less than fifteen miles away, and a further three were born in eastern Cornish parishes that fall into the 16-50 mile category. This leaves just two immigrants, John Narraway and George Nottle, who may possibly have come from beyond Devon and Cornwall; however both these surnames are found in the West Country.

**Figure 2.28 Bulkworthy - Contiguous Parishes**

Of those resident in Bulkworthy in 1841, thirty three individuals, had been born in an
adjoining parish.\textsuperscript{177} These were drawn from all sides of Bulkworthy in proportions that might be expected, given the relative populations of the sending parishes. A further thirty two people had been born in a non-contiguous parish, yet had travelled no further than fifteen miles from their birthplace, in order to live in Bulkworthy.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2_29.png}
\caption{Bulkworthy - Birthplaces of the Inhabitants of 1841 who had come from Contiguous Parishes}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{177} Abbots Bickington, Buckland Brewer, East Putford, Milton Damerel, Newton St. Petrock, Shebbear and West Putford. Milton Damerel and Shebbear do not actually share a boundary with Bulkworthy but have been considered as contiguous as there is a point of contact.
Eleven people are known to have come to Bulkworthy having been born more than fifteen miles away. Six of these were the Parsons family who had recently arrived from Lifton on the Devon-Cornwall border. The parents had been born in South Petherwin Cornwall and all four children had been born in Lifton. Two women, by 1841 married to local men, came from Ringsash and North Hill. Agnes Bridgeman and her daughter originated in Stoke Damerel; these were the only inhabitants of 1841 Bulkworthy who had come from a non-rural background. The final, longer distance, in-migrant was John Tucker, an elderly farmer from Instow.

There does seem to be some correlation between distance migrated and occupation. More than two thirds of the agricultural labourers, whose birthplace is known, had been born outside the parish. However, for tradesmen, such as carpenters, coopers and
shoemakers the reverse is true, suggesting that, for them, there was less need to migrate in order to seek work. Four of the seven farmers were Bulkworthy born. Of the three farmers who were in-migrants, only James Parsons had a holding of any notable size; he was farming the three hundred acres at Stowford.

Figure 2.31 Conduit Street - Birthplaces of the Inhabitants of 1841

Of the 148 individuals residing in Conduit Street in 1841, thirty eight had a birthplace that was no more precise than ‘Devon’. There is however, nothing to suggest that they had come any greater distances than those for whom a parish of origin is known. Of those whose Devon birthplace has been identified, 65% were born in Hatherleigh.

---

178 7 agricultural labourers were born in Bulkworthy and 16 elsewhere. 11 tradesmen were born in Bulkworthy and 4 elsewhere. The link between occupation and propensity to migrate is discussed in Chapter 5.2.iii.

179 51.3% of the total Conduit Street population.
itself and a further twenty eight inhabitants had travelled no more than fifteen miles. In the less rural environment of Conduit Street, it might have been expected that there would be more evidence of long distance in-migration. This was not the case. Nowhere in Devon is more than fifty miles from Hatherleigh and only three individuals (2%) came from outside Devon. William Weeks, a mason, had travelled from London and the child, Mary Walter, had come from Bristol to stay with her maternal aunt. The home county of the third non-Devonian, Thomas Roberts, of independent means, is not known.
Figure 2.32 Hatherleigh - Contiguous Parishes
Only fourteen (9.5%) of the residents of Conduit Street in 1841 were born in a neighbouring parish. It is probable, however, that a further five of those whose precise origin is unknown, did likewise. What is of interest is the direction from which these immigrants came. In a similar manner to Bucks Mills, the incomers were not drawn from surrounding parishes in proportions that were commensurate with the populations of

---

180 This figure is arrived at by assuming that those with unknown origins had birthplaces in categories proportionate to those who origins are known.
those parishes. Northlew, for example, had a number of residents that was more than
twice that of any of the other contiguous parishes, apart from Inwardleigh. It was home
to nearly three times the population of Highampton, yet no-one had arrived in
Hatherleigh from Northlew. There was also a noticeable tendency for people to move in
to Hatherleigh from the north and west, rather than the south and east; a pattern that
persisted throughout the century. This may in part be explained by geography,
Highampton, the birthplace of five Conduit Street in-migrants, is, for instance, on the
main Holsworthy-Hatherleigh road; yet an equally significant route, that from
Torrington to Okehampton, passes from Meeth, through Hatherleigh, to Inwardleigh. It
must be said that no such main road exists between Northlew and Hatherleigh and it
seems that inhabitants of rural Northlew who wanted to become town dwellers were
attracted to the larger settlement of Okehampton, in preference to Hatherleigh. It is
also possible that Hatherleigh was acting as a stopping off point for migrants who were
heading for the better agricultural land in south Devon.

\[181\] This is ascertained by using the 1851 census index which enables a search of all those born
in Northlew and their then residence to be carried out.
The flow from the north continues to be marked when those coming in from further away than an adjacent parish are considered. None of those arriving in Conduit Street having been born in a non-contiguous parishes within fifteen miles of Hatherleigh had made a northward journey. Of the three who travelled between sixteen and fifty miles,
two came from the east\textsuperscript{182} and only one from the south, Jane Glanville from Plymouth. The existence of Dartmoor, to the south of Hatherleigh, obviously has implications for the likelihood of in-migrants coming from this direction but this alone does not seem sufficient to explain the pattern. Again it seems that the presence of the larger town of Okehampton, only eight miles south of Hatherleigh, was proving the stronger magnet for those from this direction.

2.3.iv Kinship Links between the Inhabitants of 1841

Kinship links\textsuperscript{183} between the occupied households of the study areas, in 1841, were plotted on figures 2.35, 2.36 and 2.37. This was done by considering the patriarchal and matriarchal connections of the heads of household and their spouses.\textsuperscript{184}

In 1841, twenty four of the twenty six dwellings in Bucks Mills were occupied. Of these, twelve families can definitely be ascribed to particular houses and the others have almost certainly been correctly attributed. Even as early as 1841, just one generation after the establishment of the village, only eight of these twenty four households had no proven kinship link to any of the others. Of these, that of William Pennington, shared a surname with two other households and his wife’s maiden name was the same as that of another household head. Although no relationship has yet been found it seems highly likely that there was one.

As might be expected, the eight households for whom no link was found included four where the heads were migrants from beyond the neighbouring parishes. One of the others consisted of a Parkham born, unmarried, female head who was the illegitimate daughter of a mother who was herself illegitimate; thus the scope for kin was severely limited. The three remaining were that of William Pennington, mentioned above, John Metherell the mason and John Goodenough from Buckland Brewer whose wife shared a maiden name with the head of another village household.

\textsuperscript{182} Tiverton and Payhembury.
\textsuperscript{183} Kinship is discussed more fully in Ch. 3.2.i.
\textsuperscript{184} This process is described more fully in Chapter 1.3.
Table 2.11 Bucks Mills - Number of 1841 Households with Kinship Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>1st DEGREE</th>
<th>2nd DEGREE</th>
<th>3rd DEGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saunders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlyn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolliffe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagelhole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the households with kinship links with at least one other contained heads, or their spouses, who were born locally.\(^{185}\) Of these sixteen households, seven, all belonging to the Braund family, were connected to at least seven others. Joseph Braund senior and his brother, John, shared relationships of the first degree\(^{186}\) with five and four other households respectively and James Braund junior, whose wife was also a Braund, was related to the heads of nine other village households. It was the Braund family who were the lynch pins of the kinship network in Bucks Mills. Joseph, John and their younger brother, James senior, had all arrived in the village from Woolfardisworthy in its earliest years and, by 1901, individuals named Braund would account for 66% of the residents, with many more being descended from, or married to, female Braunds. What is less obvious is the importance of the Glover family, who came from beyond Bucks Mills in Parkham. Throughout the research period no Glover was born to a village family, yet, in 1841, four households had Glover mothers and a further three, Glover wives. The

\(^{185}\) Bucks Mills, Woolfardisworthy, Parkham or Hartland.

\(^{186}\) Parent/child or siblings.
Braunds are clearly the paramount ‘core family’ in Bucks Mills yet others such as the Glovers, Harrises and Saunders were also important, as will be seen.

Figure 2.35 Bucks Mills - Kinship Links Amongst 1841 Households

When considering the occupants of Bulkworthy homes in 1841, it is possible to be certain who lived in the larger farms. It is much more difficult to decide the precise location of some of the labourers’ households; for example, to distinguish which of the Haytown cottages was the abode of a specific family. There were thirty eight occupied households, of which eighteen (47.4%) appear to have no family links with the heads of the other households, or their spouses. As in Bucks Mills, these unrelated households do include those of longer distance migrants, such as the Parsons from South Petherwin and John Tucker from Instow. There are however a notable number of unrelated

---


188 See in particular Chapter 3.2.i and Chapter 4.2.
households whose heads are from parishes adjacent to Bulkworthy and four of these household heads were born in Bulkworthy itself.

Table 2.12 Bulkworthy - Number of 1841 Households with Kinship Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>1st DEGREE</th>
<th>2nd DEGREE</th>
<th>3rd DEGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damerel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hern</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcombe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hern</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcombe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcombe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damerel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcombe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty Bulkworthy households were linked by blood or marriage to at least one other. Of these, at least 189 fifteen had a head who was born in Bulkworthy or who had a Bulkworthy born wife. The remainder were all short distance migrants in their seventies who appear to have moved to the parish upon, or shortly after, marriage. It is the Hern and Bear families who are, between them, responsible for more than half of the kinship links within Bulkworthy. Both of these were labouring families, based in Haytown. The Newcombes, a family of substantial yeomen, also created connections between several households. Whilst, by 1841, the Newcombes had been in Bulkworthy for at least a century, the Bears and the Herns were more recent incomers, both arriving in the parish in the 1790s.

A further three households had as heads, individuals or their spouses whose precise birthplace is unknown.
An examination of the links found between the heads of the thirty five occupied households in Conduit Street in 1841 needs to take account of the fact that it is a single street within a town. It may well be that the inhabitants of this street has close kinship links with those in neighbouring streets, making the spatial entity of less significance than that of the other areas. Although this means that comparisons with the other two areas may be less meaningful, it will still be possible to investigate any changes in the degree of kinship that may occur during the study period.

The precise residence of the majority of these households can be positively identified. Only ten household heads, or their spouses, can be proved to have any link with their fellow residents of Conduit Street. There were, however, several instances of same-name families\textsuperscript{190} for whom no link has been established, yet a connection seems likely. Could, for example, two Israel Abells, living in adjacent properties, really be unrelated?

\textsuperscript{190} For example the Weeks and the Chudleys.
Table 2.13 Conduit Street - Number of 1841 Households with Kinship Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>1st DEGREE</th>
<th>2nd DEGREE</th>
<th>3rd DEGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulleid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulleid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowden</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Abell and Edwards families are responsible for most of the links that are found between households in Conduit Street. By 1841, the Edwards had been in Hatherleigh for at least 130 years and the Abells for over three centuries. Apart from the two Bulleid brothers, who had recently moved from Dolton, all of those for whom links were found were born in Hatherleigh.

Figure 2.37 Conduit Street - Kinship Links Amongst 1841 Households
It is important to compare kinship densities in the three settlements, as well as other differences that were apparent at the outset of the period under review. This is addressed in the following section, before returning, in Chapter 3, to the aspect of kinship and investigating how local family ties impacted upon the lives of the populations of the study areas.

### 2.4 The Settlements under Scrutiny

The three settlements under review are no more than fifteen miles apart and were, in the nineteenth century, not dissimilar in terms of population and the number of dwellings that they contained. They were however, vastly different in area, varying from the single Conduit Street to Bulkworthy, a parish of over a thousand acres. They also provide contrasting locations, one coastal, one unequivocally rural and the other urban. It is time to review these settlements in 1841 and, where possible, to compare them with what is seen as typical for Devon and the country as a whole.

#### Table 2.14 Comparison of the Ratio of Males to Females in the Three Settlements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England and Wales</th>
<th>Devon</th>
<th>Bucks Mills</th>
<th>Bulkworthy</th>
<th>Conduit Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male:Female Ratio</td>
<td>95:100</td>
<td>90:100</td>
<td>92:100</td>
<td>94:100</td>
<td>87:100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample sizes mean that the male:female ratios in the three settlements need to be viewed with some caution; nonetheless the figures reveal that all the studied areas contain more females than would be expected from the national ratio. When the Devon figures are considered, however, it can be seen that the proportion of women in both Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy was lower than the county figure, whilst that for Conduit Street was higher. Possible reasons for the proportions found have been discussed in Chapter 2.3.i. The Conduit Street ratio (87:100) was very different from that for Hatherleigh (97:100), suggesting that there was a particularly high number of women in Conduit Street. In the parish as a whole, however, there were less than might be expected from the national and county figures. Although Hatherleigh had a rural hinterland, the majority of the population were in the town itself, where a higher proportion of women might have been expected as a result of the employment
opportunities that towns could provide.

Table 2.15 Comparison of the Age-Sex Structures in the Three Settlements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Born</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>Bucks Mills</td>
<td>Bulkworthy</td>
<td>Conduit Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771 or earlier</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772-1781</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782-1791</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792-1801</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802-1811</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812-1821</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822-1831</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-1841</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When considering the percentage of men and women who fall into particular age groups, it can be seen that, whilst the figures are broadly similar, Devon had a slightly older population profile than that for the whole country. Apart from the lack of men between the ages of fifty and seventy in Bulkworthy, which is compensated for by those over seventy, the tendency in all three study areas was for the age profile to be even older than that of Devon. This is to be expected in Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy, given their rural nature; the Chadwick Report reported longer life expectancy in rural areas. Even Hatherleigh, undoubtedly a town, would be unlikely to provide the environment and adverse public health factors to be found in large cities such as Exeter and Plymouth.

---

Employment prospects, or the lack of them, affected the number of females under forty in the study areas. Bucks Mills, with no opportunities for domestic service and little cottage industry had very few, whereas Bulkworthy, where both types of employment were found, had figures that were nearer to the county average. There were far more working women in Bulkworthy than in the other two areas and also a greater number of those under the age of sixteen with listed occupations. This contributed to the higher overall percentage of the economically active in employment (68.5%) enjoyed by Bulkworthy. This compares favourably with the 48.4% found in Bucks Mills and more surprisingly, with the 55.4% of Conduit Street. This may be a reflection of the declining cloth trade in Hatherleigh and the consequent stagnation of the economy of this market town. In contrast, Bulkworthy’s large farms ensured that there was sufficient work for its agricultural labourers, thus allowing the percentage of those in work to exceed that of the more urban environment of Conduit Street.

Of the three areas, Bulkworthy’s occupational structure was the least diverse, with three quarters of its working men dependent on agriculture. Nonetheless it had a range of tradesmen, allowing the settlement a high degree of self sufficiency. Agriculture was also prominent amongst the occupations of the inhabitants of Bucks Mills; here, it must be remembered, a number of individuals combined fishing and agriculture as ways of earning a living. As might be expected, the widest range of occupations was found in Conduit Street. Its proximity to the rest of the town and the rural hinterland meant that it had less need to be self-sufficient, yet a variety of trades are represented. It is also the only one of the three settlements where traditional apprentices were found.

It is time to consider whether these very different occupational structures impacted upon the catchment areas from which migrants to the settlements were drawn. 85.1% of those resident in Bucks Mills in 1841, had been born no further away than a parish adjacent to the parent parishes of Parkham and Woolfardisworthy. This reflects a lack of longer distance appeal when compared to Bulkworthy and Conduit Street, for which the figures
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193 In Bulkworthy, 5 in Bucks Mills and 8 in Conduit Street.
194 These figures exclude those listed as ‘Independent’.
196 As opposed to those in the other settlements who were ‘parish apprentices’, apprenticed to farm work under the auspices of the poor law.
are 63.2% and 60.8% respectively. It should be noted, however, that both Bulkworthy and Conduit Street contained larger numbers of 1841 inhabitants whose precise birthplace could not be traced and a number of these would undoubtedly have fallen into this category, thus bringing their percentages nearer to that of Bucks Mills. Even without those whose exact place of birth cannot be narrowed down, it is clear that more of the residents of Bulkworthy and Conduit Street came from further than did those who entered Bucks Mills. At least 22.9% of the population had travelled from beyond a contiguous parish in order to take up residence in Bulkworthy, more than twice the percentage for Bucks Mills. This is not to suggest that Bulkworthy attracted migrants from long distances. What is evident in Bulkworthy is a pattern of predominantly rural-rural migration, from distances of less than fifteen miles. Agricultural labourers in Bulkworthy were likely to be incomers, whereas the majority of tradesmen were Bulkworthy born. This pattern of short-distance rural-rural movement of agricultural labourers in Bulkworthy reflects that found by Goose amongst the straw workers of the Berkhamstead region of Hertfordshire. Unlike those who had come to Bucks Mills from slightly longer distances, the incomers to Bulkworthy did not have any apparent previous links to the parish. Two of the three migrants who arrived in Conduit Street from beyond Devon had family links in the Street.

According to the 1841 census of Devon residents were born there, with gender making very little difference to the likelihood of remaining within the county. All but two residents of Bucks Mills (98.3%) had been born in Devon and one of the incomers, Elizabeth Pennington, had come from Poughill, only thirteen miles away across the Cornish border. Given that Bucks Mills was within six miles of Cornwall, this very high percentage of Devonians is of note. Both Bulkworthy and Conduit Street also had percentages of Devon born inhabitants that were higher than the county average. Bulkworthy’s 96.4% is not unexpected for an agricultural parish, yet this is exceeded by the 98% found in Conduit Street. In 1841, the more urban environment of Conduit Street was not attracting any greater number of longer distance migrants than the rural

197 Only two Bulkworthy residents of 1841 are known to have come from a town.
areas. This is partly due to Hatherleigh’s economic decline at the time but also because larger towns such as Tavistock and Bideford and beyond that, Plymouth and Exeter, were more likely to be a focus for those seeking a rural-urban move.

These three areas, whilst being similar in population size and profile, had very different physical qualities and occupational structures that impacted on their appeal for migrants. The extent of family ties within the settlements is also dissimilar. In order to compare the kinship links between heads of household that were identified in the three study areas more meaningfully, these were expressed as a percentage of the total possible kinship links for that location.

### 2.16 Identified Kinship Links between Household Heads as a Percentage of the Total Possible Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>1st DEGREE</th>
<th>2nd DEGREE</th>
<th>3rd DEGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bucks Mills</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkworthy</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit Street</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that the Bucks Mills’ kinship web was far more complex than that of the other two areas. These differences suggest very disparate settlements. It must also be remembered that, in 1841, Bucks Mills was still a ‘new’ village making the extent of the links there found even more striking.

Although a large number (52.6%) of households in Bulkworthy had some family links with others within the parish, these were not as extensive as the multiple links of the Bucks Mills households. The 33.3% of Bucks Mills household heads with no family connections to other inhabitants were mostly those who had come into the village from beyond the contiguous parishes. On the other hand, Bulkworthy had several households whose heads were born in the parish, yet who no longer had any relatives within it. Bulkworthy was a long established parish but its geography made its boundaries much more fluid than those of Bucks Mills. Geography again accounts for the paucity of links within Conduit Street, blurring as it does into the neighbouring streets. Indeed, at this date, part of what was to become Conduit Street, was named Tailors’ Street. Although Conduit Street itself was not affected, it may be that the fires in Hatherleigh in 1840,
and the subsequent rebuilding, resulted in increased movement within the town and thus lower than normal levels of relatedness.

To what extent then do the study areas fit the criteria of ‘community’ as discussed in Chapter 2.1? To what degree were these physical entities bound by common goals, kinship or shared values? Snell wrote that, ‘community in its main historical forms was comprised within a bounded or limited area in which almost everybody knew each other, to which people felt that they belonged, and in which someone who was not known was enquired about. It meant a district of inter-personal knowledge.’ Was this how the inhabitants of the three study areas viewed their localities? The relative strength of the sense of belonging will be discussed below and thus a tentative definition of what constitutes ‘community’ in each area may be arrived at.

Despite its recent creation, Bucks Mills displayed strong kinship links and was, within a generation of its inception, showing signs of being very inward looking, attracting few migrants from beyond its immediate environs. The isolation of the hamlet was partly a feature of its geography and its clearly defined, tangible boundaries were likely to have contributed to a sense of shared physical space. There were clearly a large number of family ties and responsibilities that were strengthened by the working of family fishing boats. Hidden by the statistics is the tangible religious community in the form of the Bible Christian Church that had a firm hold on the village by the 1830s. Family ties and religious affiliation worked together to create a community in Bucks Mills and this, in turn, influenced the migration decisions of its inhabitants.

Whilst the hamlet of Haytown has defined physical boundaries and thus is a community in the geographical sense, the boundaries of the parish of Bulkworthy blur with those if its neighbours and it seems unlikely that those in the outlying farms felt any more bound to each other than they did to the residents of, say, Abbots Bickington. For Bulkworthy, there was not even a shared place of Anglican worship. The Anglican community was seriously weakened by the presence of Bible Christianity within the parish and, in addition, a significant number of baptisms and marriages of Bulkworthy residents took

---

place in Abbotts Bickington or Buckland Brewer. Apart from a somewhat arbitrary church boundary, which was to change during the nineteenth century, can anything be said to be shared by the inhabitants of Bulkworthy to the exclusion of those outside? Although there were family and religious allegiances at work in Bulkworthy, these flowed across the parish border and any sense of collective values or experiences were unlikely to be restricted to Bulkworthy residents alone. As might be expected, Conduit Street displayed the fewest elements of a true community. In 1841 the residents do not even share a street name, there was a lack of family ties and nothing that distinguished this particular road from those surrounding it.

All three study areas fulfilled the definition of a community as a geographical entity. Some members within the areas were bound by family ties or religious belief, yet these were not exclusive to those within the physical boundaries of that locale. Of the three, only Bucks Mills was moving towards becoming a community that was largely self-contained and which had an identity that excludes those beyond its boundaries. This is substantiated by the high percentage of kinship links. Oral evidence, collected in the mid twentieth century, and written memoirs, reinforce the idea that outsiders were unwelcome in the village and that marriage outside the community was discouraged. Snell believes that the collapse of community and a sense of belonging was not brought about by the Industrial Revolution but that, although overlaid with an awareness of class identity, it lasted well into the twentieth century and this is certainly the case in Bucks Mills.

Ensuing chapters will discuss kinship and migration in these three areas in more detail, in order to establish how the patterns, identified in 1841, changed during the ensuing sixty years. It will also be possible to assess whether the extent of community identity became more or less pronounced as the nineteenth century progressed.

---

201 Oral evidence of Leonard Braund, Trevor Davey and Grenville Braund.
Chapter 3 Residents or Relations?

3.1 Researching Extended Kin - an essential exercise or a pointless procedure?

‘It is a wise father that knows his own child’

Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice* II.ii.83

Identifying the presence of kin is one thing, assessing their function and utility quite another. The effort involved in researching non-resident kinship links can only be justified if those ties were both known and utilised by the individuals concerned. It is necessary to consider the debate concerning the extent of kinship recognition in the past and, as a corollary, the degree to which, once recognised, such ties may have been drawn upon. Kin might be present in the same locality but these ties may not have been invoked. It is therefore important to distinguish between the presence of extended family members and the extent to which these connections were exploited.

The value of investigating extended kinship networks remains an issue that provokes argument; researchers\(^1\) fail to agree whether the weight of the findings carry sufficient significance to warrant the complexity of the task. It is thus necessary to defend the worth of the methods used in this research. Some context for the discussion concerning the level of interrelatedness and inter-kin marriage, found within the three study areas, is also required. In this way it is possible to assess whether the settlements under investigation consisted of a series of largely unconnected nuclear households, or a complex web of individuals related by blood or marriage. As stated in the Introduction, one of the key questions posed in this research concerns the effect of kinship links on the decision to migrate, or not, and on the subsequent choice of destination. In order to examine this issue, it is necessary to determine the extent to which kinship ties were recognised and the level of the influence that these connections may have had.

It can be difficult to gauge the degree to which the nineteenth century residents of a settlement would have been aware of relationships. Sources such as wills may be used as evidence of kinship links that were not only acknowledged but acted upon. Probate evidence, however, does not reveal the full extent of recognised kin; as Wrightson\textsuperscript{2} concedes, a testator could have been aware of many more kin than those mentioned in their will. Williams\textsuperscript{3} made use of lists of mourners, mentioned in newspaper reports of funerals, to deduce the extent of kinship recognition. Unfortunately, these reports are rare for the working classes in the nineteenth century; also it is not possible to know whether blood relationship or neighbourly ties were the reason for the funeral attendance of a genealogically more distant, but geographically local, relative. As Sabean wrote,

\begin{quote}
‘in any society, kin are found interacting in some situations and not in others. And there are many times when kin can transact business with each other but when kinship as a principle of their dealings is not the pertinent point.’\textsuperscript{4}
\end{quote}

Kinship exists at three levels; relationships that were acknowledged and which provided mutual support, links that were recognised but not exploited and those that were unknown to those concerned.

The extent to which kinship links were utilized is not, in the opinion of Strathern, the central issue. ‘Our understanding of kinship’, she feels, ‘need not be exhausted by data on how kinspersons interact with one another or the use to which connections are put in everyday life. It has a crucial dimension which lies beyond the domestic sphere.’\textsuperscript{5} The revisionists’ view of kinship, referred to by Plakans and Wetherell\textsuperscript{6} and adhered to by Wrightson and Levine\textsuperscript{7} and others, was discussed in the Introduction. Their stance is that, at least from the early modern period, kinship beyond the household was rarely acknowledged and was thus of little significance. The idea that extended family ties had an impact on the life of the individual, or processes within a settlement, was not

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{6} Plakans & Wetherell (2003) pp. 49-76.
\bibitem{7} Wrightson & Levine (1995).
\end{thebibliography}
accepted. ‘The payoff for seeking to find kin in the surrounding population that might have made a difference is potentially too small, therefore, to justify the effort of reconstruction.’\(^8\) It was thus felt that the difficult and time consuming process of seeking to establish comprehensive genealogical ties was unnecessary. For Plakans and Wetherell, the paucity of records showing kin who are not co-resident meant that ‘to create the measurable architecture of kinship required a quantum leap of research labour.’\(^9\) In contrast, for others such as Kertzer, Hogan and Karweit, researching in Casalecchio, Italy, the benefits, and indeed necessity, of considering extended kin were accepted.\(^10\) It was the influence of extended kin, including the often neglected maternal kin, with whom a surname is not shared, that is investigated here.

One method of calculating nineteenth century kinship awareness is to consider more recent studies, and researchers, such as Reay,\(^11\) have used twentieth century oral evidence to infer nineteenth century links. Strathern’s work on Elmdon in the 1960s\(^12\) is also relevant here. She found that those belonging to the four ‘real Elmdon’ families were acutely mindful of their membership of a significant kinship network. This consciousness seemed to cease, however, if a member of these families left the village or if female ‘real Elmdoners’ married an incomer. Williams\(^13\) found that, in 1960, the residents of the Devon agricultural village of ‘Ashworthy’\(^14\) might recognise second cousins once or twice removed. Here, in common with several other kinship studies,\(^15\) it has been considered sufficient to restrict investigations to relationships up to and including the third degree. This limit has been imposed, for the purposes of this research, because it appears to be the extent of likely recognition of kin in the communities involved.

---

\(^12\) Strathern (1982) pp. 72-100.
\(^13\) Williams (1963) p. 154.
\(^14\) Really Northlew.
The degree to which more recent recognition of relationships can be applied to the inhabitants of the villages of nineteenth century North Devon is a matter for deliberation. In the case of Bucks Mills, where evidence of this sort was available, it was found to corroborate that from Victorian letters, diaries and memoirs relating to those who constitute the sample populations of this study. This contemporary evidence suggests that the situation described by later residents, those of the 1940s and 1950s, was indeed very similar to that of a century earlier. It seems likely that, particularly where a surname was shared, there would be at least some awareness of, and sometimes pride in, kinship, even if its exact nature could not be defined. Thus the decision to research extended and maternal kin can be justified on the grounds that such links would have been recognised.

Recognition of kinship links does not, of course, mean that these were invoked, and the utilisation of such ties is essential if their investigation is to be worthwhile. What can be said with certainty is that the lack of kin within a settlement meant that there was no opportunity for support from relatives living locally. Both Zhao and Wrightson wrote of the impact of demographic change on the availability of kin, believing that the alterations in birth and death rates towards the end of the nineteenth century resulted in a smaller pool of relatives being available. Zhao does admit, however, that the real effect of this was not felt until the twentieth century. Dependence on family members, and the choice of kin upon whom to rely, varied not only with availability, but with the life stage of the individuals concerned. Calling upon kin may only have been necessary in times of crisis or significant change. Even those who believe that non-resident kinship links are not generally used, feel that there may be exceptions when major life events, such as emigration, occur. As Reay points out, migration with kin implies that there was an active decision to act upon a recognised relationship. Individual examples of acknowledged extended kin are described below and it will be seen that these
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16 That of the mid-twentieth century.
22 See Chapter 3.2.1.
relationships were invoked both at significant points and in day to day life.

It is only possible to make meaningful comments about the strength of kinship ties in the three study areas if the findings of other researchers are also considered; thus some impression of what constitutes a dense kinship web must be formed. Plakans and Wetherell found ‘that kinship density was extremely low in a relatively immobile nineteenth-century European agrarian population [this] confirms the underlying role of demography in constraining the possibilities for interaction between household and kin.’ Barry Reay, however, studying the role of kinship in three adjoining communities in Kent, discovered that in 1851 60.5% of households in Hernhill were related to at least one other, when first and second orders of kinship were considered. The majority of these (55%) were joined by first order links. 23.3% of households were related to at least four others in the first and second degree, 12.4% of these being of the first order. Wrightson’s work, on Terling, Essex in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, considered links up to the third degree of kinship. Incompleteness of sources meant that the actual links found constituted a minimum figure. Wrightson also calculated a maximum based on likely links; he thereby concluded that between 39.9% and 52.5% of households were related to others. Figures such as these provide some context for the findings in the communities studied for the purposes of this research and this will be discussed in greater depth.

Settlements that evince complex kinship networks have normally experienced high levels of endogamous and kin marriage. Wrightson’s ‘loose’ kinship links in Terling were due largely to the fact that marriage partners were ‘commonly’ from outside Terling. What then constituted a high rate of intermarriage between close relations? Kuper refers to two Victorian studies that suggest that something between 2.25% and
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27 See Chapter 3.3.
11% of marriages between first cousins could be expected. Kuper describes Arthur Mitchell’s examination of the causes of lunacy in Scotland, which involved an investigation into the extent of kin marriage. Mitchell concluded that although, overall, marriages between first and second cousins constituted less than 2% of all unions, in some areas, such as the island of Great Bernera, the percentage was as high as 11%. George Darwin studied Victorian first cousin marriage in various classes of society. He found that such marriages accounted for percentages which ranged from 4.5%, for aristocratic marriages, to 1.15% of marriages amongst all classes in London; thus the aristocracy proved to practice a higher level of intra-familial marriage than the lower classes. He concluded that 2.25% of all rural marriages were those between first cousins. This suggests that, when investigating the extent of intermarriage in the three settlements, anything exceeding 2.25% of marriages being those between first cousins, might be seen as a higher than average level.

According to Adam Kuper, the areas that form the sample for this research might expect to experience high levels of kin marriage on two counts. Firstly, ‘at all levels of society the incidence of cousin marriage was likely to be higher in small communities’ and both Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy fall firmly within this category. Secondly, ‘people who belonged to minority religions were particularly likely to marry close kin, as were family members who worked together in business.’ The strong influence of Bible Christianity in Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy and, to a lesser extent, Conduit Street, could certainly constitute a minority religion. The effect of fundamentalist religion on intermarriage was an issue that Blaikie considered worthy of further investigation. In the case of Bucks Mills, the involvement of many villagers in family fishing businesses could also be a factor. Blaikie found very high levels of kin marriage in the Victorian fishing villages of north-east Scotland, with 12% of marriages being isonymous, compared to a negligible number in non-fishing communities. This was, in part, a
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30 Then called, Berneray-Lewis.
consequence of patterns of surname distribution and isonymous marriages are not necessarily those between close kin, they do, however, suggest that a family link might be expected. Blaikie feels that the nature of the work increased social cohesion. Family members frequently co-owned boats and family labour was required for tasks such as mending nets, baiting hooks and salting fish.\textsuperscript{36} In the precarious world of the fisherman, the incentive to retain assets, such as boats, within a small group of close kin was great.

Snell wrote of the ‘relevance of geographical endogamy to research on local cultural regions and their distinctiveness’ yet he says, ‘little attention has been paid to these aspects of marital behaviour.’\textsuperscript{37} Some consideration is therefore given to these issues in Chapter 3.2.iii. Perry, researching in rural west Dorset, found that more than three quarters of all working class marriages between 1837 and 1886 were endogamous. After this date, the rate dropped rapidly.\textsuperscript{38} Snell cites several studies that suggest that the period 1830-1880 was one of falling rates of endogamy and broadening of marriage horizons.\textsuperscript{39} Having studied rural parishes in eight counties, however, he concluded, in line with Perry’s results, that it was not until the last two decades of the nineteenth century that more people sought exogamous marriage partners.\textsuperscript{40} Although Snell’s findings in Norfolk\textsuperscript{41} and Perry’s in Dorset\textsuperscript{42} revealed endogamy levels exceeding 70 and 80\% respectively, the studies of Mitson\textsuperscript{43} and that of Blaikie\textsuperscript{44} suggest that rates of 25\%-45\% might be considered high.

Of those arriving in Bucks Mills, 20\%-7\% did so as a result of their marriage to an existing resident. A similar number, although a smaller percentage (12\%-6\%), of out-migrants left in order to marry. The percentages were less in Bulkworthy and Conduit

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Perry (1969) p. 124.
\item Blaikie (2002) p. 23.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Street, nonetheless marriage horizons had significance when considering migration into and out from all three areas. The exogamous marriage partner does not seem to have been considered kin. In fact, as Strathern found in Elmdon, ‘marrying out’ often removed a villager from the kinship network in the minds of other inhabitants. This has implications for the extent to which kin were so recognised and thus the likelihood that they would influence migration decisions.

Far from being a pointless procedure, where the time involved far exceeds the value of the findings, the investigation of extended, non-resident kin does have validity for this research, and indeed is central to it. As Bowden found, ‘To more fully understand kinship, therefore, it is necessary to go beyond a study that sees the single family and the single household as being the fundamental cultural unit, toward an investigation of networks of families, households, and social groups.’ In order to accomplish this, the degree of interrelatedness between households and individuals in the three settlements has been examined. As a corollary, the extent of intermarriage and marriage horizons have also been considered.

3.2 Webs and Weddings: Kinship Links, Intermarriage and Marriage Horizons within the Three Settlements

Having examined the kinship networks in place in the three study areas in 1841, it is now necessary to consider how these links intensified or diminished as the nineteenth century progressed and to decide to what extent the kinship density experienced by the these settlements was unusually high or low. Once more is known about the web of interrelationships in the three localities, it will be easier to assess the influence that kin may have had on decisions to move out of, or to remain within, the study area concerned.
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45 In Bulkworthy 2.9% of in-migrants and 7.3% of identified out-migrants appear to have moved in order to marry. In Conduit Street the figures were 5.6% and 6.2% respectively.
48 See Chapter 2.3.iv.
3.2.i Kinship Links

It was only felt necessary to examine the extent of kinship links at three points in time. The households as they appeared in the censuses of 1841, 1871 and 1901 were chosen, as these represented the situation at approximately one generation intervals. Extant links, up to the third degree, were sought between the heads of each occupied household. Relationships between the spouses of household heads were treated in the same way.49

In 1841,50 the heads of sixteen (66.6%) of the twenty four occupied households in Bucks Mills were related to at least one other; this is not dissimilar to the percentage that Reay found in Hernhill, Kent in 1851.51 In Bucks Mills in 1841, seven households were connected to at least seven others and it is noteworthy that all of these families bore the surname Braund. With twenty four dwellings, 276 different connections between pairs of households were possible;52 thirty nine (14.1%) of these links existed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OCCUPIED</th>
<th>POSSIBLE LINKS</th>
<th>1ST DEGREE</th>
<th>2ND DEGREE</th>
<th>3RD DEGREE</th>
<th>LINKS FOUND</th>
<th>% LINKS FOUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49 Full details of the methods used can be found in Chapter 1.3.
50 See Chapter 2.3.iv for further details of kinship links in Bucks Mills in 1841.
51 60.5% of Hernhill households were related to at least one other in 1851. Reay (1996a) p. 93 and Reay (1996b) p.165.
52 (Total number of households x (total number of households - 1)).
Table 3.2 Bucks Mills - Number of 1871 Households with Kinship Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>1st DEGREE</th>
<th>2nd DEGREE</th>
<th>3rd DEGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glover</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brend</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saunders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagelhole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crews</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from Table 3.1, the Bucks Mills’ web of kinship rapidly developed a stranglehold on the village. By 1871, only one of the twenty five occupied households cannot be linked conclusively to any other. This exception was the home of William G Heal and it is almost certain that he was the illegitimate son of a former village resident. More than half the households were connected to at least twelve others and once again it was the Braund family who were responsible for the most extensive patterns of links. Such is the complexity of the ties found in 1871 and 1901 that it has not been possible to illustrate them on a single diagram. Figures 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 show, respectively, the first, second and third degree relationships between the households in 1871. 80% of all households were connected to at least one other by a first degree relationship, compared to 58.3% in 1841. Of 300 possible links between the households of 1871, 117 (39%) existed and of these, three quarters were of the second or third degree.
Figure 3.1 Bucks Mills - 1871 Households with 1st Degree Kinship Links

Figure 3.2 Bucks Mills - 1871 Households with 2nd Degree Kinship Links
Figure 3.3 Bucks Mills - 1871 Households with 3rd Degree Kinship Links
Thirty years later the situation was even more extreme. Although, by this time, three of the twenty seven households contained individuals who were unrelated to others in the village, the ties between the occupants of the other twenty four dwellings were increasingly complex. All of these twenty four households were connected to at least one other by a first degree link, eight households had seven first degree relationship links and one was connected to thirteen other households, half the village, by a relationship of the first degree. This was the family headed by Thomas and Ellen Braund née Braund; a couple who were both first and second cousins to each other. What is more remarkable still is that, when second and third degree relationships are considered, twenty two out of twenty seven households (81·5%) were kin to at least twenty other homes. In 1901, 71·5% of all possible kinship links between households, 251 out of a possible 351, existed. Seventeen households were headed by members of the Braund
family and a further four contained women who had been Braunds before marriage. Clearly the Braunds were an extreme example of what Mitson referred to as a ‘dynastic family’. The impact of such core families will be discussed further in Chapter 4.3.

Figure 3.4 Bucks Mills - 1901 Households with 1st Degree Kinship Links

Figure 3.5 Bucks Mills - 1901 Households with 2nd Degree Kinship Links

Figure 3.6 Bucks Mills - 1901 Households with 3rd Degree Kinship Links
When then did the kinship web start to slacken? Information, largely from oral evidence, for the situation in the mid 1920s suggests that, of twenty four households, no more than five were unrelated. Sixteen were occupied by Braunds and three by wives with Braund as a maiden name. This was the period when the village was referred to as being that of a single surname.\footnote{Cutting from \textit{The Evening Standard} 1 March 1928.} It was the Second World War that began to bring changes to Bucks Mills. In 1945, three of the cottages were holiday lets, eight were occupied by unrelated ‘outsiders’ and only thirteen by Braunds or née Braunds. From then on the decline was rapid, with lack of housing and occupational opportunities forcing many younger villagers to move to Bideford.\footnote{It is not to be denied that the employment opportunities of Bideford also constituted a pull factor for these migrants.} 1948 saw the selling of the five cottages belonging to the Walland Carey estate, although, as only one of these went to a non-villager, the remainder being purchased by sitting tenants, the impact was not immediately felt. It was the wholesale disposal of the cottages owned by the Pine Coffins, in 1982,\footnote{Eleven of the cottages on the Parkham side of the village were sold at the same auction.} that heralded the end of Bucks Mills as an interrelated community. What followed was the gentrification of the village, with cottages being purchased as lucrative second homes. Most that were sold in 1982 had sitting tenants but, as they died, the village became one of absentee owners, almost all of whom were from ‘up country’. In 1997 the Braund connections with Bucks Mills ceased with the death of Noel Braund. By 2008, only five of the dwellings were occupied on a full time basis and only one was inhabited by a Devonian. Although the hamlet was still a definable geographical entity, all sense of community had been lost.
It is necessary to consider the extent to which those who formed part of this complex network of kin in nineteenth century Bucks Mills were aware of these relationships and how much they depended upon them. Certainly there was knowledge of genealogical connections. When the Braund Society formed, in 1982, with the object of tracing the Braund family tree, most descendants of the Bucks Mills Braunds were able, without recourse to documentation or further research, to provide accurate, if incomplete, accounts of their descent from James and Mary Braund née Braund who married in 1832. For most, this involved not only knowledge of great-great grandparents but also of a network of cousins.

The degree to which extended kin played their part in key life-course events, such as the decision to migrate or to remain within the study area, is an issue that is central to this research and is discussed fully in later chapters. Kinship reliance was certainly a feature of the daily lives of the Bucks Mills inhabitants; for most, this took the form of a working relationship. The involvement of the villagers in fishing necessitated the dependence on family owned boats and the support of the family, in its wider sense, for tasks such as net mending and fish gutting. Examples of the invocation of extended
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57 Photograph by Clive Boursnell, reproduced here with permission.
58 The evidence for this comes from wills, memoirs, letters and oral testimony.
kinship links in Bucks Mills include at least two cases of informal adoption. This does not take account of several additional instances of illegitimate children being brought up by relatives. Despite having eleven children of their own, ten of whom survived to adulthood, John and Jane Steer née Saunders became carers for Jane’s niece and three nephews, one of whom was mentally disabled. This was a long term arrangement, following the death of the children’s mother, with one of the nephews remaining with Jane Steer for over thirty years. The story of another ‘adoption’ survived in late twentieth century oral tradition, and has been verified with documentary evidence. In this instance, Rosie, one of nine children of Thomas and Ellen Braund, lived as the daughter of her uncle William Braund. William had only two sons and Rosie was taken to live with the family when she was six years old, following alleged mistreatment by her father. Even after her marriage, Rosie remained as carer to William and his wife, into their old age.

**Figure 3.8 Rosie Braund**

The strength of the kinship ties amongst those of Bucks Mills origin is illustrated by the fact that, despite geographical distance, the links were sustained and acknowledged over at least three generations. The descendants of the Braunds who emigrated maintained connections with their relatives at home in Bucks Mills. Ralph Colwill Braund, whose
father left Clovelly\textsuperscript{59} for Canada in 1868, visited his second cousins in Bucks Mills in 1904 and again in 1937. His progeny remained in continuous contact with the Braunds of Bucks Mills throughout the twentieth century. In another branch of the family, Helena Harriet White, whose grandparents, William and Harriet Braund, left Bucks Mills in 1836, was in touch with her second cousins who remained in Bucks Mills and paid them a visit in 1912.

Not only were the kinship links in Bucks Mills particularly dense, there is evidence that inhabitants of the village were aware of, and took pride in, their connections, that these were regularly invoked and were maintained over both time and distance. The situation was very different in Bulkworthy. In 1841, 52.6\% of the thirty eight heads of household were related to that of one or more other households; a figure not far short of Reay’s Hernhill findings.\textsuperscript{60} Six households could be linked to another five or more; with the Bear, Hern and Newcombe families being central to this kinship web. Nonetheless, of the 703 possible links at this date, only thirty five (5\%) were extant, appreciably less than the 14.1\% found in Bucks Mills at the same time. In Bulkworthy, the majority of the links (62.9\%) were those of the first degree, suggesting that the web lacked the depth of that of Bucks Mills, where two thirds of all links were those of the second or third degree.

\textbf{Table 3.4 Bulkworthy - Kinship Links between Households, 1841, 1871 and 1901}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OCCUPIED HOUSES</th>
<th>POSSIBLE LINKS</th>
<th>1ST DEGREE</th>
<th>2ND DEGREE</th>
<th>3RD DEGREE</th>
<th>FOUND LINKS</th>
<th>% LINKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{59} 3 miles from Bucks Mills.

\textsuperscript{60} Reay (1996b) p.165.
Table 3.5 Bulkworthy - Number of 1871 Households with Kinship Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>1st DEGREE</th>
<th>2nd DEGREE</th>
<th>3rd DEGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newcombe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcombe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smale née Newcombe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcombe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcombe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hern</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hern</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.9 Bulkworthy - 1871 Households with Kinship Links

In 1871, 36·4% of Bulkworthy households had a family link with at least one other; a notable decline compared to the 52·6% of thirty years previously. Nonetheless the Newcombes and Herns remained as core families. Families such as the Bears, Averys and Brooks, who featured in 1841, had all disappeared. Instead of tightening as the century progressed, in Bulkworthy the kinship web weakened. The presence of 5% of all possible links in 1841 fell to 3·9% in 1871. By 1901 only two of the occupied households were linked by family ties, those of Francis Facey and his father John. It is
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61 See Table 2.15.
62 John and Rebecca Bear can be found living in Bulkworthy in 1871 but they appear unconnected to the interrelated Bear families of 1841.
probable that Bulkworthy never experienced the level of kinship links found in Victorian Bucks Mills. It is, however, likely that there was a higher degree of interrelatedness in Bulkworthy in the early part of the nineteenth century than the evidence for the period of study reveals. What began to happen in Bucks Mills in 1940s had occurred a century earlier in Bulkworthy, with the extensive out migrations of the mid nineteenth century dislocating the sense of community and signalling an era of greater fluidity amongst the population. In twentieth century Bucks Mills this was accompanied by the destruction of that sense of belonging described as ‘community spirit’. It is difficult to say whether or not the same would have been the case in nineteenth century Bulkworthy.

In Conduit Street the number of kinship links between household heads remained much more static. In 1841, ten of the thirty five occupied households could be linked by kinship to another within the street. All but three of these were linked to just one other household. Although there was an increase in family links between households by 1871, the percentage of possible links found (3.4%) was still less than that for Bulkworthy. By 1901, however, when links in had Bulkworthy dwindled to just one pair of households, in Conduit Street the level was greater than it had been in 1841.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>OCCUPIED HOUSES</th>
<th>POSSIBLE LINKS</th>
<th>1ST DEGREE</th>
<th>2ND DEGREE</th>
<th>3RD DEGREE</th>
<th>LINKS FOUND</th>
<th>% LINKS FOUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6 Conduit Street - Kinship Links between Households, 1841, 1871 and 1901
Table 3.7 Conduit Street - Number of 1871 Households with Kinship Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>1st DEGREE</th>
<th>2nd DEGREE</th>
<th>3rd DEGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulleid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulleid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By 1871, there were only twenty nine occupied dwellings in Conduit Street but more than half (sixteen) of these had some kinship link to another household within the street. Although this suggests that overall kinship levels would be greater than those of Bulkworthy this is not the case. In Bulkworthy 36·4% of the households generated the existence of 5% of possible kinship links for 1871. In Conduit Street a higher percentage of households (55·2%) contributed to the kinship web yet only 3·4% of possible links were extant. It is noticeable too that more surnames were drawn into the Conduit Street kinship network. The Abells, Bulleids and Edwards were still significant but ten different surnames were represented instead of the four found in 1841. This came about by the marriage of Conduit Street daughters to incomers. It was this spread of the kinship web across a higher proportion of households that allowed Conduit Street’s network to be sustained to the end of the nineteenth century, whereas in Bulkworthy it disintegrated. Many of the inhabitants of Conduit Street would also have had kinship links to those in the surrounding roads; there would have been a pool of kin close at hand, if not within the street itself.
Table 3.8 Conduit Street - Number of 1901 Households with Kinship Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>1st DEGREE</th>
<th>2nd DEGREE</th>
<th>3rd DEGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethern</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voaden</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.ii Intermarriage

The densities of the kinship webs in each area reflect the degree of intermarriage in the settlements concerned. It is now time to consider the extent of kin marriage and thereby its contribution to the complexity of the networks found.

In 1841, there were twenty married couples living in Bucks Mills; two of these comprised spouses who were relations. They were James and Mary Braund née Braund, first cousins who had married in 1832, and Joseph Braund and Susanna Glover who, at the time of their marriage, were not connected by blood but were brother-in-law and sister-in-law. In addition, the widowed Mary Braund née Veal had been related to her late husband, John; they were first cousins once removed through both the maternal and paternal line. Thirty years later, in 1871, there were still two, of the twenty one, married couples who were related prior to marriage; one couple were first cousins and the other were second cousins. Both of the grooms and one of the brides involved were Braunds. Once again the population included a widow who had been connected to her late
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63 Joseph’s brother, John, had married Susanna’s sister, Ann, in 1789.
husband; Matilda Braund née Braund was both first and second cousin to her deceased husband, James. Thirty years and one generation later, the picture had changed dramatically. By 1901, nine of the twenty four couples were related before they married. Yet again all these related spouses involved at least one Braund marriage partner and five couples were isonymous Braund-Braund marriages. Three of the couples were related in more than one way. It should be noted, however, that, for the most part, the connections were not close, the exception being Thomas and Ellen Braund née Braund, who were both first and second cousins. The relationships between the other partners were all of the third degree or more distant, not untypical of a rural area in the nineteenth century and commensurate with the likely percentages suggested by Kuper.⁶⁴

Fifty four couples, whose marriages took place between 1841 and 1901, made their marital home in Bucks Mills. Of these, two (3·7%) were marriages of first cousins and a further seven (12·9%) were either second cousins or first cousins once removed. In a settlement where 89·2% of the population were in some way related, it was perhaps surprising to find that more than 83% of Bucks Mills’ Victorian marriages were between partners whose relationship was apparently non-existent, or more distant than that of the third degree. Despite 11·1% of Bucks Mills’ marriages being isonymous,⁶⁵ a very similar figure to that noted by Blaikie in north-east Scotland,⁶⁶ this was a result of the increasing dominance of a single surname, rather than the repeated marriage of close relations. There appears to have been an inbuilt abhorrence of marriage between near family members, similar to that found by Kuper in his studies,⁶⁷ and by Strathern in Elmdon,⁶⁸ the belief being that any children would be adversely affected in some way. Oral traditions survive relating to two early twentieth century Bucks Mills’ marriages. One of these was between partners who were first, second and third cousins. Their close relationship was seen as the reason for two of their eleven children not reaching adulthood and a further three being ‘odd’. The 1905 marriage between first and third cousins Reuben Braund and Beatrice Braund was reputed to have only been allowed providing they had no children. This remark was made with hindsight but, for whatever reason, the couple, although in their twenties on marriage, remained childless. Yet

⁶⁵ Five of these were Braund-Braund marriages and one Bagelhole-Bagelhole.
exogamous marriage was discouraged; ‘no Bucks Mills girl should walk out with a stranger if we knew it.’

Despite this, and the density of the kinship web, there was a level of kin marriage in Bucks Mills that did not exceed that for other rural areas and which was a result of community pressure and fears of disability amongst offspring.

**Figure 3.12 The Number of Surnames in Bucks Mills**

The shrinking of the surname pool in Victorian Bucks Mills is worthy of comment. Twenty four different surnames were present in 1841; a further twelve names can be added if one considers the ‘lost’ maiden names of the married women. A generation later, only fifteen different surnames were found in the village, again with twelve additional surnames being represented by the maiden names of the wives. By 1901, the 111 inhabitants of Bucks Mills shared only thirteen surnames between them, with nine hidden maiden names. What is more remarkable is the spread of these thirteen names. In
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69 William Braund, quoted by reporter Horace Thorogood in a cutting from *The Evening Standard* 1 March 1928.

70 This differs from the 23 cited in R. C. Few, *The Development of Bucks Mills* unpublished undergraduate dissertation The University of Wales, Bangor, Bangor (2003) p. 20. This is due to a re-assessment of which cottages actually constituted Bucks Mills.

71 One of these maiden names, that of Mary Jolliffe, is unknown.

72 Using the evidence of the 1871 census.

73 An average of 8.5 individuals per surname.
1901, 65.8% of the villagers bore the surname Braund, with a further seven (6.3%) having had Braund as a maiden name. In addition, there were six males who were married to Braunds and ten individuals whose mothers had been a Braund. Only nine inhabitants, 8.1% of the population, had no kinship link with the Braunds. This is an exceptional level of dominance by one family. Mitson, writing of dynastic families in seventeenth century south west Nottinghamshire, estimated that members of these families comprised no more than 25% of the population of their settlement.\textsuperscript{74} Even if the whole sample population of Bucks Mills is considered, rather than that at one point in time, 141 (34.6%) of the 407 individuals were born Braunds. The next most numerous families were the Penningtons and the Saunders with twenty representatives each; only six other families had more than ten members who lived in Bucks Mills between 1841 and 1901. The degree of residential persistence of these families is of significance when considering their ascendancy in the village; this is discussed in the next chapter. The Braunds appeared to view themselves as a ‘dynastic family’ Captain James Braund was the self-styled ‘King’ of Bucks Mills, a title which was accepted by other villagers, James’ home being known as ‘King’s Cottage’.

\textbf{Figure 3.13 Captain James Braund ‘King’ of Bucks Mills}

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{74} Mitson (1993) p. 52.
The situation was very different in Bulkworthy. None of the twenty eight couples, found in the parish in 1841, can be shown to have married a blood relation. John and Frances Hern, part of the 1841 population, did have a familial link, when they married in 1795, as Frances’ sister was already married to John’s brother. Two other Hern brothers both married Risdon girls but they moved away from Bulkworthy and thus do not form part of the sample. Despite the isonymous marriage between William Sanders Hern and Eliza Hern, not one of the eighteen couples in Bulkworthy in 1871 was married to a relative. The same is true of the fourteen partnerships found in the parish in 1901. This is a long way from Darwin’s 2.25% of rural marriages being those between first cousins.

It seems that the much weaker kinship web and relatively high population turnover in Bulkworthy increased the opportunity for choosing a marriage partner who was not, in some way, related. The surname pool was also greater in Bulkworthy; increasingly so as the century progressed. In 1841, 196 individuals shared forty five surnames with an additional fourteen hidden maiden names. By 1901 the population had shrunk to eighty eight but there were still representatives of twenty seven different surnames with a further nine maiden names in the parish.

As part of the wider town of Hatherleigh, Conduit Street residents had a greater, easily accessible, pool from which to choose a marriage partner; thus a lower degree of kin marriage might have been expected. There were twenty three married couples living in Conduit Street in 1841. These included John and Elizabeth Braund née Heal, who married in 1824 and who were almost certainly first cousins. Both came from established watch and clock making dynasties in the Hatherleigh/Iddesleigh area. None of the remaining couples appear to have been related in any way prior to marriage. As in Bulkworthy, no Conduit Street couples found in the censuses of 1871 or 1901 can be shown to represent unions of close kin. In Conduit Street the average number of persons per surname did not change greatly. In neither Conduit Street nor Bulkworthy was there a marked shrinking of the surname pool, such as that observed in Bucks Mills.
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75 Of the 1st, 2nd or 3rd degree.
77 An average of 4.4 individuals per surname.
Table 3.9 Average Number of Persons per Surname in the Three Settlements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bucks Mills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkworthy</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit Street</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As marriage can necessitate movement, at least for one partner, any consideration of migration patterns requires an awareness of the marriage horizons of the individuals concerned. Having discussed the extent to which members of the three settlements married relations, it is now necessary to consider the breadth of the marriage pool for those who married ‘outside’.

3.2.iii Marriage Horizons

Marriage is the method by which new kin are introduced to existing networks. It ‘initiated a cycle in which people and property moved from one household to another.’

It is important to have some conception of the marriage horizons that operated for those bringing new blood into the settlements. Levels of endogamy and exogamy have been examined, together with the distances travelled by those marrying into and out from the three areas. Strathern wrote,

‘the village boundary is thus another symbolic operator. It defines in-village marriage in terms of the general ‘relatedness’ that is the essential characteristic of the real Elmdon families. It also provides a heightened perception of foreignness in instances where Elmdoners have married outside. Such in-coming spouses are strangers not simply to a particular family but to the village as such.’

This underlines the value of examining marriage horizons when considering concepts of community and kinship, and the processes and patterns of migration.

It is often difficult to distinguish between those who moved into a study area specifically in order to marry from those who moved for another reason and subsequently married an existing resident. This problem does impact upon all three settlements, thus comparisons are still valid. Abodes, as recorded in the marriage registers, helped to

---

79 Migration distances are discussed further in Chapter 5.
suggest whether one partner was not ‘of this parish’, and thus could be classed as marrying in. As with other analyses, this created problems for residents of Conduit Street as, at this period, street names were not given in the registers. It was less of a difficulty when examining the Bucks Mills’ inhabitants, as Bucks Mills does appear as an abode in the marriage records. Incomers who appeared in a census for the study area as a single person and shortly afterwards married a resident, were deemed to have moved for a reason other than marriage.

Twenty married couples lived in Bucks Mills in 1841. Given that the village had really only been in existence for thirty years it is hardly surprising that only four of these couples contained a partner who had been living in the village at the time of their marriage and none of the forty married people had been born in the hamlet. Only one marriage, that of James and Mary Braund, comprised two Bucks Mills residents,\textsuperscript{81} sixteen couples had arrived in the village after marriage, often very shortly after. Six of these marriages took place between 1806 and 1811, thus the participants were setting up home at the time that the village was being built.

When considering levels of endogamy, it is important to remember that Bucks Mills was a hamlet and not an historic parish. Comparable studies tend to treat parishes as a unit; populations and thus levels of endogamy found, are likely to be higher. If all seventy four marriages of those resident in Bucks Mills between 1841 and 1901 are taken into account, twenty seven (36·5%) had been endogamous.\textsuperscript{82} Mitson found that only six of her eleven sample parishes had rates of endogamy that exceeded 25%; the highest being Attenborough with 41%. Mitson put this high level down to the size of the parish, which was unusually large. She also found a positive correlation between the presence of a dynastic family and a greater number of endogamous marriages.\textsuperscript{83} Thus, the degree of endogamy in Bucks Mills was on a par with Mitson’s highest levels; well in excess of what might be expected of such a small hamlet. If, however, any marriage between a Bucks Mills resident and a partner from the parent parishes of Woolfardisworthy or Parkham is considered to be endogamous, the rate increases to 63·5% (47 marriages). This exceeds Blaikie’s findings in the coastal settlement of Boyndie, where 55% of

\textsuperscript{81} Both had moved to the village as young children.
\textsuperscript{82} i.e. both parties were living in the village itself prior to the marriage.
\textsuperscript{83} Mitson (1993) p. 59.
marriages between 1855 and 1974 were endogamous; the percentage he found in Gamrie was rather less, at 44%. Blaikie’s point was that these fishing villages experienced particularly high levels of endogamy. As both a fishing hamlet and one with a prominent dynastic family, Bucks Mills might therefore be expected to have a high rate of endogamy and this expectation is fulfilled.

**Figure 3.14 Bucks Mills - Distance Travelled by those Marrying in to the Settlement 1841-1901**

What is more revealing is an examination of the twenty three in-migrants, ten males and thirteen females, who arrived in Bucks Mills between 1841 and 1901 as a result of marriage to an existing inhabitant. These represented 29.5% of all marriages of Bucks Mills residents during this period. Although the sample size is small, the findings contribute to an understanding of the processes at work in the settlement. Of those marriage partners who were incomers to the area, fifteen (65.2%) came from elsewhere in Parkham or Woolfardisworthy and three (13.1%) from adjacent parishes. This is much higher than the rate discovered by Strathern in Elmdon, where only 48% of incoming marriage partners had come from within a five mile radius. The percentage in Bucks Mills reaches the levels of Eversley’s generalisation; he found 75-80% of marriage partners coming from an adjoining parish. There is a gender issue as all the
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Bucks Mills incoming grooms came from within five miles but 38.5% of the brides came from a greater distance, with three of these travelling more than forty miles. So, despite having a high level of endogamy, those who did bring brides in from outside went beyond the immediate area of the village. An examination of the individuals concerned may help to explain this. Two of the exogamous brides came between five and ten miles. Jane Budd travelled seven miles from Sutcombe in 1848 to marry Samuel Bagelhole, a fisherman and agricultural labourer. In 1900 Esther Champion came from Bideford, the nearest town, to marry fisherman, Arthur Braund.

Lord\textsuperscript{87} commented that the higher the social status of those involved the greater the distance between the homes of the bride and groom. In Bucks Mills, the three marriages that brought brides from the greatest distances all involved grooms of a social status that was higher than that of an agricultural labourer or fisherman. Ann Elizabeth Fry, the daughter of an accountant, arrived from Northfleet, Kent, where she had been acting as a companion; her birthplace being Runcorn, Cheshire. She became the second wife of Joseph Braund, who owned several boats and was one of the few owner occupiers in the village. In 1844, Hannah Maria Thorn, who had been born forty five miles away in Exmouth, married Lewis Davey, a mason. Lewis’ second wife was another ‘long-distance’ bride. Mary Sergeant, a naval officer’s daughter, came from Plymouth, however, her brother was already married to a former resident of Bucks Mills and her sister to an inhabitant of Woolfardisworthy. Their link to the area came through their uncle John, who appears to have fathered two children on the wife of the perpetual curate of Woolfardisworthy. The Daveys were a long-standing Bucks Mills family, yet they were notably reluctant to intermarry with other villagers. Not until 1868, after sixty years in the hamlet, did a Davey marry another villager. Although this is a small number of instances on which to make a conclusive statement, it can be seen that class does seem to have some relation to the distances travelled by the incoming brides.

Twenty four individuals, ten males and fourteen females, left Bucks Mills in order to get married and it is necessary to investigate the length of their journeys. It is interesting to note that, numerically, those who left to marry were almost exactly replaced by those who arrived in the village for the same reason. In many cases (54.1%) the departing Bucks Mills’ resident moved to the parish of their spouse; 20.8% moved to the nearest town, Bideford upon marriage, the remainder went to rural areas that had no apparent prior connection for either partner. Like those who married in, the distances were not normally great, with 29.2% going elsewhere in Woolfardisworthy and Parkham and a further 29.2% to adjacent parishes; thus more than half went no more than five miles. An additional 33.3% went between five and ten miles, leaving just two who went further afield. Once again the females moved further in order to marry; this is not unexpected as the groom’s opportunity for movement would be limited by the availability of employment. In contrast to the in-marrying long-distance brides, the two out-marrying girls did not come from families of higher social status as both were daughters of fishermen; their husbands, however, were gamekeepers.

When comparing the distances travelled by in-marrying migrants and those who moved away in order to marry, the pattern is very similar. The main difference was that more of those leaving Bucks Mills tended to go between five and ten miles, at the expense of those who moved under five miles. This is accounted for by those departing for the nearest town of Bideford and is likely to be a reflection of the date at which they left; the
pull of Bideford, for all out-migrants, increased as the nineteenth century wore on.

In Bucks Mills, the distances travelled by those coming in and departing in order to marry indicate that, for almost all, particularly men, the marriage market was limited to a small geographical area. Women who travelled longer distances, in order to marry in, had husbands of higher social status but status was less important for out-going brides. Those marrying in, to a large extent, corresponded to those marrying out as regards numbers, gender and distance travelled. A study of the marriage horizons for residents of Bucks Mills reveals high levels of endogamy, commensurate with a coastal settlement containing a dynastic family.

As a much larger parish than Bucks Mills, it might be expected that there would be an even higher level of endogamous marriages in Bulkworthy. Half of the marriages, that took place in Bulkworthy between 1841 and 1901, involved one partner whose abode was given as being outside the parish. This rate of endogamy is less than that for Bucks Mills but exceeded those identified by Mitson and Blaikie as being high; yet other studies suggest that rates might have been expected to be higher still. Bulkworthy, as a predominantly agricultural parish, was not dissimilar to the ‘vale’ areas of Dorset investigated by Perry, where endogamous marriages amongst the working class exceeded 80% from 1837 to 1886. Although 50% of all Bulkworthy marriages between 1841 and 1900 were endogamous, 72.2% of those between labourers and servants fell into this category, compared to only 10% for those of higher social status. Strathern found endogamy rates in Elmdon of 74% for the period 1843-52 and 50% for 1873-1882. When set in this context, Bulkworthy’s levels do not seem particularly unusual.

If the married couples who were found living in Bulkworthy during the study period
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88 If the more meaningfully comparable figure of 63.5%, incorporating those from the parent parishes of Parkham and Woolfardisworthy, is used.
93 As opposed to those who married between 1841 and 1901 and who may or may not have lived in Bulkworthy after marriage. This therefore includes those living in Bulkworthy during the study period, who married before 1841.
are examined, a less inward-looking pattern emerges. In all there were ninety seven different married couples found in the Bulkworthy census returns for 1841-1901, only four (4·1%) of which constituted a marriage between two people who had been born in Bulkworthy. What is of note is that core Bulkworthy families provided five of the eight marriage partners of the marriages between two Bulkworthy natives. Three of these four marriages, where both partners had been born in Bulkworthy, were couples who appeared in Bulkworthy in 1841. Of the remaining twenty five couples who made up the residents at this date, twelve consisted of one Bulkworthy born individual and one outsider. Eight Bulkworthy grooms had brought brides to the parish and four Bulkworthy girls had married men from elsewhere. Two of these were the daughters of substantial farmers in Bulkworthy and another was the thatcher’s daughter. The remaining thirteen couples all appear to have moved into Bulkworthy after marriage. This suggests that migration to Bulkworthy for the purposes of marriage in the period up to 1841 was not unusual but this pattern was to change.

**Figure 3.16 Bulkworthy - Distance travelled by those Marrying into the Settlement 1841-1901**

In contrast to Bucks Mills, far fewer individuals arrived in Bulkworthy between 1841 and 1901 as a result of marriage to an existing resident. In-migrants were more likely to arrive as young, unmarried farm workers or domestic servants, or as established married couples. Eleven brides and three grooms moved to Bulkworthy during the study period. 64·3% travelled no more than five miles and none of the others, whose previous location is known, had come from a distance greater than ten miles.
When comparing Bulkworthy with Bucks Mills, it is important to remember that a higher percentage of Bulkworthy out migrants have not been traced to their destinations. It is therefore not possible to know if marriage may have been the motivation for their movement. Even with this proviso, as might be expected in a parish of rapidly declining population, those leaving the parish in order to marry exceeded those entering it. Fifteen females and three males appear to have married out; the majority moving less than ten miles. Three brides did, however, make longer journeys. Although Catherine Newcombe's husband, Thomas Shute, had been born in nearby Hartland, the couple moved to North Hill, Cornwall, some twenty five miles from Bulkworthy, on marriage. Mary Nancy Avery travelled twice that distance, to Wellington in Somerset, when she married Henry Dark although, again, her husband had been born in a parish close to Bulkworthy, in this case Frithelstock. The final longer-distance bride was Ada Headon who migrated fifteen miles to North Petherwin. It is of note that the fathers of all three of these brides were farmers, rather than labourers; the Averys and Newcombes having substantial holdings in Bulkworthy.

When considering those from Hatherleigh, it is not normally possible to determine in which part of the parish individuals were living at the time of their marriage, unless they were living in Conduit Street both before and after the event. The nature of the sources means that, when calculating rates of endogamy in Conduit Street, marriages between...
inhabitants of Hatherleigh as a whole have to be treated as endogamous. This gives a much larger number of potential endogamous marriage partners than those in the parish of Bulkworthy, which was more sparsely populated. It is, however, comparable with considering the whole of the parishes of Parkham and Woolfardisworthy when investigating endogamy levels in Bucks Mills.

In 1841, there were twenty three married couples living in Conduit Street and only three of these constituted an endogamous partnership. In the study period as a whole, twenty six of the 112 enumerated couples (23.2%), appear to have both been living in Hatherleigh prior to their marriage. As expected, this is a lower level than that in close-knit Bucks Mills.

**Figure 3.18 Conduit Street - Distance travelled by those Marrying in to the Settlement 1841-1901**

When looking at those who moved into Conduit Street on marriage, the picture is similar to that of the other areas. Seven males and eleven females arrived in Conduit Street as a result of marriage to an existing resident. 83.3% came a very short distance and only two (11.1%) migrated a distance, that is greater than ten miles. Christopher Butt, an agricultural labourer moved twelve miles from Cheriton Bishop and Emma Sanders came thirty miles from Tormoham; Emma had, however, been born in Hatherleigh.
It is when the out-migrants from Conduit Street are compared to those from the other areas that a somewhat different pattern emerges. Once again, as expected, far more females (20) move out in order to marry than do males (5); seven of these females went no further than another part of the parish of Hatherleigh. Those leaving Conduit Street did, however, tend to travel much longer distances than those from the other communities under review; with 48%, two grooms and ten brides, moving more than ten miles. Four individuals travelled to London or its outskirts and one to Melcombe Regis in Dorset. Of note is the fact that all those travelling more than fifty miles and more than half those moving between eleven and fifty miles did so between 1871 and 1881. It is appropriate to examine the destinations of those moving in excess of ten miles from Hatherleigh in order to marry in more detail.
Mary Catherine Knowles left Hatherleigh for Islington, where she married Edward Charles Burchatt in 1875. Although Mary’s mother, Mary Abel Pillifant, was a native of Hatherleigh, Mary herself had been born in Islington, so this move was presumably as a result of a relationship formed before her time in Hatherleigh or during visits to relatives who were still in Islington. Mary’s parents were ‘proprieters of houses’, at what level is not known but as her grandfather was an agricultural labourer and her future husband a railway worker, it is unlikely that this was on any grand scale. The other three residents of Hatherleigh who moved to London and its environs in order to marry were of similar social status, Jesse Vallance was a labourer, Harriett Hockin was the daughter of a cooper and wife of a gardener and Eva Hurford the daughter of a tailor and wife of a painter. Thus the class bias observed amongst longer distance spouses in the other communities is not apparent here. It may be that town dwelling gave those of a lower social status the opportunity to look further afield for a marriage partner or that the expansion of marriage horizons, as discovered by Perry and Snell, came sooner to Hatherleigh than it did to the other two study areas.

It is now pertinent to conduct a more detailed comparison of the kinship links, degree of intermarriage and marriage horizons in the three communities and to set these in the context of findings elsewhere.
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3.3 Interrelated Individuals or Isolated Inhabitants?

How then do the three study areas differ and are the findings what might be expected of such communities at this time? In the early part of the period under review the degree of kinship found amongst the residents of Bucks Mills was not unexpected for a rural parish; with percentages similar to those found by Reay in Hernhill.⁹⁵ This is all the more remarkable when Bucks Mills’ status as a relatively new settlement is borne in mind. These kinship links increased both in breadth and depth as the nineteenth century progressed. The extreme dominance of a single core family resulted in many second and third degree connections being established within its population. This multifaceted web persisted well into the twentieth century and there is enduring evidence of the recognition and utilisation of extended non-resident kin.

The majority of Bulkworthy’s kinship links were between parents and children or siblings; the second and third degree links, that are indicative of a more complex and long standing web with a greater grip, were lacking. As the Bucks Mills web intensified, that in Bulkworthy weakened, in a dislocation of parish relationships that followed the exodus of 1850s. It would be expected that Conduit Street, a more urban settlement and one which blends easily into the surrounding streets, would have less evidence of a dense kinship web and this is the case when it is compared with Bucks Mills. Both Bulkworthy and Conduit Street do have long established families but these lacked the dominance of the Braunds in Bucks Mills.

Wrightson⁹⁶ compared his own finding concerning kinship density in 1671 in Terling, Essex, an area not dissimilar from Bulkworthy, with other studies in rural France. In order to do so he used the measures ‘Absolute Kinship Density’ (AKD) and ‘Relative Kinship Density’ (RKD) which he explains, thus:

‘Absolute Kinship Density is a measure of the absolute number of kin links of the average householder or conjugal family unit in the respective villages. It has the advantage of going beyond the simple categories of ‘unrelated’ or ‘related’ and allowing for the fact that some households have links to several others. …Relative Kinship Density represents the proportion of kin links of the total number of possible kin

⁹⁵ Reay (1996b) p.165.
links in the respective villages.\textsuperscript{97}

Table 3.10 Comparative Absolute Kinship Densities and Relative Kinship Densities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>AKD</th>
<th>RKD%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bucks Mills</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkworthy</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit Street</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terling*</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallines*</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernhill+</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures from Wrightson\textsuperscript{98} + Calculation based on figures from Reay\textsuperscript{99}

These calculations involve first degree links only and they underline the atypicality of Bucks Mills and, to a lesser extent, Bulkworthy. Bucks Mills had high levels of kinship density by any standards and these take on even more significance when the RKD is considered. Whilst, in 1841, the figures for Bulkworthy conform to what might be expected of a rural area, by 1901 the links are very sparse, even when compared to the more urban environment of Conduit Street.

As regards incidences of kin marriage, these do not reflect the levels suggested by other studies. The research methods used here were rigorous and had the benefit of recently available national indexes, suggesting that the levels of identification of kin marriages are likely to exceed those of earlier comparative studies. It has been easiest to trace the full extent of the kinship links of Bucks Mills residents, thereby making the degree of intermarriage found there least likely to be under represented. Even in Bucks Mills, where the genealogies are more detailed, only 3.7\% of marriages are between first

\textsuperscript{99} Reay (1996a) p. 93. These figures represent a minimum as Reay lists all households with more than four links as 4+ and these have all been calculated as if they have four links for the purposes of this comparison.
cousins. This is not much higher than Darwin’s 2.25% average for rural areas.\(^{100}\) As small communities, heavily influenced by Bible Christianity, both Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy might be expected to have had higher than average incidences of cousin marriage\(^ {101}\) yet this was not the case, certainly not in Bulkworthy where there was no evidence of kin marriages. This is largely a result of the much weaker kinship web and higher turnover of population in Bulkworthy providing a greater chance of choosing a non-kin partner. It would be interesting to look at the incidence of kin marriage in Bulkworthy prior to the period of study, when the degree of kinship was greater. The single example of a cousin marriage found in Conduit Street also reflects a loose kinship network. It is difficult to know if an in-built abhorrence of such unions, such as is evidenced in Bucks Mills, was also a factor in the other areas and perhaps contributed to the very low incidences observed.

The surname pool in Bucks Mills shrank rapidly with the increasing dominance of its core family. Although this resulted in an increasing number of isonymous marriages, unions between close relatives were rare. Despite its shrinking population, in Bulkworthy, the range of surnames retained its diversity as the grip of the core families declined. The situation in Conduit Street was more stable.

It has already been established that levels of endogamy in the study areas were not particularly unusual when compared with those identified in other studies.\(^ {102}\) If the married couples who were enumerated in the study areas between 1841 and 1901 are considered, those in Bulkworthy were the most likely to contain one or more non-natives. In all three areas, it was predominantly females who moved into and out from the communities for the purposes of marriage. This is not surprising as a newly married couple would be more likely to live in the area where the groom already had established employment. The gender split is marked in Bulkworthy and Conduit Street but less so in Bucks Mills. Of those marrying into the study areas, very high percentages travelled only a short distance. The percentages of incoming spouses who travelled less than five miles to Bucks Mills (78.3%) and Conduit Street (83.3%) accord with Eversley’s
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findings that 75-80% of marriage partners came no more than five miles.¹⁰³ Even Bulkworthy’s lower percentage of 64·3%¹⁰⁴ exceeds Strathern’s findings for Elmdon, where the percentage was 48%.¹⁰⁵

When those leaving the settlements in order to marry were considered, the widest marriage horizons were found for Conduit Street residents. Of those marrying out from Bucks Mills, 91·6% went less than ten miles; the equivalent figure for Bulkworthy being 83·3%. In Conduit Street, the percentage was much lower at 52%. The extent to which a similar pattern can be observed in all out-migrants is discussed in Chapter 5.

This chapter set out to establish whether the residents of the three settlements consisted of a series of largely unconnected nuclear households, or a complex web of individuals related by blood or marriage. The study areas provide examples of both. Although incidences of intermarriage were not high, a large proportion of Bucks Mills inhabitants were connected by family ties which can be seen to have been both acknowledged and invoked. Bulkworthy, on the other hand, contained far fewer kinship links, particularly towards the latter part of the study period; the situation in Conduit Street fell somewhere between the two. The extent to which these differing kinship densities impacted upon residential persistence in the three settlements will now be investigated.

¹⁰⁴ As the origins of some of those marrying in are unknown, this could be an under-estimate.
Ch 4 Lingerers and Lineage: the role of kinship as a factor influencing degrees of residential persistence within the three settlements

‘A home is not a mere transient shelter: its essence lies in the personalities of the people who live in it.’

H. L. Mencken (1880 - 1956)

4.1 Residential Persistence: problems for the researcher

Despite Dennis and Daniels\(^1\) citing residential persistence as one of five indicators of community, albeit an imperfect one, it is an aspect that is under-represented in research concerning residential patterns. This is, perhaps, a reflection of the difficulties inherent in the measuring of persistence levels.\(^2\) There is also a lack of agreement regarding what constitutes a high or low level of persistence, an issue exacerbated by the dearth of studies. Muriel Birch’s work on Bolton Abbey, Yorkshire, suggests that, in a rural area, up to 50% of the population might be expected to appear in two consecutive census returns.\(^3\) Margaret Escott, when investigating the slightly earlier period of 1779-1801 in the agricultural parish of Binfield, Berkshire, found that 36% of the population persisted over the whole period.\(^4\) The size of the unit under investigation is key to the likelihood of persistence; in order to be valid, comparisons need to take account of this. As Goose points out, ‘the larger the area under consideration the smaller the amount of movement one will find’.\(^5\) Bolton Abbey, for example, comprises 12,896 acres, more than ten times the size of Bulkworthy, the largest of the settlements examined here. In comparison with the three study areas that make up the sample for this research, an individual could
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2 See Chapter 4.2.


move a much greater distance in Bolton Abbey, whilst still classifying as persistent. The numbers of deaths that occur in the study areas also need to be taken into consideration as a high number of deaths may mask a sizable level of persistence amongst those who survived.

Lawton, researching in a nineteenth century urban environment, found that rates of persistence, for a ten year period, ranged from 10.4% for skilled workers to 38.1% for the professional classes.\(^6\) Dennis and Daniels refer to studies whose inter-censal persistence rates\(^7\) were typically between 13% and 20%; again, however, these were urban studies.\(^8\) Bater, looking at early twentieth century Russian cities, discovered that 38-4% of those who migrated to Moscow in 1902 were still there ten years later and a similar rate was observed in St. Petersbourg.\(^9\) It is significant that those he was studying were not natives of these cities as ‘new immigrants were prone to emigrate, thus leaving the burden of population growth to older established families.’\(^10\) This assertion, made by Bouchard, concerning Saguenay, in north-east Quebec, suggests that, had Bater been investigating natives, rather than migrants, persistence rates would have been higher. Bouchard identified a ‘stable core’ of families who stayed in Saguenay for several generations, whilst the remainder appeared to be short-term residents, with the majority of those who left the parish doing so within five years. He also discovered that the transient section of the population were more likely to be single and landless.\(^11\) The presence, or absence, of kin had an impact on the probability of remaining in Saguenay and Bouchard found that ‘the existence of kinship ties had a negative effect on mobility.’\(^12\) Mitson’s work on dynastic or ‘core’ families is also of relevance here, her
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\(^{7}\) i.e. those enumerated in one census who were present in the same area in the following enumeration.

\(^{8}\) Dennis & Daniels (1994) p. 204.


\(^{12}\) Bouchard (1991) p. 76.
findings being that members of such families were more likely to persist.¹³

Class and property ownership has also been found to influence the likelihood of persistence. Halse’s work in the moorland parish of Levisham, North Yorkshire found that tenants moved more frequently than owner occupiers.¹⁴ Those with a commitment to the land were, Halse found, less likely to move; all six of the families that she identified in every census return from 1841 to 1891 were farmers, half of whom were owner occupiers.¹⁵ Christopher Dyer writes of ‘families who, by inheriting land from generation to generation, ensured a continuity of population over long periods of time.’¹⁶ Escott too found that owner occupation induced persistence.¹⁷ In Escott’s sample those of the highest social status were less likely to remain within the parish than labourers, perhaps, she feels, because the labourers were more dependant on the parish for relief and were therefore obliged to stay in the area.¹⁸ This began to be less important with the advent of the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834, yet the settlement legislation of 1662 remained on the statute books until 1876 and its obligation to ‘belong’ before relief was available may well have lingered in the minds of the poor beyond this date.

Dennis and Daniels feel that ‘persistence, at whatever scale, is an ambiguous and imperfect indicator of community structure. …. Nevertheless, persistence is a useful index taken in conjunction with other measures of community structure’¹⁹ and this is what has been done in this research. The lack of other investigations with which to compare the findings in the study areas and the methodological problem created by the different sizes of the three settlements are issues that need to be highlighted, yet should not be a deterrent to examining residential persistence. As French wrote in his recent

analysis of persistence in Kingston upon Thames, ‘historical analysis of persistence is
important since it provides insights into such questions as the characteristics of those
who stayed ……. and the ways in which the persisters themselves differed from other
groups of people.’ The levels of persistence of both individuals and families in the
three settlements have been explored. In the context of the comments above, possible
correlations with gender, occupation, social class, land tenure and birthplace have been
sought, as has the relationship between the presence of kin and length of stay.

4.2 Length of Stay

As has been suggested, there are several difficulties inherent in the researching of
residential persistence. An individual who was recorded in just one census return may
have been in the parish for a period ranging from a single day to almost twenty years.
Indeed, a number of long-term inhabitants, those who remained in the parish for more
than twenty years, are also only enumerated in the study area on a single occasion. This
occurs because they were elderly in 1841 and did not survive until 1851, or because they
were not born until the 1890s. In either case, the principal portion of their residence in
the settlement fell outside the study period and is thus disguised. It is not necessarily
accurate, therefore, to claim that those who are only enumerated in a settlement in one
census are not residentially persistent. In this particular research it is also important to
acknowledge the problems that arise from the foundation of Bucks Mills in the 1810s.
This affects the possible length of stay of those aged over thirty in the Bucks Mills
census of 1841. The date of the creation of Bucks Mills as a hamlet must be taken into
consideration when comparing the three sets of data.

It has already been stated that comparisons between the three areas need to take account
of any differences in the number of deaths that occurred. As can be seen from the table
below, for the most part, the percentages of inhabitants from one enumeration, who can
be shown to have died before the following census, are similar in all three areas. The

---

20 Christopher French, ‘Persistence in a Local Community: Kingston upon Thames 1851-1891’,
percentage of those who can be shown to have died varies from 3.9\% to 15.3\% with a mean of 10.7\%. Thus in any one decade, in all three settlements, approximately 90\% of the population had the opportunity to persist.

Table 4.1 Percentage of the Population of the Three Settlements who Died between Census Enumerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bucks Mills</th>
<th>Bulkworthy</th>
<th>Conduit Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1851</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1861</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1871</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1881</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1891</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1901</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to establish a sense of the stability of the populations in the three areas, a number of factors have been examined. The percentages of inhabitants who are enumerated in only one census have been compared. Although this will include the elderly from 1841, the new borns from the 1890s and those who may have spent up to twenty years in the settlement, these limitations will apply to all three areas and thus comparisons between them will still have validity. The percentage of the population, resident at the time of one census, who remained for the following census, has been calculated for each decennial interval. This reveals any changes in the degree of persistence during the period of study. For those individuals who appeared in more than one consecutive census, their approximate length of stay has been determined. The persistence of families, as opposed to individuals, has also been considered. This helps to overcome the problem of long stayers being disguised by portions of their residence falling outside the study period. An assessment of any correlation between the length of stay and the presence of kin has been made. The possible relevance of factors such as gender, place of birth, occupation, the presence of family businesses, land ownership

---

21 The anomalous, very low, number of deaths in Bucks Mills in the 1870s and 1880s are likely to be a reflection of its age structure and small sample size.
22 The rates were calculated by taking the number of those from one census return who could be shown, from burial registers and death registrations, to have died before the next enumeration, as a percentage of the mid-point between the populations at the beginning and end of the decade concerned.
23 See Table 4.2 and Figure 4.1.
and social class has also been investigated.\footnote{24}

Of the 407 individuals who form the Bucks Mills sample, 211 (51.8\%) appear in at least two successive censuses.\footnote{25} This is rather more than French’s findings in the much larger area of Kingston upon Thames, where decadal persistence rates between 1851 and 1891 were between 34.7\% and 39.7\%.\footnote{26} Kingston upon Thames was also, it must be remembered, a very different environment from that of Bucks Mills. The overall percentages of those remaining in Bulkworthy for more than one consecutive census return suggest much higher rates of mobility than that of Bucks Mills or Kingston upon Thames. Only 30\% of the 627 in the sample appeared in Bulkworthy in two successive censuses. Conduit Street covers a much smaller area than Bulkworthy and its situation as one street within the town of Hatherleigh means that much lower persistence rates might have been expected. In fact 23.7\% of the 709 Conduit Street residents remained in the street for at least two consecutive enumerations; a figure approaching that of Bulkworthy. If the number of Conduit Street inhabitants who can still be found within Hatherleigh ten years later are considered, then the percentage is much higher at 40.8\%, placing it at a mid-point between the rates for Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy.

**Table 4.2 The Percentage of Inhabitants from One Census Remaining in the Settlements for the Next Enumeration**\footnote{27}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bucks Mills</th>
<th>Bulkworthy</th>
<th>Conduit Street</th>
<th>Hatherleigh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-1851</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1861</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1871</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1881</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1891</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1901</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rate</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{24}{See Chapter 4.3.}

\footnote{25}{It should be noted, however, that, in all three areas, some do appear in two, non-consecutive, censuses having left the settlement and returned at a later date.}

\footnote{26}{French (2008) p. 22.}

\footnote{27}{These are percentages of the total populations from one census who are present in the subsequent one. A proportion of those who do not persist will have died, see Table 4.1.}
Of the 121 inhabitants of Bucks Mills in 1841, sixty nine (57%) were still in the hamlet ten years later. The percentage of those who remained in the parish to be recorded in a subsequent census never dropped below 50%. Blaikie suggests that fishing villages are likely to be particularly stable and the Bucks Mills percentage is in line with other findings for rural parishes. In Bucks Mills, the rate of persistence shows a marked increase after 1871 and, between 1881 and 1891, 73·2% of the inhabitants remained in the village. As a further 4·7% of the population died during this decade, only 12·1% of the 1881 population had left the village by 1891. Unlike Bulkworthy and Conduit Street,

---

28 The figures for Kingston upon Thames are taken from French (2008) p. 22.
this upward trend began to reverse by the end of the century.

The Bucks Mills figures for 1841-1871 are very similar to those recorded by Muriel Birch, in her study of the, predominantly sheep farming, district of Bolton Abbey in West Yorkshire. Birch found that 49.3% of the 1851 population were still there in 1861 and a similar figure remained between 1861 and 1871. Unfortunately her study does not go beyond 1881, and no figures are given for 1871-1881, so it is not possible to say whether Bolton Abbey would have experienced an increase in ‘stayers’, similar to that of Bucks Mills. Birch does comment that, in 1881, 53.1% of the heads of Bolton Abbey households had been born on the estate. This is comparable with the 52% found in Bucks Mills, however, an additional four heads of 1881 Bucks Mills households were born before the village was built and moved there as young children. The inclusion of these in the Bucks Mills figures would raise the percentage to 68%. In addition, it is important to reiterate that Bolton Abbey was a much larger area than Bucks Mills and the persistence rates found in Bucks Mills must be viewed with this in mind.

The statistics for Bucks Mills reflect a large, stable, core population and a small number of short-term residents who were replaced between each census. Bouchard, researching in Saguenay, also found that it was the new arrivals who were more likely to leave the area; with 77.7% of those who left the parish doing so within five years of arrival. The same was true of Brenchley in Kent, where Wojciechowska discovered that 'the more distant the individual’s birthplace was from Brenchley, the more likely it was that they would not be present at the time of the next census.'

Bulkworthy had a much more fluid population with rarely more than a third of the inhabitants staying in the parish for longer than a decade. Despite the significant fall in overall population between 1851 and 1861, the percentage of remainers, although less than that for 1841-1851, is similar to that for the subsequent decades. There was, however, an increased level of persistency between 1891 and 1901, just at the time that

---

levels in Bucks Mills were falling. Bulkworthy’s rate of mobility, high for an agricultural parish, was, in part, due to the geography of the area. The parish is a scattered one, with only two small clusters of dwellings and several large, isolated farms. Those who moved were as likely to cross the parish boundary as to remain within it. As will be seen\(^{35}\) the opportunities for young men and women to work in the parish as domestic and live-in farm servants encouraged a rapid turnover of inhabitants in their teens and twenties. Once they married and needed live-out accommodation, they tended to go elsewhere. The falling population in Bulkworthy meant that there were more vacant cottages so, by the 1890s, providing that there was work available, there was less need for the newly married section of the population to move away; this may account for the increased persistence rates at the end of the study period.

Conduit Street might have been expected to have the lowest percentage of remainers, partly because it was within a town and partly because one street is a rather artificial unit and a very small area. Compared to the inhabitants of Bucks Mills, Conduit Street residents would have had a much greater supply of alternative housing within a very short distance. Despite this, the residents who remained from one census to the next comprised between 17% and 37.5% of the population throughout the study period; proportions not dissimilar to, and sometimes greater than, those of Bulkworthy. If the Conduit Street residents who left the street but remained in Hatherleigh are considered, the rate of persistence is much higher and resembles that which might be expected in a rural area. In the 1860s, the persistence rate of Conduit Street residents within Hatherleigh was even higher than that for Bucks Mills. Levels of persistence in Conduit Street fell from 37.5% in the 1860s to just 17% in the 1870s. The drop in percentage of those who remained in Hatherleigh, however, was much less severe (52.6% to 45.7%). This does seem to be a temporary dip as the rate rises again in the 1890s. The overall population of Conduit Street fell by 12.4% during the 1870s; the population of Hatherleigh decreased by a similar amount. It is likely that, by the end of the study period, the town was once again able to support its, now lower, population and thus there was less need for its inhabitants to move away, resulting in a stabilisation of persistence rates.

---

\(^{35}\) See Chapter 5.2.
When considering the percentage of individuals who appeared in given numbers of consecutive censuses, as illustrated in Figure 4.2, it is the comparisons between the three areas, rather than the figures themselves, that are important. Bucks Mills, once again, is revealed as being the most stable settlement, with a high percentage (27.3%) of individuals remaining to be enumerated on three or more consecutive occasions; this is more than three times greater than the percentages for Bulkworthy (8.6%) or Conduit Street (8%).

Whilst being mindful of Whittle’s comment that ‘the relationship between the persistence of surnames and patterns of individual mobility is a complex one’ and acknowledging that it is only necessary for one male from each generation to stay in order to ensure the continuity of a surname, it is, nonetheless, important to also look at the persistence of families, as opposed to individuals. This helps to overcome the problem of long stayers being disguised because part of their time of residence falls

---

outside the study period.

Fifty three\textsuperscript{37} different surnames can be identified in the censuses for Bucks Mills between 1841 and 1901. Twenty four of these (45\-%) appear in only one census. This is a similar percentage to the number of individuals who are only enumerated once. Five families\textsuperscript{38} (9\-%) remained throughout the whole study period. It has been possible to trace the length of residence of these families, either side of the research parameters,\textsuperscript{39} the results are shown in Figure 4.4.

\begin{figure}[h]
  \centering
  \includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure4.3.png}
  \caption{The Persistence of Surnames}
  \end{figure}

\textsuperscript{37} Instances of two, apparently unrelated, families sharing the same surname have been treated as two separate surnames.

\textsuperscript{38} Bagelhole, Braund, Davey, Harris and Saunders.

\textsuperscript{39} Given the creation of Bucks Mills in the 1810s, in order to provide comparable data, there has been no attempt to take this information prior to 1810.
Figures for families and individuals taken together suggest that, particularly up to the 1870s, roughly half the population of Bucks Mills were short-term residents whereas the other half persisted for most of their adult life. Once families put down roots in Bucks Mills they stayed for three or four generations.

The range of surnames in Bulkworthy was more diverse, with 134 different names appearing at some point during the period 1841-1901. When compared to Bucks Mills, a much greater percentage (61·9%) of these surnames do not appear in two consecutive census enumerations. Unlike Bucks Mills, the persistence of family names is, however, greater than the persistence of individuals, as 70·2% of Bulkworthy individuals appear in one enumeration only. Only three surnames (2·2%) are evident in Bulkworthy throughout the period 1841-1901; these are Damerel, Hern and Newcombe. The lengths of stay of these families beyond the study period, together with those of the Bear and Squire families, who are also resident for long periods, are shown in Figure 4.5.
Figure 4.5 Bulkworthy - Length of Stay of Families
The situation in Conduit Street is akin to that of Bulkworthy, with a similar range of surnames, 138, and 64.3% of surnames appearing once only. Again like Bulkworthy, three families\(^{40}\) (2.2%) remain throughout the study period. Outside the study period, it is not possible to trace, with certainty, their lengths of stay within Conduit Street itself; however, their persistence in Hatherleigh is illustrated in Figure 4.6, along with that of the Luxton and Dennis families who are found in six of the seven enumerations examined.

**Figure 4.6 Conduit Street - Length of Stay of Families in Hatherleigh**

The differences between the three settlements are highlighted when the percentage of families who appear in four or more consecutive censuses are considered. For Bulkworthy (9.7%) and Conduit Street (8.4%) the figures are similar. In Bucks Mills 20.7% of all families appear in at least four consecutive censuses, once again underlining the very high levels of persistence in that settlement.

Whilst Dennis and Daniels suggest that, ‘typically’, 13%-20% of urban dwellers are likely to be recorded in two consecutive censuses,\(^ {41}\) they also refer to the rural mill town of Copley. The model homes, built in this village by Edward Ackroyd, were designed to encourage the inhabitants to stay, thus levels of residential persistence in Copley might be expected to surpass those for most rural areas. 39% of the 1851 population of Copley

---

\(^{40}\) Bulleid, Edwards and Weeks.

\(^{41}\) Dennis & Daniels (1994) p. 204.
were found in the area in 1861,\textsuperscript{42} a figure that exceeds those for Bulkworthy (26.7\%) and Conduit Street (27.4\%) but is notably less than that of Bucks Mills (51.6\%). 40.9\% of the total 1851 population of Conduit Street were still in Hatherleigh ten years later, very similar to the percentage for Copley and more than twice the figure suggested by Dennis and Daniels for the typical urban area. It seems that, in this instance, the small market town of Hatherleigh, exhibited degrees of persistence that resembled those of rural areas rather than those that might be expected in an urban centre. This may be a reflection of Hatherleigh’s size, being a small town, its area and population did not greatly exceed that of many wholly rural parishes and the settlements mentioned by Dennis and Daniels were almost certainly larger. New research by French\textsuperscript{43} in Kingston upon Thames, an area that could certainly be classed as a town, has, however, revealed persistence rates that were higher than those suggested by Dennis and Daniels. This underlines the need for a great deal more research in this area.

It is now necessary to consider the factors that may have encouraged the inhabitants of these three settlements to put down roots, often leading to persistence for several generations.

4.3 The Influence of Factors including Kinship on Length of Stay within the Settlements

Richard Lawton found that persistence rates were ‘related to age, life-cycle stage (and associated housing needs), income, status, and social mobility.’\textsuperscript{44} For the purposes of this research, various factors have been considered as possible motivations for staying within the settlements. The relative influences of gender, occupation, class, birthplace and presence of kin within the area have been assessed, as have property ownership, the presence of a family business and the dwellings inhabited by the residentially persistent.

\textsuperscript{42} Dennis & Daniels (1994) p. 208.
\textsuperscript{43} French (2008) p. 22.
\textsuperscript{44} Lawton (1979), p. 220.
Gender

Table 4.3 The Relationship between Gender and Length of Stay in the Three Settlements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Total Study Sample</th>
<th>Male:Female Ratios</th>
<th>Those appearing in one census only</th>
<th>Those appearing in 4 or more censuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bucks Mills</td>
<td>100:108.6</td>
<td>100:107.7</td>
<td>100:93.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkworthy</td>
<td>100:106.3</td>
<td>100:89.5</td>
<td>100:92.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit Street</td>
<td>100:114.5</td>
<td>100:104.2</td>
<td>100:81.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender appears to have had little influence on the likelihood of remaining in Bucks Mills for a single census enumeration only. The proportion of males to females who fell into this category (100:107.7) was similar to that for the study sample as a whole (100:108.6). In Conduit Street and Bulkworthy, men were more likely than women to be in the area for only a short time. The sex ratio for the total Conduit Street sample was 100:114.5 yet, for those who are enumerated more once only, it was 100:104.2. In Bulkworthy the tendency for men, rather than women, to be the shortest term residents was even greater, with the ratio for those in a single census being 100:89.5, compared to 100:106.3 for the full sample.45

At the other end of the scale, considering those who appear in four consecutive censuses or more, gender again made a difference. As in French’s Kingston upon Thames sample,46 in all three settlements, men were more liable to be long-term residents than women. This is to be expected, primarily because the men were the main bread-winners and women were more likely to move on marriage than men. Thus the men fell at both ends of the spectrum; they either moved frequently or they persisted for several decades.

Age

If the age profile of those who appear in one census only is considered, the overwhelming majority (70-4%) of those in Bucks Mills are under twenty in the single census in which they appear. These findings are supported by the research into mobility  

45 Those who leave the study areas and the possible reasons for their so doing, are discussed fully in Chapter 5.  
in nineteenth century British cities, undertaken by Lawton.\textsuperscript{47} Even if those who are born in the 1890s, and who therefore cannot possibly feature in more than one of the study censuses, are ignored, 66.3\% of all those who are not residentially persistent for at least two census enumerations are in the under twenty age group. In Bulkworthy this tendency is less marked with 56.9\% of these short-term residents being under twenty. Here the removal of those born in the 1890s makes little difference as 55\% of the remaining individuals who are present in one census only are under twenty. The situation is similar in Conduit Street, with 54.5\% of those with single enumerations being under the age of twenty; the figure being 53.2\% if those born after 1890 are not considered. This suggests that occupational opportunities are a key factor and that those who are unable to find work within the settlement have been forced to move away in their mid to late teens. Thus the availability of employment is essential to becoming residentially persistent and the occupations of those who remained within the settlements for several decades will now be considered.

**Occupation**

The narrow range of occupations within Bucks Mills makes it difficult to associate the residentially persistent with a particular occupation. In Bucks Mills, virtually all the residents, those who left the area and those who remained, were fishermen and/or agricultural labourers. It seems that, in the case of Bucks Mills, the ability to find employment was more important than the nature of that employment. In Bulkworthy 77.5\% of agricultural labourers and all the domestic servants were enumerated in one census only. Those that were more likely to stay were the craftsmen and tradesmen such as the shoemakers, drapers and coopers. A third of all farmers were enumerated in at least three consecutive censuses and a further third appeared twice.

With the exception of one nurse, Mary Ann Weeks, whose husband was a mason, those who remained for five or more Conduit Street censuses were all tradesmen.\textsuperscript{48} 86.5\% of the agricultural labourers and 80.8\% of the domestic servants were short-term residents, appearing in the street for a single enumeration only. Those with established businesses

\textsuperscript{47} Lawton (1979) p. 221.

\textsuperscript{48} One of each of the following: blacksmith, butcher, carpenter, clockmaker, mason and tailor.
were more likely to stay; the trades often being carried on by subsequent generations. As with Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy, those whose occupations did not rely on shop or workshop premises moved on with greater rapidity. As Wojciechowska found in Brenchley, Kent, craftsmen and tradesmen were more likely to persist because ‘the nature of [their] business encouraged persistency, as familiarity with the local inhabitants stimulated trade’.49

Unlike other areas,50 where farmers tended to be among the longer-term residents, the position of farmers in Conduit Street is more unusual, with five of the nine being recorded only once. The farmer who did persist for four enumerations, Henry Abell, began his working life as a shoemaker and is designated as ‘farmer’ on only two occasions. There were no farms within Conduit Street so anyone styling themselves ‘farmer’ would have been working land outside the town. It is likely that these would have been very small holdings, with no farm house attached, thus reducing the incentive to continue residing in the same dwelling. The role of occupation as a motivating factor for migrants from the three settlementss is discussed in the next chapter.51

**Land Ownership**

Bouchard found that people were prone to leave Saguenay if they did not own land52 and it is generally accepted that owner-occupiers are more likely to be residentially persistent.53 Dennis and Daniels feel that high levels of persistence amongst tenants, who might have less incentive to remain in an area, reflect a strong sense of community. ‘For renters, with little emotional attachment to their dwellings and minimal removal costs, continued residence in the same house was more likely to signify commitment to the locality.’54 The majority of Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy residents were tenants;55 the

---

49 Wojciechowska (1988) p. 34.
50 Both within this study and those by others such as Halse (2000) p. 63 and Wojciechowska (1988) p. 34.
51 See Chapter 5.2.iii.
54 Dennis & Daniels (1994) p. 206
55 The system of tenure in North Devon, and its possible impact on residential persistence has been discussed in Chapter 2.2.1.
tithe schedules revealing just eleven owner-occupiers. In Bucks Mills, their dwellings include two of the three largest cottages in the village and in Bulkworthy three of the five owner occupiers inhabit farms, rather than labourers’ cottages.

Table 4.4 Bucks Mills - Length of Stay of Owner-occupiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Dwelling</th>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
<th>Reason for Departure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Loggin</td>
<td>Laburnham Cottage</td>
<td>34 years</td>
<td>Move to Bideford with daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Metherell</td>
<td>4 Forest Garden</td>
<td>41 years</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Braund</td>
<td>John’s*</td>
<td>52 years</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Braund senior</td>
<td>Whyte Cottage</td>
<td>53 years</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Braund junior</td>
<td>Bucks Cliff+</td>
<td>80 years</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Davey</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49 years</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Moved to another cottage in Bucks Mills in 1849.
+ Moved to Bucks Cliff in 1835, having already spent 28 years in the village.

Table 4.5 Bulkworthy - Length of Stay of Owner-occupiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Dwelling</th>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
<th>Reason for Departure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Avery</td>
<td>Waldrons</td>
<td>73 years</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Blight née Avery</td>
<td>Orchard Hill</td>
<td>71 years</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bear</td>
<td>Haytown</td>
<td>55 years+</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Bear</td>
<td>Haytown</td>
<td>39 years</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Newcombe</td>
<td>Blights</td>
<td>79 years</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ At least 55 years.

As can be seen, in both Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy, these were all individuals with a very high degree of residential persistence, for at least nine of them their stay only terminating with death. The records do not allow a similar analysis to be carried out for Conduit Street. The only resident who is known to have been an owner-occupier is John Braund junior the clock and watchmaker, who inherited the house from his father and appears to have spent his whole life in Conduit Street. The evidence that is available for the study areas affirms that land ownership did indeed have a positive influence on length of stay.

Landowners tend to be those who belong to the middle and upper classes but the correlation is not an exact one. Richard Lawton suggests that those of higher social

---

56 The Parkham Tithe Schedule 1840 IR29/9/317, the Woolfardisworthy Tithe Schedule 1838 IR29/9/459 and the Bulkworthy Tithe Schedule 1843 IR29/9/87, held at The National Archives.
57 From deeds in private hands.
status are less likely to migrate. Bater, however, found high levels of mobility amongst the Russian nobility, with only 25% remaining in the same city for a three year period. This was, he feels, because they were not tied to employment. The residential habits of the nobility are not an issue in these North Devon settlements, it is, however, relevant to consider the impact of class on the likelihood of migration. In Escott’s research, those of higher social status, who were not landowners, were more likely to move on than labourers.

Class

Working on the St. Albans region of Hertfordshire, Goose comments, ‘the higher social groups […] show a markedly higher propensity to migrate’. Similarly, French found that the lower classes were the more persistent residents of Kingston upon Thames. It is difficult to make meaningful comments on the class of the Bucks Mills residentially persistent as more than 90% of the village belonged to classes III or IV throughout the period. Almost all those of higher social status were long-term residents; with only 11.1% of those from Classes I and II appearing in just one census, compared to 48.2% of the population as a whole. 77.8% of those in Classes I and II spent more than thirty years in Bucks Mills and the majority of these remained in the village until they died. The presence of several substantial farms in Bulkworthy means that, compared to Bucks Mills, there was a slightly higher percentage of individuals in Class I or II. Of the 14.2% of Bulkworthy residents with occupations, who fell into this category, 45% were enumerated only once. This is a much higher percentage than that found in Bucks Mills but still much lower than the 70% of all Bulkworthy residents who appeared in a single census.

The majority of Conduit Street residents had occupations that placed them in Class III.

---

58 Lawton (1979) p. 221.
The farmers have already been mentioned; in no case are the acreages of their holdings given, although Henry Abell is described as a ‘small farmer’.\(^{64}\) It seems very unlikely that any of those styled ‘farmer’ in the censuses for Conduit Street worked the five acres or more necessary to raise them from Class III to Class II, according to Armstrong’s classifications.\(^{65}\) This leaves twelve individuals, just 3.4% of those whose occupations are recorded, who fell within Classes I or II. These included four Baptist Ministers; none were born in Hatherleigh and all were recorded once only. This is a reflection of the policy of the Baptist Church to move Ministers on fairly frequently. Two of the four schoolteachers were pupil teachers only and therefore would be expected to go elsewhere on gaining their certificates.\(^{66}\) One individual in the Royal Marines also appeared in one census only, presumably as his duties took him elsewhere. His family did not remain in Conduit Street so it does not seem that he was a resident but absent from home for other enumerations. Finally there were three clerks in Conduit Street, one was recorded once, the others for two and three enumerations but it should be noted that both of these individuals were residents whose length of stay continued outside the study period. Wojciechowska\(^{67}\) found that persistency rates were particularly low for the professional classes and this is borne out in Conduit Street, but not in the other study areas.

In Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy those in Classes I and II were more likely to be residentially persistent. There is, however, a close link between property ownership and social status, therefore it cannot be certain which played the greater part in leading these individuals to become long-term inhabitants. In Conduit Street the position is less clear-cut and it may be significant that only two of the twelve Conduit Street individuals in Classes I and II were Hatherleigh born. The links between birthplace and propensity to remain in an area will now be assessed.

---

\(^{64}\) 1871 census for High Street, Hatherleigh RG10 2151 folio 47.

\(^{65}\) Armstrong (1972).

\(^{66}\) In fact one, Ann Abell, who was born in Hatherleigh, was recorded twice, the first time as a child at home with her parents.

\(^{67}\) Wojciechowska (1988) p. 34.
**Birthplace**

Figure 4.6 The Relationship between Birthplace and Length of Stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Censuses</th>
<th>Bucks Mills %</th>
<th>Bulkworthy %</th>
<th>Conduit Street* %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natives Non-Natives</td>
<td>Natives Non-Natives</td>
<td>Natives Non-Natives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In this instance ‘Native’ includes all those born in Hatherleigh.

Figure 4.7 Bucks Mills - The Percentage of Natives and Non-natives Remaining for a Specified Number of Censuses

Bouchard’s assessment that a settlement consisted of a section of established families and a group for transient individuals is borne out by the findings in the three study areas. It is more difficult to assess the significance of birthplace in the case of Bucks Mills because inhabitants were very unlikely to have been born there before 1810. Despite
this, 64.5% of those born in Bucks Mills remained for more than one census return, compared to 39.6% of those who had been born elsewhere. To look at this another way, if all those who appear in more than one census are considered, 61.6% were native born and 38.4% were born outside Bucks Mills. These are very similar figures to those for Kingston upon Thames, where French found that 61% of persisters were native born, compared to 35-40% of the total population.\(^{68}\) Had Bucks Mills been in existence before 1810, it is likely that the difference in these percentages would have been even greater.

When looking at the percentages for Bucks Mills it does seem that it was birth within the hamlet itself that is significant, with 63.8% of those born in the parent parishes of Parkham or Woolfardisworthy moving on after just one enumeration.

**Figure 4.8 Bulkworthy - The Percentage of Natives and Non-natives Remaining for a Specified Number of Censuses**

In Bulkworthy there was a much lower overall percentage (30.1%) of those who can be found in more than one consecutive census. There was still, however, a greater likelihood of those born in Bulkworthy itself remaining in the parish for more than ten years. 40.3% of native born Bulkworthy residents appeared in at least two censuses and 11.5% were recorded in three or more; the corresponding percentages for non-natives being 17.2% and 6.7%.

**Figure 4.9 Conduit Street - The Percentage of Natives and Non-natives Remaining for a Specified Number of Censuses**

In Conduit Street, the impact of birthplace had little influence on residential persistence. In fact slightly more (28.2%) of those born within Devon, but outside Hatherleigh, remained for more than one census than did the Hatherleigh born (26.4%).

---

69 It might be expected that those with an unknown Devon birthplace would appear in the 1841 census alone, as an appearance in a later census would normally reveal a more precise location. In Conduit Street, however, there is one individual who appears in both 1841 and 1851 with no more specific birthplace than ‘Devon’. 
Presence of Kin

The locally born were more likely to have family members living in the locality and the effect of the presence of kin on length of stay will now be considered. Bouchard found that, in Saguenay, ‘the fewer relationships an individual or a family has developed within a community, the more prone it is to leave.’\textsuperscript{70} Clearly those who married into a village family, thus creating for themselves a kin presence, would have a greater incentive to stay in the locality. Yet the very act of remaining within an area made it more likely that an individual would marry another inhabitant. Thus it is difficult to assess the precise effect of kinship as an enticement to stay in an area. What is possible is to consider those who fell outside the kinship network of the study area and assess whether their lengths of stay differed from the inhabitants in general. It is also relevant to examine the length of stay of members of those families who are central to the kinship webs in their respective settlements, in order to judge whether they were likely to remain longer than was average for the study area.

In the case of Bucks Mills, only forty five people, 11\% of the total sample, did not form part of the extended kinship web of the hamlet. Of these, eight were single individuals and the remaining thirty seven made up six nuclear families whose members had no kinship links outside the co-resident family group. All of the eight singletons and half of the family groups can be found in Bucks Mills for only one census enumeration, fourteen people appeared twice and the two members of the Chidsley family remained for three decades.

\textsuperscript{70} Bouchard (1991) p. 76.
The findings show that those who did not have kinship links within the area were more likely to move on after only one appearance in a census return. Length of stay was greater for those who had kin within the study area; none of those without kin were enumerated in more than three decades.

Four families have been identified as being central to the Bucks Mills kinship network.\textsuperscript{71} Figure 4.11 compares the percentage of their members who were enumerated in only one Bucks Mills census, to that of the population as a whole.

\textsuperscript{71} Using the data described in Chapter 3.2.i, the families with the greatest number of kinship links were selected.
Figure 4.11 Bucks Mills - The Percentage of Individuals from Persistent Families who remain for only one Census, Compared with the Total Population

As can be seen, members of these families were less likely to move out of the parish after only one decade when compared to the total sample.

In Bulkworthy, a far smaller proportion (30.9%) of the sample population can be linked together on one single family tree. There was, however, a further 5.9% within the parish who fell outside this body of core kin but who did have some non-resident kin within the settlement.
19.7% of Bulkworthy inhabitants who had no kin in the parish beyond their household remained in the settlement for more than one enumeration. For those who did have relatives nearby, the percentage was much higher (47.2%). It was, however, membership of the core kinship web that had the greater effect. 50% of members of this network were enumerated at least twice and 18.6% appeared three or more times, whereas for those who had some kin but who did not belong to the central kinship web, the figures were 32.4% and 10.8% respectively. These latter percentages are close to those for the sample as a whole. Five families could be described as ‘core’ or ‘dynastic’ families in

---

Bulkworthy; all of whom played a key role in the Bulkworthy kinship network. As in Bucks Mills, individuals from these families were less likely to leave the parish after one enumeration than those in the full sample. All of those who appeared in Bulkworthy in five or more censuses were members of these families by birth or marriage.

**Figure 4.13 Bulkworthy - The Percentage of Individuals from Persistent Families who remain for only one Census, Compared with the Total Population**

Despite the apparent paucity of kinship links between the heads of Conduit Street households displayed in 1841, of the 709 inhabitants in the total sample, 313 (44.1%) can be linked to kin who were not co-resident but lived elsewhere in the street. Although this is nowhere near the level found in Bucks Mills it does exceed that for Bulkworthy. This is partly a reflection of the lack of cohesiveness in Bulkworthy but is also an indication that the residents of Conduit Street were closer knit than might be expected in a single street within a town.

---

73 See Chapter 2.3.iv.
As with the other areas, membership of an extended kinship network in Conduit Street did have a positive correlation with length of stay. 85.1% of those without extended kin in the street moved on after one census; whereas this figure dropped to 65.5% for those with family members present who were not co-resident. Of those outside the kinship network, only six individuals (1.4%) can be found in four or more consecutive enumerations; compared with 8.3% of those with family ties.

In Conduit Street, the families that were key to the kinship web were not identical to those who stayed in the street throughout the study period. The Abell family were critical as links in Conduit Street’s genealogy but they disappeared from the street after 1881. There were two distinct Weeks families, only one of which formed part of the central kinship network, yet it was the other Weeks family who persisted throughout the study period.

---

74 Although this branch of the Weeks family can be attached to the principal kinship web, they are on the fringes of this group rather than being central to it.
As in the other areas, membership of a ‘dynastic family’\textsuperscript{75} made it more likely that an individual would remain in the parish for at least two census enumerations. Only four\textsuperscript{76} of the fourteen individuals who can be found in Conduit Street in four or more enumerations did not belong to one of these families.

Thus gender, age, occupation, land ownership, class, birthplace and the presence of kin all, to a greater or lesser extent, impacted upon length of stay. Considering some of the most persistent families, those that were integral to the kinship webs of their settlements, in more detail helps to shed light upon which of these factors assumed the most importance. This is addressed in the following section by the examination of three families, each of whom remained in a study area for at least a century.

\textsuperscript{76} These are John Braund and three members of the Weeks family who fell outside the kinship web.
4.4 Stayers Under Scrutiny: case studies

The Braund Family

The Braunds were a prime example of a dynastic family within Bucks Mills. 34.6% (141 individuals) of the Bucks Mills sample population were born with the surname Braund and a further 7.1% married into the family. By the end of the study period, 65.8% of the village’s inhabitants were called Braund and 91.9% of those who lived in Bucks Mills were in some way related.

John Braund, the progenitor of the Braunds of Bucks Mills, had been baptised in Bradworthy, six miles from the hamlet, but, once married, he set up home on a plot known as Rogermans, at Bucks Cross. Three of John’s sons and one of his daughters were amongst the earliest inhabitants of Bucks Mills. Joseph Braund may have been the first to move there, possibly as early as 1802, when he married Susanna Glover; the couple were certainly in the hamlet by 1807. Joseph was a mariner and owner of fishing boats who, for most of his adult life, lived in Whyte Cottage, one of the larger properties in the village and one that Joseph owned. Two of Joseph’s five sons emigrated to Port Hope but the three who stayed in the village produced nineteen male children between them, most of whom helped the Braunds acquire their stranglehold on the Bucks Mills kinship network.

In 1812, Joseph’s older brother, John Braund junior, a cooper and mariner, leased land in Bucks Mills upon which five of the village’s cottages were built. John, like Joseph, had married into the Glover family and although John had four sons, none of them established families who remained in Bucks Mills. Thus John’s descendants did not contribute to the persistence of the Braunds within the hamlet. By 1813, James, the youngest Braund brother, was leasing three of the smaller cottages in Bucks Mills, yet his occupations suggest that he had no claim to any higher class than that of a labourer. He was variously recorded as a rat catcher, sand lander, fisherman and labourer. James had sixteen children by his two wives, the second of whom was also a Glover. This underlines the importance of the Glovers in the Bucks Mills’ kinship web; despite not a
single person born with the name forming part of the study sample. Only two of James’ eight sons perpetuated the Braund name within Bucks Mills.

Males of the second generation who survived to adulthood but did not remain in Bucks Mills were those who became mariners rather than local fishermen. Their occupations would thus have given them much wider horizons than their neighbours who worked fishing boats in local waters. It could also be argued that the personality traits that encouraged these young men to join the merchant service may also have motivated their moves from the village but this remains within the realms of speculation. Only one second generation Braund did not fit this pattern and that was William Braund, who moved a few miles away to work his in-laws’ farm at Peppercombe. It was not necessarily the eldest sons who remained in Bucks Mills. Joseph’s second and fourth legitimate sons, along with his eldest, illegitimate, son stayed in the village. All James’ sons by his first marriage left, leaving only the two eldest sons by his second marriage to continue the line in Bucks Mills.

The Braund brothers were joined in Bucks Mills in 1820 by their sister, Elizabeth, by this time married to Francis Cory. The Corys worked the mill in Bucks Mills, so again, they were of slightly higher social status than many of the residents. Although Elizabeth did not remain in Bucks Mills long enough to form part of the study sample, her granddaughter married back into the Braund family of Bucks Mills thus contributing to the increasingly complex Braund kinship web within the village.

---

There are females whose maiden names were Glover included in the sample but they had married before the study period.
What then, apart from sheer fecundity, allowed the Braunds to flourish within the village in a way that was not replicated by any other family? Certainly the fact that they entered the village as a sibling group, all of whom had male children, helped. Folklore it may be, but tales of extreme parochial xenophobia, lasting until the Second World War, deterred incomers, restricting the choice of marriage partner to others within the village, with whom an existing kinship link was likely. Snell writes of ‘the importance of such local antagonisms and rivalries, and their often long-standing nature. In overlooking them,’ he says, ‘historians are not appreciating some of the main instincts and counter-alignments affecting rural societies in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.’

Certainly this intolerance of outsiders impacted upon Bucks Mills and was partly responsible for the Braunds’ ability to hold sway.

The Braunds were clearly comfortable in Bucks Mills and, whilst they could make a living from their small scale fishing business, there was every incentive for at least some from each family to remain. At least two of the initial Braund incomers were not of labouring status and this helped to provide occupational opportunities for the succeeding

---

generations. The importance of the family unit in such fishing enterprises has already been mentioned; fishemen were reluctant to entrust their lives to those outside the family group. There was sufficient work to keep Braunds living in many of the Bucks Mills cottages until the Second World War, by which time several of the dwellings were owned by members of the Braund family. After this, many began, often reluctantly, to move away from the village that they considered ‘home’. By this time, the village was less self-sufficient and it was necessary for younger members of the family to look elsewhere for their education, employment and accommodation. Although oral evidence suggests that they still felt an affinity to Bucks Mills, improved transport links allowed them to move, predominantly to Bideford, and yet maintain ties with the village.

The Damerel Family

Fourteen individuals bearing the name Damerel, or Damrel, form part of the Bulkworthy sample, two of these were females who married into the family. Numerically they constituted a far smaller proportion of the inhabitants of their settlement than did the Braunds. Nonetheless they forged important links in the Bulkworthy kinship web and lived in the parish for a hundred and fifty years. In the context of the families who remained within Bulkworthy for several generations, the Damerels were comparative late-comers. Christopher Damerel and his wife, Ann, arrived there from Buckland Filleigh in 1817, bringing with them two of their younger children. It is of interest that the Damerels married into another persistent Bulkworthy family; James Damerel married Agnes Bear in 1836. Neither the Bears, nor the Damerels were of the labouring classes, with Agnes’ father being a shoemaker and small farmer, whilst her brother was a blacksmith. Christopher Damerel was the miller at Bulkworthy Mill and his son, James, farmed fourteen acres at Merrifield Farm, before taking over the mill from his father. Merrifield had previously been occupied by James’ in-laws. Both of these properties were tenanted but the mill was to remain in the Damerel family until 1926, with three generations working as millers.

---

79 See Chapter 3.1.
80 The village school closed in 1948.
81 Oral evidence from Wilfred Braund, Christopher Braund et. al..
82 Ann died in 1836, therefore does not form part of the sample.
83 Land Tax Returns for Bulkworthy, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
It does not appear that Christopher Damerel had been a miller prior to his arrival in Bulkworthy, he certainly did not live in the mill whilst in Buckland Filleigh. At various times during the study period, between twenty four and forty nine acres of land were attached to the mill, so, whilst being considerably smaller than some of the Bulkworthy farms, it was not an un substantial holding. By 1910, the mill was used for personal grinding only, which is unsurprising as the then occupant, William Damerel, was in his seventies. Although the Damerel’s association with the mill ended with William’s death in 1926, his descendants remained in the parish until the 1960s.

In the absence of information about Christopher’s occupation prior to his arrival in Bulkworthy, his motivations for moving are difficult to assess. It does, however, seem that the establishment of a family business was key to the Damerel’s persistency. There is no suggestion that the family had pre-existing kinship links in Bulkworthy but these were quickly established by intermarriage with an existing core family and this may well have contributed to their willingness or ability to remain in the area.

---


**The Bulleid Family**

Like the Damerels, the Bulleids were a persistent family, yet were not dominant in terms of numbers. Twenty four individuals who were born with the surname Bulleid form part of the Conduit Street sample; a further four females married into the family. All of these members of the Bulleid family descend from Samuel and Eleanor Bulleid who lived in Dolton, a small rural parish, some five miles north of Hatherleigh. The Bulleids had arrived in Conduit Street by 1830, when John Bulleid from Dolton married into the Balkwill family, who had themselves only been in Hatherleigh for a generation. There is no evidence that John moved as a child; his parents and at least two siblings appear to have remained in Dolton. Two of John’s brothers, Samuel and Thomas, also moved to Hatherleigh during the 1830s. Thomas, a builder, lived in Market Street and remained in Hatherleigh for the rest of his life. By 1841, Samuel Bulleid was running the butcher’s shop at 4 Conduit Street that was to remain in the family for the next fifty years. Although John Bulleid was a joiner, all other male Bulleids in Conduit Street were, like their Dolton forebears, butchers. John, however, moved to another part of Hatherleigh in the 1840s and his children did not remain in the parish.

The Bulleids were a very different family from the Braunds; they were persistent, yet they were not a family that spread and multiplied, establishing themselves in many households, either within Conduit Street itself or elsewhere in Hatherleigh. In 1891, the family occupied just the one household in Hatherleigh, and that was the butcher’s shop in Conduit Street.

It seems that occupation was the key to the Bulleids’ persistence within Conduit Street and the opportunity to practise their trades in a market town, rather than a village, may have been the initial impetus for the move. There were no known family links with Hatherleigh before the Bulleid brothers in-migrated. Three generations of Bulleid men inhabited the butcher’s shop throughout the study period. From 1851-1881 the adjacent property was also occupied by the family, being used by the eldest son, or the widowed mother of the butcher. Unfortunately it has not been possible to discover whether or not the property was owned by the family but clearly this was not a family of labourers but

---

85 Thus the Bulleids form 3.9% of the Conduit Street sample.
one of tradesmen, whose established business gave them no incentive to move away. The association with Conduit Street and the butcher’s shop ended in the first decade of the twentieth century and was perhaps in part due to the fact that Ernest Bulleid had no sons to continue the business.

Normally families who continued in a trade within a settlement for several generations also built up a network of kin within the area; thus making it difficult to establish whether it was the presence of family members or the chance to continue the family business that was the incentive for staying put. In the case of the Bulleid family, unlike the other more persistent families in Conduit Street, no large web of kinship was created. The initial three Hatherleigh households occupied by the incoming brothers dwindled to one by the end of the study period. The fact that they left Hatherleigh as soon as the business was no longer viable, adds weight to the evidence that it was this that was the magnet keeping them within the town.

For the Braunds then, it was their affinity to Bucks Mills as their family village and the presence of a kinship group that also provided them with work that encouraged many of
them to spend their whole lives in the hamlet. The Damerels, on the other hand, appear to have been motivated initially by occupational opportunities, with the presence of kin apparently not being a consideration. For the Bulleids, trading opportunities were paramount. This suggests that for all these families employment was vital to persistence, yet this was not unrelated to kinship as it was often the family group that provided this opportunity.

4.5 Persistence in Perspective

In general, the residents of Bucks Mills were far more likely to remain in their settlement for long periods than those of Bulkworthy or Conduit Street. Individuals who left Conduit Street, however, did tend to stay within Hatherleigh, making Bulkworthy the most fluid of the three settlements. Kevin Schürer found that decadal persistence rates between 1861-1881, in the rural areas of Dengie and Hatfield, were approximately 50%. This is similar to the percentage found by Robin in the predominantly arable parish of Elmdon in North Essex between 1851 and 1861. Margaret Escott’s work in Binfield for an earlier period, 1779-1801, found decadal persistence rates of 72% and 67%. This suggests that to find 51.8% of the Bucks Mills sample appearing in at least two successive censuses was not unusual. It is, however, important to remember that Bucks Mills was much smaller than the areas considered in these other studies and that its new creation in the 1810s restricts the number of lifetime residents for the early decades of this study. If all other aspects were equal therefore, Bucks Mills should have had a much lower level of persistence than those found by these other researchers. Thus the Bucks Mills rates of 61.7% for 1871-1881 and 73.2% for 1881-1891, underline the fact that the hamlet was a very stable settlement within which the majority of residents were content to remain for most of their lives.

Bulkworthy, with its large farms, was not dissimilar to Elmdon, yet persistence rates

---

88 Robin (1980).
were much lower in Bulkworthy and, in this respect, this settlement was the most atypical of the three study areas. Even though it was just a single road, Conduit Street’s rates of persistence were greater than those of Bulkworthy. When persistence within the whole parish of Hatherleigh was considered, rates for the decade 1861-1871 even exceeded those for Bucks Mills.

What then were the factors that influenced the differing persistence rates in the three settlements? When the effect of gender is considered, Schürer found that between 1861 and 1881, females from Dengie and Hatfield were more likely than men to migrate.\textsuperscript{89} Goose too found a greater number of migratory females in the Berkhamstead region of Hertfordshire.\textsuperscript{90} The effect of gender had little impact in Bucks Mills but for the other two settlements it was males who had the greater tendency to depart after only one census enumeration. Yet, in support of Schürer’s findings, in all three study areas, more males than females became lifetime residents or were present for four or more consecutive censuses. Thus men tended to either move on rapidly, or put down roots and remain for several decades. It does not seem that these higher persistence rates amongst men were a result of a lack of job opportunities for females, as there were plenty of working women in Bulkworthy, yet females still left in large numbers, after a relatively short stay. The reasons for women leaving have been examined in Chapter 5,\textsuperscript{91} and it appears that it was not just a case of men having more incentive to remain but females having more incentive to move, primarily for marriage, that created the imbalance.

In all three areas it was those in their late teens or twenties who were most likely to move. This is not unexpected and is similar to Wojciechowska’s findings for Brenchley.\textsuperscript{92} The lack of persistence in this age group is directly linked to the need for employment; the availability of occupational opportunities was crucial if an individual was to stay within an area. In Bucks Mills, once the employment prospects in the hamlet

\textsuperscript{89} Schürer (1991) p. 112.
\textsuperscript{90} Nigel Goose, Population, Economy and Family Structure in Hertfordshire in 1851: Volume I The Berkhamstead Region University of Hertfordshire Press, Hatfield (1996a) p. 57.
\textsuperscript{91} See Chapter 5.2.iii and 5.3.
\textsuperscript{92} Wojciechowska (1988) p. 32.
began to dwindle, at the very end of the nineteenth century, persistence rates started to fall. In Bulkworthy and Conduit Street it was the labourers who were more likely to move on because it was as easy for them to obtain work elsewhere as it was for them to continue working for the same employer.

One of the reasons for the high persistence rate of Conduit Street residents within Hatherleigh was almost certainly the availability of work within the town. Despite declining prosperity in Hatherleigh during the study period, employment opportunities were greater than those in Bucks Mills or Bulkworthy. Once a family trade or business was established, perhaps one that was taken up by succeeding generations, then individuals stayed in the same settlement. In Conduit Street the most persistent families included the Abells with their shoemaking and tailoring businesses, the Bulleids, who inhabited the same butcher’s shop for three generations and the Edwards and Dennis families who were established as blacksmiths over many years. In both Bulkworthy and Conduit Street it is noticeable that the craftsmen, shopkeepers and tradesmen had the highest persistence rates. Deacon too found that ‘a retail background increased the likelihood of persistence.’ Equally though, he uncovered high levels of mobility amongst those with a maritime background, which does not equate with the situation in Bucks Mills. As was the case in Bulkworthy, both Deacon and Wojciechowska, researching in Cornwall and Kent respectively, identified agricultural labourers as a less persistent sector of the population.

The likelihood of residential persistence in Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy was clearly furthered by owner occupancy but the possibilities of long-term tenure of a farm or workshop also encouraged families and individuals to stay. There was a correlation between social class and owner occupancy but regardless of their residential status, a higher percentage of individuals who fell into Classes I and II remained in their...

---

93 This was partly due to increasing mechanisation reducing the demand for agricultural labourers and also the impact that large commercial fishing ventures had on the small scale family fishermen.
97 Wojciechowska (1988) p. 34.
settlement for long periods than did those in Classes III, IV and V.

The effect of birthplace did not have a great influence on the residential persistence of Conduit Street residents. In the other settlements, however, the native born were more likely to persist. This was particularly noticeable in Bucks Mills where birth within the hamlet clearly increased the likelihood of remaining for more than one census. As has been stated, the native born had a greater chance of having kin living within the settlement but with whom they did not share a home. Escott’s work on Binfield found that the presence of kin had positive effect on residential persistence\textsuperscript{98} and this is also the case in the three areas studied here. In Bulkworthy, the presence of both core and peripheral kinship networks allows the distinction to be made between these groups and it is noticeable that it was membership of the core kinship network that had the greater effect. There is a rural-urban distinction. In Conduit Street the presence of kin appeared to be one of the more important factors at work but, in this case, it cannot be divorced from occupation. Families who established businesses in the street were more likely to stay in the area thereby increasing the likelihood that their extended families would be present. An examination of families such as the Bulleids suggests, however, that it was the occupation that was key and links between persistence and kinship were a less significant corollary.

Gender, occupation, class, property ownership and birthplace all had some effect on length of stay, as did the presence of kin or a family business. When assessing the relative significances of these factors it is necessary to remember that presence of kin may, in turn, affect occupational opportunities and vice versa. It also impacted upon the likelihood of property ownership and perhaps, the ability to move up the class ladder. Of the factors assessed, birthplace and kinship, aspects that are closely linked, both had a notable effect in Bucks Mills. These issues assumed less importance in Conduit Street, where occupation and business opportunities had the greatest influence. Occupation was significant in Bulkworthy also but here membership of the core kinship group was equally important. When examining residential persistence, then, it can be seen that kinship did have a part to play but it was the community, and the occupational structure

\textsuperscript{98} Escott (1988) p. 31.
and opportunities provided by that community, which encouraged individuals and families to remain for long periods of time. The next chapter will look at these influences again, and assess whether the same factors were at work when migration decisions were made.
5. Movement and Motivation: migration patterns in the three settlements

5.1 When, Where, Who and Why?: theories of migration

‘Any understanding of social, economic and cultural change in the past must take account of the process of migration’

Bogue describes migration as one of the five demographic processes. For him, migration plays a key role in the theory of demographic regulation. Migration, Bogue believes, is the most important factor in accounting for the varying growth rates of settlements as it can produce population changes that differ from those produced by natural change alone. He feels that migration, both inward and outward, affects not only the size, but also the age and sex composition of the population. The population pyramid of a typical ‘sending’ location will be narrower than average at the age group twenty-thirty nine. ‘Receiving’ settlements will have pyramids with a corresponding bulge at the same point.

Those studying migration need to bear in mind several factors. Firstly, the timing has to be considered and the chronological peaks and troughs of migration identified. Next, the migration streams, the routes taken by migrants, and the distances travelled, should be investigated. In order to identify the composition of these streams, an analysis of the migrants themselves is also important; their age, sex, occupation, religion and migration companions may all be significant. Finally, possible motivations for migration can be sought. The when, where, who and, most importantly, why, of migration to and from the locations under review, are examined below. When investigating the three study areas it soon became apparent that the patterns of and motivations for, emigration were very

---

2 The others being fertility, mortality, marriage and social mobility.
5 D. Mageen, ‘Principal Themes in Migration Studies’, in Open University D301 *Historical Sources and the Social Scientist Units 9-10 Patterns and Processes of Internal Migration* The Open University, Milton Keynes (1982) pp. 6-41 (p.13).
6 See Chapter 5.2 and 5.3.
different from those relating to internal migration. For this reason, it was decided to
examine internal migration into and out from the three settlements in this chapter, whilst
reserving comment and analysis relating to emigration for the following chapter. Before
turning to the findings from the study areas, some of the theories relating to aspects of
migration and emigration will be discussed.

**When?: the mobility transition model**

When seeking to identify the timing of migration, it is necessary to consider the possible
connections between population movement and industrialisation. Zelinsky’s influential
contribution to this debate was the model of mobility transition. He claims that
industrialisation and modernisation were associated with a qualitative shift in migration.
Thus, in his model, there was a positive correlation between industrialisation and
increased movement. As a consequence, societies that were not yet highly industrialised
would be expected to experience less migration than those who had reached a higher
stage of economic development. The extent and characteristics of migration are
therefore related to the position of the country on the demographic transition model.  
This theory is not without its critics amongst early modern historians; Ian Whyte, for
example, argues for ‘fundamental continuities’ from the sixteenth century throughout
the period of industrialisation. Although they believe that the issue is complex, Pooley
and Turnbull do feel that Zelinsky’s theory helps to explain the relationship between
‘population mobility, demographic change, urbanisation and industrialisation.’

Friedlander showed that English and Welsh rural-urban migration peaked in the 1840s,
when, he claims, 3,380,000 migrants moved from agricultural areas to more urban
counties. Following a notable dip in the 1850s, the number of rural to urban migrants
had risen again by 1860, although not to the levels of the 1840s; from then on there was
a steady decline. It seems probable that falling levels of internal migration in the 1850s
are compensated for by an increase in those emigrating, as an alternative to moving to

---

towns within the same country. Baines, however, cites the 1880s as the decade of the
nineteenth century in which emigration was at its height.\(^{11}\)

**Where to?: rural depopulation and the rural-urban debate**

When considering the destinations of Victorian migrants, the issues of rural
depopulation and rural-urban migration patterns become instantly apparent. Nineteenth
century rural depopulation cannot be denied, ‘by 1861 the rural population of England
and Wales had reached its peak and was thereafter in absolute as well as relative decline
until the first decade of the twentieth century.’\(^{12}\) The belief that Victorian rural out-
migrants were flocking to towns, rather than to other rural areas, is illustrated by
researchers, such as John Saville, who, drawing on the work of Ravenstein, wrote, in
1957, that ‘the growth of towns in the nineteenth century was a product of …. the
continuous inflow of population from rural areas.’\(^{13}\) Later authorities, such as Baines,
were to reinforce the theory that ‘heavy out-migration from rural areas was continuous
and universal.’\(^{14}\) Hoskins, in his history of Devon, described ‘the steady depopulation
of the rural parishes.’\(^{15}\) He believed that ‘from 1841 onwards, each census showed large
tracts of deep country losing people to the towns, especially the relatively poor and
isolated west Devon parishes;’\(^{16}\) parishes such as those studied here.

Redford, writing as early as 1926, was more cautious. He believed, for example, that the
economic depression of the late 1830s and early 1840s meant that there was no
incentive to move to industrial areas.\(^ {17}\) Williams too thought that the concept of rural
depopulation was an oversimplification and felt that it was ‘part of a much more
complex pattern of migration, in which short-distance movement within a well defined

---

\(^{11}\) D. Baines, *Migration in a Mature Economy: Emigration and Internal Migration in England

\(^{12}\) D. R. Mills (ed.), *Victorians on the Move: Research in the Census Enumerators’ Books 1851-

\(^{13}\) John Saville, *Rural Depopulation in England and Wales 1851-1951* Routledge and Kegan

\(^{14}\) Baines (1985) p. 216.


\(^{17}\) A. Redford, *Labour Migration in England 1800-1850* University Press, Manchester (1926)
p. 102
area [was] very significant.'\textsuperscript{18} It was Kevin Schürer who suggested that rural depopulation was not so much a result of an increasing number leaving the countryside as the nineteenth century progressed, but that these out-migrants were, later in the century, going to towns rather than other rural areas.

‘An important and overlooked feature of nineteenth-century rural depopulation was not the numbers of people moving out of rural parishes - there was nothing new about this - but instead the lack of people moving into rural parishes … a change in the destinations of migrations from similar rural parishes to urban areas.'\textsuperscript{19}

Pooley and Turnbull, however, argue that, until the latter part of the nineteenth century, there was no clear trend for migrants to move up the settlement hierarchy.\textsuperscript{20}

Williams, researching in ‘Ashworthy’, really the mid-Devon parish of Northlew, found that the decadal population loss between 1861 and 1881 ranged from 9.6\% to 11.1\%; rates that greatly exceeded those for a selection of rural parishes nationwide.\textsuperscript{21} Having classified Devon as a county of dispersal, Ravenstein’s findings would suggest that many of the out-migrants identified by Williams, as well as those studied here, would be found to have moved beyond the county boundary.\textsuperscript{22} As pointed out in the Introduction, it seemed likely that, in accordance with the findings of Adair, Melling and Forsythe, a significant amount of rural to urban migration would be identified in this research.\textsuperscript{23} Rural-urban migrants, of necessity, tended to travel the greatest distances. Emigration might be considered the most extreme example of long-distance migration. The question of the extent to which emigration became a substitute for migration is particularly relevant to Devon, one of only seven counties where Victorian emigrants comprised more than 25\% of all migrants.\textsuperscript{24} Between 1861 and 1900 60\% of the population left

\textsuperscript{21} Williams (1963) p.115-.116.
\textsuperscript{24} Baines (1985) p. 229.
Devon and Cornwall and one third of these were emigrants, rather than internal migrants; thus, according to Baines, in these areas, emigration was at the expense of migration.

Who?: the selectivity theory

It has been suggested that migrants, and in particular emigrants, were not a random sample of the population. John Saville propounded a selectivity theory in 1957, putting forward the idea that those who abandoned rural areas were the brightest and best. Baines too considers emigration to be a ‘selective process’, his ‘deviation theory’ being based on the belief that emigrants were outsiders who were ‘rejecting some aspect of the society in which he or she was living’. Jackson, however, writes of the ‘myth’ of the static society, ‘which has, inevitably, left the migrant to be depicted as an outsider, or marginal person, a deviant in relation to the settled society.’ For him, to migrate was not unusual and therefore was not a deviation from the norm.

In 1834, His Majesty’s Commission for Inquiring into the Administration and Practical Operation of the Poor Laws asked local clergy what they felt ‘would be the effect of an enactment enabling parishes to tax themselves, in order to facilitate emigration?’ The respondents for Awislcombe, Devon replied that ‘it is most probable that the idle and burdensome would stay at home, the able and industrious emigrate.’ The idea that strength of character and physical fitness had an influence on the propensity to migrate was put forward by the compilers of the 1881 Census Report, ‘it may be that the industrial centres attract from rural districts those who are comparatively strong in mind and body; and that children born to these stronger parents are less liable to congenital deficiencies than the offspring of the comparatively feeble parents, mentally and

---

25 It is accepted that migration rates were far higher in Cornwall than they were in Devon.
32 British Parliamentary Papers Royal Commission of Inquiry into Administration and Practical Operation of Poor Laws Appendix B1 Part V (1834) XXXIV (44) p. 125.
physically, who are left behind’. Thus those who were not hindered by genetic defects were more likely to become the migrant population. This does seem to ignore both the necessity for an agricultural labourer to be fit and the greater likelihood of genetic defects in a rural area, where there is liable to be a much higher degree of intermarriage. This is backed up by Kuper, who found high levels of cousin marriage in smaller settlements, although, in the three study areas, the degree of intermarriage was not high.

When considering the characteristics of a likely migrant, several theories have been expounded. Age, gender, marital status and occupation have all been seen as factors affecting the propensity to migrate. Ravenstein suggested that, when considering intra-county migration, females were more migratory than males; males were more likely to migrate longer distances. Saville offers an explanation for this and considers that women made the greater contribution to rural depopulation because it was increasingly necessary for domestic servants to move to towns in order to find employment. In contrast to Ravenstein’s theory, Deacon’s work in Cornwall suggests that female rates of net out-migration were lower than those found for men. Baines found that ‘there were about five males for every three female emigrants from England and Wales between 1861 and 1900.’ In the West Country this gender differential was even more pronounced, with the ratio of male to female emigrants being 2:1. It should be noted, however, that the higher proportion of male emigrants in the south-west was largely due to the exodus of the Cornish miners.

Single people are more migratory than family groups, partly because of life stage and

34 K. D. M. Snell, ‘English Rural Societies and Geographical Marital Endogamy, 1700-1837’, The Economic History Review 55.2 (2002) 262-298 found that, in the first half of the nineteenth century, 60-80% of the marriages in the rural areas he surveyed were endogamous.
36 See Chapter 3.2.ii.
38 Saville (1957) p. 131.
40 Baines (1985) p. 162.
41 Baines (1985) p. 163.
the lack of family responsibilities. The issue of marital status is closely connected to that of age and it has long been recognised that the peak ages for migration are between fifteen and thirty nine. ‘In the nineteenth century, the majority of those who left the rural areas of England and Wales, whether they were going abroad or to urban areas within Britain, were under thirty five years of age.’

Baines found that ‘the typical ages of first time emigrants were between seventeen and twenty-five’ and goes on to note that between 65% and 75% of those leaving for the United States in the years 1840-1930 were aged between fifteen and forty. This is backed by the findings of Deacon and also of Pooley and Turnbull, whose data suggests that the late teens and twenties were the peak ages for migration between 1850-1899, although this trend was less marked than it had been in the preceding fifty years.

Baines wrote of ‘the tendency of many writers to regard the bulk of English emigrants in the period 1815-50 as extremely poor.’ Redford described, in 1926, ‘an ominous surplus of agricultural labour’ after the Napoleonic Wars followed by ‘the stagnation of labour in the agricultural counties’ in the mid 1830s. This was thought to provide the impetus for migration, particularly to the rapidly industrialising areas. This theory was not borne out by contemporary writers who stated, ‘though of all classes … agricultural labourers are under the greatest necessity to leave their birthplaces, and have the greatest inducement to do so, no class is so hard to move away’.

As early as 1972, Charlotte Erickson undermined the previously held belief that migrants were motivated by privation and that they were primarily impoverished agricultural workers seeking opportunities in urban areas. Pooley and Turnbull’s findings suggested that ‘longer distance movement was mostly undertaken by those in higher socio-economic

42 Saville (1957) p. 89.
43 Baines (1985) p. 32.
47 Redford (1926) p. 70.
48 Redford (1926) p. 84.
groups.’\textsuperscript{51} Baines feels that ‘we can be fairly sure that English (but not Scottish) emigrants in the first half of the nineteenth century were largely composed of people like farmers and skilled artisans who were capable of making a good living in England.’\textsuperscript{52} It was not until later in the nineteenth century that large numbers of unskilled labourers emigrated. On this basis, emigrants from North Devon might be expected to be higher in status at the beginning of the study period.

\textit{Why?: chain migration and the push-pull theory}

What then motivated individuals to move to a new area? Jackson and Moch concluded that ‘migrants tend to go where neighbours have gone’\textsuperscript{53} and chain migration has been found to be a feature associated with many nineteenth century moves. As Pryce points out, ‘chain migration is linked closely to the identification of opportunities but in a context that involves successive and multi-phased movements, often over considerable distances.’\textsuperscript{54} The availability of information is a vital component in chain migration. Proponent of the ‘information hypothesis’, Baines, cites the influence of letters, returning emigrants and improved transportation as relevant factors in the maintenance of chains.\textsuperscript{55} It is clear, he says, that long distance emigrants in particular, ‘were heavily dependent on the experience of people who had gone before.’\textsuperscript{56}

Undoubtedly, some of the reasons for moving relate to the circumstances and personality of the individual. The motivation for migration was, however, according to Ravenstein,\textsuperscript{57} largely economic. The peak agricultural populations of the 1840s put pressure on the resources of the countryside, upsetting the ‘state of balance’ referred to by Bogue.\textsuperscript{58} As a result, the process of urbanisation was accelerated. For Devon, and indeed the whole south west peninsula, the pressures were especially acute, leading to it becoming the ‘county of dispersal’\textsuperscript{59} referred to above. Migration is a reaction to the

\textsuperscript{52} Baines (1985) pp. 74-75.
\textsuperscript{53} Jackson & Moch (1994) p. 186.
\textsuperscript{56} Baines (1985) p. 177.
\textsuperscript{57} Ravenstein (1885) p. 181.
\textsuperscript{58} Bogue (1969) p.52.
\textsuperscript{59} Ravenstein (1885) pp. 167-227 and (1889) pp. 214-301.
situation in either the sending settlement, or the receiving settlement, or, to a greater or lesser extent, in both. Bogue,\textsuperscript{60} echoed by others, expounds this as the push-pull theory. ‘Push’ factors are, as Pryce\textsuperscript{61} suggests, for the most part, economic; employment opportunities, wages, the availability of land or natural resources may be compromised in the sending locality. It is therefore important to consider that business may be a motivating factor prompting migration.

Other reasons that might encourage individuals to leave an area may be an intolerable political regime or religious climate. Natural and man made disasters, such as flood, famine or war, also amount to push factors. Finally, social issues, for example, the search for a marriage partner might constitute a motivation for out-migration. When possible ‘pull’ factors are considered, the economic issues, such as job prospects, good wages or obtainable accommodation, again predominate. In addition, the attraction of a new area may be associated with the environment or living conditions. Potential migrants needed to be made aware of these advantages. Information, which was frequently provided by previous migrants, helped to build up chains of migration that were fuelled both by family links and pull factors. The opportunity structure for migration was often created by the economic context, which could delay or encourage the migration decision. That decision was, however, in the end, made at the community, family or even an individual level.

In a version of the push-pull debate, Everett Lee relates the idea that migrants are a select section of the population to possible motivations for movement. He believes that the propensity to migrate depends on the individual’s response to positive and negative factors, both in the current place of residence and at the potential destination. For Lee, those who react to positive factors at the destination, what others would call pull factors, are positively selected and tend to be high quality migrants. Those responding to negative factors at the place of origin, or push factors, are negatively selected and thus are ‘more likely to be the uneducated or disturbed who are forced to migrate.’\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{60} Bogue (1969) pp. 753-754.
Although there has been much emphasis on economic motives for migration, other issues are now being acknowledged; ‘in the view of many migration scholars the perceptions of migrants about opportunities in different places are more significant in the decision to move than objective economic reality.’\textsuperscript{63} There are pull factors that relate to the presence of kin, both resident and non-resident. The migrant may be seeking support or encouragement from family members already living in the receiving settlement. Gerard Bouchard, researching in Saguenay, Quebec, for example, found a negative correlation between the presence of kin and the likelihood of leaving. It is now time to set the experiences in the three study areas into the context of these debates, to examine the migration patterns in the three settlements and to seek links between migration and the presence of kin.

5.2 Populations and Patterns of Migration

5.2.i. How Many?: the extent and rates of migration

Trace Rates

It is important to examine and attempt to explain the demographic changes in the three study areas during the period 1841-1901. The overall population levels have been studied, as have the numbers of in- and out-migrations. The number of deaths of sample individuals in each decade has been calculated as has the number of births occurring to those already living in the study area.\textsuperscript{64} These are summarised in Tables 5.2, 5.3, 5.5 and 5.7 below. The rates of success, when attempting to trace those who disappear from the census returns of all three settlements, have been varied.\textsuperscript{65} As church and civil records have been thoroughly investigated for those who died, it is likely that the great majority of the unidentified departures are not deaths but out-migrants. With the advent of

\textsuperscript{63} Jackson & Moch (1994) p. 186.
\textsuperscript{64} Using records of civil registration and parish registers to complement the evidence in the census returns.
\textsuperscript{65} See Tables 5.1, 5.3, 5.5 and 5.7.
on-line national census indexes,\textsuperscript{66} a high proportion of those who remained within England and Wales can be located. Emigrants are harder to trace, thus they almost certainly form a significant percentage of those with unidentified destinations.

It has been possible to trace 85.5\% of all Bucks Mills departees,\textsuperscript{67} with the success rate tending to improve as the century progressed. The equivalent figure for Conduit Street is 76.2\% and that for Bulkworthy 69.5\%. In both Bulkworthy and Conduit Street, the ability to locate departees is noticeably greater in the later decades; the majority of those who cannot be found left before 1861. For example, more than half of those missing from Bulkworthy in the 1861 census cannot be located; many of these have almost certainly moved abroad. If the years from 1861 onwards are considered, then the rates of success in tracing those who are missing from the study areas rise to 80.1\% in Bulkworthy and 83.2\% in Conduit Street; not far short of the overall percentage for Bucks Mills. In the case of Bulkworthy, this discrepancy is a direct result of the nature of the migration patterns and the high levels of emigration from the parish in the early years of the study period. It could well be that the same is true of Conduit Street, although there is less evidence to substantiate this.

In general, it has been easier to trace the previous residences of in-migrants than the destinations of those leaving the areas. In Bucks Mills and Conduit Street, in some cases, it has been impossible to be certain whether or not an individual was born in the settlement itself or was born in the wider parish and in-migrated as a small child. This has necessitated the use of double figures in the ‘born to residents’ and ‘in-migrants’ columns of Tables 5.3 and 5.7, representing the minimum and maximum in each category. Only fourteen (4.6\%) of the 300 new arrivals\textsuperscript{68} in Bucks Mills cannot positively be traced elsewhere within the preceding ten years and ten of these are individuals whose birthplace is given as ‘Parkham’, it being unclear whether or not this was in Bucks Mills itself. In Conduit Street the previous residences of forty five (6.8\%)

\textsuperscript{66} As well as films of original census returns, two different national on-line census indices, <<www.findmypast.com>> and <<www.ancestry.co.uk>>, have been used as well as county indices. As these are independently compiled the errors in one may be compensated for by an accurate transcription in another.

\textsuperscript{67} Those appearing in one census but missing from the study area, either through death or out-migration, in the subsequent one.

\textsuperscript{68} Between 179 and 189 of whom were born within the parish in the preceding decade.
of those arriving in the street are unknown, with a further forty one who had either been
born within the street or elsewhere in the parish of Hatherleigh. In Bulkworthy, 10·6%
of incomers cannot be traced in the preceding ten years.

It might be expected that women, with the opportunity to change their surname, would
be harder to trace than men and, at first glance, this appears to be the case in Conduit
Street. 83·3% of males arriving in the street and 74% of those leaving have been traced;
the equivalent figures for females are 79·7% and 69%. When considering departees,
however, the success rates for identifying those of a particular gender vary considerably
during the study period.

Table 5.1 Trace Rates for Identifying Males and Females Leaving Conduit Street69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males %</th>
<th>Females %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-1851 &amp; 1851-1861</td>
<td>68·2</td>
<td>48·5</td>
<td>54·8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1871, 1871-1881,</td>
<td>77·5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79·4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1891 &amp; 1891-1901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71·4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is thus only in the first two decades that women leaving Conduit Street proved harder
to locate than men. When considering those who arrived in Bucks Mills, a higher
percentage of women (89·4%) than men (87·3%) could be identified in a specific
location in the preceding ten years. The same is true for those who left Bucks Mills,
with 83·6% of females being successfully located, compared to 78·6% of males. Of the
three study areas, Bulkworthy had the highest population turnover and greater overall
percentages for those whose destinations cannot be identified. Yet even here it was
slightly easier to locate female in- and out-migrants than male. It is likely that this was a
result of the relative distances travelled by men and women and this will be discussed

69 These figures do not include those who are known to have died and are therefore the overall
total is lower than the trace rate for all those who disappear from Conduit Street enumerations.
Population Levels

Table 5.2 Populations and Dwellings in the Three Settlements 1841-1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number of Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bucks Mills</td>
<td>Bulkworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the period of study, the number of people living in Bucks Mills remained fairly static; ranging from 111 to 130. In fact, until 1891, the population was even more stable than these figures imply. It was only in the decade 1891-1901 that the number of inhabitants fell from 130 to 111; between 1841 and 1891 there was very little variation in the population total. Overall, out-migrants were replaced by a similar number of in-migrants, but in the 1890s, thirty eight out-migrants were replaced by only twelve arrivals. Bearing in mind the lack of opportunity for increasing the housing stock in Bucks Mills, this stability is unsurprising. The figures suggest that the optimum nineteenth century population for the village was around 125.

Bulkworthy, on the other hand, saw a steady and notable decline in its number of inhabitants during the years under review, the 1901 population being less than half that of 1841. The majority of this decline took place between 1851 and 1861 when the village lost 29% of its inhabitants. The number of dwellings also decreased, falling from thirty eight homes in 1841, to twenty five in 1871, three of which were uninhabited. Most of these houses, and the inhabitants, were lost from the hamlet of Haytown where seventeen occupied dwellings, housing seventy three inhabitants, in 1851, were reduced to ten households and thirty seven occupants twenty years later. The notes accompanying the 1861 Census Report for Bulkworthy reveal that ‘the decrease of population in the parishes of West Putford and Bulkworthy is attributable to

---

70 See Chapter 5.2.ii.
emigration\textsuperscript{71} and this is discussed further in Chapter 6. It might be expected that these falling numbers were due to Bulkworthy’s inability to sustain such population levels but the fact that in-migrants continued to arrive in the parish in considerable numbers suggests that the parish still had its attractions. As will be seen, it was the counter attraction of life overseas that seems to be the prime cause of the depopulation of Bulkworthy.

Conduit Street, like Bucks Mills, had little opportunity for increasing its housing stock, although there do seem to have been some additions in the 1890s.\textsuperscript{72} Between 1841 and the 1870s the population remained fairly steady at 156 plus or minus eight. The number of inhabitants fell slightly, to 134, during the 1870s but remained stable from then until the end of the century. The decline in the number of children being born to Conduit Street residents towards the end of the nineteenth century also played a part in the falling population.

**Births**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Born to residents</th>
<th>In-migrants</th>
<th>Total Arrivals</th>
<th>Deaths</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Unidentified</th>
<th>Departures</th>
<th>Total Departures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-1851</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1861</td>
<td>30/34</td>
<td>30/26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1871</td>
<td>30/32</td>
<td>36/34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1881</td>
<td>33/34</td>
<td>15/14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1891</td>
<td>25/28</td>
<td>12/09</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1901</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>179/189</td>
<td>121/111</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{72} It is likely that these were new dwellings at the South Street end of Conduit Street.
The number of children born to members of the Bucks Mills sample, who were recorded in the parish in the following census, remained reasonably constant during the second half of the nineteenth century, being 25% (plus or minus 5%) of the total sample population throughout. It is important, however, to discuss the slight variations that can be discerned. The percentage is at its highest, 30-3%, between 1841 and 1851. There are both local and national reasons why this may be so. As Pryce says, ‘in many rural districts peak populations were recorded in the early 1840s’ and this could be part of this phenomenon, coming as it did before the major period of rural to urban migrations in this area. In Bucks Mills, it could also be attributed to the ‘second generation’ effect. The initial population of Bucks Mills, in the 1810s, was weighted in favour of the newly married, who went on to have children in that decade. By the 1840s these children were themselves at the height of their child bearing, possibly contributing to the somewhat higher number of births at that time. There was a slight decline in the number of births to inhabitants after 1881, which may be a reflection of national trends or the fact that those of child-bearing age were more likely to leave the village than other age groups at this time.

In each decade the number of births to village sample members was noticeably higher than the number of sample members who died. Had there been no migration into or out of Bucks Mills, the population would have almost doubled between 1841 and 1901. As

For the purposes of this table all unidentified departures are presumed to be out-migrations rather than deaths.

a rural area in a county of dispersal  Bucks Mills was conforming to the expected trend in this respect. As there was no opportunity for expansion in Bucks Mills, the steady natural increase caused by the births exceeding the deaths forced out-migration in order to create room. It was the in- and out-migration levels that kept the population of Bucks Mills stable. The out-migrants exceeding the in-migrants by roughly the same rates as the births exceeded the deaths.

Table 5.5 Bulkworthy - Population Changes 1841-1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Born to residents</th>
<th>In-migrants</th>
<th>Total Arrivals</th>
<th>Deaths</th>
<th>Identified Out-migrants</th>
<th>Unidentified Departures</th>
<th>Total Departures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-1851</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1861</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1871</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1881</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1891</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1901</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6 Bulkworthy – Net Migration and Natural Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Net Migration</th>
<th>Natural Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-1851</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1861</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1871</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1881</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1891</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1901</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>-156</td>
<td>+41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expected, in a parish with a falling population, the number of births to Bulkworthy residents declined as the nineteenth century progressed. At an average of 16.7% of the total sample population, the percentage of births was, however, noticeably lower than that of Bucks Mills. This is directly related to the higher rates of out-migration in Bulkworthy, as a larger percentage of those born in the village moved away before being recorded in the subsequent census. Increasingly, Bulkworthy was becoming an area in which young un-marrieds worked, rather than set up their family homes. Those being born to parish residents exceed the number of deaths. Thus the dramatic fall in

---

75 Ravenstein (1885) pp.167-235.
76 For the purposes of this table all unidentified departures are presumed to be out-migrations rather than deaths.
Bulkworthy’s population was due to migration rates and not to a natural decrease, with the total number of departures from Bulkworthy being consistently greater than the arrivals.

Table 5.7 Conduit Street - Population Changes 1841-1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Born to residents</th>
<th>In-migrants</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Deaths</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Unidentified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-1851</td>
<td>30/33</td>
<td>86/83</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1861</td>
<td>28/40</td>
<td>79/67</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1871</td>
<td>24/34</td>
<td>72/62</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1881</td>
<td>10/20</td>
<td>77/67</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1891</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1901</td>
<td>16/22</td>
<td>76/70</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>120/161</td>
<td>465/424</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8 Conduit Street – Net Migration and Natural Change77

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Net Migration</th>
<th>Natural Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-1851</td>
<td>-1/+2</td>
<td>+14/+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1861</td>
<td>-24/-36</td>
<td>+12/+24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1871</td>
<td>-8/-18</td>
<td>+9/+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1881</td>
<td>-8/-18</td>
<td>-2/-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1891</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1901</td>
<td>-1/+5</td>
<td>+5/-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>-47/-70</td>
<td>+33/+42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The uncertainty of the precise birthplaces of several of the under-tens who appear in the Conduit Street census returns makes it difficult to be specific about the number of births to sample residents in the street. The percentage appears to fall somewhere between those of Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy. What can be said is that, as the century progressed, the number of births to Conduit Street residents fell, not only in actual terms but also when they are viewed as a percentage of the total sample population. For the first three decades of the study period, the number of deaths of Conduit Street sample members was roughly half the number of births. From the 1870s onwards the situation began to reverse, thus contributing to the population decrease in the street. Unlike the other two areas, where the number of out-migrants was notably higher than those arriving in the settlement, with the exception of the net loss of the 1850s, in Conduit

77 For the purposes of this table all unidentified departures are presumed to be out-migrations rather than deaths.
Street the numbers were more evenly balanced. Like Bucks Mills, it was very difficult to provide extra accommodation within the street so, once an optimum number had been reached, out-migration was necessary.

**In-migrants**

In each decade, newcomers to the study areas consisted of those who had been born in the area in the preceding decade\(^{78}\) and in-migrants. The proportion of ‘arrivals’ who fell into these two groups differed significantly between the three areas.

**Table 5.9 The Percentage of Arrivals who were In-Migrants in the Three Settlements 1841-1901\(^{79}\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bucks Mills %</th>
<th>Bulkworthy %</th>
<th>Conduit Street %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-1851</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1861</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1871</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1881</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1891</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1901</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Bucks Mills, births made the greater contribution to the newcomers, for the most part, outnumbering the in-migrants by 2:1. In Bulkworthy and Conduit Street the reverse was true, with at least twice as many in-migrations as births; the proportion of in-migrants being particularly high in the 1870s and 1880s. This underlines the key role that new-borns played in the maintenance of the population of Bucks Mills and again may suggest that much of the out-migration was enforced, due to the lack of space, rather than voluntary.

---

\(^{78}\) These have been calculated by seeking the precise birthplace of all under 10s in each enumeration. Sources used include the census returns, birth certificates and baptism registers.

\(^{79}\) For the purposes of these percentages the mid-point between the two possible ‘born to residents’ figures have been used for Bucks Mills and Conduit Street.
Migration rates in the three study areas varied in degree and stability. In Bucks Mills, the level of in-migration doubled during the 1850s and 1860s, which was due entirely to the in-migration of family groups at this time, and was less common in other decades. Most of these families had some existing connection to Bucks Mills and it is possible that their arrival was a response to employment vacancies within the settlement. This was the time when *The North Devon Journal* was bemoaning the shortage of agricultural labourers in North Devon; a result of the exodus overseas. There was a slight increase in the number of sample members who died during these decades, an increase that in itself seems inconsequential until they are examined more closely. Although there twelve Bucks Mills sample members died in the 1840s only one of these was a male household head. In the 1850s and 1860s the number of male household heads dying were seven and eight respectively. The number fell back to one in the 1870s. Thus, in the 1850s and 1860s, it is likely that a number of properties became available, allowing new families to move in, rather than the single migrants arriving to join existing families, as was more common in the other decades.

---

80 See Chapter 5.2.iii for a discussion of the characteristics of the in-migrants.
81 *The North Devon Journal* 31 March 1853 page 5 column b.
82 This is not surprising as the newly marrieds, who took up residents in Bucks Mills in the 1810s, were, by this time, in their seventies.
In Bulkworthy, the contribution of in-migrants to the maintenance of population levels was greater than in Bucks Mills, with the majority of additions to the population being those moving in rather than new-borns. The absolute rate of in-migration remained at a consistent level until the final decade of the study period when it declined. This may be due to the decreasing appeal of rural destinations by the end of the nineteenth century.

In Conduit Street the numbers of in-migrants did not vary greatly during the study period. Here the level was maintained during the final decade of study, suggesting that, unlike the rural areas, towns, even small towns such as Hatherleigh, were able to retain their appeal as destinations at this time.
Deaths

Table 5.10 Percentage of the Population of the Three Settlements who Died between Census Enumerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bucks Mills</th>
<th>Bulkworthy</th>
<th>Conduit Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841-1851</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1861</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1871</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1881</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1891</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1901</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparative number of deaths amongst members of the study samples have been referred to in Chapter 4.2 but the table has been repeated here for ease of reference. As has already been stated, it proved easier to trace deaths than departures; thus it would seem probable that individuals who cannot be traced after disappearing from Bucks Mills represent out-migrants rather than deaths. It must be noted, however, that the number of deaths of Bucks Mills’ sample members dropped notably between 1871 and 1891, and that the addition of the ‘unidentified departures’ to the deaths would maintain a more stable number of deaths. Between 1841 and 1871 the percentage of the sample population that can be shown to have died varied between 9.9% and 14.3%. This is slightly higher than the 7%-11.3% found by Birch in Bolton Abbey between 1851 and 1871 and the 8%-9% found by Reay in rural Kent. In Bulkworthy and Conduit Street the percentage of deaths were also higher than those found by Birch and Reay. Unlike Bucks Mills, in the other two areas, the levels were more consistent throughout the study period.

The rates were calculated by taking the number of those from one census return who could be shown, from burial registers and death registrations, to have died before the next enumeration, as a percentage of the mid-point between the populations at the beginning and end of the decade concerned.


It is unclear exactly how Reay and Birch arrived at their percentages so some caution must be exercised before considering their data to be truly comparable.
Out-migrants

Table 5.11 Percentage of the Total Population who were Out-Migrants\textsuperscript{37} from the Three Settlements 1841-1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bucks Mills %</th>
<th>Bulkworthy %</th>
<th>Conduit Street %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-1851</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1861</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1871</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1881</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1891</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1901</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from a dip in the 1880s, the proportion of the population who left Bucks Mills in each decade remained close to one third. These figures are similar to those that Birch discovered in Bolton Abbey.\textsuperscript{88} The 1880s was the decade when both births to residents and in-migration were low in Bucks Mills. This suggests that there was less pressure on the housing stock and more occupational opportunities, thus reducing the need for out-migration. The picture in Conduit Street was also fairly steady but the levels of out-migration were higher than those in Bucks Mills, ranging from just over half the population leaving in the 1860s to nearly two-thirds in the 1850s. It may be that the increase in departures during the 1850s meant that fewer were necessary during the following decade. Bulkworthy was much more varied, with higher proportions of out-migrants than either Bucks Mills or Conduit Street. In the 1850s nearly three-quarters of the population left Bulkworthy. It is clear from these figures that the population of Bucks Mills was notably more stable that that of the other two areas; this is reinforced by the relative levels of residential persistence discussed in the previous chapter.

\textsuperscript{37} Those deemed to have left include all those missing from a community in a census, who can be identified as being resident in the preceding census, whether or not their new location has been identified. Any who are known to have died in the community during that decade are not included. In order to work out what percentage of the population these ‘leavers’ constitute, a midpoint between the populations of the two censuses has been used.

Figure 5.4 Bucks Mills - Departures 1841-1901

Figure 5.5 Bulkworthy - Departures 1841-1901

Figure 5.6 Conduit Street - Departures 1841-1901
Having established the levels of migration in the three study areas it is necessary to look at the distances travelled by both in- and out-migrants. An analysis of in-migration distances gives an impression of the sphere of influence of the settlement. Out-migration horizons on the other hand may be relevant to the selectivity theory; for example, do the ‘brightest and best’\textsuperscript{89} travel furthest?

5.2 ii. How Far?: the origins and destinations of migrants

In-migrants

Of the 121 in-migrants to Bucks Mills, 107 can be found in a specific location in the ten years preceding their arrival in the hamlet. Three-quarters of these had come from elsewhere in Woolfardisworthy or Parkham, or from an adjacent parish.

\textbf{Figure 5.7 Bucks Mills - Origins of In-migrants}

![Pie chart showing the origins of in-migrants.]

Of the sixteen in-migrants arriving in Bucks Mills between 1841 and 1851, only two travelled from further afield than a neighbouring parish. One had come just seven miles, from Sutcombe, and the other, Hannah Maria Thorn, was from Exmouth, some forty-five miles away; she married village resident, Lewis Davey, in 1844. When considering

\textsuperscript{89} Saville (1957) p. 125.
the whole of the study period, eight of the thirteen in-migrants travelling further than ten miles in order to reside in Bucks Mills were female; two of these arriving as brides for existing residents. Apart from the two brides, all of these longer-distance migrants, both male and female, had pre-existing family connections in Bucks Mills. Only two new arrivals came from outside Devon or Cornwall. One, Ann Elizabeth Fry from Northfleet, Kent, was an incoming bride. The other, Mary Braund, moved from Eardisley in Herefordshire but had been born in Bucks Mills and was returning to the village following the deaths of her elderly parents. Mary had been in domestic service for more than four decades and now in her sixties, was able to ‘retire’ to the home in Bucks Mills that was vacated by her parents.⁹⁰

Figure 5.8 Bucks Mills - Origins of Longer Distance In-migrants

See Chapter 5.4 for full details of Mary’s migrations.
⁹¹ Those travelling more than ten miles.
Figure 5.9 Bulkworthy - Origins of In-migrants

Compared to Bucks Mills, there were much higher levels of in-migration in Bulkworthy between 1841 and 1901. It has been possible to trace the previous residences of 286 (89.4%) of the 320 incomers in the decade before they arrived in Bulkworthy. Until recently, those studying in-migrants have usually found it easier to trace those who have moved shorter distances. With the advent of national census indexes this is now not necessarily the case.\footnote{92} It is acknowledged that those who moved furthest were, due to differences in dialect and unfamiliarity with place names, more likely to have their birthplace incorrectly enumerated. The ability to use wildcard searches in the electronic indexes does, however, mean that there is no reason to suppose that those whose previous residences have not been identified travelled any further than those who have been located. Those arriving in Bulkworthy came from an even more compact area than those arriving in Bucks Mills, thus supporting Williams’ findings in nearby ‘Ashworthy’ where ‘even in the middle of the nineteenth century there was considerable short distance migration of country folk.’\footnote{93} Goose too found a ‘predominance of

\footnote{92} The situation is somewhat different for out-migrants, where it is acknowledged that emigrants are more likely to be untraced.

\footnote{93} Williams (1963) p. 123.
short-distance movement’ amongst his St. Albans’ sample.\textsuperscript{94}

Of the twenty one in-migrants who came to Bulkworthy from a distance of greater than ten miles, only eight (2.5\% of all incomers) travelled further than fifteen miles. These included the Andrews family of four from Plymouth who had no apparent connections in the parish. It may be significant that Mrs Alice Andrews was a schoolmistress; one of the other long-distance in-migrants, Cecelia O’Sullivan from Penzance, Cornwall was similarly employed. William Ridge, who arrived from Stoke Climsland, Cornwall in the 1840s, was coming to live with his grandparents. The final two long-distance in-migrants came from beyond Devon and Cornwall, John Sanguine, a servant from Newport, Monmouthshire and Harry Handcock a farmer’s son from Windsor, Berkshire. Both of these, however, had been born locally, Sanguine in West Putford and Handcock in Bulkworthy itself. Thus the patterns of in-migration in Bulkworthy bear out Redford’s statement that ‘short distance movement was especially characteristic of agrarian migration’.\textsuperscript{95}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{94} Nigel Goose, \textit{Population, Economy and Family Structure in Hertfordshire in 1851: Volume 2 The St Albans Region} University of Hertfordshire Press, Hatfield (1996) p. 130. \\
\textsuperscript{95} Redford (1926) p. 160.
\end{flushleft}
Figure 5.10 Bulkworthy - Origins of Longer Distance\textsuperscript{96} In-migrants

Figure 5.11 Conduit Street - Origins of In-migrants

\textsuperscript{96} Those travelling more than ten miles.
In Conduit Street, 81% of new arrivals whose origins are known had travelled less than ten miles. As might be expected from a more urban environment, this was a lower percentage than the 87.8% found in Bucks Mills and 92.7% in Bulkworthy. When compared with those arriving in the other two study areas, a higher proportion of those who had come to Conduit Street from further afield came from outside Devon. Even so, the arrival of a family of seven, from Dawley, Shropshire, in the 1880s, accounts for a quarter of Conduit Street’s out-of-county in-migrants. Apart from this family, whose head was the in-coming Baptist Minister, only three other out-of-county in-migrants had no existing family connection in Conduit Street; these arrived as a family group in the 1840s. Thus, two-thirds of those arriving in Conduit Street from outside Devon did so because of a kinship link within the street. The analysis of the birthplaces of the Conduit Street inhabitants of 1841, and indeed the birthplaces of all those in Hatherleigh in 1851, showed far more in-migrants coming from the north of the town. The origins of the longer distance in-migrants to Conduit Street during the study period reveals more in-migrants coming north into the street from south coast towns such as Plymouth, Dartmouth and Sidmouth.

---

97 See Chapter 2.3.iii pp. 120-123.
In all three study areas, the majority of incomers came from within walking distance. This is similar to the findings of Reay in Blean, Kent.\footnote{Barry Reay, \textit{Microhistories: Demography, Society and Culture in Rural England 1800-1930} Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1996b) p. 258.} Henry French, summarising the findings of several studies, suggests that 10% of migrants will have travelled more than forty miles and a further 40% will have moved between ten and forty miles.\footnote{Henry French, ‘"Ancient Inhabitants": Mobility, Lineage and Identity in English Rural Communities, 1600-1750’, in Christopher Dyer (ed.), \textit{The Self-contained Village?: The Social History of Rural Communities 1250-1900} University of Hertfordshire Press, Hatfield (2007) pp. 72-95 (p. 72).} It is likely that the majority of the studies to which he is referring will have been considering distances from birthplace to current location and this needs to be taken into account when comparing these figures with the findings of this research. Jackson, however, who studied six Kent parishes, found that nearly 30% of those who were in-migrants between 1881 and 1891 had come more than forty kilometres.\footnote{David G. Jackson, ‘Occupational and Geographical Stability in the Region of Sittingbourne, Kent 1881-1891’, \textit{Local Population Studies} 66 (2001) 53-75 (p. 59).} Even in Conduit Street therefore there are fewer longer-distance in-migrants than might be expected from these
percentages for elsewhere.

_Out-migrants_
This section concentrates on out-migrants to other parts of England and Wales, whose destinations, once leaving the study areas, are known. Those who emigrated are considered in the following chapter and it is important to reiterate that it is felt that the majority of those who cannot be traced were indeed emigrants.

_RURAL-URBAN OUT-MIGRATION_
Bryant wrote of the ‘rapid growth of towns’ due to ‘the steady inflow of migrants from rural areas’ in early nineteenth century South Devon. Lawton goes so far as to say that ‘migration from rural areas was universal’. It is therefore important to address the issue of rural-urban out-migration and assess the extent to which those leaving the three study areas formed part of the perceived rural exodus to the towns of the nineteenth century.

---

Throughout the study period, 29.3% of those leaving Bucks Mills went directly to an urban environment. With a very small sample it is rash to dwell too much on any changes within this time frame but there were notably more rural-urban migrants from Bucks Mills in the 1860s and 1870s than at other times during the study period. Almost all of those moving to towns remained within Devon and few went to the large urban centres of Plymouth, Exeter, or even Barnstaple. The tendency was for those leaving rural Bucks Mills to go no further than the local market town of Bideford, less than ten miles away. Only six out-migrants went to towns outside Devon, four females and two males, all in their twenties and all were moving in order to work. Only two went to the outskirts of Greater London and these were girls who were in service.
Despite Bulkworthy’s higher population turnover, its former inhabitants had a greater desire to remain in the countryside than out-migrants from Bucks Mills, thus exemplifying Holderness’ description: ‘the picture which emerges is of village communities regularly refreshed by influx from similar settlements lying at a comparatively short distance away.’

Although the market of Torrington was less than nine miles away, only 19.1% of those leaving Bulkworthy went to towns; those that did so, however, were far more likely than the Bucks Mills’ out-migrants to leave Devon. 38.9% of those who moved to a town or city went outside Devon to do so, the great majority going to towns in Somerset. The capital attracted only one former Bulkworthy resident; John Alfred Avery, a farmer’s son, who went to London to set up as a draper in the 1860s.

---

Conduit Street was, of course, already an urban environment, albeit a small one. The picture is complicated by the large numbers who left Conduit Street to go elsewhere within Hatherleigh itself. What is perhaps surprising is that sixty seven people (20.1% of all traceable out-migrants) left Conduit Street to live in a rural setting. This counter-urbanisation may be a reflection of the size of Hatherleigh and its strong links with its rural hinterland. Of those who remained in towns, most did so by staying within Hatherleigh. Once the decision was made to leave the locality then those departing from Conduit Street were more adventurous than those from the other study areas. Half of those leaving Hatherleigh, for another town, went outside Devon, with thirteen, 27% of those leaving the county, going to Greater London.

DISTANCES TRAVELLED
When considering the distances travelled by out-migrants it is necessary also to be aware of those whose destinations have not been traced. Whilst it would be rash to state categorically that all those who cannot be found have gone overseas, with the proliferation of national census indexes, it is increasingly likely that those remaining within England and Wales will have been located.
Of those leaving Bucks Mills, 38·1\%\footnote{The total includes those whose destinations are unknown.} went no further than an adjacent parish and a further 25·9\% went less than ten miles. Thus two-thirds of Bucks Mills’ out-migrants remained in close proximity to the hamlet.
Throughout the study period, only fourteen internal out-migrants from Bucks Mills were known to have moved beyond Devon; more than half of these doing so after 1881. It is interesting to note that the two migrants to Yorkshire, albeit in different decades and some sixty five miles apart, were brother and sister; their mother had connections in the county.

This map does not include one individual who joined the army in the 1840s and two who went into the navy in the 1870s.
Figure 5.18 Bulkworthy - Distances Travelled by Out-migrants

The larger number of Bulkworthy departees whose origins have not been traced makes comment on their destinations more difficult but it must be reaffirmed that it is likely
that the majority of these would have emigrated. Of those who are known to have remained in England or Wales, two thirds went less than ten miles from the parish. As in Bucks Mills, only a very small number (sixteen) of those leaving Bulkworthy can be found in a county other than Devon. All remained in the south, travelling no more than 200 miles, and half the out-of-county out-migrants went to neighbouring Somerset.

Figure 5.20 Conduit Street - Distances Travelled by Out-migrants

Although those leaving Conduit Street tended to go further afield than the internal out-migrants from the other two areas, one-third remained within the parish of Hatherleigh and a further 10-1% went no greater distance than ten miles from the town. There is no discernible change in the length of journey as the century progressed. What does contrast with the other two study areas is the number of internal out-migrants, 37.3% of those moving out of Devon and Cornwall, who found their way to Greater London. This may, in part, be related to the occupations of those concerned and this will be discussed further in Chapter 5.2.iii.
Comparisons and Contrasts

Both individual and community influences impacted upon the inhabitants of the three study areas during the period under review, resulting in varied experiences of migration and population change. Different aspects of the settlements made individuals more or less likely to move into, or out from, the three study areas.

In Bucks Mills, the number of residents remained steady until the 1890s. This was achieved by numbers of out-migrants, of necessity, mirroring the number of new-borns.
The settlement had reached its optimum size. As well as a degree of in-migration, the number of births to residents habitually exceeded the number of deaths; individuals were therefore obliged to leave. In contrast, Bulkworthy’s population was anything but static, with numbers in the parish halving within two generations. Much of this decrease took place during the 1850s and was due to cultural factors, as opposed to demographic pressures or personal influences. The impact of emigration on the hamlet of Bulkworthy and the reasons for this emigration are discussed in the next chapter.

Conduit Street lacked the pressures of space found in Bucks Mills and the cultural pressures of Bulkworthy; Conduit Street also had more attraction for its residents. It is acknowledged that Hatherleigh, during the study period, had less appeal than when the wool and copper trades were buoyant in the eighteenth and earlier nineteenth century. Nonetheless, in comparison to Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy, Hatherleigh offered much greater opportunity for employment. Hatherleigh could also provide the leisure facilities that were beginning to become important as the nineteenth century drew to a close. Those who lived in Conduit Street therefore had less incentive or necessity to move elsewhere. A large proportion of the movement that took place within Conduit Street consisted of an interchange of inhabitants with other Hatherleigh streets.

In-migration to Bucks Mills was greatest during the 1850s and 1860s. This was due to the higher number of deaths of household heads at this time, thus vacating the necessary accommodation to allow the in-migration of families, rather than individuals. Again, it was community factors that were influencing the demographic patterns in Bucks Mills. 87.3%, of those whose origins are known, moved to Bucks Mills from a distance of less than ten miles. The longer distance migrants all had individual reasons for in-migration; they were either marrying a resident or had family connections in the hamlet. In Bulkworthy too, most of the few who did travel further than walking distance in order to take up residence were joining kin. None of those who came to Bulkworthy from a distance of more than ten miles did so before 1881; until this time it was attracting in-migrants from the immediate area only. Conduit Street’s sphere of influence was the greatest of the three settlements, as would be expected. Nonetheless two-thirds of the longer distance in-migrants to the street had pre-existing family links there. The proportions of long-distance in-migrants were less in all three settlements than those
identified by some other studies.\footnote{106} It is interesting to note that the levels found by Reay, who also adopted a micro-historical approach, were in line with those identified by this research.\footnote{107}

In any decade, about a third of Bucks Mills’ population was likely to leave and, as has already been stated, this was due largely to push factors rather than pull, the pressures of natural population increase, rather than the appeal of the world beyond. In Conduit Street the numbers leaving were greater, with between 50% and 65% out-migrating during each decade. Many of these were, however, relocating within the same town, often as a result of changing family size or life stage. In Bulkworthy, the inhabitants left in similar proportions, with the percentage of leavers in the 1850s and 1860s\footnote{108} being particularly high. Here the pull factors appear to have outweighed the push; the influences at work being rooted in both community and culture. The lack of corporate identity in Bulkworthy, its nebulous geographical boundaries and scattered farms meant that the neighbourhood blurred into those of its neighbours and many short-distance out-migrants left for work in nearby rural areas. The sense of belonging, that lasted until well into the twentieth century in Bucks Mills, may have had little to focus upon in Bulkworthy. Much of the out-migration from Bulkworthy at the beginning of the study period was in fact emigration and this was fuelled by strong cultural and religious influences, prompting individuals to make the decision to move abroad.\footnote{109} It may be that any communal identity was reserved for groups who shared their patterns of worship rather than their physical space.

Bucks Mills was the most static of the three settlements, as would be expected given the levels of residential persistence discussed in Chapter 4. Particularly for those who travelled in excess of ten miles, family was key to in-migration in all three settlements. In-migrants came as a result of individual reasons, born out of kinship ties, rather than because of the general appeal of the settlements themselves. Before looking in detail at the part in the migration decision that was played by kinship,\footnote{110} the relative impact of

\begin{footnotesize}
\item[107] Reay (1996b) p. 258.
\item[108] 73.3% and 64.4% respectively.
\item[109] This will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.
\item[110] See Chapter 5.3.
\end{footnotesize}
other factors will be considered.

5.2 iii. Influences and Inspirations: the impact of factors such as gender, age, occupation and religion on the propensity to migrate

Did factors such as gender, age, occupation, class and religion have an influence on the propensity to migrate? In order to set the likely impact of kinship links on migration decisions into context, it is also important to look at the fellow travellers of the in- and out-migrants of the three study areas and these issues will now be examined.

**Gender**

The generally held view is that females were more prone to migrate than males, even if they were less likely to travel long distances. Adair, Melling and Forsythe believe that this is because ‘there was rather less pressure on males than on females to travel in search of employment and marriage partners.’\(^{111}\) Philip Aslett, for example, found more females than males arriving in nineteenth century Bentley, Hampshire.\(^{112}\) In Shorne, Kent, Grimmette discovered high proportions of young female out-migrants.\(^{113}\) As regards emigrants, as opposed to internal migrants, the reverse might be expected. As mentioned above, Baines, observed that, in the later nineteenth century, West Country emigrant males out-numbered females by 2:1.\(^{114}\)


Table 5.12 Proportions of Males and Females\textsuperscript{115} Arriving in the Three Settlements 1841-1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bucks Mills</th>
<th>Bulkworthy</th>
<th>Conduit Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-1851</td>
<td>7:9</td>
<td>32:28</td>
<td>46:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1861</td>
<td>13:17</td>
<td>26:25</td>
<td>34:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1871</td>
<td>17:19</td>
<td>32:22</td>
<td>32:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1881</td>
<td>9:6</td>
<td>34:23</td>
<td>41:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1891</td>
<td>5:7</td>
<td>32:31</td>
<td>37:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1901</td>
<td>4:8</td>
<td>16:19</td>
<td>43:33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrary to these expectations, only in Bucks Mills are there typically more female in-migrants than men. As has been seen,\textsuperscript{116} it is the females who arrived in Bucks Mills from greater distances. This is unexpected as the hamlet lacked any scope for domestic service. In the period up to 1871, the excess of female in-migrants over males in Bucks Mills is largely accounted for by incoming brides.\textsuperscript{117} In Conduit Street, numbers of male and female in-migrants were even but, in Bulkworthy, males outnumbered females by 16.2%. In an era of short-term employments for agricultural workers, particularly for the young unmarried men, this is understandable. There were several large farms in Bulkworthy requiring a steady supply of labour.

Table 5.13 Proportions of Males and Females\textsuperscript{118} Leaving the Three Settlements 1841-1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bucks Mills</th>
<th>Bulkworthy</th>
<th>Conduit Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-1851</td>
<td>19:21</td>
<td>44:50</td>
<td>39:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1861</td>
<td>23:21</td>
<td>56:54</td>
<td>49:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1871</td>
<td>19:24</td>
<td>44:33</td>
<td>34:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1881</td>
<td>23:21</td>
<td>34:31</td>
<td>36:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1891</td>
<td>14:14</td>
<td>41:28</td>
<td>42:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1901</td>
<td>19:21</td>
<td>29:26</td>
<td>35:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>117:122</td>
<td>248:222</td>
<td>235:268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher proportion of men leaving Bulkworthy reflected the ratio of the incomers who replaced them. In Bucks Mills the numbers of men and women leaving the village were similar but in Conduit Street it was the females who were more likely to be out-

\textsuperscript{115} The figure for males is given first. These figures include those whose residence, prior to arrival in the study areas, has not been located.

\textsuperscript{116} See 5.2.ii..\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{117} In the period 1841-1871 11 women and 6 men appear to have arrived in Bucks Mills in order to marry an existing resident.

\textsuperscript{118} The figure for males is given first. These figures include identified departees and those whose destination has been located.
migrants. Here, Adair’s theory\textsuperscript{119} holds good and the women were being pushed to other areas in order to find work or to join marriage partners. Why was this not so in the other settlements? Conduit Street might be expected to have had more job opportunities for women than the more rural areas. It seems that there was a balance of other factors at work resulting in a different picture in each of the three study areas.

\textit{Age}

In all three study areas, there was little discernible change in the proportions of in- and out-migrants in each age group as the nineteenth century progressed and therefore the study period as a whole has been considered. The exception to this is Bucks Mills, where there was a noticeable increase in the number of children moving into the hamlet in the 1850s and 1860s. If the ages used are those of the in-migrant at the census in which they are first enumerated in the study area, there will be a tendency to over-inflate the age at which the move took place. For example, an in-migrant who is first recorded in 1861, aged 41, may have moved at any point between 1851 and 1861 and thus would have been aged somewhere between the ages of 31 and 41 on migration. Using the ages from the census in which they first appear as the age at which the move took place would result in this individual being placed in the 41-50 age group. Conversely, when considering out-migration, using the age of the migrant in the census in which they last appear in the study area as the age at migration, will result in giving the impression that the average age of out-migrants was less than it would have been in actuality. For these reasons, the ages of the migrants at the mid-point of the inter-censal gap during which the move took place have been used as the age of migration.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & Under 11 (%) & 11-20 (%) & 21-30 (%) & 31-40 (%) & 41-50 (%) & 51-60 (%) & 61-70 (%) & 70+ (%) \\
\hline
Bucks Mills & 34.7 & 14 & 27.3 & 9.9 & 5 & 3.3 & 2.5 & 3.3 \\
Bulkworthy & 24.7 & 31.3 & 21.2 & 10.3 & 6.9 & 2.5 & 2.5 & 0.6 \\
Conduit Street & 30.7 & 24.1 & 13.8 & 11 & 7.7 & 6.4 & 3.9 & 2.4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{The Percentage of In-Migrants in each Age Group}
\end{table}

As expected, there were few older in-migrants; the peak ages for arriving in the study areas being between eleven and thirty. In both Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy more than

\textsuperscript{119} Adair, Melling & Forsythe (1997) p. 379.
three quarters of in-comers were under the age of thirty six.\textsuperscript{120} The percentage for Conduit Street was only slightly lower at 68.6%. There was a particularly high number of young children arriving in Bucks Mills, at the expense of the 11-20 age group, many of whom were incomers in the 1850s and 1860s. This was because more families arrived in the hamlet, whereas in-comers to the other two areas were more likely to be single. This will be discussed further below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.15 The Percentage of Out-Migrants in each Age Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 11 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucks Mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many researchers have found that the most mobile sections of the population tended to be those in their late teens and early twenties.\textsuperscript{121} Similarly, more than two-thirds of out-migrants, in all three areas, were under the age of thirty six. This is similar to the findings of other studies including that of Joan Grundy, researching in the agricultural parish of Canon Prior, Herefordshire, who established that mobility tended to cease after marriage.\textsuperscript{122} There was a trend, in Bucks Mills, for individuals to leave in their late teens or early twenties, whereas, in the other areas, out-migrants were more likely to be ten years older. Broadly speaking, those coming into Bulkworthy and Conduit Street were slightly younger than those leaving. In Bucks Mills, however, the difference is greater, with a much higher percentage of children moving in than leaving. This reinforces the suggestion that the lack of housing and work was forcing young people to leave Bucks Mills and that these were not being replaced by a similar number of single people. This is a different situation from that of Bulkworthy where there was a continual exchange of younger, unmarried workers between Bulkworthy and other rural parishes nearby.

\textsuperscript{120} The way in which the ages have been calculated means that an individual who appear in the 21-30 column could actually have moved at any time between the ages of 16 and 35.  
**Occupation**

Many of the motivations for movement are traditionally seen to be economic,\textsuperscript{123} therefore an assessment of the occupational profile of the in- and out-migrants was conducted. As there were no significant changes\textsuperscript{124} as the century progressed, it did not seem necessary to analyse the migrants from every decade. The occupations of those who entered or left the areas between 1841 and 1851, 1871 and 1881, and 1891 and 1901 were considered. For these purposes, all migrants were included, regardless of whether or not their destination or previous residence was known.\textsuperscript{125}

Various difficulties arose when examining the occupations of the in- and out-migrants to the three study areas, as many were likely to change their occupations during the decade in which the move took place. As a large proportion of migrants were women or children, with no stated occupation, samples of migrants with listed occupations were very small; this was a particular problem in Bucks Mills where the totals numbers of in- and out-migrants were the fewest.\textsuperscript{126} To restrict analysis to those whose occupations were known both before and after moving would have been very limiting. The occupations used were therefore those stated in the last census during which the out-migrant was resident in a study area. For in-migrants, the occupation listed in the first census in which they appeared in the study area was used.

\textsuperscript{123} Ravenstein (1885) p. 181 & (1889) p. 286, et.al.,

\textsuperscript{124} The only exceptions to this were the migrants from Bulkworthy and these changes are discussed below.

\textsuperscript{125} Those who were known to have died were not included.

\textsuperscript{126} In total, for the three decades examined, there were 19 in-migrants with enumerated occupations for Bucks Mills, 83 for Bulkworthy and 121 for Conduit Street. The numbers of out-migrants were 32, 85 and 114 respectively.
It is imperative that the occupations of migrants are considered within the occupational structure of study area as a whole; Chapter 2.3.ii describes the occupational structures of the three settlements in 1841. Throughout the study period the predominant occupations in Bucks Mills were that of fisherman, sailor and agricultural labourer; 76% of all males with listed occupations were so employed. The prevalence of agricultural labourers in the early decades was replaced by that of fishermen and sailors towards the end of the century. It is likely that this was because many of these individuals are known, from other sources, to have had dual occupations and that different enumerators favoured one over the other. The occupations of the out-migrants from Bucks Mills reflect those of the inhabitants as a whole. Analysis of the in-migrants suggests that there were rather fewer fishermen and agricultural labourers arriving in the hamlet but the sample of nineteen is very small and it is hard to be conclusive. There was a tendency for Bucks Mills to attract those with more specialist trades, rather than replacements for the out-

---

127 This is a percentage of those with an enumerated occupation.
going fishermen and agricultural labourers.

Of Bulkworthy inhabitants credited with an occupation\textsuperscript{128} in the census returns, 55% worked in agriculture, a further 12.8% were domestic servants. As discussed in Chapter 4.3, it was largely the agricultural labourers and domestic servants who accounted for Bulkworthy’s high population turnover. It was more likely to be the farmers and craftsmen, particularly the owner-occupiers, who were residentially persistent. Bulkworthy is the only one of the three study areas where some change during the study period is discernible. Between 1841 and 1851, 41.4% of out-migrants were craftsmen and shopkeepers. This coincides with the beginning of the rapid decline in the population of Bulkworthy, the shrinking of their markets and high levels of emigration. As will be seen in the next chapter, it was emigrants, as opposed to internal out-migrants, who tended to be of higher social status.

Those in employment in Conduit Street included a wide range of tradesmen, craftsmen and shopkeepers.\textsuperscript{129} Changes in the occupational structure during the study period reflect the gradual decline of Hatherleigh as a thriving market town. Although the differences were not marked, there was a fall in the numbers of craftsmen as the century progressed. This was counterbalanced by an increase in labourers, dressmakers and domestic servants. The occupational profile of Conduit Street’s in- and out-migrants suggests that employers, and those with established family businesses or shop premises, were less likely to move. Instead, like Bulkworthy, it was the agricultural labourers and domestic servants who were leaving the area, to be replaced by others with similar occupations. Tradesmen who did move in and out of the street tended to be journeymen and apprentices rather than master craftsmen. Although the trend is less notable in Conduit Street, there were similarities to Bulkworthy, with the largest number of those of higher social status leaving in the 1840s.

Social class is intrinsically linked to occupation and comment has already been made in the previous chapter concerning owner-occupiers and their greater degree of residential

\textsuperscript{128} 400, out of a total sample of 627.
\textsuperscript{129} See Table 2.8 p. 107.
Pooley and Turnbull concluded that the professional classes were more likely to move furthest and this was noticeable in both Bucks Mills and Conduit Street, where the longer distance migrants, both in and out of the settlement, included school teachers and Baptist Ministers.

Figure 5.23 The Occupations of those Leaving Conduit Street for London

As has already been stated, very few of the out-migrants from Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy went to Greater London. The nineteen Conduit Street out-migrants who found their way to the capital included three females moving upon marriage, one accompanying her marrying daughter and five becoming domestic servants. Another female, Beatrice Bulleid, moved with her elder brother and sister and died before her occupation, if any, could be recorded. The proportion of shopkeepers moving to London

---

130 See Chapter 4.3.
132 2 girls left Bucks Mills for positions in domestic service; one of whom was working for a Bideford born wine merchant. John Avery left Bulkworthy to work as a draper.
was greater than that in the population of Conduit Street as a whole but with such a small sample it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions. It does seem, however, that the retail opportunities of the capital may have been the attraction.

**Individuals or Family Groups?**

The extent to which migrants moved to places where kin already resided will be discussed in the following section but it is also relevant to consider whether they travelled alone or with other family members. It is not always possible to be certain if a family, present in one census and absent in the next, all moved at the same point in the intervening decade. For the purposes of this research, unless evidence from other sources suggested otherwise, those who were together in the first census and still in a single household in the following enumeration were deemed to have moved as a couple or family group. Those who were in separate households in the later census were counted as having moved separately. Although this is not totally satisfactory, the limitations are the same for all three areas, making comparisons valid. The collation of biographical detail using other sources does mean that the picture is as accurate as it can be with the information that is available.

Traditionally the young and single have been seen to have fewer responsibilities, thus facilitating the opportunity for movement. Mills and Schürer found that the likelihood of leaving a parish fell once an individual reached their thirties.\(^\text{133}\) It might be expected, therefore, that the majority of the sample migrants would not have formed part of a group migration. For the purposes of this analysis a ‘family group’ was defined as consisting of two or more migrants who appear to have moved together and who had discernible kinship links. Siblings and those related in the second degree\(^\text{134}\) have been included, as well as more traditional nuclear family groups.

**IN-MIGRANTS**

When considering whether or not those arriving in the three settlements did so alone or


\(^{134}\) For example, the sample included instances of grandparent/grandchild and uncle/nephew migrations.
as a family unit, it was possible to include all in-migrants, regardless of whether their geographical origins can be traced.

In Bucks Mills, the number of single in-migrants remained steady throughout the study period. In the 1840s, twice as many migrants entered Bucks Mills alone as did those who arrived as part of a kinship group. There was, however, noticeable increase in the number of families arriving in the village in the 1850s and 1860s; thus accounting for the rise in the total number of in-migrants during these decades.

**Figure 5.24 Bucks Mills – In-migrants’ Companions**

---

[135] The figures used for ‘families’ include all migrants. A family of 7, moving together, is recorded as 7 migrants moving as part of a family, not as one family migration.
In the 1840s, in Bulkworthy, the picture was similar to that in Bucks Mills, with 61.7% of in-migrants travelling alone. As the century progressed, there was a decline in lone in-migrants and a corresponding increase in the number of those arriving in the parish in couples or family units; by the 1880s, two thirds of in-migrants were part of a family group.

---

136 The figures used for ‘families’ include all migrants. A family of 7, moving together, is recorded as 7 migrants moving as part of a family, not as one family migration.
Of the three areas, the situation in Conduit Street was the most consistent, with typically 60-70% of in-migrants being part of a family group. The exception was the 1850s, when 55.2% travelled alone. Bulkworthy too had the greatest proportion of solitary migrants arriving at this time; this contrasts with Bucks Mills, which had fewer single incomers in this decade. Pooley and Turnbull’s statistics reveal an even higher number of family migrations, with only 18.3%-23.2% of migrations being those of lone individuals. It is, however, important to remember that their data were collected from family historians and their sample was weighted in favour of those who married and had offspring.

OUT-MIGRANTS

All out-migrants, whose destinations are known, whether internal migrants or emigrants, have been analysed here. Unfortunately it is not possible to include those who have not been traced to a new area as, even if a family group is missing from the study area, there is no way of assessing the likelihood of them departing together. As families are, in

\[\text{Figure 5.26 Conduit Street – In-migrants’ Companions}^{137}\]

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart}
\caption{Number of In-migrants, Families vs Individuals, 1841-1901}
\end{figure}

\footnote{The figures used for ‘families’ include all migrants. A family of 7 moving together, is recorded as 7 migrants moving as part of a family, not as one family migration. Pooley & Turnbull (1998) p. 220.}
general, easier to trace than individuals, this is likely to result in an under representation of those who travelled alone. Although this is regrettable, it is common to all three study areas so should not invalidate the comparison.

**Figure 5.27 Bucks Mills – Out-migrants’ Companions**\(^{139}\)

![Diagram showing out-migrants' companions over time](image)

Until the 1870s, in Bucks Mills, out-migrants were evenly split between those who left by themselves and those who departed with kin. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, increasing numbers of individuals were out-migrating, at the expense of families; by the 1890s, 68.4% of all out-migrants were loners. Bucks Mills was a very stable settlement, where inhabitants seemed to be content to remain for long periods.\(^{140}\) By the 1870s the natural population increase in Bucks Mills, created by the excess of births over deaths, meant that the hamlet was at its optimum size. As children reached marriageable age, most were unable to find homes in the village and were forced to move away.

---

\(^{139}\) The figures used for ‘families’ include all migrants. A family of seven, moving together, is recorded as 7 migrants moving as part of a family, not as one family migration.

\(^{140}\) See Chapter 4.
Unfortunately, in Bulkworthy, information about migration companions is limited for the first two decades of the study period. This is a reflection of the low trace rates for those decades during which emigration levels were at their highest. It might be expected that the pattern of out-goers might reflect that of those who were entering the parish of Bulkworthy, with families replacing families and individuals leaving, thus making room for a similar proportion of incoming individuals. This does not appear to have been the case. Throughout the study period, numbers of lone out-migrants were similar to those who left accompanied by kin. Thus, at the end of the century, when more families arrived in Bulkworthy than individuals, increasingly, the single were being replaced by nuclear families. In 1841, 18.9% of Bulkworthy’s population were unmarried, live-in servants; William Newcombe, for example, employed eight young people of both sexes on his farm at Hankford. The percentage was already falling by 1871, when 14.9% of

The figures used for ‘families’ include all migrants. A family of 7, moving together, is recorded as 7 migrants moving as part of a family, not as one family migration.
the population fell into this category. Thirty years later there were just four servants, two male and two female, 4.5% of the population, residing with their employers in Bulkworthy. This reflects the fact that the Bulkworthy farms were relying increasingly on family labour and were employing fewer young, unmarried agricultural labourers and domestic servants by the 1901; no doubt a corollary of increased mechanisation.

**Figure 5.29 Conduit Street – Out-migrants’ Companions**

![Conduit Street – Out-migrants’ Companions](image)

There is a similar, if less striking, situation in Conduit Street, whose number of incoming families exceeded those who left with other family members. Again the picture in Conduit Street is less varied than that in the other areas, with roughly half of all out-migrants being loners throughout the study period.

Having considered the extent to which the sample migrants moved with members of their family, it is now time to look at whether the presence of kin at their destination

---

142 The figures used for ‘families’ include all migrants. A family of seven, moving together, is recorded as 7 migrants moving as part of a family, not as one family migration.
may have been a factor in their decision to move. Did perhaps those travelling with companions feel less need to go to where they could find kin?

5.3 Relations and Reasons: the part played by kinship in the migration decisions of the inhabitants of the three settlements

As has already been said, it is not possible to be absolutely certain of a person’s motivation for migration, even if this is stated in a memoir, letter or diary. Careful consideration of the biography and genealogy of the individual and analysis of the conditions in the receiving and sending locations does, however, enable conclusions to be drawn concerning likely reasons for migration or residential persistence. Where feasible, each migrant’s patriarchal and matriarchal genealogy has been examined in order to establish whether they were related to any existing members of the settlements that they were entering. It worth reiterating that the presence of kin, particularly for short-distance migrants, cannot be proved to be the sole reason for a migration but the lack of relatives in a new area means that family support mechanisms could not be relied upon and could not have been the reason for the move.

5.3.i In-migrants’ Patriarchal and Matriarchal Kinship Links within the Receiving Settlement

The presence of kin within a settlement can be a pull factor in the migration decision-making process. It may be kin who provide news of available accommodation or employment and who can offer practical and emotional assistance on arrival. It has been possible to include all in-migrants in this analysis, regardless of whether their previous location is known.

143 See Chapter 1.2.1.
Of all Bucks Mills in-migrants, 71.9% already had relatives living within the hamlet. Understandably, the lure of kin appears to be particularly significant for those travelling the furthest. Unlike those moving less than ten miles, it would be difficult for longer distance migrants to maintain contact with their previous area, thus the need for family support at the new location would be greater. Of the fourteen incomers to Bucks Mills who travelled ten miles or more only two did not already have family in the village and they were both marrying existing residents on arrival. How they may have met their prospective husbands is a matter of speculation, however, one, coming from coastal Kent, married a seaman.

---

144 No kin present means that no paternal or maternal kin have been identified within the community or its adjacent parishes.
The presence of kin within the parish itself does not seem to be important to in-migrants to Bulkworthy. This is largely because so few had travelled more than ten miles and links with their previous settlements could be maintained. Of those who were incomers from a longer distance, with no existing families ties in the parish, only one, Cecelia O’Sullivan, the schoolmistress who arrived in the 1880s, came alone. This suggests that the attraction of Bulkworthy was largely the opportunity for employment rather than the appeal of living in the same parish as family members. Bulkworthy was not the chosen destination for those who, due to distance travelled, would be severing all previous connections with the settlement that was being left.

145 No kin present means that no paternal or maternal kin have been identified within the community or its adjacent parishes.
146 21 individuals.
Considering that Conduit Street is merely one road within a town, it is surprising to find that as many as 19.1% of all in-migrants had family members already living within the street itself. In comparison with the other two study areas, a higher proportion of Conduit Street’s in-migrants (30.1%) had no traceable family links anywhere in Hatherleigh or its surrounding parishes. As a town, Hatherleigh had factors other than kinship ties, a variety of job opportunities for example, that might attract people. Of the 140 individuals who arrived in Conduit Street without any kinship links within Hatherleigh or its neighbouring parishes, only thirty one had travelled more than ten miles, thereby making maintaining links with their previous location more difficult; of these just five individuals travelled alone.

\[147\] ‘Kin in Hatherleigh’ does not include kin in Conduit Street itself. No kin present means that no paternal or maternal kin have been identified within the community or its adjacent parishes.
Table 5.16 Conduit Street - Lone In-migrants Travelling more than 10 Miles with no Kinship Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age on Arrival</th>
<th>Previous Location</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Edwards</td>
<td>11-21</td>
<td>Woodbury, Devon</td>
<td>30 miles</td>
<td>Woodbury, Devon</td>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Down</td>
<td>7-17</td>
<td>Lifton, Devon</td>
<td>15 miles</td>
<td>Broadwoodwidger, Devon</td>
<td>Servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cole</td>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>Dunsford, Devon</td>
<td>18 miles</td>
<td>Dunsford, Devon</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Mitchell</td>
<td>9-19</td>
<td>Witheridge, Devon</td>
<td>18 miles</td>
<td>Witheridge, Devon</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Butt</td>
<td>28-38</td>
<td>Cheriton Bishop, Devon</td>
<td>12 miles</td>
<td>Cheriton Bishop, Devon</td>
<td>Hawker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noticeable that only one of the above travelled more than twenty miles and that he bore the surname Edwards, one that is prevalent in Hatherleigh. Although no kinship link has been uncovered it may well be that one exists. As has been stated, in Chapter 5.2.ii, 64.3% of those arriving in Conduit Street from outside Devon already had family members living in the street and the remaining ten individuals travelled as family groups.

5.3.ii Out-migrants’ Patriarchal and Matriarchal Kinship Links within the Receiving Settlement

Unless a destination is known, it is not possible to assess if kin were present. This analysis therefore only includes those whose new locations have been identified.
Of those who left Bucks Mills, 57.2% travelled alone; of these, nearly half (47.7%) headed for a destination where they had no discernible kinship links. A third of these apparent loners were to marry on arrival in their new settlement, thereby creating a fresh kinship network for themselves. Half of those moving without other members of the family were young girls in domestic service, most of whom were not travelling far from Bucks Mills.

It might be expected that those who migrated as a couple or family group would have less need of existing kinship links at their destination. Yet of these group out-migrants, 71.1% were going to places where relatives already resided. On the other hand, longer distance out-migrants, those moving further than ten miles from Bucks Mills, might have greater need of family ties in their new area. When examining those leaving Bucks Mills this is not found to be the case. Of those who went furthest\footnote{Travelling ten miles or more.} 43.9% appear to have had no family support either in the form of migration companions or kinship links at their new location, twice the percentage of those who remained closer to home, thus
reversing the pattern for in-migrants. To return to John Saville’s selectivity theory, it is perhaps those with the greatest sense of adventure who went furthest and they were the individuals who were prepared to make these moves without companions or family support on arrival.

The findings for kinship links amongst out-migrants contrasts with those arriving in Bucks Mills, of whom only two individuals (14.3%) made an incoming journey of more than ten miles without companions or existing family ties in the hamlet. Those entering Bucks Mills were clearly attracted by the presence of family members, but this does not seem to be the case with those leaving the hamlet. This is understandable as late nineteenth century Bucks Mills had little to appeal to the incomer, apart from the presence of kin. The destinations of out-migrants, however, had other benefits, notably housing and employment opportunities.

**Figure 5.34 Bulkworthy – Out-migrants’ Presence of Kin**

![Figure 5.34 Bulkworthy – Out-migrants’ Presence of Kin](image)

Although, when compared to Bucks Mills, a similar percentage (53.1%) of Bulkworthy

---

149 Saville (1957) p. 125.
out-migrants travelled without companions, the situation there is very different. The majority (84.9%) of out-migrants, whether they were family groups or individuals, were moving to areas where they had no discernible kinship links. The studies considered by Pooley and Turnbull ‘suggested that family migration was important, and [they found that] most qualitative work stresses the importance of kinship and friendship networks in both promoting migration and aiding the migrant to settle in a new environment.’

It appears that this was not the case in Bulkworthy and that kinship links were less important to its out-migrants. This is understandable, however, in the context of the distances that they travelled. Only twenty one individuals, 11.8% of all Bulkworthy out-migrants whose destinations are known, moved more than ten miles without companions or kin at their new location. When examining these particular lone migrants in more detail, it is revealed that agricultural labourers, so prevalent in the Bulkworthy occupational profile, are represented by only two individuals. Clearly it was not necessary to travel far to find farm work and it was those who sought more specialist employment who were lured further afield, despite the lack of companions or family support. Thus four shopkeepers, a coach smith and a miller can be found amongst this small group of those leaving Bulkworthy. Four females apparently moved longer distances in order to marry and a further three took up domestic service. Again these tended to be positions with some status, as one was a housekeeper and another took charge of the laundry in Exeter Prison.

Of particular interest is James Johns, who left Bulkworthy in the 1860s, when he would have been in his early twenties, in order to work as a fireman in a tin works in Baglan, Glamorganshire. On the surface it appears that James travelled unaccompanied and was not joining a kinship network. In adjacent properties, however, can be found two other men, similarly employed, a railway worker and a female all of whom have birthplaces within five miles of Bulkworthy. Thus what James Johns lacked in family support he may well have made up for in fellowship with those previously known to him.

---


The remaining lone out-migrants from Bulkworthy who travelled more than ten miles to an area where no family members appeared to reside were an inmate of the county lunatic asylum, an army private, two carters and a china clay labourer.
In contrast to the other two study areas, a smaller proportion of individuals (42.9%) left Conduit Street alone. 52.1% of all those who left the street went to reside near other members of their family. This is notably higher than Bulkworthy’s 15.1% and approaches the 60% found in Bucks Mills. When considering the out-migrants from Conduit Street, however, it must be noted that the apparently large percentages of both families and individuals who moved to be with kin is, in part, due to the fact that many of those leaving Conduit Street went to another location in Hatherleigh and thus maintained links with kin and neighbours.

Sixty two people, 17.3% of all out-migrants whose destinations have been identified left Conduit Street unaccompanied and headed for a location that was more than ten miles away and where they would find no kin. The distance to be travelled did not seem to deter a Conduit Street resident from setting out alone. As with those travelling furthest from Bulkworthy, it would seem that employment for craftsmen and shopkeepers necessitated longer distance moves, even if this meant severing kinship links.

The relative importance of kinship as a motivating factor for moving, both into and out
from the three study areas, will be assessed in the next section. The following chapter studies, in more detail, those out-migrants whose journey was longest and whose dislocation from their communities was greatest: the emigrants.

5.3.iii Impacts and Incentives: the relative influence of kinship and individual factors on migration decisions

Pooley and Turnbull wrote that, ‘the decision to migrate is one that has immense personal ramifications but that is also fundamentally related to the social, economic and cultural context in which it is situated.’ This emphasises that it was not only the attributes and pressures in the sending and receiving locations that influenced migration decisions but that individual qualities had an important part to play. At the end of section 5.2.ii comments were made concerning some of the community and cultural influences that affected migration patterns in the three study areas. It is now time to draw conclusions about the relative impact that individual, rather than community, factors had on those who migrated into and out from the three settlements and to assess the function of kinship as a stimulus initiating movement.

Although age and gender did have some influence on the propensity to migrate, these were not the factors that had most impact for those in the study sample. In line with the findings of other studies of migration, most migrants into and out from the three study areas were under thirty. As Smout pointed out, ‘rural depopulation occurred when the young, in particular, felt their need to associate could only be met by going to town.’ Yet for many of the sample migrants from Bulkworthy and to a lesser extent, Bucks Mills, towns were not their destination. Even a sizeable proportion (20·1%) of Conduit Street out-migrants went to a rural area.

Although females have been found to be more migratory than males, particularly over shorter distances, this was not the case in Bulkworthy, where the continual interchange of agricultural labourers with surrounding areas meant that both in- and out-migrants
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were more likely to be male. Henry French, summarising the work of others, found that, ‘most of these rural migrants were unmarried.’\textsuperscript{155} Overall, this research did identify more single migrants, yet there were many who travelled as part of a family group. In Conduit Street, for example, 60-70\% of in-migrants did not arrive alone.

As was seen in the previous chapter, occupation and class did have a role in the predisposition to leave an area, with the craftsmen and tradesmen being less likely to become internal migrants. The long distance incomers to the three settlements tended to be those of higher status. This was partly a reflection of the nature of their occupations; Baptist Ministers and schoolteachers, for example, were likely to need to move further than domestic servants or farm workers in order to find suitable employment.

When considering those who entered Bucks Mills, their gender and age profile was not unexpected. With 72\% of all in-migrants joining relatives, kinship could be seen as a crucial factor, especially for those moving into the hamlet from a longer distance. As stated above, there was little about the hamlet of Victorian Bucks Mills to attract the incomer. Yet, for those leaving the hamlet, kinship appeared to matter less; here the nature of the settlement itself generated the ‘push’ to leave. Those who felt the need for the support of relatives were those who made up the large persistent element of Bucks Mills’ population.

Kinship does not seem to have had a particular influence on internal migrants into and out from Bulkworthy. High percentages were moving very short distances and would have been able to maintain links with family and friends in an area that did not stop at the parish boundary. Bulkworthy males were more likely to migrate than females and this is linked to their occupational status, as the majority were agricultural labourers. It was the need to find work that motivated internal migrants to and from Bulkworthy.

In Conduit Street, business opportunities were certainly an influencing factor in the decision to move both into and out of the town. Kinship did have a role to play, particularly for longer distance in-migrants. In the absence of family ties, Hatherleigh

\textsuperscript{155} French (2007) p.72.
had little to encourage an incomer from beyond the immediate area. In some cases it was
kin that provided the employment and perhaps the news of the availability of work or
accommodation.

This research set out, in part, to examine the extent of rural depopulation and rural-
urban migration in the study areas. Although Bulkworthy clearly experienced rural
depopulation, the other areas maintained their populations and may well have increased
them had not their geography inhibited this. The exodus up the settlement hierarchy,
described by many researchers\(^\text{156}\) was not evident and it may be that this was because
emigration was, as Baines suggested, a substitute for this type of internal migration\(^\text{157}\) in
North Devon at this time. Kinship then, as expected, was just one of the influences at
work when migration decisions were being made; economic factors often being more
important. Initially it was expected that this research would uncover a greater
dependence on non-resident kin than was the case with the internal migrants in the areas
studied. For those who emigrated, however, very different influences were at work and
these will be discussed in the following chapter.

**5.4 Migrants under the Microscope: case studies**

‘We need to undertake in-depth investigation of the biographies of migrants in order to
gain appreciation of the intentions implicated in the migration decision.’\(^\text{158}\)

Pooley and Whyte believe that, ‘the historical study of migration can be most effectively
tackled through the behavioural approach using individual level data’\(^\text{159}\) and it is such
personal, biographical information that is utilised in this section. The use of exemplar
in- and out-migrants enables motivations to be examined at the micro level; it is thus
possible to consider the extent to which the factors discussed earlier in this chapter

---


\(^{158}\) K. Halfacre and P. Boyle, ‘The Challenge Facing Migration Research: The Case for a

\(^{159}\) Pooley & Whyte (1991) p. 11.
impacted upon individual migrants and family groups.

**William John Edwards Pillifant**

At some point between 1891 and 1899 a young man, William John Edwards Pillifant, arrived in Conduit Street, Hatherleigh, from his birthplace of Walworth in Surrey, where he had been working in a warehouse. In 1899 he married Lily Smale who was living with her mother and step-father in Hatherleigh High Street. Once in Hatherleigh, William worked as a carpenter. On the surface this appears to be an individual migrant travelling alone to a place with which he had no obvious connection. It seems an unusual route to take in the late nineteenth century, from what was effectively Greater London to a small declining Devonshire town.

Investigating William further reveals why Hatherleigh became his destination; both his parents had been born there. It is highly likely that, once in Hatherleigh, William was working for his uncle, John Edwards, who was a carpenter in Conduit Street. John, by this time was in his sixties and had no sons to help in his business. When William Pillifant is located in Walworth in the 1891 census, his household sheds further light on migration patterns from Hatherleigh. He and his parents were sharing a home with Silas Hurford, a draper’s assistant from Hatherleigh. Silas had lived in Conduit Street and left there to become a groom in the Devon village of Chumleigh in the 1870s. This was clearly only a step in Silas’ migration to a large urban environment as, by 1889, he was in London, where he married a Hatherleigh girl, Sarah Kate Abell. No family relationship has been found between the Pillifants and the Hurfords but there was clearly a geographical link, resulting in their sharing a dwelling many miles from Devon. Although William Pillifant was not born in Hatherleigh, it was his kinship links with other Hatherleigh residents that appear to have resulted in his move to Conduit Street.

**The Crews Family**

The Crews family originated in Bradworthy, a large village some six miles inland from Bucks Mills. It is likely that the first member of the family to move towards Bucks Mills was John, who married Elizabeth Hooper from Woolfardisworthy in 1848 and set up home there. In 1859, John’s brother, Simon, married Ellen Dark from Parkham and began work as the Bucks Mills’ miller. His recently widowed mother, Elizabeth, and
sister, Charlotte, together with her illegitimate daughter, accompanied him. By the time of the 1861 census, John had joined his family and was living, with his wife, in the annex to the mill at Bucks Mills. In the 1870s another Crews sibling, William, also moved to Bucks Mills.

**Figure 5.36 The Crews Family of Bucks Mills**

This short distance migration of an extended family appears to have been motivated by a two-pronged impetus. Marriage clearly brought the family in contact with the area but the decision for Simon to live in Bucks Mills itself was probably influenced by the availability of the Mill as both a home and an occupation. The property had been vacated by the Pennington family\(^{160}\) who were staunch Bible Christians and it may be that Simon learnt of the opportunity through the Bible Christian network. Unlike many other in-migrants to the three study areas, for Simon Crews this was not a sideways move from one rural area to another in close proximity. By taking over the mill Simon

\(^{160}\) The Pennington family appear as a case study in Chapter 6.3.
was raising himself above his previous labouring status. For John and William Crews, it was family connections that brought them to Bucks Mills, exemplifying Sheppard’s statement that ‘for the most part, therefore, family migration was a local affair, part of the regular pattern of exchange among neighbouring parishes.’

Mary Braund

Mary was born on the 2nd February 1836 and was the third child of James Braund, self-styled ‘King’ of Bucks Mills and his wife Mary, whose maiden name was also Braund. At the time of Mary’s birth, it is believed that the family were living at a property later known as ‘The Bluff’, on the Parkham side of Bucks Mills. Despite her father’s importance within the village, this was a working fisherman’s family, albeit one that appears to have been more financially secure than others in the village. This is evidenced by the fact that James was able to build his own property in the village and in 1845, and he moved to ‘King’s Cottage’ with his wife and seven children. Although her younger siblings are listed in the census returns as ‘scholars’, it is unlikely that Mary received any formal education. When she was a child her family were not church or chapel goers, so even the rudiments that she may have learnt at a Sunday School were probably denied her. At the age of fifteen Mary was still living with her parents and was described in the 1851 census returns as a domestic assistant. The use of the word ‘assistant’, rather than ‘servant’, suggests that she was helping her mother with her seven younger siblings, rather than being employed by an outsider. Mary’s elder sister, Hannah, was also still at home and might have been expected to be taking on this role but she was known to be suffering from tuberculosis and was to die the following year.

Table 5.17 Destinations of Young Women leaving Bucks Mills for Domestic Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Villages within ten miles</th>
<th>Bideford or Barnstaple</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-1851</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851-1861</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-1871</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871-1881</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1891</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1901</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By 1861 Mary had left home. There was no scope for domestic service within the village of Bucks Mills. At this time most girls who left the hamlet were moving to other villages in order to find work. At some point in the 1850s or early 1860s Mary, however, went to Bideford, not to work in a private house but to become a waitress in the busy New Inn in the Market Square. There were four other live in servants, all of whom came from Devon villages. It is highly likely that Mary obtained this job through the cook at the New Inn, who was Harriet Webb. Harriet came from Woolfardisworthy and her brother, Thomas, ran the beer house, The Coffin Arms, in Bucks Mills at this time. It may even be that Mary had worked at The Coffin Arms before moving to the New Inn; The Coffin Arms was one of only two properties in the village to be known to have employed female servants. Unfortunately Mary’s career can only be traced at ten year intervals, when she can be found in the census returns. She almost certainly had several other employers at locations that cannot now be identified.

Mary’s next known employment was as one of three resident servants of the elderly widow, Alice Sergeant, and her daughter. Although a Sergeant family have connections to Bucks Mills, it has not been possible to establish a relationship between them and Alice’s clergyman husband, Oswald, who came from Manchester. The property, Fordlands in Northam, was an imposing one and was almost certainly the former Rectory. In the 1870s, when Mary was there, Northam was already becoming a suburb of Bideford. It has not been possible to positively identify Mary in the 1881 census although it seems likely that she is the forty year old Mary Braund who was a cook to William Hutchinson at Wellesbourne, Northam. The age is inaccurate, as is the birthplace, Hartland, but there is no record of a Mary Braund being born in Hartland between 1836 and 1842 and it is quite possible that her employer, who would have provided the enumerator with the information, was sketchy about the precise ages and birthplaces of his servants. Wellesbourne is again a substantial, three-servant household, headed by a retired colonel. It is highly likely that the gentry of Northam would have recommended servants to one another.

Ten years later Mary had left Devon altogether and was in Erdisley, Herefordshire, working as a cook for John Cooke, a retired Major General. This was a similar status household to those of her previous employers, with four resident servants. If indeed, as
seems likely, the Mary in the household of William Hutchinson is the correct one, then perhaps she had moved between the two households of former army colleagues; Hutchinson and Cooke were of a similar age.

In 1898 Mary and her only surviving unmarried sister, Matilda, were left half shares in their father’s fishing boats and nets. Mary returned to live in Bucks Mills and can be found there in the 1901 census living with Matilda in the former family home. Mary died on 16th September 1905 and was buried at St. Anne’s, Bucks Mills.

Mary is therefore both an in- and out-migrant of the Bucks Mills sample and, like many, her motives were centred around changing employment opportunities. Her story shows that, despite a somewhat inauspicious start as waitress in local inn, it was possible to leave a working class household in Bucks Mills in order to take up employment with families of some substance. Mary was a short-distance out-migrant of the 1850s but her experiences illustrate that a move from small rural location to local town can be part of a series of steps leading to longer distance migrations. As Mary reveals, migrants might return to one’s birthplace, even after many years away. As an in-migrant at the end of the nineteenth century, Mary has been classed as one of a very few out-of-county in-migrants to Bucks Mills. What appears to be a long distance in-migration was in fact a return home. With the obvious exception of her final move back to Bucks Mills, in Mary’s case there were no apparent family links prompting her migrations. There does, however, seem to be local connection leading her to Bideford, followed by the possibility of a chain of recommendations between employers who moved in similar circles. Finally, Mary’s case acts as a warning: if the 1901 census alone had been used, comparing Mary’s place of birth and residence would suggest that Mary was not a migrant at all.

**The Harwood Family**

The story of the Harwood family is a good example of longer distance migrations, with their time in Conduit Street, Hatherleigh forming only a brief interlude in a life containing many moves. John Hitchcock Harwood was born in 1806 in Plymouth, his marriage to Mary Ann has not been traced but she came from Kings Lynn, Norfolk. Their eldest child was born in Westminster, London, in 1838. It is possible that this was
where John and Mary Ann met. The family then moved again, remaining in London but living in Marylebone. The Harwoods arrived in Hatherleigh between 1839 and 1841, at which time John was a tailor. At first they lived in Market Street but by 1851 they were in Conduit Street with an additional six, Hatherleigh born, children. Unlike William Pillifant whose move from a large urban centre to the much smaller one of Hatherleigh can be explained, the Harwoods’ choice of Hatherleigh remains a mystery, as no family connections have been found in the town.

In the late 1850s the Harwoods re-located again, this time to Accrington in Lancashire. This was a long distance family migration and initially it appears to have been the result of a change of career, for John became a railway clerk. On reflection, it seems more probable that the move pre-dated the change of employment rather than resulted from it; the initial attraction of Accrington to a tailor being its importance as a textile town. It is very unlikely that John worked for the railways whilst still in Hatherleigh as no companies were operating in the area at this date. The 1871 census finds John and Mary Ann Harwood with two of their children, living in a small village near Barton on Irwell in Lancashire. John was still working for the railways as a rent collector but the urban environment had been left behind. This was not the end of the Harwoods’ migrations as ten years later they were living in Llanbeblig, Caernarvon, another long-distance move; by this time John had retired. Finally, after Mary Ann’s death, John returned to Lancashire, to live with his daughter in Birkenhead.
The experiences of the Harwood family show that some individuals could make multiple moves across the country, often with no obvious family links to the new area. Their migration history exemplifies those who made a series of re-locations, often across considerable distances. As Deacon found, ‘families that had experienced a previous move [were] more likely to move again.’

**Jethro Stapledon**

Jethro Stapledon appeared in Bulkworthy in the 1871 census as a twenty year old agricultural labourer, working on James Crews’ 140 acre farm, Waffapool. Jethro was born in neighbouring Buckland Brewer and can be found there with his parents ten years earlier. At first glance this appears to be a single, young, agricultural labourer making a short distance rural-rural move in order to find employment. A more detailed examination of Jethro’s family shows that James Crews’ wife had been Mary Ann
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Stapledon and Jethro was in fact working for his uncle.

In 1880 Jethro married in Cardiff and the following year can be found living in Roath, Glamorganshire as a cab proprietor. His wife had been born in Gloucestershire and there is no obvious reason to think that they were known to each other before marriage. Nonetheless a family connection brought Jethro to Wales. His wife, Mary Ann, had previously been married to Jethro’s brother, John. Jethro had not only taken over his dead brother’s wife but also, it seems, his business as John too had been a cab proprietor. It is impossible to know whether family responsibilities or business opportunities were the greater incentive.

In all these examples, employment and the presence of kin worked together, not only to prompt a move but also to influence the migrants’ choice of destination. If there were no kin in the new settlement, then it was likely that an unrelated, former neighbour had made a similar move and thus would have been available to provide support for, or to suggest possible employment to, the new migrant.

5.5 Consequences for Communities: the impact of migration on the study areas

A two-way relationship exists between a locality and its migrants. Individuals are prompted to enter or leave an area by the positive or negative factors that are found there but, at the same time, their doing so can change the character of that settlement. Various aspects of the settlements in 1841 were discussed in Chapter 2.3. It is now time to consider how sixty years of movements might have altered the nature of the three study areas.

Population Levels

Changes in overall population levels have been discussed in Chapter 5.2.i. The numbers of inhabitants in Bucks Mills and Conduit Street did not undergo any great variation during the study period. A slight downturn can be observed in Conduit Street in the

---

164 Some of the Figures from Chapter 2.3 have been reproduced here for ease of comparison.
1870s, after which the population again stabilised; a similar reduction was experienced in Bucks Mills in the 1890s. In some ways, it is surprising that Bulkworthy, the only one of the three areas with the geographical conditions necessary to facilitate a population increase by adding more dwellings, was the one that experienced such a dramatic reduction in inhabitants. It was out-migration, or more specifically emigration, that was the key to Bulkworthy’s population loss. In the other two areas numbers were maintained, births and in-migrants compensating for deaths and out-migrants. It is important to reaffirm the role of new-borns in Bucks Mills who balanced, or perhaps were a catalyst resulting in, the levels of out-migration. Thus, although there were nearly twice as many Bucks Mills’ out-migrants as there were in-migrants, the total population remained stable. In Conduit Street there was a much closer equilibrium between numbers of in- and out-migrants.

Table 5.18 Comparison of the Three Settlements in 1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Native Born</th>
<th>% Born in Devon</th>
<th>% Employed In Agriculture</th>
<th>% Of Household Heads Related to another in the Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bucks Mills</td>
<td>86.5 (64.4)</td>
<td>98.2 (98.4)</td>
<td>4.8 (46.7)</td>
<td>88.9 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkworthy</td>
<td>30.7 (46.4)</td>
<td>95.5 (94.4)</td>
<td>54.5 (76.3)</td>
<td>4.9 (52.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit Street</td>
<td>68.7 (51.3)</td>
<td>89.8 (98)</td>
<td>19.3 (19.6)</td>
<td>82.9 (62.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

165 1841 percentages are in brackets, see Table I.1.
166 This is the percentage of all those with a listed occupation.
167 In order to be more accurately comparable with the figures for the other communities this percentage includes all those born in the parent parishes of Parkham and Woolfardisworthy.
168 This includes all those born in the parish of Hatherleigh.
169 This figure refers to all those who are related to another head of household within the parish of Hatherleigh. As it has not been possible to trace the genealogy of all Hatherleigh inhabitants in depth, this should be regarded as a minimum figure. In 1841, 28.6% of Conduit Street household heads were related to another within the street itself. In 1901 the figure was 24.4%.
**Age Sex-Structure**

Mageen recommends the use of population pyramids to decide whether a locality has the characteristics of a sending or receiving settlement. At no point during the study period do the population pyramids for Bucks Mills suggest that it had the features of a receiving settlement. In the 1870s the pyramid reflects the static nature of Bucks Mills at this time. In both the 1841 and 1901 pyramids it is, however, possible to discern a lower than expected percentage of the population who fell in the 20-39 age group, suggesting that, by the start of the twentieth century, Bucks Mills was taking on the characteristics of a sending settlement, similar to that of 1841.

![Figure 5.38 Bucks Mills – 1841 Population Pyramid](image)
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Figure 5.39 Bucks Mills – 1871 Population Pyramid

Figure 5.40 Bucks Mills – 1901 Population Pyramid
As might be expected, Bulkworthy too, exhibited more signs of a sending settlement than one that was experiencing an influx of incomers.

**Figure 5.41 Bulkworthy – 1841 Population Pyramid**

![Figure 5.41 Bulkworthy – 1841 Population Pyramid](image)

**Figure 5.42 Bulkworthy – 1871 Population Pyramid**

![Figure 5.42 Bulkworthy – 1871 Population Pyramid](image)
The population pyramids of Conduit Street show a tendency towards that of a receiving settlement, as might be anticipated in a less rural environment. It is interesting to note that, in all three areas, the date at which the population structure most resembles that of a static settlement is 1871.
Figure 5.45 Conduit Street – 1871 Population Pyramid

![1871 Population Pyramid](image)

Figure 5.46 Conduit Street – 1901 Population Pyramid

![1901 Population Pyramid](image)
Table 5.19 Economically Active Inhabitants of the Three Settlements in 1841 and 1901

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Economically active as a % of the total population</th>
<th>% of total population with an enumerated occupation</th>
<th>% of economically active with an enumerated occupation +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucks Mills</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkworthy</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit Street</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ This does not include those in each settlement with a stated occupation who were under 15 or over 69

When examining how the percentages of those who were economically active changed during the study period it is important to also consider also whether or not the percentage of those who may be deemed to be potentially economically active, those between the ages of fifteen and sixty nine, altered. In all three settlements, this age group formed a greater percentage of the population in 1901 than they did in 1841; this is in part attributable to the greater number of children who were surviving to young adulthood. In both Bucks Mills and Conduit Street, the actual percentage of the population with enumerated occupations rose correspondingly. In Bulkworthy, however, where the increase in the percentage of the potentially economically active was the greatest, this was not the case. If, however, the percentages of the economically active age group in employment are considered, the figure for Bucks Mills is very similar in 1901 to that of 1841. In Bulkworthy, however, this percentage has fallen from 49.5% in 1841 to 62.9% in 1901, largely as a result of the declining opportunities for women in the gloving trade.

According to the census enumerator, there was only one agricultural labourer in Bucks

---

These percentages do not include those listed as ‘Independent’ as having an occupation. See p. 100 for an explanation of the use of the term ‘economically active’.
Mills in 1901 who, together with the trapper, groom and gardener, made up 9.5% of the employed population of the hamlet. In contrast, in 1841, 45.7% of the villagers were working on the land. The situation in Bucks Mills is, however, complicated by the habit of its occupants to fish and work on farms concurrently. Far more fishermen are enumerated in 1901 than in 1841. If fishermen and agricultural labourers are added together, this section of the working population had not declined significantly.

**Figure 5.47 Bucks Mills - Occupational Categories in 1841**

**Figure 5.48 Bucks Mills - Occupational Categories in 1901**
In general, in Bucks Mills the range of occupations became more diverse during the study period. There were more opportunities for female employment by 1901, with the inclusion of three laundresses, two dressmakers and two teachers amongst the working population.

Figure 5.49 Bulkworthy - Occupational Categories in 1841

Figure 5.50 Bulkworthy - Occupational Categories in 1901
The failure of Bulkworthy’s employment rate to rise in line with the increased percentage of potentially economically active inhabitants is accounted for by the collapse of the gloving trade that employed seven women in 1841 but none in 1901. This form of in-house employment for women was known to be in decline by the turn of the century but in order to ensure that this was not a case of an enumerator discounting this form of work as employment, the neighbouring village of Buckland Brewer was also checked for similar trends. Here too this method of supplementing household income had been lost to the females of the village, sixteen glovers in the Buckland Brewer census of 1841 falling to none in 1901.

Unlike Bucks Mills, there was a narrower range of occupations in Bulkworthy by 1901. With 53% of the working population in 1841 employed in agriculture in 1841, rising to 62% by 1901, the parish was heavily reliant on a single source of employment. The proportion of those working in agriculture in Bulkworthy far exceed Hinde’s 41% rural parishes of central Norfolk.¹⁷² Bulkworthy had become less self sufficient as the number of different trades and retailers diminished and the inhabitants increasingly relied on agriculture as a source of employment. With improved transport links this may not have been a disadvantage in practical terms but as the residents were forced to look beyond the parish boundaries for an increasing number of services, the sense of Bulkworthy as a distinct unit and thus one aspect of its identity as a community was impaired.

In Conduit Street, unlike Bulkworthy, job opportunities for women increased during the study period, with more domestic servants and female shop workers and the maintenance of numbers employed in the production of clothing. The retail sector was providing work for larger numbers, whilst the number of tradesmen was declining.
The Origins of the Inhabitants of 1901

In order to assess whether the sphere of influence of the three settlements increased or decreased as the nineteenth century progressed, an analysis of birthplaces of the residents in 1901 was carried out and compared with the findings for 1841.\textsuperscript{173}

Figure 5.53 Bucks Mills - Birthplaces of the Inhabitants of 1901 (%)

Bucks Mills’ catchment area for in-migrants appears to have shrunk, with a greater number of native born villagers. By 1901, three quarters of the inhabitants had been born in the village and a further 10% elsewhere in Parkham or Woolfardisworthy; the equivalent percentages in 1841 were 31 and 33. There were just four 1901 residents who had been born more than fifty miles from Bucks Mills; this is, however, an increase on the number for 1841.\textsuperscript{174}

\textsuperscript{173} Figures 2.20, 2.24 and 2.28 illustrate the results for 1841.
\textsuperscript{174} This does not take account of the six 1841 residents whose precise Devon birthplaces have not been confirmed. At least four of these were almost certainly born within a fifty miles radius of Bucks Mills.
In Bulkworthy, unlike Bucks Mills, there was a decrease in the percentage of native-born inhabitants from 46.4% in 1841 to 30.7% in 1901. Nonetheless, only a tenth of the population had been born more than fifteen miles from Bulkworthy, suggesting that it had as little to attract the longer distance migrant in 1901 as it had had in 1841.
There are difficulties associated with a comparison of the Conduit Street figures as 26% of 1841 residents had unknown Devon birthplaces. It is, however, very unlikely that they were natives of Hatherleigh.\textsuperscript{175} Like Bucks Mills, Hatherleigh seems to have become more inward looking with the passage of time. 69% of 1901 residents were born within the parish, a notable increase on the 50% of 1841. The 1901 populations of both Bulkworthy and Conduit Street included an individual whose birthplace was Canada

\textsuperscript{175} Careful searching of the Anglican and non-conformist baptism registers of Hatherleigh for all those whose birthplaces could not be found by using later censuses should have identified almost all the native born.
and who belonged to the families of returning emigrants.¹⁷⁶

Although both Bucks Mills and Conduit Street had more native-born inhabitants in 1901 than 1841, there is evidence that those who came from outside the immediate area tended to travel further as the century progressed. Neither Hatherleigh nor Bucks Mills possessed a railway link¹⁷⁷ but improved transport and better communications may well have had an influence here. As has been noted, many of these longer distance immigrants had pre-existing kinship links within their new neighbourhood.

Bryant’s research on towns in South Devon found that, in 1851, 51% of the population of Totnes were living in their parish of birth, in Ashburton the figure was 62% and in Buckfastleigh 72%.¹⁷⁸ The latter is similar to the percentage of Hatherleigh born residents of Conduit Street fifty years later. In Totnes, however, the percentage of native-born residents was to decline rapidly, falling to 12.9% by 1891.¹⁷⁹ It is tempting to attribute this, at least in part, to the existence of a railway in Totnes; in contrast, in Buckfastleigh on the same railway line, the reduction was less dramatic, with 59.3% of its 1891 residents still having been born in the town.¹⁸⁰ In Buckfastleigh, like Conduit Street, migration had not dislocated the population in the same way that it had in Totnes. It is possible that Totnes’ situation on the River Dart, and its role as a commercial centre, was a contributing factor. The north Devon port of Bideford, albeit by 1891 not the thriving commercial centre it had been, included only 20.6% of Bideford born residents in that year. Clearly both Buckfastleigh and Hatherleigh, on the opposite edges of Dartmoor, were lacking in attractions for the in-migrant by the turn of the century.

¹⁷⁶ Neither of these families left directly from the study areas therefore they do not form part of the analysis of emigrants that follows in Chapter 6.
¹⁷⁷ Hatherleigh did not have a station until 1925. In 1901, the closest station was at Okehampton, eight miles away. Bucks Mills was equidistant between the stations at Bude and Bideford, both some fifteen miles away.
¹⁷⁸ Bryant (1971) p. 133.
¹⁷⁹ Figures based on the on-line 1891 census indexed provided by www.findmypast.com accessed 14th January 2009. The On-line indexing system makes it impossible to perform a similar search for 1901.
¹⁸⁰ Figures based on the on-line 1891 census indexed provided by www.findmypast.com accessed 14th January 2009. The On-line indexing system makes it impossible to perform a similar search for 1901.
Kinship Links

Changing densities of the kinship networks found in the three settlements were discussed fully in Chapter 3.2.i and Chapter 3.3. The ever-tightening web of family connections in Bucks Mills, which lasted until the Second World War, has already been commented upon. In contrast, Bulkworthy, whilst on the surface appearing to be in line with rural areas elsewhere had, by 1901, very few kinship links and took on the nature of a fragmenting and transient settlement. Of the three locations, Conduit Street experienced the least change as regards kinship density in the later nineteenth century. Bearing in mind that this is just one street within a town, it is perhaps surprising to find that, in 1871, the absolute kinship density for Conduit Street equalled that of Bulkworthy and was to exceed it by 1901. This is due, in greater part, to the particularly amorphous nature of Bulkworthy’s population rather than any unusually strong ties in Conduit Street. As the nineteenth century progressed and Hatherleigh declined as an economic centre, it began to acquire the characteristics of a large village, rather than an urban environment. Although family links were beginning to decline by 1901, the presence of core families with business premises in Conduit Street meant that the kinship web had not then unravelled with the thoroughness of that in Bulkworthy.

Community Diversity

Were then the three settlements more or less diverse at the end of the century than they had been in 1841 and to what can any change be attributed? Bucks Mills, with its tighter kinship networks, smaller surname pool and higher percentage of native-born inhabitants was certainly less diverse. Bucks Mills became ever more inward looking during the nineteenth century. This was in no small part due to increasing dominance of the Braund family within the hamlet. Their reluctance to marry non-villagers and their habit of discouraging incomers was fuelled by their complete reliance on the family unit as a method of wresting a living from the sea. As the village became more and more dependent on fishing, its inhabitants trusted not only their means of economic survival but also their lives to their fellow villagers. Although a higher percentage of the potentially economically active population was in employment by the end of the century, the village was to become increasingly reliant on other settlements for essential services. It was this lack of self-sufficiency that forced twentieth century Bucks Mills to look beyond its boundaries and to lose much of its community identity.
In the period between 1841 and 1901, a higher and higher percentage of Bulkworthy’s rapidly shrinking population came from outside the parish, the range of occupational opportunities, particularly for women, decreased and kinship ties became virtually non-existent. For Bulkworthy, the seeds of change were sown earlier in the nineteenth century. Always a nebulous neighbourhood, the decimation of its population by emigration, begun in the 1830s and escalating in the period up until 1861, contributed to early twentieth century Bulkworthy becoming a fragmented settlement, conforming less and less to the various definitions of the term. Its indistinct geographical boundaries and the constant exchange of population with neighbouring parishes meant that any shared experiences that might have created a sense of unity or belonging were diminishing.

The situation in Conduit Street lay somewhere between that of the other two settlements. Perhaps surprisingly, as a town environment, increasing numbers of inhabitants were Hatherleigh born as the century progressed. On the other hand, unlike Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy, by 1901 rather fewer residents were native Devonians and late nineteenth century Hatherleigh was attracting some incomers from longer distances than previously. As the majority of these had family connections in the area, Conduit Street can hardly be viewed as a magnet for in-migration. In 1901, slightly fewer household heads (24·4%) were related to another within the street than had been in 1841 (28·6%) but noticeably more had family ties elsewhere in Hatherleigh. With the passage of sixty years during which the country as a whole was experiencing economic expansion, Hatherleigh and Conduit Street itself stagnated, with no diversification of the occupational structure. After the collapse of its wool trade and the downturn in mining in the region, Hatherleigh, a town too small to succeed in the rapidly industrialising world, had little to offer in the twentieth century.

Thus, although all had changed, none of the three study areas can be said to have become more diverse during the sixty years under review. What impact did this have on the extent of community identity, or the sense of belonging, in these areas? In this respect, of the three study areas, Conduit Street experienced least change during the Victorian era. Always an integral part of the wider settlement of the town of
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181 82·9% in 1901 as opposed to 62·9% in 1841.
Hatherleigh, the street lacked the strength of family ties that bound the residents of Bucks Mills or the religious ties that many of those in Bulkworthy had held in common in the 1840s.

In the period under review, it was difficult to separate the sense of belonging to the physical space that was Bucks Mills from the membership of an increasingly dense kinship network. Loyalty to both family and hamlet meant that community identity was still becoming increasingly pronounced in Bucks Mills and continued to do so until after the Second World War. Any cohesion that Bulkworthy had as a parish was replaced by the community that was the Bible Christian Church. These loyalties were keenly felt by members of this religious community and the resulting effects on the parish were to fracture and fragment kinship links that might otherwise have continued to provide some form of community within Bulkworthy.

Undoubtedly in and out-migration, or perhaps, in the case of Bucks Mills the lack of it, had impacted upon life in these three areas. How conditions in the settlements in turn affected migration decisions will be discussed in the final chapter. As this research progressed it became apparent that it was not internal migration that had the greatest consequence for the three settlements but emigration and the fact that many of those emigrants had a very different agenda from individuals who moved to other parts of England and Wales. The following chapter assesses those who left the three study areas for overseas destinations, their motivations and how their moves fitted into a wider pattern of emigration from North Devon at this time. Those who emigrated from the settlements were partly responsible for the changes experienced by those who were left behind and it is the emigrants who will be analysed in the following chapter.
Chapter 6 Emigrants, Evangelists and the Extended Family: the influences of family and faith on the emigration decisions of the inhabitants of the three settlements

6.1 Cod and God: The background to Emigration from North Devon

Between 1840 and 1900 434,806 people left Britain via a Devon port,¹ fifty eight² named individuals from the three settlements can be identified amongst this number. 75% of Victorian British emigrants chose the United States as their destination; those leaving Devon followed a very different pattern, with only 1.1% of Devon’s expatriates going to the United States.³ Instead, the gold rushes of the 1850s and the government promotions of the 1870s, led many Devonians to head for Australia. 86.8% of emigrants from Plymouth were departing for Australasian destinations and these included a number of North Devonians as, from 1842, Plymouth was an official port of departure for assisted emigrants. The majority of the emigrants from the study areas left from Bideford.⁴ Although the official figures for Bideford only cover the more restricted period of 1840-1856, the destinations of those embarking from this North Devon port appear vastly different from those who left from Plymouth.

² These include both known and probable emigrants but excludes those known to have left from Liverpool; see 6.2.i. below.
⁴ There were exceptions, for example 15 emigrants from the sample left from Liverpool and the White family from Woolfardisworthy, who are not part of the sample, sailed from Plymouth to Port Hope, Upper Canada, in 1843.
Even allowing for the fact that those from North Devon wishing to travel to Australasia would almost certainly have done so from Plymouth, the preference of Bideford emigrants for British North America warrants some explanation. Hancock asserts that, ‘in European migration overseas… the geographical origins of migration activity require careful reconstruction at national, regional and local level. Only then can one begin to investigate and understand the processes involved in the transfer, the mechanics of movement, and the behavioural and socio-economic characteristics of the migrants themselves’.  
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5 Based on figures from Brayshay (1994) p. 108.
6 Based on figures from Brayshay (1994) p. 108.
The background to links between North Devon and certain parts of what is now Canada are very illuminating when considering the reasons why emigrants from the study areas chose particular destinations.

There had long been a tradition of trans-Atlantic contact between Bideford and Newfoundland. The seasonal fishing trade was well established by the seventeenth century, with annual journeys from ports, such as Bideford, to the cod fisheries of Newfoundland. The lack of agricultural opportunities in Newfoundland meant that any kind of permanent settlement there was discouraged. Despite this, there was a degree of over-wintering. This was, in part, a result of the terms of the Fishing Act of 1699, which required between one fifth and one third of the seamen to be inexperienced ‘green men’. This policy was instigated in order to provide training for potential merchant seamen and naval personnel. A large number of men were needed on the outward journey, in order to fish and then cure the catch. On the, somewhat shorter, return trip, however, there was nothing for less experienced men to do and they were a drain on the ship’s supplies. For this reason many, mostly younger, men, were abandoned in Newfoundland or sent south to New England. Nevertheless, this was far from constituting a significant number of permanent emigrations.

By the late eighteenth century, as far as North Devon was concerned, the Newfoundland fishing trade was in serious decline. In 1792, Justice Reeves gave evidence to the committee appointed to investigate the state of the trade and said, ‘Biddeford and Barnstaple were once great towns in this trade and have long since ceased to employ any ship at all.’ The earlier Atlantic voyages did, however, have an influence on later emigrations. As Greenhill and Giffard point out,

‘the forces at work were those which had operated in the migrations from North Devon to North America of two centuries before … the great Devon fishery off the North American coast meant that people were familiar with the idea of an Atlantic crossing and had some knowledge of what lay beyond … there were empty ships outward bound; merchants
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8 Usually May-September.
9 On average, the westward trip took six weeks and the return journey under a month.
The Napoleonic wars resulted in a revival of trans-Atlantic trips from Bideford. The shipyards of the River Torridge, such as those at Appledore, were being encouraged to increase production in order to supply the navy in time of war. Between 1800 and 1808, output reached an unprecedented level, with seven warships and 107 merchant ships being built in Torridge yards. In 1806, the timber came largely from Prussia, Norway and Russia, who, in that year, sent almost 6000, 1400 and 297 loads of timber to Britain respectively. The Berlin Decree of 1806, prevented British ships entering ports of the Napoleonic Empire. The following year, the Treaty of Tilsit saw Prussian, Danish and Russian ports joining the blockade, thus leaving only Sweden as a European source of timber for British shipbuilding. In 1808, the total imports of timber into Britain from Russia, Prussia and Norway fell to 115 loads. In an effort to find an alternative source of shipbuilding materials, those importing on behalf of the North Devon yards, once again looked west and revived the tradition of trans-Atlantic travel, with the hope of obtaining timber from the St. Lawrence shores. Between 1807 and 1809 timber imports from Prince Edward Island increased tenfold.

The shipbuilding connections between Bideford and Prince Edward Island were to have an impact on emigration from North Devon in the 1820s and 1830s. Bideford shipbuilder and timber merchant Thomas Burnard, together with his brother-in-law, Moses Chanter, acquired property on Prince Edward Island and many ships were built at the yard they established there. Burnard and his nephew, Thomas Burnard Chanter, made frequent trips between Bideford and Prince Edward Island and, by 1829, the company was advertising for passengers. These early advertisements in local newspapers extolled the quality of the passage but made no attempt to entice emigrants with promises of land or wealth at their destination. Between 1829 and the early

15 The yard opened in 1818.
16 See, for example, Figure 6.3 from North Devon Journal 18 February page 1 column e also North Devon Journal 22 Feb 1849 page 1 column b and 19 April 1849 page 1 column c.
1840s, when his interest in passenger carrying waned, 2250 emigrants, including some from the areas under investigation here, left on Chanter’s ships. Emigration from Bideford to Prince Edward Island continued under the auspices of James Yeo, whose ships carried passengers westward from 1842 until the 1860s. Yeo had been born in Kilkhampton, Cornwall and established a carrier’s business between there and Bideford. He later worked for Burnard and emigrated to Prince Edward Island in 1819, where he set up his own ship building concern. James’ son, William, returned to Appledore and ran the Devon branch of Yeo’s business. Many of their passengers came from the area between Kilkhampton and Bideford, which had been so well known to James Yeo. The introduction of steam navigation on Lake Ontario, in 1817, and the opening up of the canal system, \(^{17}\) made travel easier and gradually the emigrants began to settle further west. In the 1840s, Cobourg, on the northern shore of Lake Ontario, became prominent as a port of entry, and many landed there before settling further inland.

**Figure 6.3 Advertisement for Passengers\(^ {18}\)**

The 1830s saw a concerted effort on the part of various strands of the English Methodist Church to evangelise Upper Canada, ‘the spiritual stimulus of Methodism encouraged many ministers of that and other crusading faiths to emigrate to the colonies.’ \(^ {19}\) The Methodist Seminary in Cobourg opened as early as 1831. Van Vugt, although speaking
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\(^{17}\) 363 miles of the Erie Canal opened in 1825, the Rideau Canal from Ottawa to Kingston in 1834 and the St. Lawrence canals were completed in 1855.

\(^{18}\) *North Devon Journal* 18 February page 1 column e

of the United States, commented, ‘It is likely that the great majority of emigrants from Dorset and Somerset to America were Methodists or some other kind of nonconformists, and that their religious convictions and associations were important for their migratory decisions and experiences.’ The same appears to have been true of Canada.

Many of those who crossed the Atlantic to the shipyards of Prince Edward Island and beyond were Bible Christians. Their need for support and ministry was quickly recognised and at the Bible Christian conference of August 1831, a decision was made to dispatch two missionaries to Canada. This resulted in Francis Metherell being sent to Prince Edward Island and John Glass to Cobourg. Glass lasted only a few months and was replaced by John Hicks Enyon. This set the pattern for rapidly expanding Bible Christian circuits in these areas and later emigrants were encouraged to settle in places where they could reinforce existing Bible Christian communities.

The departure of many residents from Kilkhampton and the surrounding district, under the protection of James Yeo, has already been mentioned. A great majority of these emigrants were affiliated to the Bible Christian Church. Kilkhampton Bible Christians were described as being ‘very fanatical’ and consisting ‘almost without exception of the lowest classes of society.’ The class bias indicated here is not borne out by investigations into the Bible Christians of the Shebbear circuit, where the fathers’ occupations, as given in the baptism register, suggest that many of the families were of higher social status than that of labourer. In 1832, the annual conference urged those members who formed part of the extended franchise under the terms of the Reform Act, to use their vote in support of sympathetic candidates; the suggestion being that there were a substantial number of church members of sufficient social status to have been

---


22 Wickes (1987) p. 73. A comparison between the fathers’ occupations given in the baptism register for Parkham and that for Shebbear Bible Christian circuit, for the period 1813-1825, reveals that 58.3% of the Anglican fathers were labourers, compared to 42.3% of the Bible Christians.
given the vote by this legislation.\textsuperscript{23} Certainly the Bible Christian emigrants, studied for the purposes of this research could not be described as being ‘of the lowest classes of society.’ \textsuperscript{24}

Emigration formed an important part of the Bible Christian way of life; in 1832 1.1% of their total membership left Britain. By the 1860s, emigration had reached such levels that it was having a detrimental effect on the Bible Christian following in this country. Not only were members of the church attracted by the prospect of helping to establish circuits abroad, many were meeting with hostility at home. An article in the \textit{North Devon Journal} entitled ‘A Case of Persecution’ described one such incident.\textsuperscript{25} In 1858, Sir James Hamlyn Williams of Clovelly Court forced the Bible Christians to cease using a barn at Dyke as their chapel. Although they had been meeting there for over twenty years, the congregation was compelled to close and a replacement chapel had to be built at Hartland.\textsuperscript{26} In 1862, Lady Elwes, the then owner of the Walland Carey estate, which included the Woolfardisworthy portion of Bucks Mills, was so incensed at the villagers’ flirtation with Methodism, that she arranged for Bucks Mills Anglican church to be built in the village. The intention being that, with an Anglican church on their doorstep, the residents of Bucks Mills would return to the fold of the established church. Gould writing of the earlier days of Methodism, in all its branches, was of the opinion that, in North Devon, ‘persecution was rife…. Its followers had not only to endure the scorn and derision of the populace, but not infrequently were subjected to personal violence for conscience sake.’\textsuperscript{27}

Victorian emigrants from North Devon appear to have chosen routes and destinations that were familiar to them, if only through oral traditions that persisted from the eighteenth century. They left because ‘a tradition of movement was now well established. … There were plenty of relatives in North America who wrote home encouraging letters and provided instructions and money and a feeling of not being

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{23} F. W. Bourne \textit{The Bible Christians: Their Origins and History 1815-1900} 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition Tentmaker Publications, Stoke on Trent (2004) p. 213.
\item \textsuperscript{24} The Anglican Visitation returns of 1821, quoted in Wickes (1987) p. 38.
\item \textsuperscript{25} \textit{North Devon Journal} 2 December 1858 page 8 column c.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Wickes (1987) p. 90.
\item \textsuperscript{27} John Gould Hayman, \textit{A History of Methodism in North Devon 1739 to 1898} Wesleyan Methodist Book Room, London (1898) p. 95
\end{itemize}
alone on the other side.\textsuperscript{28} Whereas earlier trans-Atlantic travellers had been motivated by economic pressures and were, in the main, not permanent emigrants, by the 1830s, individuals were influenced by other factors and were setting sail without intending to return. Exactly who some of these emigrants were, where they went and what prompted their moves will now be examined.

6.2 Emigration Examined

6.2.i How Many?: the extent and rates of emigration

Having provided a background against which to consider the emigration patterns of Victorian North Devonians, it is necessary to set specific emigrants from the study areas into this context. The data referring to emigrant numbers needs to be treated with some caution as additional individuals who disappear from the three settlements undoubtedly left the country. As has been stated above, internal migrations and deaths are easier to trace than emigrations; therefore the majority of those whose destinations have not been located almost certainly went abroad. Only those who have been recorded overseas within ten years of being enumerated in a study area have been categorised as known emigrants. There are individuals who appear in colonial records more than a decade after leaving a study area; although these are referred to, they have been classed as probable emigrants as it is uncertain whether or not they went abroad immediately following their residence in one of the three settlements.

Unless records such as shipping lists or family letters survive, it is not always possible to be confident whether a family group, who are found in a study area in one decade and who are together in another location ten years afterwards, all travelled together. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it has been assumed that they moved as a single group. It is, however, acknowledged that, especially in the case of emigration, an initial gateway migrant might be followed by other family members within a short space of time. Fortunately further evidence is sometimes available to provide a clearer picture of

\textsuperscript{28} Greenhill & Giffard (1975) p. 180.
emigrants’ travelling companions.

Between the census enumerations of 1841 and 1901, twelve\(^{29}\) residents are known to have left the village of Bucks Mills for overseas destinations. In addition, there are forty-five individuals recorded in a Bucks Mills census who cannot be traced in England or Wales in the subsequent enumeration and for whom no death or burial record has been found. The more unusual surnames belonging to many of these missing departees and persistent oral traditions for Bucks Mills, mean that it is possible to identify a likely destination\(^{30}\) for most of these forty-five people. The evidence is, however, not strong enough to conclusively place them in a new location within a decade of leaving the hamlet. On the basis of this less reliable evidence, it can be speculated that Bucks Mills provided an additional eight emigrants during the study period. Certainly these eight individuals did leave England but whether they did so directly after living in Bucks Mills cannot be verified.

\(^{29}\) Two of these, members of the Pennington family, are included in further analysis but did not form part of the original study sample. They were born in Bucks Mills after the 1851 census and left with their parents in 1857.

\(^{30}\) Both overseas and within the United Kingdom.
Emigrations from Bucks Mills took place in two waves, one in the 1830s and another in the 1850s; this can be explained by local events and pressures during these decades. The emigrants who left Bucks Mills during the ten years preceding the period of study have also been investigated. As research progressed, it became clear that emigrations from Bucks Mills peaked at this time and that an examination of those who had gone abroad prior to the study period would be valuable in order to establish whether the study sample emigrants were joining kin. The migration patterns of these earlier emigrants have also proved to be illuminating when exploring both the choice of destination and the motivations of those who left at a later date. The emigrants of the 1830s appear to have travelled on five different ships. All were linked by kinship, however, and all went to the same small area of what is now Ontario.

The first departee from Bucks Mills amongst the study sample was Samuel Avery Goodenough who was transported to Australia in 1848; a lone enforced migrant. In 1857, two parties of emigrants left Bucks Mills. One was James Braund, who settled permanently in New Zealand after several sea voyages to Australasia. It is highly likely that a sister, brother and niece accompanied him or followed shortly afterwards. A further sister married in Bucks Mills in 1864 and then disappears from the records; she too may have been an emigrant. The Penningtons, a family of nine, also left in this year, heading for Upper Canada. In 1870, Elias Slee married for the second time and took his bride, who was from Bucks Cross, to join other family members in Canada.

31 See Chapter 6.1.  
32 No emigrations have been positively identified between the establishment of the hamlet c.1810 and 1831. This is not surprising as James-Korany lists only forty four emigrants to British North America, leaving from Bideford, in the period 1825-1830. Margaret James-Korany, "'Blue Books' as Sources for Cornish Emigration History", in Philip Payton (ed.), Cornish Studies 1 University of Exeter Press, Exeter (1993) pp. 31-45 (p. 34).  
33 The province of Ontario was created in 1867 when Canada was confederated; before this date the area was known as Upper Canada. In this research, the term Ontario is sometimes used when speaking of emigrations that include those that may have taken place before the area was so called.  
34 The emigration experience of the Pennington family is described in Chapter 6.3.  
35 As there is no evidence that Mrs Slee ever lived in Bucks Mills she has not been included in Figure 6.3.
It is frustrating that so few of those who undoubtedly left Bulkworthy in order to emigrate have been conclusively located in their new homes. Only twenty one\textsuperscript{36} can be identified, although a further four have been found in a colonial destination more than ten years after their departure from Bulkworthy. All but two of these people moved during the first two decades of the study period, at which time many were leaving Bulkworthy and surrounding parishes in order to go overseas.\textsuperscript{37} It is likely that many of the 106 untraced Bulkworthy out-migrants of the 1840s and 1850s went abroad. The trace rate for Bulkworthy departees from 1861 onwards improves as the number of emigrants declines. With two exceptions, all the known emigrants from Bulkworthy and all those for whom the evidence is less secure, went to Ontario. Those who went elsewhere are Rebecca Heal, who married William Hooper just prior to her 1846

\textsuperscript{36} Two of these, members of the Martin family, are included in further analysis but did not form part of the original study sample. They were born in Bulkworthy after the 1851 census and left with their parents in 1857.

departure, and her brother John who accompanied her; they moved to Wisconsin.\textsuperscript{38}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure66}
\caption{Conduit Street - Emigration Rates 1841-1901}
\end{figure}

Twenty five certain emigrants from Conduit Street have been traced. Two families, nine Pethericks and three Normans, left Conduit Street in the 1850s; they were followed a decade later by the Wonnacotts. All of these emigrants went to destinations in Upper Canada. Those who left Hatherleigh later in the century travelled to America. They consisted of two migrants who left between 1871 and 1881 and a family of six who arrived in New York in the 1890s. It is very unlikely that these were the only people who went overseas from Conduit Street. Although the overall trace rate is greater for Conduit Street than Bulkworthy,\textsuperscript{39} both areas have the majority of their un-located departees disappearing in the first two decades of the study period, during which high levels of emigration occurred.

Plainly, with information that is unlikely to ever be complete, it is difficult to draw conclusions relating to overall rates of emigration. Detailed analysis of the occupations, ages, religious belief and emigration companions must be limited to those who can be

\textsuperscript{38} The emigration experiences of Rebecca Hooper and John Heal are described in Chapter 6.3.

\textsuperscript{39} Conduit Street 76.2\%, Bulkworthy 68.6\%. 
traced but there is nothing to suggest that these form an unrepresentative sample. What is important, for the purposes of this research, is the biographical detail that is available for those who can be shown to have left the country. Charlotte Erickson, when studying the experiences of American immigrants using a sample of letters, felt that she could ‘reach judgements about the entire population [of immigrants] from which these few case histories are drawn.’

It is by examining the emigration experience at an individual level that a clearer understanding of the nature of the people involved and their motivations for moving can be reached. The remainder of this chapter therefore concentrates on the emigrants who can be named and whose histories have been traced.

### 6.2.ii Where to?: emigrant destinations

Initially, one of the easiest ways to locate emigrants and their destinations was through use of online census indexes for Canada and the U.S.A. Unfortunately, English birthplaces recorded in these censuses are no more specific than ‘England’, which makes it difficult to positively identify those who have common names. There is no similar availability for Australia or New Zealand but various indices of birth, marriage and death can be accessed.

It must be acknowledged that these sources alone probably resulted in trace rates that were higher for emigrants to the U.S.A. and Canada than those to Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere. As explained in 6.1 above, the majority of those leaving North Devon, certainly those doing so from a North Devon port, were not travelling to Australasia. Although, following the use of online sources, the number moving to Australia and New Zealand may have been slightly under-represented, this has been partly addressed by other means. Much information has been forthcoming

---

41 This includes the 10 Bucks Mills emigrants of the 1830s and those known emigrants from all three areas for the period 1841-1901 (12 from Bucks Mills, 21 from Bulkworthy and 25 from Conduit Street).
following extensive enquiries via a large network of family historians. In this way, descendants of emigrants from the three study areas have been able to provide details of the emigrants’ lives overseas. This has far less geographical bias as genealogy is popular in all the former colonies; it does, however, favour emigrants who have living descendants. Although there are many more emigrants yet to be located, it is felt that the destinations of those who have been identified are representative of all emigrants from the study areas.

![Figure 6.7 Bucks Mills - Destinations of Known Emigrants 1831-1901](image)

The destinations of the twenty two individuals who left Bucks Mills between 1831 and 1901 have been investigated. The ‘immigrant’ to Australia was transported and therefore had no control over his destination, which was Port Philip. James Braund, who went to New Zealand, settled in Auckland; here he continued to follow his trade as mariner. Shipping records show that he had taken ships to Australia prior to his emigration. All of the twenty Canadian immigrants travelled to Upper Canada. Those who left during the 1830s went to either Port Hope or Cobourg, a settlement some ten miles further east. Elias Slee and his wife were to join them in Port Hope in 1870. The nine remaining immigrants to Canada, a single family, moved to Goderich, on the

---

44 For example, appeals for information were made in the journal and on the message board of Devon Family History Society, which has in excess of 5500 members, to 1400 members of a forum for those interested in Devonshire genealogy and at relevant conferences.

shores of Lake Huron. One of the probable emigrants from Bucks Mills was Henry Steer, who left for America with his newly-acquired wife\textsuperscript{46} in 1890. They were to reside briefly on the United States side of the Niagara Falls, on the southern shore of Lake Ontario. He is the only one of the Bucks Mills emigrants who appears to have had a change of heart, as he was back at Bucks Cross within two years. It is, of course, possible that he never intended to settle permanently.

\textbf{Figure 6.8 Bulkworthy - Destinations of Known Emigrants 1841-1901}

![Pie chart showing destinations of known emigrants from Bulkworthy 1841-1901 with 19 for Canada and 2 for USA.]

In 1846, recently married Rebecca Hooper, from Bulkworthy, her husband William\textsuperscript{47} and brother, John, were sent to Yorkville, Wisconsin, where William was to be working as a Bible Christian minister.\textsuperscript{48} Within four years, however, William and Rebecca had moved to Cobourg. As has been seen, apart from Rebecca Hooper and John Heal, all those who are known to have emigrated immediately following their residence in Bulkworthy made their way to Upper Canada. The recently widowed Susanna Newcombe and her children, the youngest of whom was eleven, went to Bowmanville, situated on Lake Ontario, between Cobourg and Port Hope. The Newcombes’ emigration differed from many in that they left, not from Bideford but from Liverpool.\textsuperscript{49} Liverpool was the principal port of emigration for those leaving England for North

\textsuperscript{46} She was not a Bucks Mills resident.
\textsuperscript{47} William Hooper does not form part of the study sample as there is no evidence that he actually lived in Bulkworthy.
America in the 1850s but it was not used by large numbers of North Devonians. It was viewed as a more luxurious route than some so this port of departure may be a reflection of the social status of the Newcombes. The Ching family settled further west, in Guelph. The six members of the Martin family, which included two children born after the 1851 census, who therefore were not part of the study sample, went to Caledon, Peel County, about thirty five miles north west of Toronto and Noah Quance entered a college in Toronto itself.

The destinations of the emigrants from Conduit Street fall into two distinct groups. Before 1871 the destination was again Upper Canada, with the Petherick Family going to Berlin and the Normans to Yarmouth, Elgin in the 1850s. This was followed by another family immigration to Delaware, Middlesex County in the next decade. These settlements were further to the south-west than those favoured by the Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy emigrants and were not on the shoreline of one of the lakes. Those who left Conduit Street later in the century went to the U.S.A., with two migrants arriving in Ohio between 1871 and 1881 and the Edwards family settling in New York in the 1890s.

---

51 The emigration experiences of the Ching family are described in Chapter 6.3.
52 The emigration experience of Noah Quance is described in Chapter 6.3.
53 Now known as Kitchener.
54 Two individuals are known to have emigrated, one was almost certainly accompanied by his wife.
In order to better understand the possible attractions of the emigrants’ destinations, it is necessary to know something of the areas in which they settled.\textsuperscript{55} In the early 1870s, recently widowered Samuel Cudmore, who was almost certainly accompanied by his brother, arrived in Cleveland, Ohio. Samuel and his brother, John, had been born in Sheepwash and it is known that other natives of Sheepwash had moved to this area in the 1850s. Following the American Civil War, industry in Cuyahoga County, of which Cleveland is part, had expanded, stimulating waves of immigration particularly from southern and eastern Europe. It may well have been this economic boom that prompted the Cudmores’ move; they were to become labourers in an area renowned for its iron and steel production.

Although Emmanuel Luxton’s father and grandfather were both thatchers, Emmanuel had worked as a machine maker for members of his extended family prior to his immigration to Chicago in 1880. It is not difficult to see the attraction of this area for Emmanuel. Nearby natural resources and its key position on the American railway network made Chicago an ideal centre for heavy industry. The appeal of this burgeoning city drew large numbers of immigrants, primarily from Germany, Scandinavia and Ireland; the 1870s and 1880s saw the population multiply tenfold. Elmer Riley wrote that, by 1880, ‘the chief characteristics of manufacturing in Chicago and the Vicinity have become well established, the peculiar effects of the Civil War have largely subsided, and industry, in the main, has recovered from the great depression following the panic of 1873.’\textsuperscript{56} This was this Chicago to which Luxton came.

\textsuperscript{55} Further information about some of these locations can be found in the case studies in Chapter 6.3.

\textsuperscript{56} Elmer A. Riley, \textit{The Development of Chicago and Vicinity as a Manufacturing Center Prior to 1880} Chicago (1911) p. 90.
Port Hope, previously known as Smith’s Creek, Bowmanville and Cobourg, are on the northern shoreline of Lake Ontario, some eighty miles from the city of Toronto. Emigrant, John Thompson, described the district as it was in 1819. He wrote of the agricultural possibilities and climate,

‘for here the Farmer can grow anything he pleases & with half the labour, I have seen all sorts of grain grown … they can grow Melons & squashes & cucumbers to a very great size so you may judge the heat, the Thermomiter stood at about one 100 in the shade, about the middle of July & at this time it has been as low as 25 in our room, not more than than three yards from the fire. This country chiefly consists of a light loamy soil & well watered, for fine springs are numerous, it is rather ridgy but cant be called mountainous … I considered that the Almighty made the climate & he had made the soil to suit it & he could make the cabages to grow. Every thing growes here with more vigour then in England.’

Fishing too was good, a particular attraction for former residents of Bucks Mills. ‘Back in the woods than here as our place is situated on the mouth of a creek on the Lake Ontario famous for fish chiefly salmon, since we came there has been 100 caught in one night.’

Thompson bemoaned the lack of an organised Methodist ministry, ‘this place or parts came to be almost unknown to any Preacher of the gospel we have not heard a

---

57 In 1819 the settlement was still known as Smith’s Creek.
Methodist Preacher since we left Montreal I believe many of the people would gladly set under the sound of a Methodist Preacher but they with us have not the opportunity, Bibles & other good Books seem to be scarce hear."\(^{60}\) As has been seen in Chapter 6.1, the reinforcement of the Bible Christian form of the Methodist Church was a key motivating factor for the immigrants to this area. The Bible Christian Movement encouraged female preachers and Mrs Susanna Newcombe, one of the Bulkworthy emigrants, was well known as a Bible Christian preacher.\(^{61}\) Leetooze describes Bowmanville as ‘the centre of Bible Christian activity in Ontario’\(^{62}\) and it is interesting to note that Bowmanville’s Bible Christian chapel, the largest in the circuit, was erected in 1857, the year that the Newcombe family arrived.

Caledon, Peel County, in present day Ontario, where the Martin family from Bulkworthy settled, was primarily a wheat growing area and thus suited to John Martin, who had a farming background. Many migrants had been attracted to Peel County in the 1840s and 1850s; the arrival of the railway at this time resulting in an economic boom, as the American market was opened up to the farmers of the area. Despite the depression of the 1860s, a result of over cultivation and unsustainable land prices in the face of falling yields,\(^{63}\) the Martin’s decision was made and they remained in Caledon. Although the Martins declared themselves to be Episcopalian Methodists in the census of 1881\(^{64}\) they had not settled in an area where their Bible Christian connections could be maintained. No evidence of any Bible Christian circuits has been found in Peel County.\(^{65}\)

What then of the destinations further west? Elgin County, not to be confused with Port Elgin on the shores of Lake Huron, was described, in 1831, by Margery McNicol, in a


\(^{61}\) The Bible Christian Magazine March 1854 p. 119.


\(^{64}\) 1881 census for Caledon, Cardwell, Ontario District 141 Sub-district D Division 3 Page Number 57 Household Number 284.

\(^{65}\) Leetooze (2005a).
letter to her brother in Scotland.

‘The wheat is mostly all cut in this quarter, and in most places is a very heavy crop. You may tell my sister & Donald McPhail her son, that I do not advise them to come to this country, but one thing I know is that when people once get themselves properly settled that they are much better off here than at home. I tell you that it goes very hard with people at first, particularly with those that have no pieces of money with them after settling. When we settled here, there was not a single tree cut down, but now I have eight acres clear, and that the very best of land. I got built a fine large house to live in. I have about four acres under Indian corn, pumpkins, potatoes, Kail and a variety of other things to tedious to be mentioned. Soon I intend to sow my wheat, from eight to nine acres…. The land costs about eleven shillings & threepence an acre and a few other little expences, but should he not take land, he would get 4/6 sterling per day & victuals which is no bad wages…. There are all denominations of preachers here, you may go and hear whomsoever you please, such as Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians & Roman Catholics if you choose.’

By the 1830s many west country immigrants were heading to Elgin County and Yarmouth, where the Normans from Conduit Street settled, was known to have a Bible Christian presence. As the name suggests, the area around Berlin was, from its founding in the 1790s, largely occupied by German immigrants. It had particular appeal to Mennonite settlers; ‘the German language of the Mennonites and their tolerance for other religions and cultures attracted many German-speaking immigrants.’ 1856 saw the opening up of this area with the establishment of the Grand Trunk Railway and it was in this year that the Petherick family arrived from Conduit Street. From then onwards the area industrialised rapidly and John Petherick, a shoemaker, may have been attracted by the flourishing tanneries in the locality.

Delaware, on the Thames River, grew up about the same time as Berlin. It is some five miles south of London, which was originally designated as Upper Canada’s capital. Rebellions in the 1830s resulted in London becoming a garrison town and industrial

---

67 Leetooze (2005a) p. 147.
boom followed the coming of the railway in 1853. A few years later the area suffered an economic depression but the American Civil War enabled London to prosper. Its surrounding fertile hinterland, of which Delaware was a part, supplied grain for the Unionist troops and the locality was once again prospering when the Wonnacott family from Conduit Street arrived in 1869.\(^69\) Emmanuel Wonnacott had been a farmer before emigration so this locality would have had its appeal. Another attraction may well have been the Bible Christian presence in Delaware, as the Wonnacotts were adherents. Thorne wrote of Bible Christian migrants, ‘when members moved anywhere in North West Devon they probably found a Bible Christian chapel within easy reach of their new home;’\(^70\) many of those travelling overseas attempted to ensure that, there too, their spiritual needs would be catered for.

6.2.iii Who were they?

Having discussed the number of emigrants involved and their destinations, it is now necessary to examine these individuals in more detail, considering their occupation, age at departure, migration companions and religious beliefs.


When looking at the occupations of those who emigrated, it is important to set this in the context of the occupational structures of the settlements from which they came. For example, in 1841, 48.5% of those in Bucks Mills who were enumerated with an occupation were agricultural labourers. Although this percentage did decrease later in the period of study, it was compensated for by an increase in fishermen. This change is almost certainly due to the fact that most inhabitants were both fishermen and agricultural labourers; the taking of the 1841 census in June, rather than March or April, may account for the differences.

Of the adult males who left Bucks Mills between 1831 and 1901, four were sailors or mariners, three were millers and the occupations of gardener and agricultural labourer were both represented by one individual. The four wives who accompanied these men were the daughters of a miller, two yeoman farmers and an agricultural labourer. The one male emigrant of a lower social status, Samuel Goodenough, the farm labourer, was the transportee; thus the voluntary emigrants were not poor agricultural workers seeking land and new opportunities. This contrasts with Hitch’s Fowlmere emigrants of the

---

71 See Chapter 2.3.ii.
1850s, 78.4% of whom were agricultural labourers.\(^{72}\) The class profile of the Bucks Mills emigrants does not reflect that of the settlement as a whole. The fact that so many emigrants were seamen may suggest that those possessing maritime confidence and a sense of adventure were more likely to embark upon a long sea journey. As Hitch found, emigrants appear to have been ‘amongst the most active and forward looking people in the village.’\(^{73}\)

**Figure 6.12 Bulkworthy - Occupations of Emigrants 1841-1901**

As is the case in Bucks Mills, the occupational profile of the identified Bulkworthy emigrants is not representative of that of the parish as a whole. More than a third of all Bulkworthy residents in the study period, with stated occupations, were agricultural labourers. A farmer and two farmer’s sons are amongst the known Bulkworthy emigrants and the widow and two wives who left Bulkworthy were all the daughters of farmers. Only one agricultural labourer, John Martin, has been identified amongst the


\(^{73}\) Hitch (2002) p. 89.
Bulkworthy emigrants. There are, of course, the large number of unlocated departees from Bulkworthy to consider. Figure 6.12 shows that the occupations of those 1851 residents who have been located in 1861 are not proportional to the occupational profile of all 1851 departees. Those who cannot be found in 1861 include fewer agricultural labourers than might be expected. 73.1% of the agricultural labourers have been traced compared to 61.8% of the total population with stated occupations. It is the tradesmen and domestic servants who disappear from the records in disproportionately high numbers; with only 50% of domestic servants and 57.9% of tradesmen and craftsmen being located.

Figure 6.13 Bulkworthy - Located and Unlocated Residents with Stated Occupations in 1851
Thus, Baines’ belief that emigrants tended to be tradesmen and farmers rather than labourers is borne out in both Bucks Mills and Bulkworthy. It was not, according to Baines, until the end of the nineteenth century that large numbers of unskilled labourers emigrated. On this basis, emigrants from North Devon might be expected to be higher in status at the beginning of the study period. The very small number of emigrants from these two study areas after 1871 makes it impossible to comment on whether the number of lower status emigrants increased, in the way Baines suggests, as the nineteenth century progressed. Although an exhaustive search of newspaper advertisements encouraging emigration has not been carried out, those that have been discovered show that, by the end of the study period, the economic benefits of emigration are more likely to be stressed, with sub-headings such as ‘free grants of land’ and ‘money bonuses given’.

Figure 6.14 Conduit Street - Occupations of Emigrants 1841-1901

Only in Conduit Street does the emigrants’ occupational profile resemble that of all residents of the street. Here a variety of tradesmen are represented, along with a farmer and farm labourer. Two of the four accompanying wives from Conduit Street were the

---

75 Baines (1985) pp. 74-75.
76 The Bideford Gazette 8 March 1892 page 1 column f.
daughters of carpenters and the others had fathers who were an agricultural labourer and a brickyard labourer. Pooley and Turnbull comment that ‘longer distance migration was most likely to be undertaken by those with skills’ and this certainly seems to have been the case with those from Conduit Street.

**Age**

![Figure 6.15 The Ages of the Emigrants](image)

Smout, researching nineteenth and twentieth century Scottish emigrants, found that ‘it was the youngest and most reproductive who found the situation intolerable: the old were content to stay.’ This proved to be the case in the three settlements with 63.6% of all those from Bucks Mills, 78.9% from Bulkworthy and 72% of those from Conduit Street being under the age of thirty on emigration.

**Emigration Companions**

The kinship links between the emigrants from the study areas and those who were

---


already at their destination will be discussed below.\textsuperscript{79} Here the kin who accompanied the emigrant at the time of departure are considered.

**Figure 6.16 The Emigration Companions of the Emigrants\textsuperscript{80}**

As can be seen, nearly all the emigrants from the study areas moved as part of a family group; only one emigrant from Bulkworthy and one from Conduit Street travelled alone. Five of the twenty two emigrants from Bucks Mills appear to have travelled as individuals, without attendant close kin. These are the transported Samuel Goodenough, James Braund who went to New Zealand and the three earliest emigrants to Canada, one of whom was joining relatives who had already made the journey. Travelling without kin did not necessarily mean that kinship was not a factor in an emigration and family links at the emigrants’ destinations are examined in Chapter 6.2.iv.

Baines found that the family emigrations of the mid nineteenth century changed to

\textsuperscript{79} See Chapter 6.2.iv and 6.3.

\textsuperscript{80} Three Bucks Mills migrants have been classed as travelling as a married couple. One is Elias Slee who travelled with his wife who was not a Bucks Mills resident. James and Sarah Elliott travelled as a couple and may or may not have been accompanied by other members of their family.
individual emigrations once improved transport links made the possibility of returning more practical. He also cites the changing economic conditions in the receiving countries as a factor.\textsuperscript{81} Again the small sample size makes it difficult to discern this pattern amongst the emigrants from the three settlements. The shift in chosen location from rural to more urban environments, detectable amongst the Conduit Street emigrants later in the study period, may suggest that economic conditions were having a greater impact by this time.

\textit{Religion}

In order to establish the religious affinity of the emigrants, various sources have been consulted. These include the Canadian census returns, which show denomination, the baptism records both for the emigrant themselves and for their children, and obituaries. Family legend may often recall religious preference but this alone was not considered to be sufficient to assign a religious group to an individual.

\textbf{Figure 6.17 The Religious Denomination of the Emigrants}

Shepperson wrote that, ‘probably more Nonconformists emigrated during the middle

\textsuperscript{81} Baines (1985) p. 33.
years of the nineteenth century than persons from the Anglican and Catholic faiths combined.\(^82\) and this is certainly the case with those in the study sample. Almost all the emigrants from the three study areas, and all of those going to Canada, were affiliated to the Bible Christian Church. It is important to set this within the context of patterns of worship in the sending settlements.\(^83\) The attendances recorded in the 1851 religious census have been used for this purpose. This is not completely satisfactory as a method of assessing religious adherence, particularly for Bucks Mills, for whom the Parkham and Woolfardisworthy returns have been used. It does nonetheless give an overview of the possibilities for worship within the settlements at the height of the emigration period.

The Quarterly Meeting Minute Book for Shebbear Bible Christian Circuit survives for the years 1832-1853.\(^84\) This gives lists of members of each Bible Christian congregation within the circuit, including those on trial but these figures do not reflect the influence of Bible Christianity in the area, as many attended services without being classified as members. For example, 102 people were present at the afternoon service\(^85\) at the Bethel Bible Christian Chapel in Haytown, Bulkworthy in March 1851\(^86\) yet the minute book records only twenty two members for that quarter. From 1840 onwards, the number of members emigrating is also listed for each quarter, however, these too refer to full members only, thus under-representing the extent of Bible Christian emigration.

\(^{82}\) Shepperson (1957) p. 133.
\(^{83}\) See also Chapter 2.2.
\(^{84}\) The book for 1854-1876 is missing.
\(^{85}\) Eighty people had attended in the morning.
Both Anglicanism and Wesleyan Methodism had strong followings in the parishes of Parkham and Woolfardisworthy although this was not necessarily the situation in Bucks Mills itself. The Bible Christian Chapels at Dyke and Woolfardisworthy, those closest to Bucks Mills, recorded a total of fifty seven members between them in 1836.\textsuperscript{88} The 1851 census lists 348 attendances for these two chapels\textsuperscript{89} so, like Bulkworthy, it seems that attendance levels far outweighed membership. In Bucks Mills, almost all the families were content to baptise their children within the Church of England. By the 1870s, the Wesleyan Methodist Church had enough support within the village for a new chapel to be erected, however, the emigrations of the first half of the nineteenth century had left the hamlet with very few remaining adherents of Bible Christianity by 1851.

As in 1851 96\% of all Bulkworthy attendances\textsuperscript{90} were at the Bible Christian Chapel, it is hardly surprising that all Bulkworthy’s known emigrants were Bible Christians. It must be said, however, that Anglicans living in Bulkworthy may have worshipped at the

\textsuperscript{87} The figures for Bucks Mills include attendances at Woolfardisworthy, Parkham and Dyke Chapel, Upper Clovelly, all of which were used by Bucks Mills residents.
\textsuperscript{88} After this date these chapels transferred to the Kilkhampton Circuit and their minute books have not been located.
\textsuperscript{89} Wickes (1990) p. 139.
\textsuperscript{90} Wickes (1990) p. 136.
parent church in Buckland Brewer rather than in Bulkworthy itself and therefore the Church of England was probably better supported than these attendance figures suggest. Only 6.2% of Hatherleigh church attendances in 1851 were at the Bible Christian Chapel, yet all the emigrants from Conduit Street whose religious affiliation has been identified, were Bible Christians. In all three settlements, the percentage of known emigrants who were Bible Christian exceeds that which might be expected from the worshipping patterns of 1851.

Shepperson believed that the propensity to migrate was greater amongst those from a nonconformist background because dissenters ‘were especially susceptible to the blandishments of agents who outlined the remarkable wealth yet the social equality, the religious enthusiasm yet the theological freedom, to be found in America.’ Although he does not develop the idea, Baines commented that ‘many of the migrations from the German states in the 1830s and from Scandinavia in the 1850s were connected with Pietist religious movements.’ Pietist theology is seen as one of the precursors of Methodism and it may be, as Shepperson suggests, that there was something about the mind set of those who subscribed to such beliefs that made them more likely to emigrate and this will be discussed further in Chapter 7. The Bible Christians who emigrated from the three settlements did so in extended family groups and it is important to examine the kinship links of these emigrants more closely.

6.2.iv Emigrants’ kinship links within the receiving settlements

Erickson found that, ‘in spite of the want of a central economic function for the family, its vitality was strong enough …. to carry the main responsibility for the movement of people from England and Scotland to agricultural areas in America’ and the role of the extended family is key to many of the emigrations from the three settlements. The patriarchal and matriarchal genealogies of the known migrants were researched in order to establish whether they were joining family members in their new country, or if they

\[91\] Shepperson (1957) p. 6.
\[92\] Baines (1985) p. 29.
\[94\] Erickson (1972) p. 38.
were accompanied by or followed by kin. Any assessment of kinship ties will represent
the minimum number of connections for that emigrant as there may well have been
additional links that have not been traced.

With the exception of the transportee, all those who emigrated from Bucks Mills
between 1831 and 1901 went with, were preceded by or were followed by, members of
their extended family. Apart from the children travelling with their parents, the
emigrants were usually joining, or were joined by, family members of the same
generation. Frequently this was a sibling, or siblings, but there were also two brothers
who followed their first cousin to Canada. In almost every instance, the new arrivals
settled, at least initially, in the same town as their relatives who had already emigrated.
In two cases the newcomers went to the adjacent town. As this was within ten miles of
the kin who were already in residence, it is likely that they would have been close
enough to offer support and the presence of family within the vicinity may well have
had a part to play in the choice of destination.

---

95 In fact, the brother of the transportee was also transported, ten years later but presumably this
was not a deliberate attempt to join kin.
James Braund was the first known emigrant from Bucks Mills to go to New Zealand. James Braund had certainly sailed to Australasia on previous occasions and had no doubt made contacts prior to permanent emigration. James had been hired by an entrepreneurial Bideford shoemaker, who had built up a business sending shoes and boots to the Australian goldfields. James had probably been making trips to the other side of the world for a decade before his emigration. Henry Steer, a probable emigrant as it is not certain whether he went to America immediately after living in Bucks Mills, travelled to the Niagara Falls region of the United States with his wife, Clara Pennington from Bucks Cross. Three of Henry’s maternal uncles and one paternal uncle were mariners. One of these, John Steer, had emigrated to Australia but Henry’s immediate family had no history of trans-Atlantic emigration prior to his departure. This may have had a bearing on his length of stay; he remained abroad for only two years.

James-Korany found evidence for ‘networking in progress between areas of Cornwall

---

96 Henry Steer is a probable emigrant as it is not certain whether he went to America immediately after living in Bucks Mills.
97 No connection has been found between Clara Pennington and the Pennington family who emigrated to Ontario and who are featured in Chapter 6.3.
98 His mother was Jane Saunders before marriage.
and patches of immigration into Canada through kinship and neighbourhood contacts. In this way, the emigrants to Port Hope formed part of an intricate network of kin who left Bucks Mills and the surrounding area during the nineteenth century. It is only by looking at emigrants from villages in the vicinity of Bucks Mills that the true complexity of this network can be appreciated. The extended kinship web involves members of several interrelated families, all of whom originated in Bucks Mills itself or a parish within a five mile radius. Eleven of the Bucks Mills’ emigrants to Canada, who have been considered in this chapter, form part of this web. Appendix 1 shows that virtually all of these emigrants in this extended family network, belonged to the Bible Christian Church. It is interesting to note that James-Korany’s comment relates to emigrants from Padstow, a port that attracted emigrants from north-eastern Cornwall where Bible Christianity flourished. Membership of this denomination, amongst those appearing in Appendix 1, is almost certainly understated as some of the emigrants could not be located in a Canadian census that designated their religion. The extent to which kinship links and religious affiliation appear to have provided motivation for emigration will be considered below.

---

100 The network includes members of the Braund, Elliott, Oke, Cory, Dark, Found, Pennington, Prouse, Palmer and White families. A family tree illustrating these links can be found in the Appendix.
102 See Chapter 6.4.
Only one known Bulkworthy emigrant did not travel as part of a family group and that was Noah Quance, who was joining his older brother. Rebecca Hopper née Heal and her brother John travelled together with Rebecca’s husband William. Although they have not been positively identified, it is very likely that other Hoppers and Heals who can be found in the areas where Rebecca and John settled are related. The Chings were travelling to join William’s aunt and her husband and the Newcombes were paving the way for other member of their family to follow. Hitch, researching emigrants from Cambridgeshire to Australia found similar evidence of chains of family movements. He found that, of thirty seven people who left Fowlmere, five had no links, five were pioneer emigrants and the remaining twenty seven were joining relatives.\(^{103}\)

\(^{103}\) Hitch (2002) p. 93.
The situation in Conduit Street was rather different. Although only one individual appears to have travelled without the company of kin, these emigrants do not seem to be part of a chain migration of extended family members. Instead, those leaving Conduit Street did so as separate family groups, heading for locations where there were no relations already present. This is not to say that they did not know anyone at their destination and it is likely that their new locations contained residents to whom the new emigrants were connected by faith or former home, if not by family ties.

Having discussed the destinations, age, occupation, migration companions and kinship links of the emigrants, it is now necessary to put these elements together in an examination of individual emigrants. Halfacree and Boyle stated that ‘histories must be accompanied by the additional emphasis of demonstrating how the migration fits into the person’s whole life’\textsuperscript{104} and this is the purpose of the following section.

6.3 Emigrants Examined: case studies

In order to gain a greater understanding of the processes of, and motivations for, emigration, the lives of some of the individuals involved have been studied in more detail. It is thus possible to reflect upon the emigration experiences of some of those who left the three settlements and to set these within a wider context.

William Braund and the Elliott Family

William Braund was born in 1805 in the parish of Woolfardisworthy. It is not possible to be sure whether or not he was born in the village of Bucks Mills itself but his parents had certainly moved there by the time William was nine years old; his family was one of the first to settle in the hamlet. The Braunds were a sea-going family and William’s father, Joseph, four brothers and at least fifteen of his eighteen nephews were fishermen or sailors. Although William himself emigrated too early to form part of the study sample, his experiences have been found to be key to the emigrations of those who followed and a more detailed examination of his life has served to illuminate the picture of emigration from Bucks Mills during the period of study.

Figure 6.22 William Braund 1805-1890

Photograph used with the permission of Joan Beck.
William went to sea in boyhood; two of his brothers were certainly at sea by the age of eleven\textsuperscript{106} and there is no reason to suppose that William’s working life would have begun any later. In 1831, William married Harriet Elliott. The Elliott family hold a pivotal position in the emigration patterns of those leaving Bucks Mills and the surrounding area.\textsuperscript{107} Harriett was the youngest child of James and Catherine Elliott née Adams. The family came from Eastcott Farm in Morwenstow, Cornwall, an area that played a noteworthy part in the development of the Bible Christian Church from its earliest days. The Chapel and ‘Preacher’s Cottage’ are situated opposite Eastcott Farm. Harriet’s father was, at the time of his death in 1826 a miller at Gooseham Mill in Morwenstow and three of Harriet’s brothers followed the same profession. It was, almost certainly, after the death of their father that John, Henry and Harriet Elliott moved to Bucks Mills, the birthplace of John’s wife Agnes née Dark. Initially they settled at The Coffin Arms, which was being run by Agnes’ sister and her husband, but, within a year, John and Henry were working the mill at Bucks Mills.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Eastcott_Farm_Morwenstow.jpg}
\caption{Eastcott Farm, Morwenstow}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{106} Seamen’s Ticket for Thomas Braund and Master’s Certificate of Service for James Braund.
\textsuperscript{107} See the Appendix.
The Elliotts and these Braunds were Bible Christians and formed part of the early emigrations to Port Hope, in what was then Upper Canada. Henry Elliott is known to have left Bideford on 4th May 1831, as one of sixty one passengers on the Bollina, owned by William Grigg of Appledore; his journey took five weeks. Henry was to marry a girl from North Devon on arrival in Canada. John Elliott, it seems, emigrated with his wife and son between 1832 and 1835. William and Harriet Braund née Elliott followed with their two children in 1836; in the same year another brother, James Elliott, emigrated with his wife. Their mother, the widowed Mrs Catherine Elliott, also went to Canada but it is uncertain which of her children she accompanied.

Initially the Elliotts and the Braunds all settled in Port Hope, although, by 1840, Henry had moved twenty five miles further west to Hampton, where he founded Elliott’s Mill. John and James Elliott and William Braund were to remain in Port Hope. The families continued their affiliation to the Bible Christian Church, with James Elliott’s son,

108 Although James’ wife was born in Woolfardisworthy, there is no evidence that she, James, or his mother, ever lived in Bucks Mills. They do not therefore, form part of this study.
Joshua, becoming a Bible Christian preacher. There are several reasons why Bible Christians may have been motivated to go to Canada. Their formal missionary work there, initially centred on Cobourg and Prince Edward Island, commenced in 1831. This was partly in response to the demand from earlier Bible Christian emigrants, who felt the need for ministerial support and the establishment of formal circuits. Many of these emigrants originated from the borders of north-west Devon and north-east Cornwall where Bible Christianity had taken a firm hold. Henry Elliott, the pioneer migrant of this group, went to Canada a few months before the Bible Christian ministry commenced with the appointment of Francis Metherell. It is likely that Henry was taking advantage of the opportunities provided by the transatlantic voyages of the ship owners of Bideford such as Burnard, Chanter and Yeo.  

Figure 6.25 William Braund’s home at Port Hope

According to family legend, William sailed his own boat to Port Hope; although possible, this seems unlikely. What is known is that William, once in Canada, was a man of some substance; he set himself up as a ship’s captain on Lake Ontario and

---

109 See Chapter 6.1.
110 Photograph used with the permission of Joan Beck.
111 Information from the late Bertrand Baulch, great great grandson of William.
owned several vessels. The tradition amongst William’s descendants is that he came to Canada to ‘retire’, bringing with him a hoard of gold that he hid under the floor boards. This sounds highly implausible. William was, however, able to finance the purchase of ships and build three houses. An article in *The Kingston Daily News* of 22\textsuperscript{nd} March 1858, described his schooner, Sarah, as being the first vessel to enter the newly built harbour at Port Hope. ‘The Sarah is owned and commanded by Captain Braund, the first salt water sailor that settled in Port Hope.’ The article goes on to describe Captain Braund as having been ‘upwards of 40 years a navigator on Lake Ontario’.\textsuperscript{112} Although William had been a seaman for more than forty years, he had only been in Canada for twenty two of them, so there is some distortion of the facts here.

What is significant for this study is that the Elliott brothers and William were all somewhat higher than labouring status and had specific occupational skills that they took with them to their new country. This seems to be the case with almost all the emigrants from Bucks Mills. Although, as stated in Chapter 2.2.i., many of the Braunds who remained in Bucks Mills were described as possessing ‘very little mental culture, and no moral instruction’,\textsuperscript{113} William was a staunch Bible Christian until his death, as were all his fellow emigrants who left Bucks Mills for Canada. The move to Port Hope was clearly part of the relocation of an extended family network. Not only did William’s mother-in-law and three brothers-in-law settle in the area, but the two John Braunds in the district were William’s first cousin and brother. Whilst the gateway emigrant, Henry Elliot, may have been motivated by business opportunities in William’s case both faith and family formed motivations for emigration and were influential in his choice of destination.

*The Pennington Family*

William Pennington grew up in Clovelly, where his father worked the 175 acre Downland Farm. By the 1820s, the family were affiliated to the Bible Christian church and William’s younger siblings were baptised in the Shebbear circuit. In 1838, at the age of twenty two, William married Mary Hamlyn, the daughter of another Clovelly farmer.

\textsuperscript{112} *The Kingston Daily News* 22 March 1858 page 2.
The Hamlyn’s farm, at Stitaford, was substantial, some 400 acres. William and Mary Pennington moved to Bucks Mills about 1840 and, initially, William worked as a butcher, which was the trade of some members of his mother’s family. The 1841 census records William, Mary and their son Thomas, living at the Old Mill in Bucks Mills. At this point, William was described as a butcher and the co-resident miller was sixteen year old Thomas Hamlyn. Thomas Hamlyn and William Pennington were first cousins on their mothers’ sides. It has not been possible to make a definite connection between the families of Thomas Hamlyn and Mary Pennington née Hamlyn, although there almost certainly was one.

Figure 6.26 The Old Mill, Bucks Mills

The following year, William described himself as a miller and he remained in this occupation for the rest of his life, as did two of his sons. In 1851, William’s younger brother, Oliver, emigrated from Clovelly to Colborne, Huron County, Upper Canada, with his newly acquired wife. In 1857, William took his wife and six surviving children and settled slightly further south in Goderich. Goderich, one of two ports on the Lake

---

114 The millwheel itself is housed in the first, white, building on the left. The miller’s home is next door.
115 Kilkhampton Bible Christian Circuit baptism register, transcribed by Sheila Townsend.
116 Not to be confused with Colborne near Port Hope.
Huron shoreline, was in ‘the most agriculturally productive county in Ontario.’\textsuperscript{117} The first serious settlement of this area began in 1827, under the auspices of The Canada Company and many settlers arrived during the 1830s. A Canada Company Bill advertised land for between 7/6 and 25/- an acre, available in the Huron Tract. The ‘principal town’ of Goderich is particularly noted, as are the twelve grist mills.\textsuperscript{118}

**Figure 6.27 John Pennington 1845-1942**

By 1871, both William and Oliver Pennington were living further north, in Ashfield, although William’s son, another Oliver, remained as a miller in Goderich. William ‘owned two mills a few miles apart, one a wind-mill at which they ground feed, the other a water power mill which was better for grinding flour because of its steadier power.’\textsuperscript{119} Thus, like the Elliotts and Braunds, the Penningtons were not of labouring status.

Although the Penningtons left rather later than many Bible Christian emigrants from Bucks Mills, 1857 was a peak year for Bible Christian emigrations from elsewhere\textsuperscript{120} and it seems that their faith was not an insignificant motivation for their departure. Not only did they continue their membership of the denomination, but they settled in an area

\textsuperscript{117} <<www.hurontourism.on.ca>> Huron Tourism Association accessed 12 March 2006.
\textsuperscript{119} Undated article c. 1943 from *The Grant County Herald*, Elbow Lake, Minnesota,. The obituary for William’s son John.
\textsuperscript{120} Wickes (1987) p. 56.
where the Bible Christians were flourishing; a chapel being established in Colborne in 1857. It is also significant that the 1850s were a time when landowners in the vicinity of Bucks Mills were hostile to Methodism in all its forms. Lady Elwes, owner of the Walland Carey estate upon which the Old Mill lay, was no exception. As a miller, neither maritime trades, nor the acquisition of farm land, seem to have influenced William Pennington’s decision to migrate. Nevertheless, the fact that his new home was a flourishing agricultural area clearly had advantages for a miller, thus business opportunities may have played a part, alongside the opportunity to support the Bible Christian cause overseas.

The Ching family
William Ching was born in Bradworthy, about six miles west of Bulkworthy, on 4th April 1819. His parents, William and Ann, farmed the 212 acres of Atworthy Farm, where a Bible Christian Chapel was erected in 1836. William’s mother had been Ann Cottle before her marriage; the Cottle family being one of the first to espouse Bible Christianity. William Ching’s aunt, Mary Cottle, married William Reed, who was a leading Bible Christian preacher and who became president of the Bible Christian Conference on four occasions.

Figure 6.28 Stowford Farm, Bulkworthy

121 Wickes (1990) p. 140.
In 1841, William Ching married Mary Ann Walter in Bradworthy and the couple moved to Stowford Farm in Bulkworthy. With 300 acres this farm, like Atworthy, was large by the standards of the time. William was a key member of the Shebbear Bible Christian Circuit, of which the Chapel at Haytown, Bulkworthy was a part. In 1850 William was appointed Circuit Steward, a position of some importance requiring a good standard of literacy.\textsuperscript{122}

**Figure 6.29 Shebbear Bible Christian Circuit’ Minutes for 1850, showing the appointment of William Ching as Circuit Steward**

The following year, the Chings, William, Mary Ann and their three surviving children, left Appledore on the 600 ton barque, The Secret. The Secret was owned by Richard Heard, a Bideford timber merchant. Heard’s three ships regularly advertised for passengers, assuring them that, ‘every accommodation possible will be given to the passengers, and no expense spared to make them comfortable during the voyage.’\textsuperscript{123} It is

\textsuperscript{122} Quarterly Meeting Minute Book and Accounts 1832-1853 Shebbear Bible Christian Circuit B607/1, held at North Devon Record Office.

\textsuperscript{123} *North Devon Journal* 22 February 1849 page 2 column b.
fortunate that a ledger has survived that records the emigration details of the family and also hints at their reasons for moving.

‘Wm & Mary Ann Ching with their three children Wm, Mary Ann & Richd Walter left Appledore, Devon, Old England on the 19th of August 1851 and arrived at Quebec on the 29th of Sept. Left Quebec on the 1st of Oct and arrived Hamilton on the 4th left Hamilton on the 6th and arrived at Guelph at Uncle Henry Heards on the 7th all in good health Praise the Lord for all his Mercies. O may our coming to Canada be beneficial to both our bodys and Souls. Amen.’

This short extract shows that the Chings were joining Henry Heard, who was the husband of William’s aunt, Salome Ching. It has not been possible to link Henry Heard with Richard Heard, in whose ship they travelled. If there is a family connection is is more distant than that of the third degree and therefore very unlikely to have provided any motivation for the move. Later entries in the ledger show that family ties with England were maintained over many years. William deposited money in a Devon bank in Holsworthy until the time of his death, in 1881. The ledger records regular payments, customarily £17 a year, being sent to the family in Bradworthy from 1860-1874. When William’s mother died in 1874, more than twenty years after their emigration, William sent money to his brother in law to help pay for the funeral. Thus not only did the Chings have family support on arrival in Guelph, but they maintained links with and clearly felt a responsibility towards, their family remaining in England.

124 Ledger of William and Mary Ann Ching, in private hands.
The ledger also suggests that they hoped for spiritual fulfilment as a result of their move. Despite the implied religious motive for emigration and William’s status within the Bible Christian Church in England, there was no chapel in Guelph Township and indeed none in Wellington County until 1874. In 1858, the Ching family appear on the list of members for nearby Rockwood Wesleyan Methodist Church. The census return of 1871 and his 1881 death certificate, record William’s denomination as Episcopalian Methodist, one that was very similar to Bible Christianity.

---

125 Used with the permission of Barry McKeowan.
126 Leetooze (2005a) p. 192.
Guelph, where the Chings settled, was opened up by John Galt, on behalf of the Canada Company, in 1827. Many of the early settlers were, like Galt, Scots. A predominantly rural area, Guelph did not achieve the status of a town until 1855, four years after the arrival of the Chings, and the railway linking it to Toronto did not arrive until the following year. The Chings were living in a hamlet known as Eramosa and it may be that William was running the saw mill that was sited there.\textsuperscript{130} William held a position of some importance in the area as, in 1865, he was appointed as a trustee of what was to become Rockwood Academy.\textsuperscript{131}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{mary_ann_ching_junior.png}
\caption{Mary Ann Ching junior\textsuperscript{129}}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{129} Photograph used with the permission of Barry McKeowan.
\textsuperscript{130} 1861 census for Eramosa, Wellington County, Upper Canada C1082.
\textsuperscript{131} Day (1953) p. 34.
After almost twenty years in Guelph, the Chings moved to nearby Erin Township. At both Canadian locations, William continued to farm, although his ledger suggests that he was also involved in the buying and selling of timber. He acquired land in both Canada and the United States; his son, William, farmed the family holdings in Michigan. As an employer of seven men, both when in Bulkworthy and in Ontario, William senior was far from being an impoverished labourer. Although he worked on the land, he had a substantial farm in England so it seems that this was not the main incentive for his emigration. Although faith, as well as family connections, appear to have prompted the Ching exodus, it was, in their case, the presence of family, rather than the availability of a Bible Christian congregation, that influenced their destination.

**Noah Quance**

Noah Quance was born on 20th September 1855 in Buckland Brewer, where the family lived close to Thornhillhead Bible Christian Chapel. Noah’s father, William, was a shoemaker and Noah took up the same trade. During the 1860s the family moved to David’s Hill in Bulkworthy. In 1869, Noah’s elder brother, William, emigrated to Dereham, Oxford County, Ontario whereupon he was taken on probation for the Bible Christian Ministry. William was not the first member of the family to move to Ontario, his maternal aunt, Jane Hopper, was living in Baltimore with her husband Robert Harstone, as early as 1850. Baltimore was less than ten miles from Port Hope, so Jane had immigrated to an area that was very popular with North Devonians, particularly those affiliated to the Bible Christian Church. Jane appears to have emigrated as an unmarried woman so it is likely that she travelled with members of her extended family who have yet to be identified.

133 Leetooze (2005a) p. 201.
Noah was to follow his aunt and brother to Canada in 1875. It is not known where Noah received his early schooling; anything beyond a Sunday School education seems unlikely. Once in Canada, however, Noah became a student in Toronto, acquired both a B.A. and an M.A. and took up a post as a teacher of modern languages at the prestigious St Thomas’ Collegiate Institute in Elgin.\textsuperscript{134} Noah went on to become principal of St Thomas’ Collegiate Institute and, in 1901, was earning $1500 a year.\textsuperscript{135} He resigned his post in 1910, following two debates about his suitability for the role, in which he just managed to secure the support of the majority of the trustees.\textsuperscript{136}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{134} 1881 census for St Patrick's Ward, Toronto, York, Film Number C-13247 District 134 Subdistrict H Division 2 Page Number 127 Household Number 640; William Tassie, \textit{Galt Collegiate Institute Semi-centennial and Tassie Old Boys' Reunion} Galt, Ontario (1902) Register p. 3.
\item\textsuperscript{135} 1901 census for Noah Quance District: ON ELGIN (East/Est) (#57) Subdistrict: St. Thomas E-2 p. 19.
\item\textsuperscript{136} \textit{St. Thomas Times-Journal} 24 June 1910 p. 1 columns d & e and p. 5 columns c & d; \textit{St. Thomas Times-Journal} 21 July 1910 p. 1 columns a & b.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Noah appears not to have shared his brother’s choice of religious denomination, as he is listed as a Presbyterian whilst a student in 1881. He may have been attending the Presbyterian Knox College in Toronto. In 1894 Noah married his cousin Mary Euphemia Harstone. The Harstones were also Presbyterians and both Noah and his wife are listed as such in the 1901 census.

Although William Quance was part of the Bible Christians’ evangelising mission, Noah’s experience was rather different. Knowledge of Noah’s life between his arrival in Canada, in 1875, and his time as a student in Toronto is not available but would be revealing. In later life both Noah and William lived in London Township, yet Noah’s adoption of the Presbyterian outlook might suggest that he had spent time with his aunt and her husband, rather than William, following his emigration. It is extremely unlikely that Noah was a Presbyterian prior to leaving England. Noah certainly maintained contact with his brother as in the 1901 census Noah has his nephew, William’s son.

---

137 *St. Thomas Times-Journal* 4 Sept 1926 p. 16. This picture was taken in 1906. Noah is third from the left in the front row.
138 1881 census for St Patrick’s Ward, Toronto, York, Film Number C-13247 District 134 Sub-district H Division 2 Page Number 127 Household Number 640.
Edgar, living with him.\textsuperscript{140} Noah’s emigration formed part of a family chain, one that may well have begun through links to the Bible Christian faith. Unlike William Braund and many others, however, Noah did not maintain a connection to this denomination. As a shoemaker when he left England, Noah did not enjoy any particular status. How he managed to acquire the necessary learning to achieve the rank of principal of a college is a matter for speculation. It could well be that his uncle by marriage, Robert Harstone the Presbyterian merchant, was influential in this respect. Although family, rather than faith or the possibility of acquiring a large land holding, seems to have been the major factor in Noah’s emigration, it must be remembered that, for the family members who preceded him, faith was key.

\textbf{William and Rebecca Hooper and John Heal}

John and Rebecca Heal were the children of Laurence and Francis Heal of Bulkworthy. There are several Laurence Heals, making identification difficult, but he may have farmed the fourteen acres that comprised Merrifield. By 1841, both John and Rebecca were working in Bulkworthy, Rebecca as a dressmaker and John as a journeyman blacksmith.

In 1846, just prior to emigration, Rebecca married William Hooper. Hooper had been born in 1818, in Brighstone, Isle of Wight, another area where the Bible Christians had a considerable following. One of the leading female Bible Christian preachers, Mary Toms, had visited the island in 1823 and the first church was established there later the same year, following a visit by James Thorne. An early island preacher was William Metherell Bailey, originally from Jacobstow, Cornwall; he is credited with the conversion of the fourteen year old William Hooper.\textsuperscript{141} William Hooper’s father, James, was a labourer, living in 1841, in a cottage attached to Waytes Court, which was the local manor house; he too was very active within the Bible Christian movement.\textsuperscript{142} Unfortunately the Rector of Brighstone in the 1830s was one Samuel Wilberforce.\textsuperscript{143}

\textsuperscript{140} 1901 census for Noah Quance District: ON ELGIN (East/Est) (#57) Subdistrict: St. Thomas E-2 p. 19.
\textsuperscript{141} \langle http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/specialcollections/collections/methodist/using/biographic alindex/habershamtohutton/headertitlemax32words,109086,en.htm\rangle accessed 15 March 2009.
\textsuperscript{142} \textit{The Bible Christian Magazine} March 1848 pp. 93-97.
\textsuperscript{143} Samuel was the son of the abolitionist William Wilberforce and later became Bishop of Oxford.
who was fanatically anti-Bible Christian. In 1831, Wilberforce wrote a tract on tithes 'to correct the prejudices of the lower order of farmers.' He spoke out against the Bible Christians urging that they should be evicted from their homes and sacked from their jobs. This resulted in the congregation that was led by James Hooper having to meet in a marl pit. Perhaps in order to be nearer to the centre of Bible Christianity or perhaps to remove himself from such blatant persecution, William Hooper moved to North Devon and was accepted on probation for the Bible Christian ministry in 1840.

Figure 6.34 William Hooper

In response to a call for missionaries at the 1845 Bible Christian conference, William chose, or was chosen, to take the Bible Christian message to America. On the 13th April 1846, only weeks after their marriage, William and Rebecca, together with John Heal, left from Padstow, Cornwall on the brig Voluna. Half of the adult passengers on board were Bible Christians. Their journey was recorded in the diary of their leader, Paul

---

145 The Bible Christian Magazine March 1848 pp. 93-97.
Robins, who also submitted an article to the magazine ‘Missionary Chronicles’ in the hope of encouraging other emigrants. Robins’ account reveals that he, William Hooper and Henry Ebbett were destined to evangelise in Ohio, Wisconsin and ‘Canada West’. They were not to decide which preacher should take charge of which of these three circuits until they arrived in Canada.148

After a meeting in Bowmanville, Canada, to allocate the newly arrived preachers to their circuits, William Hooper wrote

‘Everyone refused to go to Wisconsin. Bro. George Rippon volunteered to go to Ohio and for a time the meeting was at a standstill. I walked outside, leaned my head on the gate post, and lifted my heart to God in prayer; and while doing so felt willing to offer myself for Wisconsin, to which all readily agreed. But I knew no more about Wisconsin than Abraham did about Canaan.’149

Despite his call, William and Rebecca did not have an easy time in Wisconsin, both were ill and William complained of the lack of response to his evangelism.150 William and Rebecca appeared never to settle in Wisconsin; they were forced to sell their house due to lack of money and the alternative accommodation offered to them was in so remote a location that Rebecca was frightened by wolves.151 In the June of 1851, William Hooper was sent to Peterborough, in Canada, where he assisted in the erecting of a new chapel. Hooper was a passionate advocate of the Bible Christian cause. In 1854 he sent a heartfelt plea for fifty ‘young and healthy’ preachers to be sent to Canada,152 thus helping to promote further emigrations to the area. Hooper served in several Ontario circuits and was responsible for the building of a chapel at Crediton, South Huron, part of the Exeter Circuit.153

John Heal remain in Mauston, Juneau County, Wisconsin. Although apprenticed to a blacksmith when in Bulkworthy, John became a farmer once in America, for him perhaps the lure of land was a factor in prompting his emigration. Unlike the Hoopers he

149 Leetooze (2005a) p. 244.
150 The Bible Christian Magazine May 1848 p. 242.
151 The Bible Christian Magazine May 1848 p. 242.
152 The Bible Christian Magazine July 1854 p. 283.
153 Crediton Methodist Church Crediton Methodist Church: Golden Jubilee 1869-1919 Crediton Methodist Church, Crediton, Ontario (1919) p. 6.
did not feel inclined to move on when they found furthering the American Bible Christian cause less than straightforward. In fact, despite William’s despair at the lack of response, the Wisconsin Bible Christian circuits did survive.

For William and Rebecca, their faith was fundamental to their emigration. Their initial destination was dictated by the perceived needs of the Bible Christian movement, although the Hoopers immediately hoped for a transfer to a Canadian circuit. They left England as part of a Bible Christian community and after a short-lived and not very successful attempt to carve out a similar community in Wisconsin, the rest of their lives were spent in areas where William could, and did, proclaim the Bible Christian message.

The Edwards Family

Thomas Henry Edwards’ family had been established as the Hatherleigh blacksmiths for several generations. Although his wife, Emma Sanders, had also been born in Hatherleigh, for some reason the couple married in Exeter registration district, perhaps because Emma was working as a servant in the area. Emma continued working after their marriage and the couple were living apart in 1881. Thomas was at 32 Conduit Street, the site of the family business, with his widowed mother, whilst his wife, Emma, was a servant in Torquay. After the birth of four children, the family left England on the Nevada, in 1891, travelling not from a Devon port but from Liverpool.

Figure 6.35 Passenger List for the Edwards Family
With Thomas’ departure, the smithy in Conduit Street closed\textsuperscript{154} but in America he was able to continue as a farrier. A description of the Edwards’ new home, East Aurora, written in 1898, mentions its fertile dairy farms and that the area was ‘noted for its large stock farms,’\textsuperscript{155} perhaps these provided scope for Thomas’ trade. When the Edwards family arrived, East Aurora, some eighteen miles from Buffalo, was already considered to be a town, with a population of 1,600 and a connection to the New York and Pennsylvania railway. The East Aurora of 1898 had ‘enjoyed almost uninterrupted prosperity during the past fifteen or twenty years, and [was] an attractive, thrifty village with every local advantage. Many of its dwellings, business blocks, etc., [were] imposing and valuable. It seems’, continues the chronicler, ‘unnecessary to enumerate the various business and other establishments because of their number and diversified character.’\textsuperscript{156} The Edwards appear to have prospered with the area. The 1900 census reveals that Thomas was already the owner of a home that was free of a mortgage on homelot 10, East Aurora, Erie County in the state of New York.\textsuperscript{157}

The emigration experience of the Edwards family differs from most of those in the study sample, this may in part be due to their later departure date. Although they travelled as a family group, no trace of other family members or former Hatherleigh residents have been found at their destination; there is also no suggestion that religious belief played any part in their emigration decision. In this case, economics seem to have been the driving force, the continuing decline of late nineteenth century Hatherleigh being no match for the flourishing East Aurora.

6.4 Relations or Religion: the influence of kinship, religious belief and other factors on emigration decisions

Having described the kinship networks\textsuperscript{158} and religious convictions\textsuperscript{159} that influenced many of the emigration choices made by those who left the study areas, it is time to

\begin{footnotes}
\item[154] 1901 census for Conduit Street, Hatherleigh RG13 2122 folio 38.
\item[157] 1900 census for Elma Township, Erie County, New York Enumeration district 0240, sheet 3A, household 56.
\item[158] See Chapter 6.2.iv..
\item[159] See Chapter 6.2.iii..
\end{footnotes}
weigh up the relative importance of these and other factors, such as economic opportunity, that may have played their part. Thus we return to the ‘Faith, Fish, Farm or Family’ of the title and attempt to assess which of these had the greater influence on the decision making processes of those from the three settlements who went overseas.

In contrast to Baines’ findings that farmers and tradesmen were more likely to go overseas than labourers, Shepperson wrote that it was rural Britons who were encouraged to emigrate and it was the abundance of land that was the lure. Redford too cited the agricultural depression of the 1830s as an impetus for emigration. Hatton and Williamson assert that, ‘most observers believe that the critical factor driving emigration was poverty’. Nevertheless, only one of the Bucks Mills emigrants was described as an agricultural labourer and he was forcibly transported. Apart from the transportee, one gardener seems to be the closest in status to an agricultural labourer. Evidence has been found of Australian immigrants being motivated by economic opportunity. In addition, Charlotte Erickson’s analysis of nineteenth century immigrants found that ‘economic ambition … stimulated agricultural labourers and farm servants to find their way to the United States’ and she also uncovered similar motivations amongst industrial workers. She did, however, acknowledge that there were other considerations and that, in the case of the Mormons, for example, membership of a religious group could aid assimilation into the new community.

None of the emigrants from the study areas became farmers on arrival at their destination. Although the three millers were able to develop businesses that were far more substantial than those they would have had in their native Devon, it is unlikely that this was the principal reason for their move. Similarly, only one farm labourer can be found amongst the Conduit Street emigrants. Even those known emigrants from
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160 Baines (1985) pp. 74-75.
161 Shepperson (1957) p. 25.
162 Redford (1926) p. 150.
Bulkworthy, whose working population consisted primarily of those employed in farming, include only one agricultural labourer. One farmer, William Ching, and two farmer’s sons, the Newcombe brothers, also left from Bulkworthy. Although Ching continued to farm in Canada he also had other business interests and it has been shown that family and faith also played a key part in his emigration, as it did in that of the Newcombe family. The only Bulkworthy emigrants who appear to have benefited from the availability of land in their new location are John Martin and former blacksmith, John Heal. Nonetheless, both were Bible Christians and Heal emigrated as part of a programme of evangelism.167 Emmuanel Wonnacott farmed both before and after his emigration from Conduit Street to Delaware, Ontario, yet for him too, religious belief is likely to have been instrumental in prompting his move.

Although agricultural wages were still low, by the early 1850s, the North Devon farm labourer was in demand: ‘throughout all those districts where emigration has thinned the agricultural population labourers are not to be had for money. Everywhere in fact we hear of wages being advanced and the labour market never before looked up so well.’168 This differs from Hitch’s findings; he writes of the intolerable local circumstances, poor agricultural wages and the attractions of better conditions in Australia.169 Farming conditions, both in the place of origin and at their destination, seem to have been of far greater importance to Hitch’s Cambridgeshire emigrants than they were to those from the three settlements studied here.

Bulkworthy and Conduit Street were too far from the coast to contain any sea-going residents who may have been tempted by the rich fishing grounds off the eastern coasts of Canada and the U.S.A.. Four of the Bucks Mills emigrants were seamen or mariners. Although this gave them valuable experience, overseas contacts and possibly the reassurance that oceanic travel was relatively safe, they would not have lacked for work had they remained in Devon. Indeed many of their relatives continued in these occupations from their homes in Bucks Mills until well into the twentieth century. The search for new fishing grounds was not an issue as it was perfectly possible to make
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167 See Chapter 6.3.
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seasonal fishing trips, returning home to Devon. For these individuals, a sense of adventure, rather than a search for employment or ‘fish’, may well have prompted their move.

It is unwise to be dogmatic about motivations, and agricultural opportunities and the chance of economic betterment were contributory, yet, when looking for the prime stimulus for emigration, the faith of the individuals who left for Canada must be acknowledged. Lack of tolerance at home\(^{170}\) and the need for evangelists and chapel members abroad both played their part. The fact that almost all the emigrants remained affiliated to the Bible Christian Church, or a similar branch of Methodism, once abroad, is an indicator of the importance that their faith held. What is perhaps of greater significance is that they chose to move to areas where the Methodist Church, and Bible Christianity in particular, needed adherents. The emigrants of the 1830s formed part of the initial move to evangelise these districts of what is now Ontario and those who followed helped to swell the burgeoning Bible Christian communities. Some of the emigrants held key roles in their new Bible Christian circuits, donating land for chapels, serving as preachers or, in the case of William Hooper, reaching the peak of the Canada Bible Christian hierarchy.

Erickson wrote that, ‘migration required considerable risk-taking, a high level of adaptability to changing circumstances, and often a break with family and community.’\(^{171}\) The majority of the emigrants studied here, however, travelled with kin, neighbours and those from their religious community. Shepperson’s view that, ‘the usual assumption that religious beliefs were the cause for very few British departures in the nineteenth century fails to weigh the influence religion exerted over early Victorian Britain’\(^{172}\) is endorsed by the findings of this research. Obelkevitch believed that, in rural Lincolnshire, ‘for all classes, Methodism constituted a community within the
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\(^{171}\) Erickson (1972) p.2.

\(^{172}\) Shepperson (1957) p. 129.
dissolving wider community'\textsuperscript{173} and the same can be said of North Devonian Bible Christianity. Adherents of this denomination were able to sustain these communities by travelling with other affiliates or choosing destinations where their former religious community could be replicated.

Baines felt that ‘emigration tended to run in families'\textsuperscript{174} because chain migration relied on an exchange of information that would be likely amongst family members. In the cases examined there were not only family links but also those of neighbourhood and religious community, that provided the information flow. In many instances Bible Christian emigrants sent back accounts of their experiences not just to family members but with the express intention of reaching other members of their church. This was often through the medium of \textit{The Bible Christian Magazine}. Many of these accounts appealed for others to join their congregations in Canada. William Hooper’s pleas have already been mentioned, as has the account of Paul Robins who accompanied him.\textsuperscript{175} Bartholomew Fulford, a Wesleyan Methodist from Buckland Brewer, a parish adjacent to Bulkworthy, sent a diary of his voyage to Quebec back to England. This included a comprehensive list of those amongst whom he wanted the diary circulated. Alongside family members, prominent members of the Methodist congregations with which Fulford was associated are named.\textsuperscript{176}

Despite his emphasis on economic factors, Hitch goes on to say that, ‘as time went on a most important element in the decision to migrate was kinship links.’\textsuperscript{177} It is clear that information flows, communications that were often religiously motivated, facilitated the chain migration of many inter-related North Devonians. All but two of the sample emigrants left in extended family groups or as part of a chain of family emigrations, usually both. Appendix 1 shows the complex kinship web linking many North Devon emigrants of this period.\textsuperscript{178} It also illustrates just how many of them were affiliated to the Bible Christian church itself, or its later manifestation as Congregational.

\textsuperscript{174} Baines (1985) p. 177.
\textsuperscript{175} See Chapter 6.3.
\textsuperscript{177} Hitch (2002) p. 93 .
\textsuperscript{178} This includes some emigrants from the study sample as well as other emigrants.
Methodism. The chains are least apparent amongst the Conduit Street emigrants, perhaps because this was the area where Bible Christianity had the least influence.

Unlike earlier emigrants from North Devon, and many Victorian emigrants from elsewhere, the incentives of ‘farm’, ‘fish’ and indeed wider economic factors, do not appear to have been the prime force behind the emigration choices of many of those who left the three study areas. ‘Faith’ and ‘family’, however, were clearly central issues. Bible Christianity created push and pull factors, influencing both the decision to emigrate and the selection of a destination. The importance of their faith is evinced by their desire to settle within a Bible Christian circuit and their encouragement of family and neighbours to do likewise. Almost all were to maintain active involvement in the denomination after emigration and indeed for the rest of their lives.
7 Conclusion

It is now possible to re-examine the concepts of community and kinship in the light of this research and to consider the influence that they had on migration patterns and in turn, the impact that these migration patterns had on the settlements involved. Historical research requires an integration of macro and micro studies because, say Halfacree and Boyle, ‘whilst the macro uses measurable characteristics of the socio-economic and physical environments to explain migration, the micro approach emphasises the migrant’s decision making process.’\(^1\) The methods chosen for this research proved fit for purpose. It was important to conduct in-depth, biographical histories of individuals in order to get a complete picture of the processes at work. Without lifetime migration stories, circular movements are concealed. Birthplace and current residence may be the same; intervening moves are only revealed by more detailed investigations such as those carried out here. Snell writes of his desire to further the cause of social and cultural history, ‘I am hoping to press the case for local history in a period when the nation state, national identity, and national expansion allegedly swept the boards.’\(^2\) This research underlines the importance of such social and cultural history in the local context. Analysis at the micro level reveals the unique characteristics of those settlements. The danger of the macro approach alone, is that the influence of such characteristics on the migration decision making process can be masked.

When assessing the migration experience, Pooley and Turnbull found little variation across the country and they felt that ‘the processes operating in each region were remarkably similar.’\(^3\) Deacon, however, discovered ‘clear differences in migration patterns and propensities at the community level.’\(^4\) This discrepancy justifies Drake’s comment when he writes of

‘the balancing need not to rest content with generalised country-wide

trends, statistical aggregates or numerical counts of migrants, but also to explore the individually-experienced processes on the ground and the opportunities and constraints which faced people in specific communities at a given time.5

The methodology employed in this research has addressed this need and thorough investigations at the individual level, have helped to fill what Halfacree and Boyle called ‘a substantial lacuna’ in biographical research.6

This research supports Reay’s argument7 by re-installing the key role of kinship in modern social history. Deacon, however, wrote that ‘the really important spatial unit for studying the migration decision is the locality or community’8 and a localities were the basis upon which samples were selected for this research. It was, however, not so much the geographical unit, but the ideological and cultural communities, that were to have the greatest impact upon migration patterns, processes and preferences. In turn, this study of migration choices has shed light upon the perception of community in Victorian North Devon. If ‘community’ requires a sense of belonging then this was not limited to the notion of a shared physical space. This research has highlighted the importance of communities that went beyond the boundaries of the parish, hamlet or street. The influence of the religious community upon migration patterns affected not only the members the study areas but those in the wider geographical area.

The lives of those in North Devon and north eastern Cornwall were shaped by the factionalism that arose from the rise of non-conformity and also by the demographic dislocations that resulted from the mass emigrations that were part of belonging to the Bible Christian community. Snell writes of the un-addressed issue of the effect of the rural exodus on people’s sense of place;9 the large-scale removal of one section of the population, from parishes such as Bulkworthy, had an impact on the inhabitants and structures that they left behind. Brayshay, referring to the work of Lawton and others on rural depopulation, wrote that ‘the gradual creaming-off of the younger and more
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enterprising elements in the population inevitably led, in the longer term, to important social and demographic changes in the countryside.\(^{10}\)

Snell believes that, of late, community history has assumed an increasing importance in an age of globalisation, when ‘local place has become less a source of identity than hitherto, losing much of its social meaning.’\(^{11}\) It is both necessary and relevant to examine the communities of the past in order to identify and evaluate what is being lost.\(^{12}\) What then gave the inhabitants of the three study areas their sense of belonging and source of identity? Only in Bucks Mills could the inhabitants be said to have had a commonality with those inside their physical boundaries, to the exclusion of those on the periphery. The community of Bucks Mills can be likened to an ecological niche, where individuals and the relationships between them create a self-contained entity. It was not only geographical isolation that cemented connections between the Bucks Mills’ residents. The complex inter-relationships and the density of the kinship web created networks that, in turn, gave the hamlet a community identity and allowed its inhabitants to have something upon which to focus their desire to belong. Thus a combination of geographical, occupational and familial factors were at work in Bucks Mills.

For Bulkworthy\(^{13}\) it was the ideological community of the Bible Christian church that provided security and a sense of belonging for many of its inhabitants. Whilst religious groups created unified communities of their own, at the same time they served to fragment the wider, geographical area in which they were found. MacIver and Page felt that such groups were a threat to community cohesion.\(^{14}\) Snape believed that this threat was perceived by those within the established church who ‘were concerned to protect their Church, their king, their families, their livelihoods and the integrity of their
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\(^{12}\) Snell (2006) p. 3.

\(^{13}\) This also applied to Bucks Mills but the strongest influence of Bible Christianity in Bucks Mills was in the years prior to the study period.

In this way, non-conformity was seen, by those outside its embrace, as being responsible for dividing communities and was associated with disloyalty and insurgency. Beacham sums this up in his comment concerning west country Methodism: ‘it was an alternative society, whose membership risked social exclusion and even legal sanction from the establishment, but in which the humblest could rise to become leaders, teachers and pastors.’ The existence of these ideological, trans-parochial communities and the extended kinship networks that also crossed parish boundaries, call into question the dominant role of the parish in English local history. ‘Community’ is all too often linked to the geographical unit of the parish, even if the spatial definition is not paramount. It may be that the sense of belonging referred to by Snell should be examined in the light of ideological and not geographical units.

Snell writes of the necessity to address ‘questions concerning the integrity and survival of the parish or other local entities as civil and religious units.’ By the dawn of the twentieth century, Bucks Mills was still functioning as a community and aided by its geographical isolation and increasingly dense kinship ties, its community identity was robust. With the declining influence of the Bible Christian church, due largely to the emigration of so many of its members, Bulkworthy, with its high population turnover and weakening kinship links, ceased to have much beyond its parish boundary to identify it as a cohesive unit. Conduit Street, on the other hand, was no more or less of a community in 1901 than it had been in 1841. It remained part of the economic community that was the market town of Hatherleigh. As the twentieth century began, there were signs that Hatherleigh was no longer the self-sufficient unit, serving a rural hinterland, that it had been. Improved transport links and increasing competition from larger towns, together with the decline of long-standing family businesses were to bring changes to Conduit Street. In the first decade of the twentieth century the street became a residential area losing, with one exception, all its businesses and workshops.

In 1985 Alan Everitt wrote, ‘I believe we should study places, localities, counties and
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regions not simply for their own sake, but for the light they shed on English society as a whole.’ 19 Can then the settlements studied here be seen to be representative of a wider area? Two observations have emerged from this research. Firstly, when settlements are investigated in great depth it can be seen that, even those in close proximity, those that might have been expected to have much in common, have many differences. Margaret Shepherd drew similar conclusions as a result of her Cumbrian research, finding that ‘not only did change occur but also that there were significant differences in the experience of each small town and among the village communities’. 20 Of course, although they all formed part of North Devon and, indeed, the wider region of the South West, the study areas were deliberately chosen for their differing natures and thus a variety of migration experiences is perhaps not so surprising. This acts as a warning to those who seek to generalise to too great an extent from a particular experience. If, however, there were neither shared experiences nor common themes, then all that this research would have accomplished would be to provide information about three individual settlements that would have no relevance to the world beyond. Certainly more work is needed on other settlements in North Devon and north east Cornwall but what is already clear is that, secondly, the work on the three study areas does reveal a picture that is representative of the wider picture. In particular, when the emigration patterns and the motivations for emigration are considered there is undoubtedly a regional experience. The marked preference of those leaving North Devon and North East Cornwall for the district around the shores of Lake Ontario, the connections of many of these individuals to the Bible Christian Church and their tendency to emigrate in chains of extended family and neighbourhood groups, all warrant further investigation. Through the specific examples that have been examined here it becomes easier to see which generalisations are reflected in actuality.

When examining the under-researched topic of residential persistence common themes can also be detected. Mitson found that ‘the presence of … highly-localised and continuing families was the delimiting factor in the perpetuation of quite precisely

defined neighbourhood areas.'

Thus for her, the presence of a core family, such as the Braunds in Bucks Mills, was a key factor in the establishment of a community. What role did kinship have to play in encouraging residential persistence in the three settlements that form the basis of this research? At the commencement of this research, the expectation was that the presence of kin would increase the likelihood of an individual remaining within a settlement. Although there was a positive correlation between family ties and length of stay, the relationship was not a straightforward one. In the areas studied here, it was, as Mitson suggests, membership of a core family group, rather than the presence of a peripheral kinship network, that encouraged persistence. Obviously, it is virtually impossible to remain in an area if there is no opportunity for employment. Kin, especially well established, deep kinship webs, frequently provided those opportunities and it was the availability of a family business, rather than the availability of family per se that impacted upon persistency.

The occupational structure and employment opportunities within a settlement facilitated or inhibited the chances of an individual remaining within it. Bulkworthy for example, had very low levels of persistence, both in comparison with the other study areas and with research done elsewhere. Those who did remain for long periods of time did so for reasons that were similar to those long-term residents in other areas. It was not the motivations for remaining that made Bulkworthy atypical but the extent of that persistency. It was not so much that fewer inhabitants chose to remain in Bulkworthy but that the incentives to leave outweighed the advantages of staying; community influences were thus key in this respect.

Persistence breeds persistence; as a family remains within an area for succeeding generations kinship ties multiply. This, in turn, increases the opportunity for employment within a family business and impacts upon the less tangible sense of belonging that is impossible to quantify but was nonetheless influential. These factors certainly encouraged Bucks Mills’ residents to remain in the hamlet for very long
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periods. On the other hand, Bulkworthy’s persistence rates and kinship ties were dislocated by the mass emigration of the 1850s and from then on there was little to encourage a resident to remain within Bulkworthy, in preference to one of its neighbouring parishes. Thus it was not Bulkworthy itself that engendered ‘community’ loyalty but the wider area of rural North Devon of which Bulkworthy was a part.

Communities, occupational opportunities, kinship density, and religious sub-communities all helped to provide a perception of unity that had a bearing on the likelihood of residential persistence. French, in his study of Kingston upon Thames, identified both communal and individual factors that affected persistence rates. There is a pattern evidenced by the findings for the study areas; the influences on the decision to stay, or perhaps the lack of a decision to move, have an application that is much wider than the settlements studied here. There are two things to remember, firstly that the relative influences of these factors varied from settlement to settlement and secondly that they only applied whilst a stronger influence that prompted movement was lacking.
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What then were these influences that might outweigh the factors encouraging residential persistence? It is time to return to the ‘faith, fish, farm and family’ of the title and
consider the role that these issues had to play when migration decisions were being made, within the study areas and beyond.

The impact of the fishing industry on residential patterns had a key effect on both movers and stayers within Bucks Mills. In the decades before the period under review here, the North American cod trade impacted upon coastal settlements of North Devon. It was not so much that it led directly to permanent emigrations but that it created an atmosphere in which long-distance sea travel was seen as possible and acceptable.\(^{24}\) It also helped to establish links on the other side of the Atlantic that continued when the trading had all but ceased.\(^{25}\) The early decades of the nineteenth century saw the long distance fishing trade eclipsed by the importation of timber and it was the development of these trade routes that laid the foundation for the emigration routes of the Victorian era.

It may also be that the mind-set and characteristics of the long-distance mariner were those that were also required of individuals who were prepared to leave their families and homes for a new life elsewhere, whether it be abroad or within England. Prior to, and in the early years of, the study period, their maritime heritage, influenced the likelihood of Bucks Mills’ inhabitants emigrating. Working together with the cultural influence of religious belief within the area, it facilitated the emigration of family groups, beginning chains of migration that lasted well into the Victorian era.

Conversely, the role of Bucks Mills as a fishing village also encouraged its inhabitants to stay within the hamlet. Once an established fishing business was functioning, one which was supported by, and in turn supported, a family group, then the necessary employment was created that allowed people to remain. Today, North Devonian fishermen closely guard ‘their patch’ and it is almost impossible for a newcomer to become established. Oral evidence reveals that this is nothing new and it would have been difficult for those who wished to make their living primarily from fishing to move


On the surface it seems that ‘fish’ was only an issue when considering motivations for moving from, or remaining within, coastal settlements such as Bucks Mills. The existence of established family businesses was, however, also a relevant factor in the other areas studied here. Although the limitations of the available sources meant that it was not specifically considered in this research, it may be that it was not employment so much as self-employment that encouraged residential persistence.

As was the case with fishing businesses, the family farm, whether owned or tenanted, encouraged individuals and families to remain within a study area. This only lasted whilst there was no stronger influence at work to lure individuals away. So, in Bulkworthy, the emigration fever generated by the Bible Christian church proved to be that stronger influence, leading even those from long established farming families to leave.

The out-migrants from the three study areas were not, in the main, agricultural labourers who were prompted to move overseas by the promise of land; neither were they abandoning their agricultural heritage in droves, in order to take up residence in urban areas. The individuals examined in this research were predominantly agricultural labourers making short-distance moves to other rural areas or those of slightly higher social status going further afield. On the whole, the inhabitants of the three settlements did not typify the processes referred to by Adair and Melling when they wrote of a ‘predominant flow of people from the inner, rural heartland of the county to the urban and coastal areas.’ Most of those leaving Bucks Mills for towns left in the 1860s and 1870s and the majority went no further than nearby Bideford. Very few went to towns beyond Devon; those that did so left later in the study period and often had family connections at their destination. As the population of the hamlet remained stable, this could hardly be viewed as a mass exodus from the countryside; rather, these were moves

26 Oral evidence from Christopher Braund.
27 Those available when the research began, in 2003.
necessitated by a lack of opportunities for expansion within the village.

The rapidly declining numbers of people in Bulkworthy could be seen to constitute rural depopulation. Unlike the process in Bucks Mills, Bulkworthy out-migrants were not replaced by similar numbers of new-borns or in-migrants. Closer examination shows, however, that those leaving Bulkworthy did so principally in the 1840s and 1850s, whereas the research on rural depopulation in Devon, by Williams, identified the 1870s as the peak decade of loss. In the 1850s, Williams’ ‘Ashworthy’ was still maintaining its population level. Although some Bulkworthy residents did leave in order to go to towns, many more made short distance rural-rural moves such as those identified by Deacon in rural Roseland, Cornwall where he observed ‘the agricultural population’s greater rate of circulatory movement around the countryside.’

As regards rural to urban movement, the most significant fact emerges when the urban destinations of those from Bulkworthy are examined in greater detail. Few went to the nearest towns; they tended to move greater distances than those leaving Bucks Mills. Frequently their destinations, such as Wellington in Somerset, had a strong Bible Christian presence, suggesting that it was not just a desire for an urban environment that was prompting their move.

This research in the study areas did not uncover significant waves of movement up the settlement hierarchy. Indeed, there was evidence of counter-urbanisation, with 20·1% of out-migrants from Conduit Street going to rural destinations. That the expected levels of rural-urban migration were not found underlines the importance of looking at individual migration histories and investigating each step in migration chains. The fact that the migration patterns in Victorian North Devon were not as expected, in this respect, means that the findings of this research are an important contribution to an understanding of why this should be so.

Bucks Mills’ in-migrants almost all had kin already residing in the parishes of Woolfardisworthy or Parkham, many within the hamlet of Bucks Mills itself. The presence of kin was, as might be expected, most significant for those travelling the furthest. Bulkworthy in-migrants were less likely to be influenced by pre-existing

kinship links in the parish, primarily because they were less likely to have travelled far from their previous location; only eight individuals arrived in Bulkworthy from a distance greater than fifteen miles. The fewest existing kinship links were found for the in-migrants to Conduit Street, however, all but five in-migrants travelled with, or were going to reside near, family members. The motivations for in-migrants to the three study areas were not dissimilar to those at work engendering residential persistence. Although the influencing factors were common to the three study areas, and indeed to other areas in the region, the relative strengths of these different influences varied from settlement to settlement.

In general, kinship played a much smaller part in the migration decision-making process of those leaving the three settlements than it did for those arriving. The significance of family ties when moving out of a study area was greatest for those leaving Bucks Mills. It is understandable that those who came from an area where tight kinship networks created a community would seek to maintain contact with relatives on moving. It must be noted that, perhaps unexpectedly, those going longer distances from Bucks Mills were less likely to be maintaining links with family than those who remained closer to the hamlet. This may relate to the selectivity theory: those who were prepared to make longer distance moves were also better able to manage without the support of kin; or rather, the ability to be independent of kin enabled them to be comfortable with longer distance moves. Although few Bulkworthy out-migrants seem to have moved in order to join family members, most of these moves were over short distances and would not have necessitated the severing of existing kinship links.

Like Bucks Mills, in-migrants to Conduit Street do seem to have been influenced by the presence of kin. For out-migrants, however, economic motives appear to have been the most important. When comparing the three areas, there is far less evidence for chain migrations, or emigrations, of family groups from Conduit Street. Although this could be a reflection of its urban status, it is important to remember that Bible Christianity had less of a grip on Conduit Street.

If the influence of non-resident kin was not as great as anticipated at the outset of this research, what can be said about kinship in Victorian North Devon? It has been pointed
out that ‘genealogical data per se provides no direct information on the social significance of the kin relations that they describe.’ Assessing kinship density allows different settlements to be compared but it is the interaction between these relatives that is important. Common migration or emigration experiences, either moving as a family group or as part of a chain migration of kin, constitutes a working relationship between those individuals. Although kin have been shown to be influential, particularly in the settlement of Bucks Mills, where kinship density was greatest, this was only one of several factors at work. The presence of kin was more likely to be an issue for those entering the three settlements, than it was for those who became out-migrants. Kin can been seen to have been important in attracting people to places that otherwise have little to recommend them. Nonetheless it must be said that Deacon’s statement relating to Cornish migrants, ‘labour markets and occupational structures remain the most important explanatory variables structuring migration but that these were mediated at the individual level by the influence of the family which played a key role in facilitating or deterring movement,’ applied equally to those in North Devon.

The working hypothesis, formed on the basis of piecemeal investigations in North Devon, was that the role of non-resident kin in the migration process would be greater than had been previously identified. Having carried out the systematic research involved in this study, on the surface, it may appear that this has not been the case. Yet, the presence or absence of a dense kinship network most certainly changed the character of a settlement, which in turn impacted upon the likelihood of residential persistence. Kinship, intertwined with faith, undoubtedly motivated emigrants from the study areas and beyond. It may be that the findings have shown ‘community’ to have a greater influence than kin, yet kin were an integral part of what helped to constitute the shared experience that can be called community. In the emigration experience the role of ‘family’ was important, as evidenced by the chain emigrations of extended family groups, yet it was the faith that these extended families shared that was the greater influence.

Faith, in particular the Bible Christian faith, became, for many residents of nineteenth century North Devon and north eastern Cornwall, the community with which they identified. As Wickes says, ‘in creating an ethical community within the community and an extensive social network beyond it, Methodism gave its followers a distinct social as well as religious identity.’\(^{32}\) Not only did non-conformity generate its own communities but it fragmented the pre-existing village community. Obelkevich, writing of Primitive Methodism, said that it ‘created a religious counter-culture, with its own values, activities, and community, that offered a response and alternative not only to the new social order, but also to the older village culture and to the Established Church,’\(^{33}\) and the same was true of Bible Christianity.

The influence of the Bible Christian movement was such that it outweighed the factors that were encouraging residential persistence. For those who wished to leave North Devon, the pressures to emigrate were greater than those that prompted others to move to large towns and cities. Was there something, as Shepperson suggests,\(^ {34}\) about the mind-set of non-conformists that made them more likely to emigrate? In support of the selectivity theory, Jackson wrote, ‘all of the pre-disposing circumstances may be available but it still takes a particular recognition of circumstances and a confirming proposal and acceptance to bring the matter to a head.’\(^ {35}\) Perhaps the personality traits that found non-conformity attractive also spawned the sense of adventure required of longer distance migrants and emigrants. Dackombe, researching Quaker migrations, found that only 10% of Quakers migrated less than thirty miles,\(^ {36}\) suggesting that members of this non-conformist community were comfortable with migrations over longer distances. This may have been something inherent within the individuals themselves. Alternatively, it might be more to do with their sense of religious obligation, or the level of security, support and sense of belonging provided by the Quaker network in their new location.

---


\(^{33}\) Obelkevich (1976) p. 257.

\(^{34}\) Wilbur S. Shepperson, *British Emigration to North America* Blackwell, Oxford (1957) p. 6, p. 129 et. al..


It appears that, for the bulk of the emigrants from the study areas, the more traditional pull factors such as economic betterment and the availability of land were not of paramount importance and for some, appear to have been of little relevance. It was the Bible Christian ethos, fuelled by information channels such as reports in *The Bible Christian Magazine* and within the local circuit that constituted the greatest ‘push’ factor. Although adherence to the Bible Christian Church created its own sense of belonging, at the same time, it led to an alienation from the rest of the community and intolerance from members of the Anglican church.37

---

37 The incident described in Chapter 6.1 p. 326 is just one example.
The study areas provide examples of the influences that were at work when the decision to move, or to remain, was made. Although the relative strength of these factors varied from settlement to settlement and, indeed, from migrant to migrant, the models that resulted can be applied elsewhere. Although there were exceptions, where faith and kin
had little impact and economic motives prevailed, the model that applied to the majority of emigrations from the study areas holds good for nineteenth century emigrations from North Devon and north eastern Cornwall in general.

Work has been done on the history of the Bible Christian faith\textsuperscript{38} but there is scope for investigating the impact of that faith upon the settlements in which it flourished. The extent to which the rise of non-conformity in the south-west had a negative effect upon community cohesion by establishing a church-chapel divide, could be set alongside the united religious communities that it created; communities that crossed geographical boundaries but nonetheless were restricted to those who were prepared to accept the tenets of a particular denomination.

Compared to neighbouring Cornwall and Dorset, Devon in general and North Devon in particular is not well covered by researchers, particularly researchers of migration patterns. Devon is a large county and one which is not homogenous, thus it is likely that a generalised ‘Devon migration experience’ would not accurately reflect the situation in either the north or south of the county. More work needs to be done in order to explore these regional differences, and not just in the context of residential patterns. The religious landscape of the county has been examined in work such as that by Barry and Coleman\textsuperscript{39} but other aspects of Devon communities also warrant attention. Coleman established that, as regards religious adherence, North Devon more closely resembled Cornwall than it did the rest of the county.\textsuperscript{40} It would be of benefit to investigate whether or not North Devon also fell in line with Cornwall in other respects.

It is clear that much more work is needed on residential persistence before firm conclusions can be drawn about factors that have an impact on inhabitants’ ability, or desire, to stay put. Additional research in rural areas, in different parts of the country, would be particularly welcome. It is hoped that French’s recently published work on

\textsuperscript{38} For example, Roger Thorne, ‘The Last Bible Christians: Their Church in Devon in 1907’, Transactions of the Devonshire Association 197 (1975) 47-75.


\textsuperscript{40} Coleman (1999) p. 232.
Kingston upon Thames\textsuperscript{41} will encourage other studies, especially those at the micro level. Occupational opportunities are clearly closely related to persistence levels. Now that three decennial censuses\textsuperscript{42} are available with information on self-employment it would be especially interesting to see if the self-employed were more persistent than those who worked for others.

This research has highlighted the need and opportunity for further research in several areas. Snell has recently emphasised the point that the modern trend for globalisation increases the attraction and, more importantly, relevance of studying the ‘locality’ or ‘community’. In the context of community, he has looked at past senses of belonging in order to identify what is now being lost.\textsuperscript{43} It would be interesting to extend this search for the continuity of cohesiveness and examine causes, conflict and divisiveness in the settlements of the past, relating these to the twenty-first century experience.

According to Snell, recent changes in historians’ conceptions of community, ‘call for a re-thinking of our historical purposes, of what we write history for.’\textsuperscript{44} What then has this piece of history been ‘for’? What began as research into kinship and its role in the migration process, came to concern community and the effect that kinship densities had upon settlements. Kinship could be the glue that held the settlement together, thus creating a community, but so too could religion. Factors, familial, economic and ideological, influenced migration decisions. These decisions in turn had an impact on those who remained. Can conclusions be drawn about modern communities and the perceived dislocation and fracturing of those communities? Continuing weakening of kinship densities, lower levels of residential persistence and the lack of common goals that near universal church or chapel going once provided, have meant that faith and family neither have the power to influence nor the ability to engender a sense of security and belonging that they once had. By examining their role in the localities of the past, it has been possible to point the way forward to further research, which may have relevance for the communities of the future.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[42] Those for 1891, 1901 and 1911.
\item[43] Snell (2006) p. 3.
\end{footnotes}
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**Oral Evidence and Memoirs**

The late Florence Annis née Braund, born 1877 (interview taped c. 1965).
The late John Annis, born 1908.
The late Bertrand Baulch.
Christopher Braund.
The late Grenville Braund, born 1921.
The late Leonard Braund, born 1921.
Wilfred Braund, born 1914.
The late Trevor Davey, born 1924.
Mr Hockin.
The late Winifred Norah Judd, born 1916.
Ethel Packham.
Mr Poole.
Prunella Scales née Illingworth.
Muriel G Withecombe née Braund, born 1920.

**Letters and Diaries**

Diary of Paul Robins taken from *Missionary Chronicles* October 1846 as transcribed at
*Description of the Journey of Bible Christians from Cornwall To Quebec*
*Bible Christians: Paul Robins’ Journal Voyage to Quebec In 1846 from Padstow* at
Ledger of William and Mary Ann Ching, in private hands.
Scrapbook compiled by Ralph Colwill Braund c. 1930-1940, in private hands.
Letters from John Thompson, written 1819, as transcribed at
Letter from Margery McNichol, written 1831, as transcribed at
Letter from John Yeo, written 12 September 1900, in private hands.
Letter from Jabez Elliott, written 13 September 1900, in private hands.
Letters from John Braund (1847-1910) written 1904-5, in private hands.
Letter from Deborah Devonshire, written 9 January 2005, in private hands.
Letter from Lady Soames, written March 2005, in private hands.

**Photographs and Photographs**

In private hands.

**Directories**

* Cassell’s Gazetteer* (1900).
* Moore’s Directory* (1870).
* Morris and Co.’s Commercial Directory and Gazetteer* (1870).

**Newspapers and Magazines**

*The Bible Christian Magazine* July 1854 p 283.
*The Bideford Gazette* 8 March 1892 p. 1 column f.
*The Bideford Gazette* 31 October 1939 p. 4 col. e.
Cutting from *The Bideford Gazette* 2 November 1948 found in BT 243/279 at The National Archives.
Cutting from *The Bideford Gazette* 1977.
* Canadian News and British American Intelligencer* 10 June 1857 as transcribed at 
Cutting from *The Evening Standard* 1 March 1928 (page not visible) cols a & b.
Cutting from *The Grant County Herald*, Elbow Lake, Minnesota, undated c. 1943.
Kingston Daily News 22 March 1858 p. 2.
North Devon Journal 18 February 1834 column 1e.
North Devon Journal 22 February 1849 p. 2 col. b.
North Devon Journal 19 April 1849 p. 1 col. c.
North Devon Journal 31 March 1853 p. 5 col. b.
North Devon Journal 1 March 1855, p. 5 col. d.
North Devon Journal 21 September 1871.
St. Anne’s Church Magazine July 1920.
The St Thomas Times-Journal 24 June 1910 p. 1 cols d & e and p. 5 cols c & d.
The St Thomas Times-Journal 21 July 1910 p. 1 cols a & b.
The St Thomas Times-Journal 4 September 1926 p. 16.
Cutting from The Times 28 December 1970.
Unidentified newspaper cutting Estate Agent’s advertisement for sale of cottages in Bucks Mills 1982.

Memorial Inscriptions
St. Anne’s, Bucks Mills.
Upper Churchyard, Bucks Cross.
St. Michael’s, Bulkworthy.
St. John the Baptist, Hatherleigh.
St. James’, Parkham.
All Hallows, Woolfardisworthy West.

Indices of Birth, Marriage and Death
Birth, Marriage and Death Certificates
Death Certificate of Hannah Braund 1852.

Census Returns


1851 census index for Devon, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (1997).


1841 census for Bucks Mills, Woolfardisworthy West HO107 223 en. dist. 12 folios 11-12 and en. dist. 13 folios 6-12.

1841 census for Bucks Mills, Parkham HO107 244 en. dist. 1 folios 5-7.

1841 census for Bulkworthy HO107 242 enumeration district 20 folios 3-7.

1841 census for Taylors Street/Conduit Street, Hatherleigh HO107 257/6 folios 12-14 & 16-17.

1851 census for Bucks Mills, Woolfardisworthy West HO107 1895 folios 470-471.

1851 census for Bucks Mills, Parkham HO107 1895 folios 425-427.

1851 census for Bulkworthy HO107 185 folios 688-692.

1851 census for Conduit Street, Hatherleigh HO107 1885 folios 155-159.

1861 census for Bucks Mills, Woolfardisworthy West RG9 1505 folio 68.

1861 census for Bucks Mills, Parkham RG9 1504 folios 71-72.

1861 census for Bulkworthy RG9 1506 folios 22-24.

1861 census for High Street, Hatherleigh RG9 2223 folios 43-44.

1861 census for Eramosa, Wellington County, Upper Canada C1082.

1871 census for Bucks Mills, Woolfardisworthy West RG10 2207 folio 8.

1871 census for Bucks Mills, Parkham RG10 2205 folios 29-31.
1871 census for Bulkworthy RG10 2208 folios 22-24.
1871 census for High Street, Hatherleigh RG10 2151 folios 43-45 & 47-49.
1881 census for Bucks Mills, Woolfardisworthy West RG11 2262 folio 65.
1881 census for Bucks Mills, Parkham RG11 2261 folios 58-60.
1881 census for Bulkworthy RG11 2263 folios 19-20 & 30.
1881 census for Caledon, Cardwell, Ontario District 141 Sub-district D Division 3 Page 57 Household Number 284.
1881 census for High Street, Hatherleigh RG11 2223 folios 43-44.
1891 census for Bucks Mills, Woolfardisworthy West RG12 1789 folio 54.
1891 census for Bucks Mills, Parkham RG12 1788 folios 72-73.
1891 census for Bulkworthy RG12 1790 folios 18-20.
1891 census for High Street, Hatherleigh RG12 1754 folios 33-34.
1900 census for Elma Township, Erie County, New York Enumeration district 0240, sheet 3A, household 56.
1901 census for Bucks Mills, Woolfardisworthy West RG13 2165 folios 59-60.
1901 census for Bucks Mills, Parkham RG13 2164 folios 75-76.
1901 census for Bulkworthy RG13 2166 folios 14-15.
1901 census for High Street, Hatherleigh RG13 2122 folios 37-39.
1901 census for Elgin Ontario (East/Est) (#57) Subdistrict: St. Thomas E-2 Page 19.

Parish Registers


Baptism Register for St. Anne’s, Bucks Mills 1862-date, in the custody of the churchwarden.

Marriage Register for St. Anne’s, Bucks Mills 1862-1921 3447-1/1, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.

Marriage Register for St. Anne’s, Bucks Mills 1921-date, in the custody of the churchwarden.

Burial Register for St. Anne’s, Bucks Mills 1862-date, in the custody of the churchwarden.

Baptism and Burial Register for St. Michael’s Bulkworthy 1709-1812 2964A/PR1, held at Devon Record Office, Exeter.
Baptism Register for St. Michael’s, Bulkworthy 1813-2000 2964A/PR3, held at Devon Record Office, Exeter.

Marriage Register for St. Michael’s Bulkworthy 1829-1837 2964A/PR2, held at Devon Record Office, Exeter.

Marriage Register for St. Michael’s Bulkworthy 1837-1930, held at North Devon Record Office (no accession number allocated yet).

Burial Registers for St. Michael’s Bulkworthy 1709-1812 2964A/PR1 and 2964A/PR5, held at Devon Record Office, Exeter.

Marriage Register for Clovelly 1837-1989 1058-2/1, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.

Baptism Register for St. John the Baptist, Hatherleigh 1843-1883 2917A/PR1, held at Devon Record Office, Exeter.

Marriage Register for St. John the Baptist, Hatherleigh 1838-1930 2917A/PR2, held at Devon Record Office, Exeter.

Burial Registers for St. John the Baptist, Hatherleigh 1872-1955 2917A/PR5 and 2917A/PR6, held at Devon Record Office, Exeter.

Baptism Register for Kilkhampton Bible Christian Circuit, transcribed by Sheila Townsend.

Baptism Registers for St. James’, Parkham 1782-1843 1892A/PR4, 1892A/PR7 and 1892A/PR8, held at North Devon Records Office.

Baptism Register for St James’, Parkham 1843-date, in the custody of the incumbent.

Marriage Registers for St James’, Parkham 1782-1978 1892A/PR6, 1892A/PR9 and 1892A/PR10, held at North Devon Record Office.

Burial Registers for St James’, for Parkham 1782-1871 1892A/PR7 and 1892A/PR11, held at North Devon Record Office.

Burial Register for St James’, for Parkham 1871-date, in the custody of the incumbent.

Baptism Register for Shebbear Bible Christian Circuit 607 held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.


Marriage Registers for All Hallows, Woolfardisworthy West 1754-1989 922A/PR1, 922A/PR5 and 922-2/1, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
Burial Registers for All Hallows, Woolfardisworthy West, 1813-1993 922A/PR6, 922A/PR7 and 922-3/2, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.

Deeds, Leases and Sale Catalogues

Deeds of 7 Conduit Street, Hatherleigh (later renumbered 11), in private hands.
Sale Catalogue for the Peppercombe Estate 1988, in private hands
Goldsworthy Manor deeds 63/4/11-13, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
Lease for three cottages in Bucks Mills 1777B/L93, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple..
Lease of a cottage in Bucks Mills, Pine Coffin Estate Records 1845, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple - not on open access.

Wills

Will of Mabel Braund proved 1940, held at The Principal Probate Registry, London.
Will of William George Braund proved 1932, held at The Principal Probate Registry, London.
Letters of Administration for James Elliot 1826, held at Cornwall Record Office, Truro.

Tithe Maps and Schedules

Bulkworthy Tithe Schedule 1843 IR29/9/87, held at The National Archives, Kew.
Bulkworthy Tithe Map 1843 IR30/9/87, held at The National Archives, Kew.
Hatherleigh Tithe Schedule 1842 IR 29/9/199, held at The National Archives, Kew.
Hatherleigh Tithe Map 1842 IR 30/9/199, held at The National Archives, Kew.
Parkham Tithe Schedule 1840 IR29/9/317, held at The National Archives, Kew.
Parkham Tithe Map 1840 IR30/9/317 , held at The National Archives, Kew.
Woolfardisworthy West Tithe Schedule 1838 IR29/9/459, held at The National Archives, Kew.
Woolfardisworthy West Tithe Map 1841 IR30/9/459, held at The National Archives, Kew.

Valuation Office Field Books
Valuation Office Field Books for Bulkworthy IR58 4482, held at The National Archives, Kew.
Valuation Office Field Books for Hatherleigh IR58 4655-4660, held at The National Archives, Kew.
Valuation Office Field Books for Parkham IR58 4850, held at The National Archives, Kew.
Valuation Office Field Books for Woolfardisworthy West IR58 5012, held at The National Archives, Kew.

Land Tax Returns
Land Tax Returns for Bulkworthy 1780-1832, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
Land Tax Returns for Hatherleigh 1780-1832, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
Land Tax Returns for Parkham 1780-1832, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
Land Tax Returns for Woolfardisworthy West 1780-1832, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.

British Parliamentary Papers

Population: Comparative Account of the Population of Great Britain in the Years 1801, 1811, 1821, and 1831 (348) (1831).
Abstract of the Answers and Returns: Enumeration MDCCC1 (1834).
Royal Commission of Enquiry into the Administration and Practical Operation of the Poor Laws Appendix B1 Part V XXXIV (44) (1834).
Address from Upper Canada Imploring Her Majesty’s Government to promote Emigration VII (127) (1841).
Abstract of the Answers and Returns Enumeration: Abstract MDCCCXLI (1843).
Census of England and Wales 1841 Volume 27 (1844).
Census of England and Wales 1881 Volume IV LXXX (583) (1883).
Census of England and Wales 1901: County of Devon Cd. 1271 (1902).

Miscellaneous
Walland Carey Estate Rentals B170/233, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
Survey of the Manor of Goldsworthy 63/4/5/4 held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
1874 Voluntary Rate towards the restoration of Parkham Church - list of heads of household, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
Parkham Lunacy Return 1828 Q5/115/1/301, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
Parkham Church Rate Book 1892A-3, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
1892 A-2/PC5 notice to parish constable re license for Coffin Arms 1864, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
Quarterly Meeting Minute Book and Accounts 1832-1853 Shebbear Bible Christian Circuit B607/1, held at North Devon Record Office, Barnstaple.
Seaman’s Ticket for Thomas Braund, in private hands.
Master’s Certificate of Service for James Braund, in private hands.
BT 243/221 Alwington and Goldsworthy Manors 1853-1857 re: rights of salvage, held at The National Archives, Kew.
BT 297/595 Bundle of documents re: right to removal of material from the beach between Westward Ho! and Hartland Point, held at The National Archives, Kew.
**Websites**


*Kitchener* - the history of Berlin, Ontario (formerly Kitchener) at <<www.kitchener.ca/visiting_kitchener/history.html>> accessed 3 February 2009.


University of Chicago Library - Before and After the Fire: Chicago in the 1860s, 1870s, and 1880s at <<www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/su/maps/chifire/>> accessed 15 February 2009.


