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Abstract

One of the central problems facing academic local historians is the extent of the spatial and social space occupied by communities in the past. This is crucial to the definition of the 'local' component in local history. This thesis works towards using the space occupied by communities to define 'local' by measuring the effect of 6 spatial and social boundaries on 19 contiguous but socially and topographically diverse rural communities in S.E. Surrey, Sussex and Kent.

Patterns of inter-action are mapped in relation to the administrative boundaries of the parish and county; the natural boundary of the pays; and the social boundaries formed by kinship; social structure; and religion. Finally these boundaries are dissolved to form social areas. The sources used contain elements that describe movement - the chief of these are marriage registers and census data, with a qualitative dimension added by diaries and family papers. Nominal and linguistic material is also used, as well as artifacts, whilst the whole is set within the socio-economic context of the area.

The social areas defined by inter-action show a remarkable resemblance to those shown by dialect, material culture, surname distribution and kinship networks. The main characteristics of these areas are that they extend over at least 4 communities which share an intense level of activity. These communities nest within a symbiotic framework of looser activity that goes beyond the study area to include market towns and an important urban centre.

Three keywords emerge in the study. The first of these is community - many parishes consisted of several communities reacting in different ways so that this is a more relevant description of groups of people on the ground than parish. The second is symbioses - each community was an integral part of the whole. The last is process, as the patterns of inter-action were not stable but responded to internal and external stimuli. In the final essence, the 'local' component in local history is defined as up to 4 communities set within a loose regional framework. A viable research area for local historians should consist of at least 4 communities as single community studies are unique rather than local.

This work contributes both to the study of continuity and change within communities, as well as to the historiography and practice of local history.
Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy to the University of Leicester in March 1989.
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CHAPTER ONE

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Introduction

One of the central problems facing local historians is that of defining the geographical and social space occupied by 'communities' in the past. This theme has been discussed in detail in two recent works, one by a local historian, the other by a sociologist. In what must be one of the most important statements on the nature of local history, Phythian-Adams suggests that the two concepts of society and community which are the basic units of local history are multi-faceted terms which relate:

"however imprecisely, to a membership process, to a structure, and to sets of ideas and images concerning both the particular nature of that structure, and to sets of ideas and images of cultural identification with a social territory."

He also writes that "historians should now be seeking new ways in which to discover local 'societies' at the very start of their investigations and therefore before they relate such societies to the landscape, to 'community' or 'class', or even the broader trends or processes within which these societies had to function and adapt." In order to define the spatial limits of the social territory, therefore, we need to find ways of identifying groups of

\[\text{\cite{1C. Phythian-Adams, Re-thinking English Local History, Department of English Local History, University of Leicester, Occasional Paper, 4th ser.1, 1987, passim.}}\]

\[\text{\cite{2A. P. Cohen, The Symbolic Construction of Community, 1985, passim.}}\]

\[\text{\cite{3Ibid., 1, p. 44.}}\]

\[\text{\cite{4Phythian-Adams, op. cit., p. 43.}}\]
linked communities. Whilst Phythian-Adams' approach is to identify potential community groups by dissolving the boundaries between them, Cohen sees the boundary as marking the beginning and end of the community. He writes that the:

"boundary encapsulates the identity of the community and like the identity of the individual, is called into being by the exigencies of social interaction. Boundaries are marked because communities interact in some way or other with entities from which they are, or wish to be distinguished."

Boundaries under Cohen's terms confer a sense of belonging, or help to define the community's identity. Cohen continues that: "This consciousness of community is encapsulated in perception of its boundaries, boundaries which are themselves largely constituted by people in interaction."

If, therefore, the boundaries of a community can be defined, it should be possible to establish the spatial and social limits that relate to the "membership process", or promote a feeling of identity or belonging amongst the members of the community.

These twin themes - belonging and boundaries - are the main concern of this work. It aims to use the latter to define the former by measuring the relative strength of various boundaries in order to assess the components that shaped local identity in the past. It has the objective of using the results to make a statement on the 'localness' and nature of 'local history'. It will start by establishing a working definition of local identity before moving onto discuss this in relation to boundaries. It will also relate these boundaries to developments in the

---

5 Phythian-Adams, op.cit., p.44.
7 Ibid., 6, p.13.
8 Ibid., 5.
Local Identity: A Definition

Local identity is an abstract concept which evolves from belonging to a recognisably distinct group. Cohen expresses this in cultural terms as:

"The sense of belonging, of what it means to belong is constantly evolved by whatever means come to hand: the use of language, the shared knowledge of genealogy or ecology, joking, the solidarity of sect, the aesthetics of subsistence skills."

This sense of belonging is essentially pragmatic, developing to meet changing requirements and conditions. In the past, when the majority of the population was illiterate, it was acquired through everyday experience. A working definition is, therefore, that local identity is a body of conscious and unconscious attitudes, values, customs, rituals, language and shared experience peculiar to one group of people.

No concession is made in this definition to the spatial element of the group which shares this identity. Those with qualities in common could be a nation - or a parish. Similarly, it could be restricted by social constraints that pressurised the sense of belonging or local identity in one direction rather than another. The relation of the boundaries formed by spatial units and social constraints will be discussed in the following section.

---

Local Identity and Boundaries

Boundaries, Cohen suggests are symbolic markers by which a community strives to make sense of reality. 10 Before discussing either the symbolic or the actual boundaries that could enclose a community, it is necessary to establish a definition of 'community'. This is no easy task, for as the Blake Report on Local History says, the only agreed definition of a community is that it concerns human beings.11 Community, in the context of this work can be taken to mean a group of human beings sharing a common identity, but at this point of the discussion, of unknown spatial or social dimensions.

To return to the consideration of boundaries, although these are often symbolic they are nevertheless perceived markers. Boundaries, therefore, will be the measurement by which the spatial and social definition of the community of local identity will be assessed. In examining boundaries, it is necessary to move from abstract to actual terms as the landscape of eighteenth and nineteenth-century England was divided into institutional and natural blocks, which were contained within boundaries. The first of these blocks to be discussed will be institutional - the administrative boundaries formed by the parish and the county. The discussion will start by considering the role of the smaller of these, the parish.

Local Identity and Administrative Boundaries: The Parish

Cohen writes that: "The parish border may mark the beginning and end of a settlement. But these boundaries are symbolic receptacles filled with meaning that members impute to and perceive in them." This statement encapsulates the two aspects of boundaries that will be considered in the following sections. The first of these is the institutional and statutory context of the boundary - whilst the second is the individual perception of these boundaries as symbolic-markers.

The smallest administrative unit used in this study, the parish, is a divided unit. Its original spatial borders had no statutory rights or duties attached to them. These were purely ecclesiastical divisions where a parish priest was appointed to dispense religious services to a given spatial area in return for tithes and obligations. Gradually, however, the territorial unit came to be used as an instrument of civil administration. The officers that managed the parish reflected this two-tier formation. The most prestigious was the ecclesiastical post of church-warden. This officer was directly responsible to the diocesan authorities for the repair of church fabric, as well as the morals of the parishioners. By the eighteenth century ecclesiastical and civil functions had become fused in the office, so that the church-warden was often jointly responsible with the Poor Law Overseer for distributing poor relief.

In the eighteenth-century, the role of the parish as an

\[\text{12} \text{Cohen, Symbolic Construction, op.cit., p.19.}\]

\[\text{13} \text{S.and B.Webb, English Local Government from the Revolution to Municipal Corporations Act; The Parish and the County, 1924, p.10.}\]

\[\text{14} \text{Ibid., 13.}\]
organ of social service became the crucial factor in maintaining it as a boundary-marker. By the mid-eighteenth-century the burden of the poor on the parish rate was so great that the settlement requirements which gave entitlement to relief were stringently applied. As relief could only be obtained from the parish of legal settlement it became in everyone's interest to know where the parish border lay. Such was the importance of the parish as an agency of social service that the Webbs see the decline of the parish as an organ of local government as coinciding with the passing of the New Poor Law, which by setting up unions of parishes created a broader base for local government. 15 Other civil parochial officers helped to maintain law and order - the Parish Constable, or oversaw the maintenance of the highway - Surveyor of the Highways. These, with the Overseers of the Poor were subordinate "to a superior organ of local self-government, the Justices of the Peace", 16 who were in turn responsible to central government. The parish lay at the end of a chain of legislation which started at national level.

Cutting across the parochial unit were other older boundaries. Manorial boundaries, for instance, could divide parishes into different manorial units or unite groups of parishes under one manor. The manorial court was in decline by the late eighteenth century, although it survived in parishes with copyhold land. These parishes will be discussed where relevant in the following chapters.

Manorial units often crossed parish boundaries. Nevertheless, the physical limits of the parish were important. In most cases, however, there were no visible geographical boundaries between parishes, so that the boundaries were undefined unless held in local memory. In

---


16 Webb, op.cit.,p.41
order to preserve this memory, annual perambulations of the parish bounds were made at Rogation. Indeed, in 1698 Archbishop Stillingfleet exhorted parishioners to continue this practice so that the boundaries could be preserved. This ritual of marking the bounds re-emphasized communal solidarity as well as the geographical and symbolic aspects of the boundaries. Although The Gentleman's Magazine for January 1787 says that the practice of walking the bounds was in abeyance by that date, there is evidence from S.E.Surrey for its continuance into the late eighteenth century. The Godstone Vestry Minute Book describes the exact route of a perambulation of the parish boundary made on May 30th and 31st 1794. It gives the landmarks to be noted, as well as idiograms of the way in which they were to be marked. In all there were sixty-seven stages to be marked. A further entry records that the 'outside' boundaries of Tandridge, Oxted, Crowhurst and Lingfield were trodden on the 9th day of July 1802. The several perambulations meeting at various points for refreshments.

Having outlined the ecclesiastical and civil status of the parish and the way in which the boundaries were drawn and symbolically marked, it is also necessary to draw attention to other factors that placed constraints on inter-action across parish boundaries in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In parishes where there was a dominant resident landholder there could be restrictions to settlement that transcended Poor Law Regulations. In order to keep the rates down the landholder could manipulate the supply of housing so that few outsiders could gain settlement. The result was

17 Webb, op.cit., p.10.
19 S.R.O. P/25/3/1, Godstone Parish Vestry Book.
See also C.Cox, 'Parish Boundary Markers and the Decline of Parish Authority', The Local Historian, 18,2, May 1988, pp. 58-64.
20 S.R.O. P/25/3/1, loc.cit.
that the population of these parishes failed to rise to meet labour demands. This was supplied in theory, from those neighbouring parishes which had no dominant land-owner, fewer pressures on settlement, so a buoyant population with a surplus of labour. These parishes were described by mid-nineteenth century writers on rural affairs, such as James Caird, as 'close' or 'open'. Twenty-first century historians have used various socio-economic and demographic features to define these parishes. Holderness used labour-supply, whilst Mills suggested predictive models for these parishes by using land-ownership as the causative factor in their creation. These approaches have been criticised in an important paper by Banks, who nevertheless suggests that: "A detailed examination of the inter-actions, inter-dependancy, and communications between neighbouring parishes may be a fruitful route for understanding certain social and demographic factors of nineteenth century life". She concludes that the features of 'open' or 'closed' parishes were much exaggerated by nineteenth-century commentators, which has in its turn misled twentieth-century historians.

Notwithstanding these constraints, it can be seen that interaction and identity was directed in some measure by the structure and limitations of society. Individual responses to the parochial unit were likely to be coloured by the position of the individual in parish society. When, for instance, John Clement, a Surrey yeoman, serving his term as

---


Overseer to the Poor, wrote in his diary on November 1742:- ".... a male child. Charged to our parish of Nutfield," his use of "our" was likely to mean the rate-payers who would have to support the child. It should not be forgotten that the parish was the stage on which the two actors in the Poor Law drama were face-to-face. Both 'belonged' to the parish, As the Webbs pointed out, who 'belonged' to a parish was determined by law and custom - i.e. birth or settlement. Obligation to the parish, however, depended not on settlement but on residence, so that the resident poor could be put to work on the parish highways without receiving relief from that parish. In the context of local identity, the parish operated on a practical level by administering poor relief, or maintaining law and order. Those officers appointed to oversee these functions were in the final essence responsible to the larger administrative unit of the county or shire. The next section will look at local identity in relation to that unit.

Local Identity and Administrative Boundaries: The County

The shire or county is of great antiquity as a territorial unit. Hackwood, following Lambard suggests that the shire boundaries were finalised by Alfred the Great, with the smaller kingdoms automatically becoming shires. However, shire formation was a process with variable timing. For instance, Shropshire or the shires that included the five boroughs were late formations, probably post-1018, whereas those shires that relate to the Saxon kingdoms were earlier units. Once created, the shires made convenient units for the administration of justice, the maintenance of law and order and the dissemination of national legislation to a local level. The Webbs continue this theme of law and order by suggesting that the governing class saw the dignitaries

\(^{24}\) S.R.O. 3140, Clement Family Papers, Diary of John Clement, Nov. 1742.


of the county as the chief instruments of government, with all the parochial officers responsible to the county authorities as personified by the Justices of Peace.\textsuperscript{27}

The Commission of the Peace is, therefore, a key factor in the context of the county as a boundary-marker. Paradoxically, the commission itself was responsible not to the county but to the crown, thus emphasizing the statutory role of the county in enforcing \textit{national} or \textit{crown} legislation. This role produced certain obligations which can be summarized as follows - the county as a whole was expected to supply an army in the time of national emergency and it was obliged to collect taxes and subsidies. It was also charged to maintain law and order. As well as these obligations, the county as a unit was responsible for the upkeep of the roads, bridges and gaols, as well as providing a venue for the Assizes. Failure to comply with any of these could result in the county being fined, with execution of the fine being levied against any inhabitant of the county.\textsuperscript{28}

The county was a corporate body, which the parish was not, but this was not recognised constitutionally until the foundation of the county councils in 1888.

Geographically, however, the county was a large space, difficult for the individual to grasp, especially as the functions of the county were administered at a parochial level. The question has to be asked whether the county could be perceived as a boundary-marker by the individual, when in many cases no physical features separated one county from another. Nevertheless, the county boundary was important as the jurisdiction of the county officers could not pass over it. In earlier times, for instance, 'hue and cry' had to be recalled at the county border. A fact which could be exploited by wrongdoers.

\textsuperscript{27}Webb, \textit{op.cit.}, p.280.

\textsuperscript{28}Webb, \textit{op.cit.}, p.307.
Furthermore, there is evidence that the county or shire borders were often marked in the same way as parish boundaries. Hackwood gives examples of shire oaks, shire ditches and shire stones marking shire boundaries. Place-name evidence from Sussex shows that the Surrey/Sussex border was marked with a County Oak, now in the parish of Crawley in Sussex, as well as a Shire-Mark Farm in the parish of Warnham.\(^{29}\)

Other evidence suggests that the county/shire was an early cognitive unit of local identity. In 1313, for instance, "the community of the whole county of Kent" made a petition to the Justices in Eyre that they might be allowed their customs that they had ever been used to have. Kent has always stood out as a unique county. It is no surprise, therefore, that some of the earliest county histories to be written were on that county. Hasted writing in the late eighteenth century extolled its excellence: "Amongst the different counties of England, few have been more enriched by art and nature, than the county of Kent."\(^{30}\) Hackwood writing in the 1920s saw the county unit as fostering local pride through its uniqueness:

"The tendency for centuries has been for each shire to exploit its own vitality, to cherish its own traditions. Everywhere local patriotism and civic independence has gone hand in hand, the operation of the shire system tending towards variation and individuality."

\(^{31}\)

\(^{29}\) Hackwood, op.cit., p.177.


\(^{31}\) Hackwood, op.cit., pp.34-35.
Variation was inherent in the geography of each county, but natural variations in landscape crossed both parish and county boundaries uniting communities by natural features held in common. Whether the landscape could form a perceived boundary-marker will be discussed in the following section.

Local Identity and Natural Boundaries: Pays

The concept that the environment could form boundaries by affecting socio-cultural values is by no means new. John Aubrey noted in the seventeenth-century that: "According to the several sorts of earth in England (and so in all the world over), the Indigenae are respectively witty or dull, good or bad." Embedded in this statement is one of the central concerns of the relationship between man and the environment – i.e. whether the latter can determine the course of the former. Geographic determinism has undergone many modifications since the seventeenth-century, with the conceptual balance between man and nature undergoing alteration. Semple, for instance, writing in 1911 still saw man as passive, subject to physical constraints. In contrast, Vidal De La Brache saw man as the dominant partner in the environmental relationship. Other writers have seen the landscape as a series of ‘culture areas’. One of the first to develop this concept was the Danish folklorist, Carl von Sydow, who formulated the hypothesis that traditions undergo a change determined by ecological requirements. He described these ecological regions as ecotypes, each with its own environmentally determined culture. Steward also saw the environment as the constant variable in the man-environment relationship. He used the term ‘culture areas’, which he defined as areas where

34 C. von Sydow, Papers on Folklore, Copenhagen, 1948, p.51.
constant behavioural uniformities occur within an area of environmental uniformity. 35

Moving from abstract theory to its application in practice, it can be seen that the concept of pays as articulated by British agrarian historians also recognizes the relationship of culture to environment. For many years Britain had been divided topographically into highland and lowland zones, each with characteristic socio-economic and cultural features. 36 These divisions are over simplistic. Work on the agricultural regions of Britain led Thirsk and Everitt to refine them. From this developed the concept of pays. The essence of pays is encapsulated in this statement by Thirsk: "Beneath the man-made landscape, and underlying all the institutions of society which differentiated neighbouring communities and united widely separated ones, nature had laid a foundation which men were forced to accept." 37 It was from this premise that the concept of pays as defined by Everitt developed. Broadly speaking this concept suggests that certain types of terrain will produce certain types of settlement, agriculture, socio-economic conditions and cultural attitudes. It implies that a community can be typed according to its position in the landscape. Furthermore, the pays could unite those in different parishes or counties who shared a similar ecologically determined life-style - so by inference the pays can form a natural boundary.

How far the individual perceived these landscape boundaries might depend on the point in time and place in society of that individual. Although writers such as Aubrey or Harrison 38 realised in the seventeenth-century that the geography of England could be divided into different zones with

36 For example, C. Fox, The Personality of Britain, 1932.
characteristic settlement morphologies, landholding structure and building etc., they were well travelled men who could compare the different regions. They also knew that underlying the various landscapes were geological conditions that favoured one type of agriculture over another. It is doubtful how far the ordinary member of the community would perceive these differences, especially by the end of the eighteenth century when agricultural differences were minimized during the Napoleonic wars, with each type of pays laid down to corn.

The pays was an abstract concept lacking the institutional structure of the parish or county to give it symbolic meaning. The first social boundary to be discussed, kinship, is also founded on natural phenomenon, but unlike the pays, it is embedded in the institutional framework of society. The next section will discuss this in detail.

Local Identity and Social Boundaries: Kinship

The institution of marriage and the family with its attendant obligations helps to focus identity onto people rather than place. Williams in his study of a west country community describes the individual countryman's inter-actions as a series of concentric circles with the individual at the centre and the family forming the next ring. Under certain circumstances the family network could form a boundary blocking inter-action with the next ring of outsiders. Strathern in her anthropological investigation of Elmdon found that family networks formed strong boundaries
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38 Aubrey, op. cit., passim.


against outsiders. She also found that membership of certain families conferred status in the community. Although both Elmdon and Ashworthy are based on twentieth-century evidence, the growing body of studies on migration in the past which show a highly mobile population, coupled with the high mortality rates in eighteenth-century England, suggest that the likelihood of dense kinship networks being experienced in the past was rare.

Furthermore, kinship-centred networks are a feature of a peasant economy rather than one based on wage-labour. Whether a peasant economy ever existed in England, or if it did, whether it survived into the nineteenth-century is a matter of some debate. The acceptance or rejection of the idea of a peasant based agrarian system in England depends to a certain extent on the definition of the word 'peasant'. Beckett who discusses the semantics of the term in a paper in Agricultural History Review points out that during the nineteenth century much confusion surrounded the meaning of the word as to whether it should refer to the mass of agrarian labour or only those who held land. Once the idea of a landholding peasantry was assumed, it took on political overtones with the possibility of lost rights to be redressed. Macfarlane, who defined the peasant as a small landowner/occupier with a family based method of production thinks that this type of productive unit had disappeared from England as early as the thirteenth century. Conversely, Mills, who uses a broader definition which
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40 M. Strathern, Kinship at the Core, 1979, p.24.


includes all kinds of small-productive units such as wheelwrights etc., gives evidence for a thriving peasant economy in nineteenth-century Wiltshire. 44

Undoubtedly, small family run productive units did not fare as well in England as on the Continent. By the late eighteenth-century a combination of enclosure, agricultural rationalization and a fluid land market, had to a large extent forced the landholders with small units of land into a wage economy. Reed, however, argues for a peasant economy surviving in Southern England in the nineteenth-century. He points out that Appendix D of the Poor Law Report seen in conjunction with the 1851 census shows that there were many small family run farms in the Wealden area of southern England. 45 In some areas, therefore, kinship networks were likely to be denser than others. In these areas kinship may form a stronger boundary against outsiders than elsewhere, as well as promoting kin-identity amongst its members. Thus forcing inter-action inwards onto the kinship groups, rather than outwards onto outsiders.

The perception and significance of kinship as a boundary-marker was determined to a certain extent by the institutional structure of society. Macfarlane in Marriage and Love in England suggests that the state in taking over the responsibility for the relief of the poor removed one of the prime obligations of kinship, that of succouring the old or needy members of the family. 46 The Poor Law was, therefore, indirectly responsible for the tenuous kinship links of pre-industrial England, where as Laslett's work
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44 Mills, op. cit., pp.54-58.  
45 M. Reed, 'The Peasantry of Nineteenth Century England,' History Workshop, 18, Autumn 1984, p.53.  
shows, the nuclear family rather than extended household was the normal experience. In these circumstances the individual in the mid-eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was likely to have a kinship field which was limited to the descent family. In practice, however, many could call up an extensive network of kin in times of need. A network of relations that in many cases conferred both status and identity on its members.

Social-status, on the other hand, was part of the structure of society. Eighteenth and nineteenth century rural society was arranged hierarchically. Each rank in this hierarchy was based on inequalities in the distribution of resources. These basic inequalities could have united members of similar resource bands into communities of common interest. In the next section the boundaries formed by the social-structure of society in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries will be discussed.

Local Identity and Social Boundaries: Social Structure

The rural community in eighteenth-century England was composed of a number of common interest blocks arranged by rank. This was seen by eighteenth-century writers as the natural order. In 1753, for instance, James Nelson wrote that: "every Nation has its classes". He listed five - ranging from Nobility, through Gentry, Mercantile or Commercial People, Mechanics and Peasantry. Nelson's use of the word class is part of an increased usage of the word across the eighteenth-century, whilst the older terms of degree, rank or estate started to fall into disuse. As the iconoclasm of the French Revolution instilled a fear of similar popular uprisings, interest in the structure of .

47 P. Laslett, The World We Have Lost, 1965, for example p.72.

48 P.J. Corfield, 'Class by Number and Name in Eighteenth Century Britain', History, 72, Feb. 1987, p.38.
society grew in Britain. But the divisions of society in Britain were both rigid and immutable, for although it was possible for the individual to cross the boundaries formed by the social structure of rural society, there was no group mobility across these boundaries.

It has been suggested by some social historians, Newby, for instance,⁴⁹ that the identity formed through being on the same rung of the social ladder cut across other boundaries. Wrightson and Levine’s work on Terling confirms that common interest or socio-economic groups within the parish formed identifiable ‘communities’, but they cannot offer any evidence for the territorial extension of these groups across spatial boundaries. Neither have they found it possible to confirm the existence of such groups below the level of the office-holding power base of the parish. They write:

"The overlap of wealth, status, and power, the common participation in parish affairs, and the myriad other services performed for one another by the more substantial villagers of Terling surely justifies our regarding these men as a distinct group in village society. They formed a local ruling group that possessed a distinct social identity."

⁵⁰

By the nineteenth century significant divisions had emerged between social groups. The growth of self-consciousness within each socio-economic group led to heightened tensions between the groups which divided communities. Thus, the social boundaries formed by the social-structure of the community could both divide and unite. Social boundaries had the potential to form blocks of identity that could transcend spatial boundary-markers.


⁵⁰ K. Wrightson and D. Levine, Poverty and Piety in an English Village, Terling 1525-1700, 1979, p.106.
Other groups shared qualities that formed identities which crossed spatial boundaries. Religious affiliation to a sect other than the Anglican church could unite its members in a community of common interest, as well as setting up boundaries against outsiders. The final boundary which will be discussed is that formed by religious allegiance.

Local Identity and Social Boundaries: Religion

Wrightson and Levine consider that the seventeenth-century nonconformists were likely to be one of the village groups that shared a collective identity comparable to that of the local ruling group. Similarly, Corfield suggests that in eighteenth-century society, religious allegiances gave a powerful sense of identity. Some parishes, Terling for example, were swarming with nonconformists. In others it was confined to a few who met with brethren from the same faith from other parishes, thus setting up social interactions which crossed spatial boundaries. The organisation of some sects encouraged this development. Quakers, for instance, usually chose to build their meeting-houses in a local market town, so that they drew their congregation from a wide rural hinterland. Baptists too, met in locations convenient for travel from outlying districts.

Nonconformist religious allegiances could unite one set of people but divide the whole. Obelkevich's work on nineteenth century Methodism in rural Lincolnshire shows that early Methodism was seen as a disrupting influence on the community. He contends that:

"The Methodist 'society' was drawn from village society but stood apart from it in a specifically Methodist circuit structure... At every level in Methodism one's religious identity as 'brother' or 'sister' cut across hardening class lines in a wider society...."

52 J. Obelkevich, Religion and Rural Society: South Lindsey 1825-1875, 1976, p.95.

51 Wrightson and Levine, op.cit., p.106.

Corfield, loc.cit., p.46.
Methodism in Lincolnshire cut across spatial and social boundaries to realign communities into interest blocks formed by religious affiliation. These religious communities had in-built organizational and doctrinal features. Those who belonged to a dissenting sect were, for instance, encouraged to marry within the sect or religious comforts were withdrawn. Just as in the parochial organisation of the Church of England so there were certain obligations exacted from the nonconformist congregations, for example, financial obligations in the form of covenants and collections, or administrative duties as officeholders, or practical tasks in providing food for 'love-feasts' or communal breakfasts. Nonconformism had, therefore, the potential for forming strong boundaries against outsiders as well as perpetuating identity amongst its members.

Everitt suggests that rural dissent was likely to flourish in specific types of communities. It was prevalent in parishes where there were outlying hamlets at a distance from the parish church, or loose manorial control. It also thrived in decayed market-towns or in communities situated on boundaries. There is evidence for the latter from S.E.Surrey where early Baptist meetings were held on a common where four parishes met. The symbolic boundaries of the parish were in this case being used in a positive way, as there was less likelihood of the meetings being prevented in a situation where responsibility could be shifted to a neighbouring parish.

Some boundaries were being perceived as a concrete entity by the religious community, but the members of this community

54 T.R.Hooper, Surrey and Sussex Border Church 1650-1840, 1925, p.29.
came from several parishes, thus dissolving other spatial boundaries. Moving from the boundary-markers that might have formed local identity or pushed it more in one direction rather than another, the next section will consider the possible modes of transmission and maintenance of local identity or a sense of belonging.

Local Identity: Transmission and Maintenance

Local identity has already been defined as a pragmatic phenomenon, evolving to meet changing conditions. It has also been suggested that it was acquired through everyday experience, so that its transmission was likely to be through face-to-face inter-action, such as the mother-child relationship, peer groups, work-mates and neighbours etc. In a pre-literate society, therefore, it was transmitted orally. This would help to control its spatial horizon, as an oral tradition of disseminating information would make it difficult to keep in touch with those who moved out of their home areas, as well as making it impossible to organise people outside a small radius. The growth of literacy although enabling the development of collective class-consciousness, diluted the customs and traditions of 'popular culture' which were an intrinsic part of local identity.

The calendrical and customary rituals of 'popular culture' were, nevertheless, beyond the everyday experience of the rural community. These rituals can be seen as the conscious articulation of its identity with the festivals and rites verbalizing the unconscious attitudes of the community. By formalization of its structural components by role-reversal, for example, in the appointment of a Lord of Misrule or Boy Bishop, the rituals also acted as a safety valve for the tensions within the community. The hierarchial nature of the community is visible from its culture. Burke's analysis of popular culture makes this clear by drawing comparisons between the 'great' traditions of the literate society and
the 'little' tradition of popular culture. Burke's divisions omit a substantial section of society - the literate middling rank of yeomen, wealthy tradesmen and merchants. Their position was ambiguous. On the one hand they had pretensions to the life-style of the upper sections of society, but on the other they participated in local festivals, although by the eighteenth century this was often in an official capacity, for example, church-warden. John Clement, a yeoman of Nutfield in Surrey, is a good example of this ambiguity. His diary records ordering the church bells to be rung on November 5th. It is kept in an almanac with the appropriately superstitious title of Rider's Merlin Book, but his probate inventory shows that he owned 42 bound books including Keble's Statutes at Large. His daughter Ann's commonplace book was kept in the margin of The Ladies Companion. The table of contents of this shows some of the preoccupations of middle-rank eighteenth century women. It includes an account of the dress and manners of the Ladies of the Grecian Archipelago, tables of fares for watermen and hackney coachmen, tables of moveable feasts and holidays, the rules for playing whist and a ready reckoner. The Clements were a mixture of the literate and the superstitious, a combination of the 'great' and 'little' traditions, absorbing values from both. They aspired to the social conventions of the upper ranks of society but were still involved with the ranks lower than themselves.

By the nineteenth century the 'little' tradition had almost disappeared from adult life. George Sturt/Bourne writing in 1919 but describing the situation of sixty years earlier, writes of how the popular customs had become diluted into

57 S.R.O. 3140 E 54. Clement Papers, Probate of Mr. John Clement of Kentwins Farm, Nutfield.
children's games. Similarly, Flora Thompson shows how the May-Day ceremonies had become a schoolchildren's mockery of former events. These changes can be attributed to the growth of literacy which not only made the labouring classes more articulate and self-conscious, but also promoted a national popular culture in the form of novels, pamphlets and magazines etc., which helped to change local expectations and attitudes.

Notwithstanding the growth of literacy, language and the way in which people used it helped to form identity. In some locations where the local dialect persisted it helped to keep local identity unique. Indeed, the extreme diversity of dialects in the past was such that peripatetic occupations such as masons developed their own argot so that workers from anywhere could be understood. Language, therefore, is another boundary-marker that has to be considered in the context of local identity, inter-action, and boundaries.

To sum up the preceding sections - six possible boundary-markers that might have shaped spatial and social inter-action in the past have been discussed in both their structural and symbolic forms. The penultimate section of this chapter will look at the historiography of work on these boundaries, as well as relating it to the epistemology of local history.
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Local History and Local Identity: Historiography

This section will be in two parts. The first will look at definitions of local history; whilst the second will examine the way in which it has been treated, with especial reference to the boundaries used to define the areas of research.

The definitive and most recent work on the historiography and philosophy of local history, Re-thinking English Local History, deals fully with the development of local history as an academic discipline. Briefly, two approaches can be traced in the growth of local historical inquiry. One could be called an antiquarian/populist approach, the other an academic approach. The first grew out of an inherent desire in most people to know something of the locality where they live or were born. This desire is especially pertinent today, when individuals are separated from their descent families by long distances in a society which is both rootless and standardised. The Report of the Committee to Review Local History suggested that the need to relate to something stable might account for the growth in popularity in local history since the Second World War. It saw local history as satisfying many and varied needs but growing out of the fact that: "Human adjustments do not take place as abruptly as administrative changes, many of which are imposed by centralized institutions operating on a national or supra-national basis." 59

Similarly, people in the past tried to make sense of their existence by looking at the history of their home areas. Hoskins suggests that the study of localized history and topography is five hundred years old, growing out of itineraries and notes of curiosities seen on journeys into topographical accounts of specific localities, progressing

59 Standing Conference for Local History, op.cit., pp.6,9.
onto historical inquiries and speculations on individual counties or parishes, usually by upper-class leisured gentlemen. These admirable, but often unselective publications, provided the backbone of local historical inquiry that is continued by the 'amateur' local historian, or local history society. Parallel to these 'antiquarian' local historians are those who treat the subject as an academic discipline.

Local history as an academic discipline developed in the early years of the twentieth-century when a local history research fellow was appointed at the (then) University College of Reading. It was not until the foundation of the Department of English Local History at the (then) University College of Leicester in 1948 that a conscious articulation of a definition and aims of academic local history was attempted. In 1952 Finberg wrote that: "The business of the local historian, then, as I see it, is to re-enact in his own mind, and to portray for his readers, the Origin, Growth, Decline and Fall of a local community."  

This statement contains the essence of the Leicester approach to local history - i.e. it is concerned with the study of the local community. Briggs in a review article of some Leicester publications in The New Statesman called the approach the 'Leicester School'. In this article he raised the question of how far generalizations could be drawn from any one local community. He also suggested that the Leicester approach as represented by Finberg and Hoskins was both too nostalgic and too materialistic.  

Further criticism of the 'Leicester School' was raised by

Pugh, who suggested that local history should be concerned with area rather than community. Pugh had isolated the main difficulty in defining academic local history—should it be concerned with communities or territories—people or places? This in turn raises the question that if the latter is the prime concern of local historians, how large an area is a viable proposition for being termed 'local'? Powell, another protagonist in the 1958 debate, objected to the Leicester approach for its insistence that local history was not national history at a local level. He stated that England from Saxon times to the present has been an administrative unit so that "the actions of the central government have influenced the lives of people living in all parts of the country." Should local history be used to look at national themes at a local level? This was the approach used by Hoskins in The Midland Peasant. He wrote that he saw the work—"as a contribution to English economic and social history, and not a history of the village as such."

Everitt, Hoskins successor at Leicester endeavored to put the 'local' back into local history but without specifying its area. In Ways and Means in Local History he writes:

"The local historian shall aim, rather, to study either the making of the landscape of his area over the centuries, the feature of its local topography so as to speak; or else the development of some particular organism, with a more or less distinct life of its own...."

Thus, he manages to include within this definition the dichotomy of academic local history—should it be people or place based, whilst avoiding the question of how large an

---

63 Finberg and Skipp, op.cit., p.32.
area is local? This was one of the questions which the Blake Committee considered. It came to the conclusion that: "local history as such could only be defined as the study of man's past in relation to his locality, locality being determined by an individual's interests and experience", which is a definition for all seasons. 67

Two writers who have attempted to define the scale of 'local' are Skipp and Marshall. They take opposing views of the problem. Skipp advocates in-depth micro studies, 68 whilst Marshall who describes himself as a regional historian defines the 'local' in local history as "the countryside or region around one's main area of interest". He continues that: "An historic region relates to some kind of large extended community of interest of people." 69 It is the community he suggests that should interest the local historian, not as the "parish or county communities but as communities of like minded people". He concludes that the local historian "has to be prepared to study the patterns of historical development across large tracts of the English countryside." 70

67 Standing Conference on Local History, op.cit., p.3.
68 For example, V. Skipp, 'Local History: a New Definition. Part 1', The Local Historian, 13, 1, 1978, pp.4-5.
69 J.D. Marshall, 'Local or Regional History - or both? A dialogue', The Local Historian, 13, 1, Feb.1978, pp.3-10.
70 Ibid., 74.
This brief summary of the definitions and scope of academic local history cannot help but conclude with a reference to the framework for future study suggested by Phythian-Adams. This seeks not to confuse real social entities with administratively, economically or geographically defined entities, but insists on the need to identify a local societal area before locating it in space.\footnote{Phythian-Adams, \textit{op.cit.}, pp.43-44.}

From the preceding discussion it can be seen that no one definition of the 'local' component in local history can be given. That it concerns the community is generally accepted, but the geographical space that constitutes a viable area of inquiry is not. The possible scale of inquiries range from single parish micro studies to macro regional studies. The rest of this section will look at some of the ways in which 'local' historians have used space in their research. The discussion starts by considering works which deal with the parish community as a unit of inquiry. Although parish histories were a later development than county histories,\footnote{Hoskins, \textit{Local History}, \textit{op.cit.}, pp.16-19.} single parish studies have remained primarily the concern of local societies or squires with antiquarian interests. Lambert's two volume work on the parish of Blechingley in S.E. Surrey is a good example of this genre, packed full of facts but with little analysis.\footnote{U. Lambert, \textit{Blechingley}, 1921, passim.} Academic works which concentrate on single parishes tend towards the thematic. Hoskins preamble on \textit{The Midland Peasant} is a good example of this trend.\footnote{Hoskins, \textit{The Midland Peasant}, \textit{op.cit.}, p.xviii.} Similarly, Wrightson and Levines's examination of Terling in Essex was a socio-demographic study of the parish rather than its history.\footnote{Wrightson and Levine, \textit{op.cit.}, passim.} Indeed many of the academic works dealing with a single parish or community...
over the last twenty years have been sociological or anthropological studies, such as Robin's work on Elmdon, or Prior's on Fisher Row.\(^{76}\)

A survey of the books reviewed by *The Local Historian*, *History, The Economic History Review*, and *Local Population Studies* over the last ten years, which could be classified as 'local history' showed that overall 56 books or pamphlets were single parish studies; compared to 55 single county studies or 32 regional inquiries. The list could be further broken down into 'antiquarian' or 'academic' publications. This showed that 18 or 32% of the single community studies could be called academic compared to 29 or 53% of county-based studies and 19 or 59% of regional studies. The larger the unit, therefore, the greater the likelihood of it getting academic treatment. The reason for this is obvious.

The 'amateur' or 'local society' is likely to lack the resources and time needed for a wider-based study. This raises the question as to whether the academic local historian should be concerned with single community micro-studies or whether time would be more profitably spent in broad overviews, or in utilizing material from the 'amateur' worker in comparative studies. It is hoped that this is one of the questions that will be answered in part by this research.

Historical investigations into the county or shire were an early development. Hoskins writes that by the start of the nineteenth-century only seven counties were without a history.\(^{77}\) By the end of the nineteenth-century work on the monumental *Victoria History of the Counties of England* had commenced whilst the development of cheaper paper and printing techniques, and improved public transport


encouraged nineteenth century publishers to bring out series of county guidebooks. These often followed the format of the earliest type of local history - perambulations and itineraries, but by this time taken by train. The nineteenth century guidebooks and V.C.H. apart, there were also general works on the county which were often collections of single parish histories rather than the history of the county as a whole. Academic historians on the other hand have tended to write thematic studies on the county, although mention has to be made of the pioneering series of chronological histories of Lincolnshire. The seventeenth-century in particular has lent itself to the study of the county community, examples by Everitt and Fletcher come to mind.  

It should also be noted that surveys of place-names or surnames tend to be county based. This is partly due to the nature of the sources so that part of the brief of this study is to look at the relevance of the county as a unit of study, taking into account this bias in the sources.

Regional studies too, have tended to be either thematic such as Harrison's study of the Pilgrimage of Grace in the Lake Counties, or to examine blocks of landscape or physical features in the landscape such as vernacular buildings. A further group deal with regional industries. These form a convenient bridge to those studies based on pays, via a series of studies looking at the iron industries in the Weald, which is a distinctive ecological region or pays.

78 For example, N.R. Wright, Lincolnshire Towns and Industry, 1700-1914, 1982, passim.
A.Fletcher, A County Community in Peace and War, 1600-1660, 1975, passim.
80 For example, E.Straker, Iron Industry in the Weald, 1931, passim.

(Footnote continued)
Local historians have found the concept of pays a useful model to test on various geographical areas and themes. Everitt did this to good effect in his study of rural dissent, as did Spufford in her examination of three Cambridge parishes. Most notable, however, is the brave attempt by Underdown to look at the 'chalk' and 'cheese' dichotomy of S.W. England. The difficulty in using the pays as a unit of investigation is that geographical determinism creeps in so that cause and effect become blurred.

Similarly, the area between demography and local history becomes fused in studies of kinship patterns in the past. Many kinship studies depend on family reconstitution as a methodology. This is a lengthy process which of necessity makes for smaller scale studies, although the files of the Cambridge Group for Population History have been used for several general studies. Everitt used directories to reconstruct farming and artisan family networks in Kent, whilst Prior used a variety of sources to show the ramifications of the Fisher Row family networks over time. Whilst kinship studies tend to be on a small scale, many studies on the social-structure of communities are often universal in character, for example, Newby's work on the nineteenth-century countryside. Alternatively, one section of society is isolated from the rest, such as the labouring
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poor. Single community studies such as those on Terling or Elmdon have looked at the social-structure of the entire community. The difficulty is that whilst a single community is manageable enough for an examination of all the social groups, large numbers of communities are less viable, so that logistically it is easier to select out one section of society to look at in depth.

Studies of religious communities also isolate out one section of the total community. These too, can be treated either as single or multiple community studies. Everitt's overview of rural dissent has been discussed earlier in this chapter. Mention has also been made of Obelkevich's work on nineteenth-century religious affiliation in S. Lindsey. He shows that using religious denominations as a starting point can be an entry into a wider social and geographical examination of an area.

This broad and incomplete survey of the way in which academic local historians have written about local history shows that a variety of approaches have been used. Although no attempt has been made to criticise them, the ensuing chapters are designed partly to look at areas as limited by the boundaries discussed earlier, which might make profitable and viable units of research in the future.

Conclusion

This chapter has defined the aims and objectives of this research project. It is primarily a study of local identity as measured by inter-action across a series of boundaries - the parish, the county, the pays, kinship, social-structure
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and religious affiliation. In looking at these boundaries it has the objective of finding ways to identify local communities of common interest as well as finding viable spatial areas for future research. Its secondary aim, therefore, is to make the work a statement on the nature of local history - i.e. the meaning of 'local'. The next chapter will describe the area which has been chosen to help fulfil these aims and objectives.
CHAPTER 2

SPATIAL LANDSCAPES

Introduction

In Chapter One the spatial boundary-markers that might have been important in determining the character of local identity were discussed. These markers are the parish, county, pays, kinship, social-structure and religious affiliation. In order to look at inter-action within or across these boundaries it is necessary to find a geographical space that has certain criteria. It needs to cover several parishes. It should also include at least two counties, as well as two demonstrably different ecological zones or pays which should cross administrative boundaries. However, these administrative boundaries should not present a physical barrier to free movement. Furthermore, the area should have some communities situated on the boundaries, whilst in order to provide a comparison, others should lie away from the county or pays borders. Lastly, to remove any bias inherent in certain types of community, the study area should include a full range of communities - such as open/close parishes, or nucleated/hamlet settlements. It should also include communities that show a cross-section of population, acreage and plot sizes.

This chapter will set the geographical context of the study area. It aims to describe the general physical outline of the area by looking at its geology and topography. It will also look at the way in which its administrative boundaries were drawn, the acreages of its constituent parishes, settlement morphology, landholding patterns, the communications network and
marketing structure. It will start by outlining the area chosen for study, as well as discussing a viable size for a project area.
The Study Area

The area chosen to work on is South East Surrey with its immediate neighbouring areas of Kent and Sussex. This satisfies the spatial requirements listed in the introductory section of this chapter. Not only does it encompass parts of all three counties within a relatively small geographical space, but there are no physical barriers dividing these counties. Furthermore, the area can be divided into distinct ecological zones or pays which cross the county borders. It also contains enough variety of community and settlement types to allow for comparisons. Not only does it fulfil the basic geographical requirements of the inquiry, but it is an area which has undergone radical economic and social changes whilst still retaining the vestiges of an indigenous subculture. This makes it of contemporary relevance in an age of standardisation.

It might also be relevant at this point to declare a personal interest in the area, as being that where I was born and brought up. As Mills states - "Readers of this book who go in search of bias will find it easier to detect if I mention it owes a great deal to the nature of my upbringing and subsequent places of residence." This approach accords well with the Blake Committee’s definition of local history - "we venture to suggest that local history is the study of man’s past in relation to his locality, locality being determined by an individual’s interest and experience."

Apart from the location of the study area another factor to be decided is the size of locality relevant
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to this inquiry. Inter-action is per se at least a two-way exchange. Therefore, it is desirable to have in view as many participants in the exchange as possible. It is important, however, to keep in mind the number of communities that can be realistically managed over a restricted time-span. It will be remembered that in the discussion on the historiography of local history in the first chapter it was mentioned that single parish/community studies tended to be the preserve of the amateur/antiquarian local historian precisely because of this time and resource factor. Part of the aim of this study is to consider the relevance of such studies to academic local history, therefore, although it is proposed to deal with more than one community it will incorporate case-studies of single communities.

Another consideration is that 'distance-decay' means that the further away from the core area the less inter-action will occur. Therefore, to plot the density of inter-action it is necessary not only to have a block of communities, but also to be able to define a reasonable radius over which spatial inter-action might occur. In the south-eastern corner of Surrey where it borders Kent and Sussex this spatial block consists of fifteen interlocking parishes. This includes 'inland' as well as border parishes, which are set within an area that can be divided into recognisably different geological zones. These zones also cross the county borders. Across the county boundary in Kent and Sussex the parish acreage is considerably higher than in Surrey, so the immediate neighbours in those counties consist of two parishes each in Kent and Sussex. A full list of the parishes is given below with a grid reference for the 1" O.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kent</th>
<th>Surrey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>TQ 4546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>TQ 5445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Blechingley</td>
<td>TQ 5033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>TQ 4131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Spelling of Blechingley. Blechingley or Bletchingley are interchangeable. At present Bletchingley is in vogue. Twenty years ago and in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Blechingley was favoured. This version is used in this work.*
Sussex

East Grinstead TQ 5445
Worth TQ 3630

Caterham TQ 5433
Chaldon TQ 5630
Crowhurst TQ 3947
Godstone TQ 5237
Horne TQ 4433
Limpsfield TQ 4152
Lingfield TQ 3943
Nutfield TQ 5030
Oxted TQ 3952
Tandridge TQ 3751
Tatsfield TQ 4257
Titsey TQ 4155
Warlingham TQ 3658

Map 2.1 shows the geographical position of the parishes in relation to the geography of S.E. England, whilst Map 2.2 illustrates the relationships of the parishes, sets them within their pays as well as showing the main communications arteries. The next section will describe the physical context of the parishes.

Physical Geography of the Study Area

The maps show how the study area divides into three distinct horizontal geological zones. The northernmost of these is the North Downs, which form a physical barrier between the study area in the south and the urbanized region to the north. The Downs are high chalk uplands running from Western Surrey to Eastern Kent. The nineteenth-century topographer Brayley writes that the downs "rise to some remarkable heights, overlooking the Weald at Oxted, Godstone, Reigate, and Dorking". These heights achieve 808 feet on the southernmost escarpment between Warlingham and Oxted, which Brayley described as "rugged and abrupt, broken with precipitious cliffs." There are no running streams at

4 Ibid. 4.
this point of the downs, although the slopes are cut by dry valleys which allow for north-south access, as for example, in the valley between Godstone and Caterham which carried the turnpike. The top soil on the downs was clay with flints. Today this area of the Downs is extensively wooded, but the Rocque map of Surrey dated 1762 has a ratio of 11.25 units of arable/grass to woodland for the downland area. Similarly, Caird writing in 1851, describes the North Downs as "bare", which suggests that the afforestation is relatively recent.

Directly beneath the chalk downs is a thin line of black loam, followed by a ridge of greensand, which in some places almost touches the chalk, whilst in others lies at a great distance. Cobbett writing in 1830 described the two geological bands thus:

"I have often mentioned the chalk-ridge and also the sand ridge which runs parallel to it, and the two ridges approach so near to each other in many places you actually have a chalk-bank to your right and a sand-bank to your left and not more than 40 yards from each other. In some places these chains of hills run off from each other to a great distance, even to a distance of twenty miles."

The greensand ridge overlooks the Weald from a height of 250 feet. It provided a dry east-west highway which connected a string of villages and towns from Sevenoaks in the east to Guildford in the west. The greensand

5 J.Rocque, A Topographical Map of the County of Surrey in which is Expressed all the Roads, Lanes, Churches, Noblemen and Gentlemens Seats & C. 1762, Facsimile Reproduction, 1931.


itself was valuable for its mineral resources, with Fullers Earth found at Nutfield and Blechingley and fire-stone quarried at Blechingley and Godstone. Continuous belts of woodland form the characteristic scenery on the greensand today, but Rocque's map shows only isolated blocks of woodland with a ratio of 16.9 arable/grass units to woodland. The northernmost stretch of the greensand abutting the Downs was much emparked during the eighteenth-century. Marden Park between Godstone and Caterham is a good example of this. The parishes which lay on the greensand ridge invariably stretched from the foothills of the Downs onto the Wealden clay. The term 'greensand', therefore, describes a group of parishes that share certain characteristics, but which are not confined solely to the greensand ridge.

Directly to the south of the greensand lies the Weald. In the study area the Weald is composed almost entirely of the notorious low-lying, ill-drained soil, described by Forbes in 1755 as "a stiff deep clayey soil that absorbs no rain or water..." Cobbett writing in 1830 reinforces the view of the unattractive nature of the Wealden soil: "Now, mind, this is the real Weald where the clay is bottomless, where there is no stone of any sort underneath." Numerous streams rise from the heavy water-logged Wealden soil of S.E.Surrey, including the head-waters of the Rivers Eden, Mole and Medway. The usual landscape found in the area is of small fields surrounded by narrow bands of woodland known locally as 'shaws'. These are the remaining evidence of the gradual clearance of the large blocks
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8 Rocque, op.cit.
10 Cobbett, op.cit., p.152.
of woodland that once covered the Weald, but as Rocque’s map shows a high ratio of 33.5 arable/grass to woodland units it suggests that most of the Wealden forest had been cleared by the 1750s. The state of the Wealden roads was notorious. In the seventeenth century Circuit Judges refused to cross the Weald in winter, whilst Forbes describes the hollow-ways of the Weald like sloughs in the eighteenth-century. The difficulties of traversing the clay produced a peculiar road system in the Wealden area, of trackways with very broad verges. As one part of the track became impassable the traveller could move onto the verge. Notwithstanding this arrangement, movement across the Weald was so restricted that it remained an isolated area into the mid-nineteenth century.

The general outline of the geological and physical features of the study area can be summed up as follows - the area can be divided into three distinct east-west horizontal bands. In the north are high chalk uplands, with a greensand ridge below these, falling to the low-lying clay zone of the Weald. All of these geological zones cross administrative boundaries with the Downs and greensand spanning Kent and Surrey, whilst the Weald covers parts all three counties. The nature of the administrative boundaries will be discussed in the following section.

---

11 Rocque, op.cit.


Administrative Boundaries in the Study Area

As can be seen from Map 2.1 there are no physical barriers between the three counties, although there is some ambiguity as to where the Surrey/Sussex border lies. Copthorne Common, for instance, is now in Sussex but was entirely in Surrey in the nineteenth-century, whilst Worth, which today is also in Sussex, appears in the Surrey Domesday folios. Furthermore, when the New Poor Law set up unions of parishes it placed Lingfield a Surrey parish into the Sussex union of East Grinstead. It would seem, therefore, that the administrative borders between Surrey and Sussex have always been loosely drawn.

On the other hand, this lack of definition may be an illusion, for the territorial units corresponding to the counties were certainly of great antiquity, probably reflecting the three Saxon kingdoms of Jutish Kent, South Saxon Sussex and the South Regio of Mercian Surrey. Although Everitt writes of Kent and Sussex, "that the two kingdoms developed equally early and in many ways along similar lines", Kent was always considered a territory apart from others because of its special place as the gate-way into England from the continent. The 1313 petition to the Justices in Eyre for the continuance of Kent's peculiar customs has already been mentioned in Chapter One. It will be suggested later in this chapter that these peculiar customs survived into the eighteenth-century.

Sussex, like Kent borders the sea, but Surrey is a land-locked county, although the River Thames forms its

---


Map 2.3: Ecclesiastical peculiar of the Archbishop of Canterbury in east Surrey
northernmost boundary. Of the three counties it is in within the easiest reach of London, with Southwark which was in the ancient county of Surrey, abutting the south-side of London Bridge. Everitt suggests that apart from those settlements nearest to the capital, London had little influence on Kent, so that Surrey's closer relationship with the capital may have influenced its patterns of inter-action in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Surrey also lay between Sussex and the metropolitan area, so might be seen as an 'intervening opportunity' for migrants from the latter county. In relation to local identity or 'belonging' the position of the three counties can be summed up as follows - all three counties were early distinctive spatial units but Surrey was more likely to be subject to pressures both from London and its neighbouring counties, which might have changed its spatial exclusiveness.

Ecclesiastically, however, Surrey was clearly distinguished from Kent and Sussex. It was placed in the Diocese of Winchester with "no record of it ever having been included in any other diocese." There is one exception to this in the study area. Burstow the Wealden parish on the border with Sussex was a Peculiar of the See of Canterbury, within the Deanery of Croydon. The parish distribution map in The Atlas of Parish Registers shows a broken corridor of Canterbury See parishes running from Croydon in the north to the Sussex border in the south. (See Map 2.3). This suggests that the diocesan boundary, with perhaps the Saxon kingdom/county border might have once been

15 Ibid., 14, p.21.
further west than it is today. There is neither time
or space in this inquiry to investigate this
speculation, but in the case of Burstow, it is probable
that this was part of an early estate of the
Archbishops of Canterbury, providing Wealden grazing
for a manor north of the downs, perhaps Wimbledon or
Croydon. The two Kentish parishes in the study area
were in the Archdeaconry of Rochester. Westerham was
part of an ancient estate with a minster church, of
which Edenbridge was a chapelry. The Sussex parishes
East Grinstead and Worth, both lay in the Archdeaconry
of Lewes, which was part of the Diocese of
Chichester.18

The ecclesiastical dioceses mirrored the ancient
kingdom boundaries, which in turn were reflected by the
counties. Within the counties the smaller units of the
parishes were grouped together for administrative
purposes in Hundreds in Surrey, Lathes in Kent and
Rapes in Sussex. These different terms are significant
in showing the basic differences in the three counties.
All the Surrey parishes in the study area, except
Burstow and Nutfield which were in the Reigate Hundred,
lay in the Hundred of Tandridge. By the eighteenth
century the hundred as a unit had ceased to have any
significance, whilst the hundredal units were further
split up by the Poor Law Unions in 1834. Westerham and
Edenbridge lay in the Lathe of Westerham, but the
Sevenoaks Union, whilst Worth in Sussex was in the
Hundred of Buttinghill but the East Grinstead Union.
East Grinstead itself was in the Rape of Lewes.

The hundredal unit as well as the Poor Law Union
covered all three geological zones or pays. When
looking at the geography of the parishes which made up
the units of the study area it can be seen that the

18 Everitt, Continuity and Colonization, op.cit., p.79.
pays produced recognisable variations in the way in which in the parish boundaries were drawn. Those parishes where the land was either solely on the Downs or in the Weald have a horizontal east-west orientation, whilst parishes which include the greensand ridge are characteristically long and narrow with a vertical north-south orientation. (See Map.2.2) Godstone, for example, is eleven miles long but never more than one and half miles wide. It runs from the foothills of the Downs across the greensand onto the Wealden clay. This mixture of soils is found in all the parishes that included the greensand. This suggests that in the share out of resources these parishes did better than the Wealden or Downland parishes.

In terms of acreage, the Wealden parishes were better endowed. Table 2.1 shows the mean acreage of the parishes in the study area arranged by pays.

Table 2.1. Mean Acreage of the Parishes in the Study Area Arranged by Pays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pays</th>
<th>Downs</th>
<th>Greensand</th>
<th>Weald</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>4794</td>
<td>7786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σn-1</td>
<td>379.8</td>
<td>1157.38</td>
<td>4539.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that not only did the Wealden parishes have the highest acreage but also the highest deviation. This is caused by the difference in area of the small parish of Crowhurst in Surrey of 2119 acres compared to the vast Sussex parish of Worth 15331 acres. All Wealden parishes were over 2000 acres, but no Downland parish achieved this figure.

It has already been mentioned that the parish could be further divided into manorial units. Table.2.2 moves from parochial to manorial acreages.
Table 2.2. Mean Acreage per Manor in the Study area, with mean number of manors per parish arranged by pays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pays</th>
<th>Downs</th>
<th>Greensand</th>
<th>Weald</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Acreage per Manor</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>1557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Number of Manors per Parish</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that those who held a manor on land which included the greensand belt held relatively more land than those on the Downs or Weald. Furthermore, where manors crossed administrative boundaries it can be seen that ‘greensand’ manors crossed onto Wealden land, but both Downland and Wealden manors stayed within the same physical zone. Although the manorial organization would seem to be far removed from the land-holding patterns in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries it can be said to have laid its foundations. It could be further speculated that the Wealden parishes, where land was divided between many manors, would have the potential to be much divided by the early-nineteenth century.

To sum up this preliminary examination of the physical and political geography of the study area – it has been shown that the administrative boundaries of the parishes take into account the geological zones in the distribution of resources. This in turn produced characteristically different shapes for parishes on different types of soil. The county and ecclesiastical boundaries which cross all three pays, are probably of extreme antiquity, emerging from the political geography of the Saxon kingdoms. The succeeding section of this chapter moves from the larger units of the county and parish to examine the settlement morphology and tenurial customs of the area.
Settlement Morphology

"It is so, that, our soil being divided into champaign ground and woodland, the houses of the first lie uniformly builded in every town together, with streets and lanes, whereas in the woodland countries (except here and there in great market towns) they stand scattered abroad, each one dwelling in the midst of his own occupying.."

wrote Harrison when contrasting the isolated farms and hamlets of wood-pasture regions with the nucleated settlements of the corn country. Similar variations can be seen in the settlement morphology of the parishes in the study area.

The first distinction to be made is in the temporal differences in settlement foundation for the area. Although the Downland and greensand settlements are mentioned in Domesday with the exception of Westerham and Edenbridge in Kent, Wealden settlements in the area were mostly post-Domesday. Worth, is the only named Wealden settlement for the area in the Surrey Domesday folios.

Most of the Wealden settlements had to be won from the thick forest which covered the area. This produced pockets of settlement, with isolated hamlets and farmsteads but no central focus to the settlement pattern. As clearing progressed so the characteristic small fields of the area edged by thick belts of woodland emerged, as well as extensive belts of common grazing land which by the eighteenth-century housed many squatters' communities.

20 A.Everitt, Continuity and Colonization, op.cit.
21 Domesday Surrey, op.cit., passim.
Early settlement in those parishes which included the greensand was on the lighter sandy soils. These settlements, which were densely packed along the east-west ridge, were all of a similar type with a nucleated settlement on the greensand but isolated hamlets and farms in the Wealden parts of the parishes. The parish church of these settlements invariably lay to the north of the greensand ridge, with the houses along the four arms of the cross-roads formed by a north-south trackway crossing the east-west ridge. At least one 'greensand' parish, Nutfield in Surrey, (and probably others) had a two-field open field system still in use in the eighteenth-century.

Whilst the greensand parishes show a certain morphological uniformity no such pattern can be seen in Downland settlements. Chaldon, for instance, consisted of six scattered farms, whereas the other Downland settlements represented a mixture of nucleated centres with scattered outlying farms. In the case of Warlingham there was also a considerable amount of commonland.

As well as the general description of the area it is also proposed to take some parishes as case-studies in order to look at patterns in more depth. These parishes are Caterham on the Downs, Nutfield on the greensand, and Burstow in the Weald. These parishes have been chosen to illustrate trends within the study area because they possess relatively good documentation. Rocque's 1762 map shows a central common in Caterham. The parish was bisected by the turnpike with a considerable amount of land in it taken up by Marden Park. Nutfield had little commonland and a greater density of farms, whereas Burstow had clusters of farms and large swathes of commonland.22

22Rocque op.cit.
A century later, in 1850, considerable changes had started to appear in the first two parishes. Caterham had both railway and station, but although the railway traversed Nutfield it was not to get its own station for another thirty years. The parish was, however, close enough to the fast London-Brighton line at Redhill to make commuting possible. In these early days of commuting only the wealthy could afford to travel to work daily. They favoured large country residences set in several acres of parkland. There are examples of these found in Caterham and Nutfield. In the latter parish a nucleated daughter settlement grew up around the railway which gained autonomy as South Nutfield in 1879. The railway never reached Burstow. This parish showed less physical change than the other two, although piecemeal enclosure of small plots of land produced a landscape of small open greens with narrow enclosed plots round the edge. By 1850 two of the commons in the parish were completely enclosed, but two survived.

The labouring population in these parishes were more likely to live in close proximity at Caterham and Nutfield. By the mid-nineteenth century, census data shows that at Nutfield there was a trend for old farmhouses to be let out in rooms to labourers and their families. A similar practice existed at Caterham. In Burstow, cottages were often built in pairs on roadside waste. These cottages tended to be smaller than those in its neighbouring parish of Nutfield.\(^2^3\)

It can be seen from this discussion that settlements sited on different soils had different morphological characteristics. Downland settlements tended to be
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clustered, greensand a mixture of cluster and scatter, whilst the Wealden settlements were comprised of scattered habitation. It is possible that the land-holding patterns of the parishes will reflect the morphological differences. Tenure and inheritance patterns will be discussed in the following section.

**Landholding and Tenurial Customs**

This section will discuss three aspects of land-holding in the study area, viz. the proportion of owner-occupiers in a parish, the size of holdings and inheritance customs. It starts with an examination of the proportion of owner-occupation in the area. Everitt's work on Kentish land-holding patterns suggests trends which might be universally applicable in this study:

"In the mid-nineteenth century the patterns of ownership in the two regions (Wolds and Weald) was totally different... In more than 80% of the Wealden parishes ownership of land was sub-divided amongst many small though not very small proprietors, and in only 11% was it concentrated wholly in the hands of the squirearchy. In the Wold areas, on the other hand, it was divided amongst small proprietors in 30% of the parishes, whilst it was concentrated in the hands of the squirearchy in 70%..."

This argues for a model which suggests that predominantly 'open' or small landholder parishes are to be expected in the Weald, with 'close' or tenanted or land-lord dominated parishes more prevalent on the Wolds/Downs. Work on Sussex confirms that a similar pattern existed in that county. Reed found that many farms were family run small sized holdings in the Weald, whilst Short shows that closed tenanted parishes were characteristic of Downland areas.
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24 A. Everitt, 'River and Wold', *Journal of Historical Geography*, 3,1, 1977, p.16.


that now has to be answered is whether the pattern or model will be repeated in the study area.

In this inquiry, the proportion of owner occupation is based on the Land Tax Returns. The drawbacks in using this source have been discussed fully in a collection of essays edited by Turner and Mills\(^{26}\) so will not be dealt with here. The problems inherent in interpreting this source have been noted before using the tax to compile Table 2.3. This shows the proportion of owner-occupiers to all land owners for two dates for those parishes in Surrey for which the tax return is extant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N.of Landholders</th>
<th>N.of Owner-Occupiers</th>
<th>% of Owner-Occupiers to Landholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley G.S.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow W.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham D.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst W.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne W.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield G.S.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield D.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey D.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham D.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N.of Landholders</th>
<th>N.of Owner-Occupiers</th>
<th>% of Owner-Occupiers to Landholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley G.S.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow W.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham D.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst W.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne W.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield G.S.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge G.S.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is interesting as it shows that owner-occupation was not so widespread in the Surrey Weald as writers on Kent and Surrey have found for those counties.\textsuperscript{27} Equally significant are the changes in the proportion of owner-occupation that took place in all three pays over the fifty years between 1780-1832. There is a noticeable increase in owner-occupation on the Weald but a considerable decrease in Blechingley on the greensand as well as in all the downland parishes. The decrease in the former might be the result of the Russell family buying up as many burgage tenements as possible in 1830 in order to gain access to the franchise, as Blechingley was a notorious rotten borough. On the Downs several factors come into play that could have reduced owner-occupation. In Titsey, for example, there is evidence of the land reverting into the hands of the Leveson-Gower family who then put in tenants; whilst at Warlingham the decrease seems to have been caused by the enclosure of much of its commonland, which disadvantaged the small owner-occupier. On the Weald the reverse happened, with the increase of owner-occupation being the result of piecemeal enclosure of roadside waste and common edges by the cottagers, thus giving them enough land to subsist on. This indicates that Parliamentary Enclosure militated against owner-occupation, whereas free-lance enclosure worked for the owner-occupier and smallholder.

A check on the Land Tax Returns can be made by using the Tithe files created under the 1836 Tithe

\textsuperscript{27}Land Tax S.R.O. Parish Name.

For example, Reed, \textit{op.cit.}, passim.
Commutation Act. (7 Wil.4.4 & 1.Vic.c.69) Table 2.4 shows the proportion of owner-occupation as indicated by the Tithe Allotments. (It was not possible to match the parishes exactly between the two sources.)

Those parishes which are extant in both sources show little discrepancy between the two, except in the case of Burstow in the Weald and Nutfield which is a greensand parish. The former shows an increase of 3 land-holders in the Tithe Schedule but a 12% increase in owner-occupation; whilst the latter shows an increase of 1 landholder, but a decrease of 12% less owner-occupation. Horne in the Weald, on the other hand, shows an increase of 11 land-holders in the Tithe Schedules, but no discrepancy in the proportion of owner-occupation. Whether these discrepancies are caused by the sources or are of a greater significance indicating radical changes in the structure of landholding over the ten years which elapsed between the last Land Tax and the Tithe Schedules is difficult to decide. It can be said, however, that the pattern at Burstow continues a trend towards owner-occupation that can be seen in the Land Tax.

Overall, the pattern of landholding had altered considerably by the 1840s with a low proportion of owner-occupation on the downs, but over half the holdings on the Weald in owner-occupation. This suggests that the differences between the two areas increased in the early-nineteenth century. This might be due to the higher rents that land on the Downs could command when compared to the Wealden area. It might also be due to the size of holdings, with the owner-occupied land in the Weald representing numerous smallholdings, whilst the tenanted land on the Downs covered more acreage per holding.

A reasonably reliable source for the size of holdings
### Table 2.4 Proportion of Owner-Occupiers to All Landholders Based on The Commutation Awards in South East Surrey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Pays</th>
<th>Date of Award</th>
<th>N.of Landholders</th>
<th>N.of owner-occupiers</th>
<th>% of owner-occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borne</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffield</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizay</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herlingham</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aggregate % of owner-occupiers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downs</th>
<th>Greensand</th>
<th>Weald</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although these figures can only illustrate general trends, the land-holding patterns can be summed up as follows - the proportion of owner-occupation fell in downland areas across the latter half of the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries so that by 1851 the agricultural units of that area were mainly large tenant farms. Conversely, on the Weald and to a certain extent in those parishes with land on the greensand, the proportion of owner-occupation grew but land was held in smaller units than on the downland, suggesting small subsistence units on the Weald and greensand, but market agriculture on the Downs. In fact these patterns may relate to the over-riding economic situation in the area with the north-western section of the study area responding to the market forces of the boundary of the metropolis, whilst the south became steadily more insular. It should also be noted that the patterns shown in the different zones do not diverge radically until after the 1830s. This raises the question as to how far differences observed in pays landholding patterns were a late development. Is it correct describing a situation that emerged in the last half of the nineteenth-century or one which had been in existence for a considerable time when he
in an area is the 1851 census which asked farmers to give the number of acres they farmed. It should be added that not all cottagers with one or less acre entered their land, thus making a short-fall of small proprietors. A sample of nine parishes, three from each pays, showed that on the Downs 60% of the farms were over 100 acres compared to 45% on the greensand, whilst only 25% of the farms in the three Wealden parishes of Burstow, Horne and Worth were over 100 acres, but 39% were under 20 acres. The greensand parishes were comparable to this with 34% of farms being under 20 acres, but on the Downs only 10% of farms were under 20 acres with none under 10 acres.

Although these figures can only illustrate general trends, the land-holding patterns can be summed up as follows - the proportion of owner-occupation fell in downland areas across the latter half of the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries so that by 1851 the agricultural units of that area were mainly large tenanted farms. Conversely, on the Weald and to a certain extent in those parishes with land on the greensand, the proportion of owner-occupation grew but land was held in smaller units than on the downland, suggesting small subsistence units on the Weald and greensand, but market agriculture on the Downs. In fact these patterns may relate to the over-riding economic situation in the area with the northernmost section of the study area responding to the market forces of the demands of the metropolis, whilst the south became steadily more insular. It should also be noted that the patterns shown in the different zones do not diverge radically until after the 1830s. This raises the question as to how far differences observed in pays landholding patterns were a late development. Is Everitt describing a situation that emerged in the first half of the nineteenth-century or one which had been in existence for a considerable time when he
writes of nonconformity in Kent:

"Underlying the local variety of religious allegiance in the county, in fact were remarkable regional differences in the structure of landownership. In the Weald and similar forest tracts, freeholders parishes comprised as much as 81 per cent of all parishes in the area. In the chartlands - the greensand countryside bordering the Weald to the north - the comparable figure was only 46 per cent. In the foothills to the north of the downs, it has not more than 39 per cent, and on the chalk downlands themselves a mere 30 per cent."

Everitt based his conclusions on the landholding patterns given in The Imperial Gazette. He assumed that freeholders parishes were described in that publication as "subdivided" or "much subdivided". A similar exercise carried out on the parishes in the study area produced no such clear cut result as that shown by Everitt, primarily because 50% of the parishes had no such description attached to them, although those Wealden parishes that were so described were either "sub-divided" or "much sub-divided". In the face of this inconclusive evidence it is necessary to reconstruct the way in which land was held or passed onto the next generation from other sources. The tenurial customs for the area can be summarised, therefore, as follows - in Kent gavelkind was the usual system of inheritance. This divided the land between all the sons equally whilst the daughters got a cash hand out. On the Downs a type of Borough English was the custom, with the eldest son inheriting the freehold land, the youngest the copyhold land and any...

---


29 Ibid., pp. 14, 59.

30 J. M. Wilson, The Imperial Gazetteer of England and Wales, 1875, parish entries.
intervening sibs receiving a cash grant. Thus at Banstead in Surrey, which lies on the Downs adjacent to the study area, the Lambert lands were divided in this way with the middle son who was sent into trade ending up as a knight and Lord Mayor of London.  

The greensand parishes had a mixture of free and copyhold land. The Manorial Court Records for Nutfield which survive into the nineteenth-century, show that there was both sub-letting of copyhold land and land exchange between tenants as they attempted to rationalise their holdings. This had an origin in scattered lots in a residual open-field system. Although Baker suggests that this type of holding encouraged the concentration of land into a few hands at an early date, Nutfield was described as "much sub-divided" in The Imperial Gazetteer.

Tenurial custom in the Weald presents a paradox. The two Sussex Wealden parishes in the study area - East Grinstead and Worth, both had manors in them where Borough English was customary, although other manors in these vast parishes had a predominance of freehold land. Furthermore, nineteenth-century commentators describe a custom in the Weald of farms held on yearly unwritten dilapidation tenancies. The custom being for

32 S.R.O. 67/1/1-12, Nutfield Manorial Court Rolls, 1522-1856.
33 P. Finch, 'Landholding and Sub-letting; A Surrey Manor in 1613', The Local Historian, 18, 1, Feb.1988, pp. 16-18.
the incoming farmer to compensate the outgoing tenant for top-dressing, ploughing, improvements etc. Caird describes it thus:

"Farms are principally held on yearly tenancies...the custom is somewhat of the nature of "compensation for unexhausted improvements", with the difference that it embraces also large payments for imaginary improvements and alleged operations, which, even if they had ever been performed, would be more injurious than beneficial. Under this custom the outgoing tenant receives from his successor the amount of a valuation which includes "dressings and half dressings of dung and lime, and sheep foldings, the expense of ploughing fallows, including the rest of taxes of the fallows and half fallows and lays, the values of seeds, the underwood down to the stem, hay and straw at a feeding price' and other items greater or less in proportion to the expenditure of the out-going tenants assessors."

Caird continues that a land-agent Robert Clutton described the system to the Parliamentary Committee in 1848 as promoting fraud and falsehood amongst the farmers as out-going tenants "work-up to a quitting" by using inferior dressings etc. Furthermore, collusion with appraisers meant that a growth industry of land-valuers and appraisers had developed in the small market towns of the Weald. On the Weald there was, therefore, much variety in land-owning patterns, ranging from small owner-occupied family run farms to itinerant tenant farmers.

The land-owning patterns of the area can be further divided on the Downs and greensand into east and west. On the Surrey/Kent border in the east the Leveson-Gower family dominated the scene as 'paternalistic' landlords, with the parish of Titsey in Surrey being virtually a 'close' parish. In the east absentee

36 J. Caird, English Agriculture in 1850-1851, 1852, pp.119.
37 Ibid., 37.
landlords administering their land through agents was much more prevalent, the Budgens of Nutfield being an example of this.

Land allocation in the study area is complicated. This has led to it being dealt with in some depth. The penultimate section of this chapter will return to a more general overview of the physical geography of the area by looking its markets and communication networks.

Roads, Markets and Fairs

Two main road arteries crossed the study area. These can be seen on Map 2.2. The most important was the north-south turnpike which linked Lewes to London, via Godstone, through the dry valley gap in the North Downs at Caterham, onto Croydon and London. Equally important was the road described in the Nutfield Manorial Court Records as "The King's Highway". This ran east-west along the greensand ridge, linking Westerham in the east to Guildford in the west. Other east-west routes ran across the Weald from the market town of East Grinstead in the east of Sussex to Horsham another market town in the west. The Downs were also served by an east-west route with a ridgeway running between Warlingham and Tatsfield and into Kent.

Although the east-west communication system was reasonably well developed, most traffic focussed on the north-south route to London. Carriers to Croydon or
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38 S.R.O. 2186/1/26, Limpsfield Manorial Court Rolls, 1801-1836,
S.R.O. 2186/3/1-2, Tatsfield Manorial Court Rolls, 1801-1812.
S.R.O. 2186/2/1-11, Titsey Manorial Court Rolls, 1750-1812.
39 S.R.O. 67/1/1-12, Nutfield Manorial Court Rolls, 1522-1856.
London went twice a week from all the greensand villages, whilst daily services ran from Lingfield and Edenbridge on the Weald. East Grinstead had no direct carrier link with London but until 1841 had a fast coach service along the turnpike.

By 1841 the area was further linked to London by rail with the opening of the Redhill-Tonbridge line which connected to the fast London-Brighton route. The Redhill-Tonbridge section of the permanent way passed through the Wealden area of Nutfield, Blechingley, Godstone and Edenbridge, but although the latter two parishes had stations before the 1880s, Nutfield had to wait until 1879 for a station, whilst Blechingley never had its own station. East Grinstead and Lingfield were eventually joined to the system via a branch line. Before that opened, an omnibus ran between East Grinstead and Godstone station or East Grinstead and Three Bridges station to coincide with the London trains. Similarly, another omnibus ran from Westerham to Edenbridge to meet the morning and evening London trains, whilst a daily bus service left for London from Limpsfield, calling at Oxted, Godstone, Warlingham and Croydon.

The dominance of these north-south routes shows the importance of the metropolitan area to the rural hinterland. It also shows at what an early date 'commuting' started. It should be noted, that some parishes were left out of the communications network. Burstow, Horne and Worth in the Weald were without easy access to road or rail links to either London or Brighton. This was much to the detriment of their economy as they were robbed of a ready urban market for agricultural produce. It is probable that most marketable produce from the area had concentrated on

---

the urbanised areas of Croydon or London for many years before the railways gave easy access to the metropolis. The Hundred of Tandridge, in which 75% of the parishes in the study area lie, is remarkable for having no market town. If most of the produce was sent north to Croydon or London this would have obviated the need for a local market. There were nearer markets, at Reigate and Dorking in Surrey to the west, Westerham in Kent to the east and East Grinstead to the south in Sussex.

Documentary evidence shows that the Surrey yeoman, John Clement who lived at Nutfield went to market at Croydon, Guildford, Reigate, Dorking and Smithfield, even though Westerham and East Grinstead are closer to Nutfield than Guildford or London. However, he attended fair at Horsham and Crawley in Sussex. The account book of Richard Hale a miller from the same parish shows a slightly more restricted market area covering Blechingley, Chaldon, Epsom, Godstone and Reigate.

There were annual fairs held in Blechingley and Lingfield in Surrey, Westerham in Kent and East Grinstead in Sussex. The latter was a 'stock' fair, but by the eighteenth-century the fairs at Blechingley and Lingfield were 'toy' fairs. There were no hiring fairs recorded in the district. This is confirmed by the evidence to the 1833 Select Committee on Agriculture where one of the Surrey witnesses, John Neve, states that; "there are no hiring fairs in this area, the labourers go round the farmers houses and offer themselves". This must have had the effect of severely curtailing labour mobility. Thus, there is a
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41 S.R.O. 3189/59 Clement Family of Nutfield, Diary of John Clement.
42 S.R.O. 2447/2/1 Account Book of Richard Hale, Miller of Nutfield.
43 British Parliamentary Papers, Evidence of the Select Committee on Agriculture, 1833, p.246, response 5197.
paradox between wide trading horizons that focussed on 
the metropolitan area to the north, but an extremely 
localised labour market. The next chapter will examine 
these social aspects of the landscape in detail. The 
concluding section of this chapter will sum up the 
spatial features of the landscape.

Conclusion

This chapter has looked at the physical geography of 
the area chosen for study. It has shown that 
geologically it divides into three distinct horizontal 
regions - high chalk downs to the north - a greensand 
ridge - with Wealden clay in the south of the area. 
Each of these three geological zones has a 
characteristic settlement morphology. The land-holding 
patterns and tenurial customs are less well defined, 
with the land-holding pattern owing much of its 
appearance to prevailing trends in the market economy 
of South East England.

The formation and position of county and ecclesiastical 
boundaries has also been discussed, as well as the way 
in which parish and manor land was allocated. This 
showed that those parishes which included greensand 
soil were likely to have a better allocation of 
resources, as their area often included chalk and clay 
soil as well. The county and ecclesiastical boundaries, 
it was suggested, reflect older boundaries formed by 
the Saxon kingdom divisions. It is possible, however, 
that the Surrey/Kent border was at some time further 
west. In any event the divisions that form these three 
counties are of great antiquity. Therefore, on the one 
hand there are man-made boundaries that had been in 
existence for a great length of time, grafted onto 
natural boundaries formed by physical and geological 
features. Although these natural boundaries produced 
some features typical to their geological nature they
had other features which were subject to outside pressures. The social pressures on the landscape, economy, agriculture, employment, demography and social structure of the area will be presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3

SOCIO-ECONOMIC LANDSCAPES

Introduction

Chapter Two described the location of the study area. It discussed its physical features, as well as the way in which land was allocated and held. This last gave a social dimension to the discussion. It was suggested that this was especially prone to social pressures and outside forces. This chapter aims to examine the socio-economic landscape of the study area in order to identify internal and socio-economic patterns and the extent of outside pressure on these. In view of the discontinuity shown in land-holding patterns in the area between the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries it will be especially concerned to see whether a similar discontinuity existed in the socio-economic perspective. It proposes, therefore, to move from the overall economic state of the area to look at agricultural and non-agricultural sectors of the economy in relation to their bearing on the demography and social-structure of the communities in the area. Lastly, it will move from the general to look at the particular, in order to assess the life-experience of the people of South East Surrey in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The conclusion of the chapter will contribute to the main objective of this work - the definition of local history, with the way in which it can be most profitably studied from an academic viewpoint. The first section will set the socio-economic scene for the study area.
General Economy of the Study Area

Throughout this chapter it is proposed to look firstly at such primary evidence as exists for the study area, but to set it within the context of national trends. Two points have to be made before starting the discussion. The first is how to define the state of the economy. Should this be from the point of view of the producer or the consumer of goods and services? In the latter case real-wages are the most significant measurement, as these indicate the consumer’s buying power. In the former, G.D.P. in relation to population growth might be a more realistic measurement, as this would indicate how far G.D.P. could satisfy the market demands. The second point is that both national and local economic trends were subject to long and short-term fluctuations which may not have reflected each other. A local economy, for instance, which depended on a single industry could react in a different way to the national economy. If, therefore, a broad outline is given of the national economic scene during the period 1750-1850, it does not follow that this can be applied wholly to the study area.

A brief general synthesis of the economic situation in England, as defined by G.D.P. is given by Anderson. He writes that from 1750-1810 G.D.P. rose by 60%, by 1830 it had risen by over 150%, whilst by 1850 output was 50% higher than it had been in 1750.\(^1\) Nationally, therefore, the economy was both buoyant and expanding. Responding to new technologies in a positive way. In the study area, however, this was far from being true. By 1750 the Wealden iron industry, which had been the mainstay of the area’s economy, was defunct. Furthermore, there is evidence that farming in the

\(^{1}\text{M. Anderson, Population Change in North-Western Europe; 1750-1850, 1988, pp.76-77.}\)
area was in dire straits by the mid-eighteenth century. John Clement, a Surrey yeoman, was so heavily in debt by 1760, that his land was mortgaged and he was borrowing by note of hand. When he died, his son was forced to sell off a portion of land in order to settle his father's debts. There is also evidence from the study area that the prices paid to the farmer for his produce in the 1750s remained static, whilst the prices charged for items such as shoeing rose by 25%. But although the volume of Poor Law cases in the area show a slight rise in the 1750s, it was nothing like the increase that occurred from 1800-1830. Locally, therefore, there is some evidence that the economy was stagnant if not depressed.

Thirty years later, during the French Wars, the effect of the war economy on the area was both considerable and confusing. Although Cobbett believed that the farmers made handsome profits during the war, national sources suggest that the rewards may not have been so great as Cobbett imagined. The cost of cultivating 100 acres, for instance, went up by 33% from 1790-1803 but the price of wheat rose by only 12%. Consumer goods, on the other hand, went up by 34%. Only part of the rise in the cost of cultivation went on an increased wages bill. A sample of Poor Law Overseers account books for the area show a per capita increase in expenditure during the war which suggests that wages were not keeping pace with inflation. Poor Law expenditure rose by 51% from 1790-1810 on the Downland area, 60% on the

---

2 S.R.O. 3140, Clement Papers.
greensand and 72% on the Weald. 6 There was widespread economic distress both nationally and locally when the French wars ended. Discharged troops flooded onto a labour market, which in the south east was already beginning to feel the deleterious effects of a rising population with no other industry apart from agriculture to take up the excess supply of labour. Evidence to the Select Committee for Agricultural Distress reports that the greatest hardship was on the smaller farms on the Wealden clay, with both farmers and labourers in distress. 7 A decade later the situation had not changed. Great economic distress on the Weald was reported by the Select Committee on Agriculture for 1833. Richard Peyton a land-agent in the study area, says in his evidence that in no Wealden parish was there full employment. Farmers were forced to sell off stock on a Saturday night in order to pay their labourers. Tenants could not afford to pay their rents so went bankrupt, freeholders mortgaged their land but failed to repay the mortgage, and the land was sold. Peyton continues that most of the farmers had been prudent in the time of affluence during the French wars. He attributes much of the distress to the fact that woodland had been grubbed up during the war which meant less winter work for the family, who were then forced onto poor relief. The land that had been reclaimed during the war had been left uncultivated in the 1820s, so had reverted to rough pasture by the 1830s. 8

6 S.R.O. 2870/5/1 Burstow Parish Records Accounts of Churchwardens and Overseers of the Poor.
S.R.O. CA2/2/1-21 Caterham Parish Records, Accounts of Churchwardens and Overseers of the Poor.
S.R.O. P26/8/3 Nutfield Parish Records, Accounts of Churchwardens and Overseers of the Poor.

7 British Parliamentary Papers, Select Committee on Agricultural Distress, Minutes and Evidence, 1821, pp. 44-61, 68-77, 95-97, 118-124.

8 British Parliamentary Papers, Evidence of the Select Committee on Agriculture, 1833, pp. 337-347.
Conversely, those farming on the greensand were better off. It was easier to diversify into sheep or root crops on the lighter soils. Peyton reports that rents were correspondingly higher on the greensand than in the Weald, but highest of all on the Downs where land was much sought after. The economic disjunction between the Downs and the other two areas can also be seen in the mean per capita income tax paid in the three areas in 1841. This was £5.13s on the Downs, compared to £4.6s on the greensand and £4.5s on the Weald. By 1851 the agricultural economy of the area was well into another decline. Local evidence for this can be seen in census entries for homeless people living in barns and sheds, mostly, but not all in the Weald. Caird's map which shows the division between high and low agricultural wage areas places the south east firmly in the latter.

This brief general summary of economic trends shows that this area of S.E. England was reacting against national trends. Nationally G.D.P. rose, with an expanding and buoyant economy. In the study area it was stagnant and depressed, apart from minor fluctuations. The exception to this was the downland area, where the most valuable commodity was land. The value of this resource was to increase as the improved transport infrastructure of the 1840s and 50s put London within

8 British Parliamentary Papers, Evidence of the Select Committee on Agriculture, 1833, pp. 337-347.
9 Ibid., 8.

Peyton is a 'local' name, there being a yeoman family of that name in Nutfield during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Their name remains in a row of cottages known as "Peyton's cottages".
easy daily reach. This illustrates one of the paradoxes which persists today - that land is most valuable as a commodity in S.E.Surrey when it is not cultivated but used for building commuters' housing. In the nineteenth century, however, this was only true of the downland and northernmost part of the greensand. In the purely agricultural areas of the Weald, land was not a valuable resource, so the general economy of the Wealden area was depressed. The main hindrance to economic growth in the study area was its lack of industries other than agriculture. The character of which will be the subject of the following section.

Agricultural Economy of the Study Area

The preceding section has already mentioned that the study area was overwhelmingly agricultural. This section aims to take a closer look at the type of farming followed in the area during the period under examination. It aims to do this by using primary sources for the area. The first of these is the Rocque Map of Surrey for 1762 which not only shows fields and meadows but also attempts to indicate whether the land was being used as pasture, arable, or woodland. Although it is impossible to vouch for the absolute accuracy of this map, it can be used to give a general impression of agriculture in the area in the mid-eighteenth century. Overall, the map shows a preponderance of arable to grass in all areas, with such pasture and meadow as existed bordering the water-courses. A ratio of arable to grassland was derived by counting the units of each (i.e. each field = 1 unit). This showed a ratio of 4 arable to 1 grassland unit on the Downs, 3 arable to 1 grassland

---

12 J. Rocque, A Topographical Map of the County of Surrey in Which is Expressed all the Roads, Lanes, Churches, Noblemen and Gentlemens Seats & C., 1762, Facsimile Reproduction, 1931.
for greensand parishes and 4 arable to 1 grassland in the Weald. The lower ratio of arable to grass on the greensand is mainly due to the numerous small streams crossing the area. The lack of pasture on the Downs is surprising, as it might have been expected that sheep would be run on the dry chalk lands.

Sheep were not kept on the Wealden clay. Its dampness was too prone to produce foot-rot. A series of probate inventories from Worth in the Sussex Weald have no evidence of sheep rearing, although a valuation of stock on a farm near East Grinstead, dated 1781, includes 33 sheep worth 12-15s. This valuation was taken in April when grain stocks were low, so that wheat and oats account for only 25% of the valuation, whereas later in the year it would be expected that cereals would represent a higher proportion of farm stock. The valuation also included ploughing oxen worth £5 each, compared to the £3 for ordinary cattle. 5000 hop poles indicate the extent and importance of hop cultivation in the area.

The 1785 probate inventory of John Clement, whose land included the lighter greensand as well as Wealden clay, shows a heavier reliance on sheep with a flock of 194 listed. Other livestock included 9 horses for riding or draught, 46 poultry, 24 ducks, 8 plough oxen and 26 other cattle. This inventory was taken in June so once more grain stocks were low, but in the fields were sown 52 acres of oats, 52 acres of clover and pasture, 29 acres of wheat, 3 acres of barley and an orchard. The latter was obviously important to him, as just before he

---

13 W.Sx.R.O. 516/37/5/1-2,5-6,11-13, Probate Inventories pertaining to Worth, W.Sussex.
15 S.R.O. 3140 E 54 The Probate Inventory of Mr. John Clement of Kentwins, taken 27 and 28 June 1785.
died Clement had 51 trees grafted with new stock. This was witnessed by his neighbours and friends, Edward, John and Robert Russell, who later acted as his executors. Clement's account books show that the grain and fruit were sold directly to the local labourers and cottagers. These books and the inventory show that small areas of hops were grown on the farm as well. If Clement's farm Kentwins is a representative farm of those parishes with land on the greensand as well as in the Weald, it can be seen that full advantage was taken of the different soils, with a mixed agricultural policy of livestock and arable.

The next source which gives some indication of the character of the farming in the area is the 1801 Crop Returns. Unfortunately, these exist for only 25% of the parishes in the study area. The veracity of the returns is also doubtful, as dishonest returns were made under the misapprehension that the return would be used for tax purposes. Despite these drawbacks, the Return gives some indication of cropping procedures in the area. The mean cropping percentages show that in the Downland area 34% of all land was cultivated with 29% of this laid down to cereal production. This can be compared to 28% of all land under cultivation on the Weald, with 27% of this producing cereals. On the greensand only 22% of land was under cultivation, with 20% put down to cereals. How far this reflects the land holding structure in the three areas is interesting. It could be argued that the larger holdings on the Downs where the land was concentrated into a fewer hands, resulted in a more intensive cultivation of land, whilst the
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fragmentary nature of the residual open-field systems on the greensand meant a less productive agriculture.

Qualitative descriptions suggest that even if there were no substantial differences between the crops grown in the different counties or pays, there were differences in the way in which the land was cultivated. The types of plough used, for instance, varied between the swing plough used with horses in pairs in Surrey and the turnwrist plough with the horses driven in tandem used in Kent. Crop rotation also varied, with the Downland and Wealden areas following a four year rotation of fallow-wheat-beans-oats, whereas on the greensand a five year rotation was used of turnips-wheat-clover-pease-wheat. Stevenson in his review of the agriculture of Surrey also remarks on the extensive hop fields on the greensand at Oxted and Tandridge, as well as at Lingfield on the Weald. The inclusion of clover in the greensand rotation as well as the hops are both confirmed by the Clement inventory discussed earlier in this section. Stevenson, however, reports that that grassland was on the increase in Surrey, although there had been no exclusively grassland farms in S.E. Surrey for many years.  

The Tithe Schedules for the area c 1837-1841 confirm the trend towards increasing use of grassland. A count of titheable acres shows a ratio of 5.43 arable acres to grass for the downland, 2.83 for the greensand, with 2.31 for the Weald. It suggests that the Downland was growing progressively more arable whilst the Weald became more pastoral. The situation was partly the result of marginal land utilised during the early part of the nineteenth-century on the Weald, reverting to rough grazing. The situation on the Downs did not last
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19 W. Stevenson, General View of the Agriculture of Surrey, 1813, pp.49, 116-120.
long. There is evidence in the 1851 census for an increase of sheep husbandry on the Downs. This is confirmed by Caird in 1851. He describes four field husbandry on the Weald with scarcely any stock kept, whilst the greensand and Downs were starting to capitalise on the easier accessibility of the London market by fattening stock for the metropolis.  

From the above descriptions it can be seen that certain general features emerge for the agriculture of the area. The first is that although some marginal land was brought into cultivation during the Napoleonic wars there was no drastic turnover to arable farming, but merely an intensification of a trend which is visible in the 1760s, of a high level of arable farming across the study area. The second is that the agriculture on the greensand was likely to be a mixture of livestock and arable. Thirdly, the significant differences in the agriculture of the different pays did not emerge until relatively late in the period. When these differences become obvious they are part of a response to a market opened up by the improved transport infra-structure - i.e. they are a response to outside stimulus and not inherent in the geological or pays structure of the area. Contradicting this, however, it is also obvious that different pays and different counties had different practices for cultivating the land. Finally, as the first section of this chapter suggested, the whole area was predominantly agricultural in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Such other occupations as existed were concentrated mainly on the greensand ridge. The non-agricultural economy of the area will now be discussed.

The Non-Agricultural Economy of the Study Area

---

20Caird, op.cit., p. 49.
After the decline of the Wealden iron industry that area was left almost wholly dependant on agriculture. The 1851 census shows, however, that coppice and small-wood was used in hurdle, hoop and chair-making enterprises, whilst the Wealden clay came into its own in the 1840s when it was used for making the thousands of bricks needed in the construction of Blechingley Tunnel on the Redhill-Tonbridge railway line. The mineral resources on the greensand were systematically exploited by the mid-eighteenth century. Great quantities of Fullers Earth is to be found around the environs of Blechingley and Nutfield. Stevenson describes numerous pits in those parishes by 1813. He writes that the oldest pit at Nutfield was then about sixty years old - i.e. opened in the 1740s. The sandstone that covered the Earth was sold for building, whilst firestone was quarried at Godstone and Blechingley, chalk at Godstone and Caterham, and fine sand for hour glasses at Tandridge. By 1851, however, the chalk quarry at Caterham employed only four local men. The census return further suggests that non-agricultural employment on the Downs fell into two groups; professional and business men commuting to London, or those providing services for them and the farming community. At Warlingham a lime-burning business employed eight men, whilst at Nutfield on the greensand, 30% of the labour force was employed in the Fullers Earth Pits.

Although railway construction was the growth industry of the area during the 1840s and 50s it made little impact on the local labour scene. The 1841 census shows that most of the railway navvies employed on the construction of the Redhill-Tonbridge line, were born out of the county. They were part of a mobile labour force living in temporary barracks. Moving on as each

21Stevenson, op.cit., p.49.
section of the line was completed.

This brief section shows the extreme dependency on agriculture throughout the study area. The Wealden area once its iron was depleted had little other employment to offer apart from agriculture. In view of the depressed state of farming in the Weald in the period 1750-1850 it is probable that this led to considerable out-migration which will be reflected in population growth. The next section will discuss the demographic state of the area.

Population

In Chapter 2 it was shown that the parishes on the North Downs were of smaller acreage than those on the greensand or Weald. This spatial differentiation should be reflected in the demography of the area with the Downland parishes having densely packed populations when compared to the greensand and Wealden areas. Table 3.1. shows the absolute population totals at two points in time, 1801 and 1851.

Table 3.1. Absolute Population Totals for the Study Area Divided into Pays, (data taken from the 1801 and 1851 Census Returns).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Downland</th>
<th>Greensand</th>
<th>Weald</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>6045</td>
<td>7725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>9359</td>
<td>11588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that in terms of absolute numbers more of the population lived on the Weald, than on the greensand or Downlands. However, because of the larger acreage of the Wealden parishes the greensand had a higher density of population in both periods. As it is important not to loose sight of the overall aim of this work, i.e. that it is an examination of local identity by using inter-action over certain boundaries, it has to be considered whether the density of population in
that area may have influenced the patterns of inter-action.

Turning from absolute population figures to the rate of growth for the study area, as no census type listings exist for the area in the eighteenth-century the first consideration is what sources can be used in order to assess this. One impressionistic way of doing this is by using the ratio of baptisms to burials. This is shown on Table 3.2 where it is compared to the national figures given in Wrigley and Schofield.

Table 3.2. Ratio of Baptisms to Burials in the Study Area Compared to the National Ratios for the Period 1750-1799.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Average Ratio of Baptisms to Burials in the Study Area</th>
<th>National Ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1750-1759</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760-1769</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770-1779</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780-1789</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790-1799</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that the behaviour of the two sets of figures corresponds nicely, with both showing a small but steady increase in the ratio of baptisms to burials in the last half of the eighteenth-century. Within the individual areas of the study area, the Downland and Wealden parishes peaked at the end of the eighteenth century, whereas the greensand parishes had reached their optimum by the 1770s showing a sustained growth from that decade onwards. The accelerated growth in greensand parishes was probably due to the opening up of the Fullers Earth Pits in the 1740s, which may have attracted emigrants into the area as well as creating conditions favourable to them staying.

Thus, in the eighteenth-century, it would seem that there was some temporal variation in demographic

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1801</th>
<th>1811</th>
<th>1821</th>
<th>1831</th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downs</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensand</td>
<td>6045</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>7725</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>9948</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>4160</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
growth, which could be loosely related to pays type. Again it has to be borne in mind that this may affect patterns of inter-action.

In order to see whether similar trends persisted into the nineteenth century, Table 3.3 shows the decadal rate of population growth for county and pays as shown in the census returns. The break-down of parochial figures is shown in Appendix 1.

One of the most interesting trends shown in this table is the overall pattern in the last column as it indicates an extreme divergence in growth between the Downs in the north of the area and the greensand and Weald. This could be related to the proximity of the urban opportunities offered by Croydon or London, which might have made it an area prone to out-migration. It could also be related to the fact that two of the parishes, Tatsfield and Titsey, were dominated by the Leveson-Gower family. Lack of growth in these parishes could reflect a controlled housing policy. The individual performance for Titsey in particular shows this, with a rise in population of 86% between 1801-1831 when the church and manor were razed and re-built. Once this work was complete the population fell by 25%. Similarly, an influx of labour to build the railway in the 1840s can be seen clearly in greensand parishes, as well as to a certain extent on the Weald. The overall population growth in these two areas does not suggest much rural de-population. The parish which experienced the highest growth during the period 1801-1851, was Warlingham on the Downs. Here the population increased by 170% across the period. This parish is in the near vicinity of the Leveson-Gower parishes of Tatsfield and Titsey. It is possible, therefore, that this indicates a classic 'open-close' supply and demand situation. Apart from Warlingham, population growth was highest in the Kentish parishes.
with 58% overall growth, compared to 56% in Surrey, but only 43% in Sussex. The two small market towns of Westerham in Kent and East Grinstead in Sussex show comparable growth rates of 59% and 50% respectively, but the two Wealden parishes of Edenbridge in Kent and Worth in Sussex show widely dissimilar rates of 81% and 30%. Worth was mainly agricultural whereas Edenbridge had a tannery as well as being the centre of a thriving shoemaking industry.\textsuperscript{23} If the growth rate of Edenbridge is compared to that of a parish of roughly the same population size, for example, Limpsfield in Surrey, it can be seen that Limpsfield had a similar growth rate of 79%. In Limpsfield an influx of wealthy settlers stimulated the service industry. Conversely, Blechingley, which was like Limpsfield a Surrey greensand parish sharing an identical population size, shows only 15% growth rate.

General conclusions that can be drawn on population growth in the area are as follows - first, in the eighteenth- century there was a steady rise in population growth which was in line with national trends. Second that the growth was maintained during the first half of the nineteenth century although there were deviations in the rate between individual parishes. Third that the irregularities in the rate of growth suggest a high rate of out-migration in the northernmost part of the study area, although it was the southernmost zone which was hit hardest during the agricultural depression in the early- nineteenth century.

The parishes in the north of the area were small in acreage but less densely populated than their neighbouring greensand parishes. Does this mean that on the greensand the population was densely packed into

over-crowded houses? Table 3.4. shows the Mean Household Size for the study area at two points in time 1801 and 1851.

Table 3.4. MHS for Parishes in the Study Area Taken from the 1801 and 1851 Census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parishes</th>
<th>1801</th>
<th>1851</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downland</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensand</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weald</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 shows the MHS to be highest on the Weald for both periods. This indicates that the population was not spread haphazardly across the wide Wealden acres, but concentrated into large households. This probably reflects the higher level of family run farms in this zone which were discussed in Chapter 2. Similarly, when the MHS for the three counties is compared it can be seen that in 1801 Sussex had a high MHS of 7.35, but by 1851 the Kentish parishes had slightly larger households than those in Sussex with a MHS of 6 compared to 5.7 for Sussex. This could be related to the figures for population growth discussed earlier in this section. These indicate a low rate of growth in Sussex parishes which might be commensurate with the disintegration of an economic system based on family labour, or living-in farm servants, acting as a push to out-migration. In 1851, however, Caird writes of the Surrey Weald that: "Many farmers are reverting to the custom of keeping farm servants more in the farmhouse, the low price of corn and meat rendering this the cheapest plan they can now adopt." If this was the case it is not immediately evident from the MHS for the Weald in 1851, which fell everywhere except in Edenbridge in Kent and Horne in Surrey.

---

24 Caird, op.cit., p.125.
To sum up this section on the demography of the study area, it shows that the Downland parishes were both smallest in area as well as having the lowest absolute population figures and least demographic growth. The inhabitants of this area lived in smaller households than those on the greensand or Weald. The patterns in the Downland area suggest that it was subject to intense out-migration, although internal circumstances conspired to produce a redistribution of population in the 1830s so that there are signs of a classic 'open-close' model in the east of the Downland area.

The greensand too, was subject to an unusual employment situation whilst the railway was being built in the 1840s. This led to an inflated population in the 1841 census. Overall, however, there was a high increase of population in the area which suggests either little out-migration, or that migrants were coming into the greensand from outside. The depressed state of the agriculture on the Weald in the first quarter of the nineteenth century makes the area a good candidate for supplying migrants, but population growth in the Weald maintained a similar rate to that on the greensand.

When the three counties are compared, it can be seen that Kent's dynamic population growth was in excess of the other two counties. This was especially true for Edenbridge where there was a diversification of employment opportunities. Employment and the occupational structure of the study area will be discussed in the next section.
Occupational Structure of the Study Area

The preceding discussions on the state of the economy and demography of the study area have shown that agriculture was the main industry with few opportunities for employment in other sectors. This section starts by exploring this theme further. Table 3.5 uses the 1821 census data to look at the proportion of the population listed as being in paid employment as being employed in agriculture.

Table 3.5 The Proportion of Employed Population Working in Agriculture in the Study Area in 1821.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N.of Population Employed in Agriculture</th>
<th>% of Employed Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downland</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensand</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weald</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5 shows that the greensand area was much less heavily dependent on agriculture than the Downland or Weald. It also indicates that the Kentish parishes were less agriculturally dependent than those in Surrey and Sussex. The pattern can be related to the trends in population growth shown by the three counties. The greensand area and Kent show the highest rate of population growth as well as the highest incidence of non-agricultural occupations to offer. This suggests that a tentative hypothesis could be formulated for the study area which equates population growth with the incidence of non-agricultural employment.

It is equally possible that the proportion of adult population in employment is also related to the incidence of non-agricultural employment.

Table 3.6 examines this by using the figures from the 1821 census.
Table 3.6 Proportion of Population in Paid Employment Compared to Total Population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N. of Population in Paid Employment</th>
<th>% of Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downland</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensand</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weald</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>3026</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall this table shows little variation between pays or counties. What is clear, however, is that there was a high dependancy ratio. Only one parish, Tandridge, had less than five persons dependant on the wage earner.

By 1851 the dependency rate had fallen in most parishes, although not so much on the Downs as on the Weald or greensand. The main reason for this was a change in the structure of the population with a higher proportion being in the 15-30 age group. In the Weald and greensand 23% of the population fell into this age group, compared to 19% on the Downs. Furthermore, 83% of this age group were in employment on the Weald, compared to 66% on the greensand, but only 56% on the Downs. As this is the age at most risk of marriage it has important implications for the marriage patterns of the area which are the main concern of this study.

This section has looked at the occupational structure of the area by using aggregates for a broad over-view. The penultimate section of this chapter will be an attempt to turn the numbers of the previous sections into people.

The People of the Study Area

The aim of this section is to put flesh and blood onto the statistical bones of the preceding sections. It is, therefore, essentially qualitative. It asks the
question as to what manner of people were they who lived on the Surrey, Sussex and Kentish border in the mid-eighteenth and nineteenth centuries? It is proposed to answer this by using three different types of sources. The first is evidence taken from letters, diaries etc. written by people living in the area during the period under examination, the second is observations on the study area written by outsiders, whilst the third is inferences drawn from census data.

It is fortunate in regards to the first of these categories that two sets of family papers have survived for the same parish, Nutfield in Surrey. One set comes from the Budgen family. They were Lords of the Manor of Nutfield, having purchased the lordship with profits from their West Indian plantations. The land they owned was an investment meant to bring maximum return. It was administered by land-agents to whom the Budgens sent a series of complaints from whichever resort they happened to be in. For example - "Jersey, September 29th, 1838." I am disappointed in the valuation. Ham Farm is let at a low rent because it was in a poor state...Mason's Bridge rent could be increased, it was set too low, "25 or concerning the tenancy of a public house they owned - "No skittles to be allowed. I think it is a great object not to have a tenant with a large family for the house will not maintain them and only bring charges to the parish...."26

On the other hand the Budgens dictated on parish matters, but on the other they professed profound detachment about its inhabitants, as in this uncivil extract:

"A letter has been forwarded from a Mr. Dann, a respectable farmer of Nutfield requesting an extension of time beyond the 24th June for taking off the hay from the ground provided it is not cleared, to which I shall make no reply."27

25 S.R.O. 181/7/1 Budgen Family Papers.
26 Ibid.
27 Ibid
Mr. or Thomas Dann was a Quaker yeoman who with the Clement and Russell families of Nutfield were the leaders of a very unpretentious society. Glimpses of this society can be seen in the Clement papers which record mundane journeys, business transactions, observations on the weather and the extreme impecuniosity of the Clement family. The writer of the diaries, John Clement, was heavily in debt paying off two mortgages as well as making payments to penniless uncles who descended on him at regular intervals. The main impression given by the diary is one of immense energy. John was continually on the move either on parish or private business. The same impression is given by the diary of his great-grandson, Clement Pain, who lived in London in the 1890s, but still visited the family farm Kentwins in Nutfield.

The Clement land spread across greensand and Weald. Just to the south on the Weald lived the Gale family, whose money had come from Wealden iron. They too left memoirs and accounts. In particular Leonard Gale, an eccentric with two obsessions - enclosure and Roman Catholicism. "Suffer no man to enclose any land", he exhorts his son, "The highway was never enclosed save by old Sears who took delight to dam it up and bought about his own ruin when he stopped up the Langley Lane and ploughed the Crawley footpath." or - "Never have company of wicked men and depraved priests such as Lee or Troughton of Worth....above all hold fast to the Protestant religion." Is Gale an example

\[28\] S.R.O. 3140, Clement Family Papers.

\[29\] Ibid.


\[31\] Ibid.
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of the radical Protestant Wealdener described by Everitt in his work on nineteenth-century rural dissent? 

What does the contemporary external evidence suggest about the nature of the people of the area? In 1751, Dr. John Burton, of Eton College made a journey through the Sussex Weald. He writes of the people he saw:

"Mud has permeated their being. Not barbarous but not gentlemanly. This because of their inadequate diet. Women more genteel than men. All beasts and men long legged through pulling feet out of the mud. The farmers of the better sort considered squires and are inelegant, rude and illiterate, caring only for their cattle."

Burton’s worldly wise judgement on the Sussex wealdener is echoed to a certain extent by William Stevenson writing sixty years later on the inhabitants of the Surrey Weald:

"There are still to be found, especially in the Weald, and the more remote parts of the county many of the old class of farmer’s men who are shy and jealous in their communications; unwilling to adopt any new mode of husbandry; in short, with much of the ignorance and prejudice of former times, and with all its rigid and inflexible honesty - on whose bare word alone the utmost reliance may be placed, and who have so little of the impartial spirit of commerce, that they prefer selling their grain to an old customer at lower prices to accepting a higher offer from one with whom they have not been in the habit of dealing. The round-frocked farmers (for they pride themselves on frequenting the markets in the dress of their fore-fathers) are equal enemies to improvements in agriculture and relaxation in morals..." 

32 A. Everitt, The Pattern of Rural Dissent: the Nineteenth Century, Department of English Local History, Occasional Paper, 2nd ser. 4, 1972, for example, p. 57.


34 Stevenson, op. cit., p. 88.
Stevenson not only gives evidence for the backwardness of Wealden farming, but also of a distinctive type of independant men with a pride in their work and a suspicion of strangers and strange ways. On the Downs the farmers were more commercially minded, but could also be as independant, secretive and suspicious of strangers as their counterparts in the Weald. Heath describes the poverty yet stiff-necked independence of common dwellers on the Downs at Epsom, which lies a few miles west of the study area. He concludes that by the end of the nineteenth-century change was on its way with an expectation of a better life. He describes the efforts being made by illiterate parents to have their children educated.\textsuperscript{35} In the mid-nineteenth century, however, school was a luxury that most children did without. Table 3.7 shows the proportion of "scholar" in the 5-10 age group in the 1851 census.

Table 3.7. Mean Proportion of Scholars in the Age Group 5-10 from the 1851 Census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downland</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensand</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weald</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greater proportion of "scholars" in the Downland area could be the result of more innovative behaviour. Or it could reflect the relative accessibility of schools in the smaller Downland settlements when compared to the sprawling centreless Wealden parishes, or the elongated greensand parishes, where the school if it existed, could be three long miles of muddy road away.

The children enumerated in the 1851 census lived in male dominated communities, there being a higher ratio of men to women in all areas. The ratio was especially

\textsuperscript{35}R. Heath, \textit{The English Peasantry}, 1898, p.145.
### Table 1.8: Religious Attendance and Non-conformism in 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>% of Total Population Attending Place of Worship</th>
<th>% of Total Population Those Aged 5-10 Attending Sunday School</th>
<th>% of Total Population Listed as Non-conformist School on Census Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Osses</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensand</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wield</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that all types of religious attendance were highest in the town. This is perhaps something of an anomaly as E. J. H. suggests that the town was the area for radical nonconformity in Kent. However, the high level of all churchgoing suggests a conservative attitude to old ways. The remarkable was the smallest religious census was the smallest religious parish of Crowhurst, were the total population of the church on Census Sunday, whilst 100% of children aged 5-10 went to Sunday School. Now far this is through coercion by a resident landlord can only be surmised. The influence of a strong willed landowner can be seen at Tilbury, where in the manuscript return for the religious census, the Vicar writes that the attendance of his church would have been higher had the lower-class family not been absent on that day. 36

36 P.R.O.H.O.129.44,45,56,82, 1851 Religious Census Returns for the Parishes in the Study Area.
high on the Weald, where the children were also likely to be living in a household which included a male lodger. On the greesand the household was more likely to be comprised of a nuclear family, whereas on the Downs it often included either farm or domestic servants. Although the Wealden child was less likely to attend a day school he or she would be more likely to go to a Sunday School than counterparts in other areas. The 1851 religious census will be discussed at length later in this work, but Table 3.8 uses it to show some general patterns in religious attendance in the area.

This table shows that all types of religious attendance was highest in the Weald. This is perhaps something of a paradox as Everitt suggests that the Weald was the prime area for radical nonconformism in Kent, but the high level of all churchgoing suggests a conservative adherence to old ways. Most remarkable was the smallest Wealden parish of Crowhurst. Here the total population attended church on census Sunday, whilst 100% of children aged 5-10 went to Sunday School. How far this was through coercion by a resident landlord can only be conjectured. The influence of a strong minded landowner can be seen at Titsey where in the manuscript return for the religious census the Vicar writes that the attendance at his church would have been higher had the Leveson-Gower family not been absent on that day. This brings the section full-circle back to absentee landlords.

36 P.R.O. H.O.129.44,45,56,82, 1851 Religious Census Returns for the Parishes in the Study Area.
37 A. Everitt, Pattern of Rural Dissent, op.cit., p. 57.
38 P.R.O. H.O.129.45 1851 Religious Census Return for Godstone Registration District, Titsey Parish Return.
Conclusion

The conclusion to this chapter will draw together the trends illustrated in the economy, demography and society of the study area. It will also attempt to assess the relevance of using the boundary-markers of the county or pays as a shorthand on which to hang the discussion of the issues and problems in the study area. Finally it will relate the discussion in the last two chapters to the main aims and objectives of this work - the boundary markers by which local identity was formed and maintained.

Chapters 2 and 3 have described the spatial and social landscapes of the chosen study area. They have moved through an examination of the topography of the area to the way in which the administrative boundaries were drawn. They have also looked at how the land was allocated, settled and held. Chapter 3 continued this theme by describing the economy and society of the area. However, it was found that in order to give a coherence to the discussion it was necessary to use aggregate blocks. As Chapter 2 suggested that certain physical and customary differences could be discerned between different geological zones as well as the different counties, these boundaries were used to delimit blocks of aggregative features in Chapter 3. Did this pre-judge the results - would a less biased approach have been to use groups of parishes with the same acreage or absolute population size. The discussion in these two chapters has shown that this methodology would have resulted in a grouping similar to that used.

The inadequacy of grouping parishes together by pays cannot be escaped. For example, the group of parishes described as 'greensand parishes' include land on the Weald. In defence of this grouping it should be noted
that this group display different characteristics to those parishes with land solely on the Downs or Weald. It is also obvious that whatever grouping is used there are going to be deviants from the general trends shown by the group. Should this or any other local history study consist of a collection of individual 'unique' community studies? On the one hand the differences in spatial and social aspects shown by the general trends in the different counties and pays suggest that the society we are seeking to identify was not uniform but varied according to its type or place. On the other hand, the 'people' who make up the society come through as possessing a unifying dominant characteristic of independance. Is this last caused by the nature of the sources, quantitative sources suggesting one thing whilst qualitative evidence shows another?

These two chapters illustrate some of the problems in choosing an area to study, as well as in describing it. The problems are closely related to the people/place dichotomy of local history, which it is hoped that an examination of inter-action across spatial and social boundaries might help to solve. Chapters 2 and 3 have also set up some trends which might help to predict the way in which inter-action will behave. Chapter 4 moves from the descriptive to an analysis of inter-action in relation to the boundary-markers discussed in Chapter 1.
CHAPTER 4

THE SPATIAL LANDSCAPE OF MARRIAGE AND INTER-ACTION

Introduction

The preceding chapters dealt with the overall scheme of this work as well as describing the geographical area chosen for study. This chapter starts with a discussion on the way in which its aims and objectives can be achieved. It moves on to put theory into practice by testing the strength of the spatial boundaries discussed in Chapter 1. These are the administrative boundaries of the parish and county, with the natural boundary of the pays. The first section of the chapter considers how it might be possible to test these boundaries.

Methodology: Marriage and Local Identity

Chapter One discussed the spatial and social boundary-markers which may have limited inter-action, or pushed it into one direction rather than another. It suggested that the form this inter-action took could be a guideline as to the nature and intensity of local identity in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The aims of the work are, therefore, an examination of local identity in relation to significant boundaries. This section will consider ways in which this inter-action can be measured.

The prime concern of this study is local identity. This has been defined in Chapter One as a body of values and behaviour often assimilated unconsciously and transmitted orally. The ephemeral qualities of local identity are likely, therefore, to present a logistical problem when it comes to measuring its depth or deciding which factors helped to shape it. There are a lack of documentary sources on attitudes and emotions
in the past. Those that exist tend to be status selective, coming from a literate minority. Often covering only a limited time-span - only a few years in one life. To analyse aggregative identity a source is needed which covers a cross-section of the population. Shows change over time and spans the period 1750-1850. Furthermore, as well as covering an aggregative population it needs to have an element of individual choice embedded in it. A methodology and possible source will be considered in this section which allows for the measurement of spatial and social inter-action in relation to boundary-markers, and covers a good cross-section of the population.

In order to measure local identity it is necessary to have a surrogate measurement that reflects the attitudes and expectations of individuals. It also needs to be set within an institutional and socio-economic framework. Marriage is a good institutional candidate as a surrogate measurement of this. It embodies an element of selection or free-choice, whilst also being subject to restraints placed on it by the society in which the participants lived. It also represents a public act and an individual union. It had personal, economic and social consequences for the individual as well as the community as a whole. Marriage patterns can be seen, therefore, as indicative of the general values and attitudes of the adult population. Sociologically, marriage is seen as the best institutional evidence of status perception. Evidence for this in the past is given by Houston in his study of marriage in eighteenth century Scotland. He wrote: "In social terms equality of parentage was felt to be a highly desirable precondition of marriage in the pre-industrial society." Houston found a high level of occupational endogamy in eighteenth-century Kilmarnock. He concluded

that social inter-action was horizontal and personal.² Crozier reports a similarly high degree of status endogamy in nineteenth-century middle-class London. Although in this case there was a high degree of spatial exogamy.³ Perry found, however, that both social and spatial exogamy were rare amongst the labouring population of nineteenth-century Dorset. He developed the concept of a population isolate or small homogenous population living within a larger geographic area.⁴ Work by Peel shows that most individuals find marriage partners within their isolates - i.e. within their immediate spatial or social area.⁵ Marriage partners, therefore, were likely to share the same life-style, or experience and expectations, as well as coming from an area that was spatially homogenous. This area could, however, show a directional-bias in that partners were likely to be chosen from one direction rather than another at a similar distance; whilst the 'historical feedback process' suggests that once an avenue of communication is opened up it is likely to continue over time.⁶ Communities which inter-acted constantly, had the potential to form a social-area. A geographic space measured in terms of social movement. These are the 'linked communities' which Phythian-Adams suggests need locating before starting research on one particular component of local history.⁷ Each marriage,

---

Chapter One outlined spatial and social boundaries which might have had some bearing on marriage interaction, but there were other factors which might also have influenced marriage patterns and interaction. Population structure, land-tenure practices, local economy and agricultural patterns might favour endogamy in one parish but exogamy in another. Marriage, therefore, cannot be taken out of its wider socio-economic context. The question of how far marriage choice was determined by these wider socio-economic issues has to be considered. So does the question of parental control over marriage choice. The latter could operate in two ways. If land or property were involved, marriage could either be delayed until the property was inherited, or put forward by inter-vivo transfer. The majority of the population had no property to transfer. In their case marriage could be delayed by low real-wages or hastened by the expectation of good living-standards in the near future. Parental experience could play a part in both of these, as could parental expectations of the role they thought the children should play in their future welfare. This might help to limit spatial choice to a partner near to the parental home. Institutional factors came into play on this variable in the shape of the Poor Law which relieved the individual from the responsibility of succoring elderly, sick or needy relatives by putting the onus of poor relief onto the parish. Although this released the individual from spatial restraint, it could place other constraints on

---

the freedom of choice in marriage partners in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. Parish poor-law officers anxious to keep down the poor rates, could actively prevent marriages that might become chargeable to the parish. The extent of this intervention is hard to assess. Smith in a footnote to his essay on Marriage Processes in the English Past, suggests that the intervention might consist of the minister refusing to read the banns or conduct the ceremony for undesirable matches. In this case the interaction will be absent from the records by default. It might, however, show up as an increase in bastardy orders, which Smith quotes as the case in an Essex parish. ⁸

Better documented are the physical and psychological means used by members of the community to warn off men from alien communities courting their women. Taking a woman away from her home parish was seen as stealing. Rough music, barriers erected across trackways, blackmail and beatings could be used to deter the suitor. Physical or symbolic censure against certain out-marriages is universal. Aggressive attitudes to some out-marriages by women are found all over Britain and the Continent. ⁹ As it was invariably directed against women marrying out of their home communities it raises the question as to whether this was caused by anxiety that the man would settle in the woman's community so increasing competition for jobs. Usually, however, it was the woman who moved on marriage, so that objections to out-marriage should have come from the man's parish rather than the woman's. Was there a

---


⁹ For example, the Oud-Catholik community of Egmond-aan-Zee in North Holland was deterring courtship of its women by outsiders as late as the 1970s. (Personal communication from Lisbeth Hardwijk, Heerhugowaard, Holland.)
reason beyond economic consideration that provoked a violent reaction against some (but not all) out-marriages? If we consider the terms used to describe a woman marrying out of her own community - 'lost' or 'stolen', perhaps we can get some measure of the psychology behind the actions. We may also see how marriage reinforced or shaped local identity. First it has to be considered whether it was the woman or the community that "lost" something. One way of looking at this is to refer to back to the definition of local identity given in Chapter One. It was suggested that it was a quality assimilated unconsciously - growing out of the texture of everyday experience. The groundwork for this was laid down as the child learned to speak by imitating the mother (significantly the native language is known as the mother-tongue). The woman was, therefore, the prime transmitter of identity, passing on her store of local knowledge, values and attitudes to the next generation. A woman from an alien community was in an ambivalent position - which traditions should she pass on - her own or those of the host community? If spatial and social variables were equal in the match - i.e. she came from the same social background within a spatial isolate, the ambiguities would be less. Her entry into a new community would have caused little or no adjustment trauma. The community that she had left, however, had 'lost' part of its uniqueness. Its identity was threatened - it's gene pool depleted, it's males found wanting. The woman had been 'stolen' from them. The community had been deprived of a resource, but that resource had been forcibly removed.

Religious groups also saw marriage as important in maintaining values. Excommunication could follow a marriage outside the 'faith'. Marriage and the family were seen as basic to the propagation of piety, with man and woman united in a common religious aim. Often, this was difficult, and to marry within the same
persuasion meant considerable spatial exogamy. Therefore, the extent to which nonconformists or recusants abandoned their search for a suitable mate within their faith to marry one from another faith from their home area, will act as a sensitive indicator of the strength of the spatial factor in shaping local identity.

Shorter uses a similar default variable to assess the strength and extent of the affective marriage. He sees deviation from normal status endogamy as indicating a break from social constraints so and a move towards personal fulfilment. Like much of the sentiments approach this assumption has no base in reality, as cross-status marriages were rare in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This does not mean that personal fulfilment was absent from marriages made at this time. Until the end of the nineteenth-century the labouring classes could not record their feelings, but this does not mean that they did not feel deep affection for their spouses. Those who could record their emotions are testimony to the passions felt by the unexceptional members of the community. For instance, John Clement, a yeoman-farmer from S.E. Surrey, left rough drafts of his love-letters in a notebook. "Dearest Love of My Affection" he wrote, "As my cares pressed from your fealty let the oxenes of your bounty pasture on my happiness..." or "True love is a perilous pleasure with delight unalloyed treasure. Two firme hartes in one meeting grasping hand in hand now floating wraith like like a maze intwining...Two fair minds combining..."

or from the minute book of the General Baptist Assembly comes this tribute to affectionate marriage:

---

11 For example, Houston, loc.cit., passim.
12 S.R.O. 3089/6/ Clement Papers.
Marriage can be seen as a free choice, but a choice set within social and spatial constraints. Vincent’s analysis of working-class autobiographies describes how marriage often followed ‘love at first sight’ across a meeting-place, usually a church or chapel. Courtship could last as long as five years until sufficient capital was accumulated to set up a separate residential establishment. In all cases though marriage was the result of free choice. It had to be the right choice as well, for the wrong choice meant permanent unhappiness with release only possible for the very wealthy. Generally, the autobiographies showed that marriage was a bond based on shared experience and mutual dependence; a partnership for survival with the home seen not as a refuge, but a battlefield against hunger and destitution.

The element of choice in marriage as an institution links marriage to local identity. Social constraints, or spatial restrictions notwithstanding, marriage in the past was likely to be between partners with a similar life-experience, or shared spatial and social backgrounds. This study will use these similarities as a surrogate by which to measure spatial and social inter-action. Marriage patterns will be used, with especial attention paid to the way in which these crossed the symbolic boundary-markers discussed in Chapter One. The next part of this section will start with a discussion of the main documentary source

---


that can be used to look at marriage and courtship patterns in the past. The following section will look at marriage patterns in relation to the parish boundary.

The most important source for eighteenth and nineteenth century marriage patterns are the Anglican marriage registers and banns books. Unfortunately these are flawed sources. Referring to parish registers as a whole Wrigley and Schofield write of "intractable problems" connected with the use of parish registers in demographic research. They point out that the registers record only the Anglican ceremony so that there is a high probability of a discrepancy between what happened in the past and what is recorded.\textsuperscript{15} Snell writing specifically on marriage registers shows that there are other problems inherent in the registers connected both with prevailing customs as well as the semantics of the entries.\textsuperscript{16} Although these problems exist, they can be overcome. Drake, for instance, shows how statistical tests can be run on registers in order to isolate biased or defective registration. The degree of coverage in the marriage registers for the study area is shown on Table 4.1.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{16}K.D.M. Snell, 'Parish Registration and the Study of Labour Mobility', L.P.S., 33 Autumn, 1984, pp.29-32.
Table 4.1. Number of Entries with Defective Years for the Marriage Registers of the Study Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N. of Entries</th>
<th>Yearly Average of Entries</th>
<th>N. of Defective Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Grinstead</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4238</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N. of Entries</th>
<th>Yearly Average of Entries</th>
<th>N. of Defective Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Grinstead</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4442</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows that coverage is far worse in the nineteenth-century than for the eighteenth. A similar table in 'The Population History of England 1541 - 1871' 18 shows a continued improvement in registration in the early years of the nineteenth-century, but this does not occur in the study area. The faults in the registration mean that the patterns shown in the following sections of this chapter are essentially impressionistic. They should be seen as relative rather than absolute statements. With these constraints in mind the chapter will continue by looking at marriage choice and personal mobility in relation to the parish boundary.

**Marriage, Identity and the Parish**

Before analysing the data derived from the registers, it is worthwhile reconsidering the part played by the parish in the spatial or social experience of the individual in the eighteenth and nineteenth-centuries. This can be summarised as follows - the parish was the most immediate administrative, social, psychological and spatial boundary marker for the individual. It provided a framework for law and order as well as policing the moral life of the community. It was suggested that parish boundaries were both symbolic and actual, marked by ritual and custom. On the one hand they conferred a distinct identity on the inhabitants of the parish by marking it off from other parishes. On the other, a lack of physical barriers between parishes meant that the boundaries could be crossed easily. How far these symbolic and actual boundaries served to focus identity will be discussed firstly by using a simple comparison of the numbers of marriages involving partners from the same parish - endogamous marriages, with those which involved one partner from a parish.

---

Map 4.1: Rate of Endogamy, 1750-1799.
Map 4.2: Rate of Endogamy, 1800-1849.
other than the registering parish - exogamous marriages. The proportion of endogamous marriages was derived from this count data for two periods - 1750-1799 and 1800-1849. This is shown figuratively on Maps 4.1 and 4.2 as well as on Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 The Rate of Endogamy for the Parishes in the Study Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N.of Marriages</th>
<th>N. of Endogamous Marriages</th>
<th>Endogamous as % of all marriages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Grinstead</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4238</td>
<td>3203</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total endogamous marriages as a percentage of all marriages = 75.5%
other than the registering parish - exogamous marriages. The proportion of endogamous marriages was derived from this count data for two periods - 1750-1799 and 1800-1849. This is shown figuratively on Maps 4.1 and 4.2 as well as on Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 The Rate of Endogamy for the Parishes in the Study Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N. of Marriages</th>
<th>N. of Endogamous Marriages</th>
<th>Endogamous as % of all marriages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Grinstead</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpfield</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4238</td>
<td>3203</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total endogamous marriages as a percentage of all marriages = 75.5%
Table 4.2 continued - The Rate of Endogamy in the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N. of Marriages</th>
<th>N. of Endogamous Marriages</th>
<th>Endogamous as % of all Marriages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Grinstead</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4442</td>
<td>3612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Endogamous Marriages as a proportion of all marriages = 81%

These maps and tables suggest that with an overall mean of 75.5% for the first period, rising to 81% in the second that the parish boundary was a significant determiner of marriage choice. Under the terms of this inquiry, therefore, this implies that it was an important factor in shaping local identity. There are, however, some considerations that have to be taken into account before this can be accepted. These come partly from semantic flaws in the sources. Take, for example, the statement ‘of the parish’. Does this mean that the subject had been born in the parish, or had merely been resident there for the four weeks prior to the marriage? If this doubt is taken into account does the unqualified rate of endogamy represent a fallacious measurement? Some check is needed to reveal the deeper
trends hidden by the simple count data.

Two ways of doing this are to use the marriage registers as a base for a family reconstitution exercise, or to link the register to the census data. Both of these rely on Nominal Record Linkage, i.e. the main criteria used to identify or link the separate units is the name of an individual. To do this successfully, other variables must match as well. For instance, the re-use of the same forenames in families often led to several members of the same community bearing identical fore and surnames. Therefore, dates such as baptismal or burial events should be within a realistic time-span. Occupational data, place of residence and other internal evidence should be considered. Similarly, discrepancies in the spelling of surnames should also be noted, as well as synonyms for occupations. Such are the difficulties of linking, either within the same source or across several different records, that many links that may have existed in reality have to be discarded. The members of the community that are linked represent but a small percentage of the total population of a parish. It is possible, however, to exploit those that cannot be linked. Souden treated the members of a community that could not be linked in a family reconstitution exercise, as 'movers'. It is probable that this is an erroneous assumption. In reality, many of those who appear only in the marriage register, remained in the registering parish but had their vital events registered elsewhere, or not at all.

In the following discussion expected events that are missing from the parish register are exploited in a different way. The registers were searched for the

\[19\]D. Souden, 'Movers and Stayers in Family Reconstitution Populations', L.P.S., Autumn 1984, pp.11-28, passim.
baptism of each partner in the marriages for a sample of eight parishes. This allowed for three categories of marriages to be formed:

1) Insider (i.e. baptised and married in the same parish) married to insider.
2) Outsider (i.e. no record of baptism in marriage registering parish) married to outsider.
3) Insider married to outsider.

Table 4.3 shows the result of this linkage for the sample parishes.
Table 4.3. Marriages in Each Category of Marriages for 8 Sample Parishes in S.E. Surrey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Insider/Insider</th>
<th>Outsider/Insider</th>
<th>Insider/Outsider</th>
<th>Outsider/Outsider</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>627</td>
<td></td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Insider/Insider</th>
<th>Outsider/Insider</th>
<th>Insider/Outsider</th>
<th>Outsider/Outsider</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>614</td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upto this point the term endogamy has been taken in its generally accepted sense to mean a marriage between partners resident in the same parish at the time of marriage. Table 4.3 suggests that residence in a parish at the time of marriage did not necessarily mean that the subject had been baptised there. In order to distinguish those marriages which were between partners baptised and married in the same registering parish and those merely resident in a parish at the time of marriage, the term true endogamy will be used to describe the former.

Table 4.3 implies that either the registration of baptisms was defective in the sample parishes, or that very few individuals choose to stay or marry within their native community. If the latter was the case the trends shown on Table 4.2 are erroneous in that they reflect the place of residence of the partners at the time of marriage rather than the birth-place. In order to check this assumption, the birthplace data has been collated from the 1851 census for all married couples in the sample parishes and categorised into the same classes as those used for the marriage registers. The result of this is shown on Table 4.4.
Table 4.4 Married Population in Each Marriage Category Shown by Birth-Place Data from the 1851 Census for a Sample of 8 Parishes in S.E. Surrey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Insider/Insider</th>
<th>Outsider/Outsider</th>
<th>Insider/Insider</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 confirms the trends shown in Table 4.3. It has an overall mean of 12% true endogamous marriages, or partners who had been born and were still living in the same parish in 1851. The last exercise in this series checked the marriage registers of the sample parishes for the marriages of those couples listed in the census to see how far the entry agreed with the birthplace data. The result of this is shown on Table 4.5.
Table 4.5. Cross-reference of Birth-place Data of Married Couples in the 1851 Census to Marriage Entries in the Parish Register for a sample of 7 Parishes in S.E. Surrey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N. of Couples traced in 1851 census</th>
<th>% of all couples in census</th>
<th>Born and resident (agrees with reg.)</th>
<th>'Of' in register born else-where</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bursot</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5. is interesting. It shows how small a proportion of actual marriages can be matched to couples resident in an enumeration district. It suggests that on the whole the registers were inaccurate as the statement 'of' usually meant resident rather than born in a parish. The majority of couples listed in the 1851 census had also been born and married outside the enumerating parish, as well as originating from different parishes to each other before marriage. Therefore, the high level of parochial endogamy shown in the marriage registers gives a false impression of the situation. It masks such movement as took place between birth and marriage. Coleman in his work on twentieth-century marriage patterns calls this the "birthplace distance". He writes:

"'Birthplace distance' is not a 'real' migration which people actually make, but the 'resultant' of different phases of movement and behaviour which occur between the time of an individual's birth and the time of his marriage."^{20}

Before the 1851 census gave a named location for the birthplace, the extent and scope of this "birthplace

---

movement" is hidden. Often the first documentary evidence of an individual's residence in an area is the entry in the marriage register. Where that individual had been between birth and marriage is lost. In view of the aims of this work, however, some way is need of reconstructing this movement and assessing which boundaries it might have crossed. This section is looking at the parish boundary. Table 4.2. suggests that this was a strong boundary-marker. This is not borne out by Table 4.3 which involves 1930 marriages or 3860 individuals. 833 individuals or 21.5% of these had been baptised in the parish where their marriage was registered. Furthermore, the 1851 census data confirms this pattern. Table 4.4 involves 698 couples or 1396 individuals. 403 or 28.8% of these individuals had not left their birthplace. We are left with the conclusion that at least 70% of the married population of the study area had crossed the parish boundary to live in another parish at sometime prior to their marriage. This reduces the strength of the parish as a boundary marker. It means that the patterns shown on Maps 4.1 and 4.2 must be seen as relative rather than absolute.

It suggests that local identity as measured by marriage choice was likely to cover a wider area than the discrete space bounded by the parish border. The parish did not represent a population isolate, but was part of a wider horizon embracing several parishes. This is analogous with the demographic and genetic patterns shown in the study on the Otmoor parishes of Oxfordshire. Kuchemann et.al. write of these parishes: "although Charlton and its two hamlets do not seem to form a closed gene pool, they may turn out to be segments of a fairly localised gene pool."21

21 C.P. Kuchemann, A.J. Boyce, and G.A. Harrison, "A Demographic and Genetic Study of a Group of Oxfordshire" (Footnote continued)
Later in this chapter the likely origins of incoming partners will be discussed. At this point, however, it is proposed to use the 1851 census to assess the proportion of potential native or indigenous genes present in a sample of 9 parishes. Native is defined as born and resident in the enumerating parish, whilst potential genes are present in all married couples where the wife is of child-bearing age, all unmarried adult males, as well as all unmarried females of childbearing age (under 47). Outside genes come from any bearer of potential genes born outside the parish. Table 4.6 shows the result of this.

Table 4.6 Comparison of Native to Outside Genes in the Population of 9 Sample Parishes. Shown as a % of all potential genes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Total Pop.</th>
<th>Total N. of Potential Genes</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Outside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n % of total pop.</td>
<td>n % of p.g.*</td>
<td>n % of p.g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>274 30</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>176 35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>236 36</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>299 41</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>413 46</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>72 40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>71 46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>199 34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>2113</td>
<td>436 21</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p.g. = potential genes

This table shows that there is the marked difference in the proportion of population at risk of child rearing. Only 21% of the total population came within this age range at Worth on the Sussex Weald, compared to 46% in Nutfield on the Surrey greensand and Titsey on the North Downs. Second, there is a lack of agreement between a low total population of child-rearing age with proportion of native genes. Worth, for instance,
I11 has the lowest proportion of potentially fertile population but the highest proportion of native genes. Third, there is a lack of co-ordination between parishes from the same pays. On the Downs, for example, the proportion of native child producers ranges from 35% at Caterham to 46% at Titsey. Similarly, the two greensand parishes of Limpsfield and Nutfield show an equally wide range. In the Surrey Weald Burstow and Horne share an equal proportion of native potential genes, but Worth which adjoins both has a 20% higher proportion. These trends should be related to the rate of endogamy, as the greater the number of the population of marriageable age in a parish the greater the chance of endogamous marriages. This assumption works in the case of Nutfield and Titsey, but is contradicted by Worth which had a high rate of endogamy and a low proportion of population at risk of marriage. It is probable, that this is related to the economy and tenurial practices in that parish which were described in Chapters 2 and 3. These chapters showed that Worth lies in the Sussex Wealden area described in Appendix D of the Poor Law Report as consisting of small family run farms. It was also an agricultural parish with no other type of employment to offer. Given these two factors it is likely that the following scenario can be given for this parish. One son remained to work and inherit the family holding whilst the other brothers left home to find employment elsewhere. This might account for the low proportion of population of fertile age, but the high percentage of native genes. A different process was in action at Nutfield, where a high percentage of fertile population is matched by a high proportion of native genes. Employment prospects offered by the Fullers’ Earth pits encouraged young adults to stay, marry and settle in the parish. This resulted in a population which was indigenous to the

parish and of child rearing age.

Those who settled in a parish after marriage, baptised their children in it, and were subsequently buried in the village churchyard can also be assigned to marriage categories. This is shown on Table 4.7.

Table 4.7 Marriage Categories of Those Who Settled in the Parish Where Their Marriage was Registered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>1750-1799</th>
<th>1800-1849</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insider/Insider</td>
<td>Outsider/Outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of settlers</td>
<td>% of % of settlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20 21 27 42 53 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36 15 32 15 32 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36 15 32 15 32 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 56 58 31 32 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12 8 47 7 41 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 12 46 10 39 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13 17 44 17 44 39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Settler is defined if the marriage is followed by a baptism or a burial.

This table shows that the likelihood of remaining in the parish where the marriage was registered was greatest when at least one member of the partnership had been baptised in that parish. The exception to this is Nutfield in the first period. But a dramatic reversal is shown in this parish in the nineteenth century. In Chapter 3 it was shown that the Fullers Earth Pits in this parish were opened up in the 1740s. This created employment opportunities that attracted
outsiders to the parish. Conditions were favourable for
them to settle and raise a family in the parish. This
is demonstrated on Table 4.6. Equally interesting is
the overall drop in settlers in the nineteenth-century
which contradicts the rate of endogamy which rises.
There is a paradox here, of more partners who were
resident in the same parish marrying in that parish,
but at the same time more of these couples moving on
after marriage to settle elsewhere. The main reason for
this probably lies in the depressed state of the
agricultural economy of the area in the early
nineteenth century, which encouraged personal mobility.

A further indication of the role of the parish in
partner preference comes from those who mated without
benefit of clergy. 69 bastardy bonds have been traced
for the study area. 32 or 46% of these named a putative
father living in the same parish as the mother of the
child.23

It is doubtful whether such a small sample is
significant, but if it can be taken as a rough guide to
the situation it would seem that nearly half of
extra-marital sex took place between partners living in
the same parish. The origins of the other partners will
be discussed later in this chapter.

The final check on the relationship of the parish
boundary to personal mobility comes from the proportion
of the total population who were enumerated in 1851 in
the parish in which they were born. This is shown on
Table 4.8.

P9/3/31-36, Lingfield Parish, Bastardy Bonds.
P26/8/35-41, Nutfield Parish, Bastardy Bonds.
W.Sx.R.O. Par.516/3/1/1-10, Worth Parish, Bastardy
Bonds.
Par.516/3/6/6-26, Worth Parish, Bastardy Bonds.
Table 4.8 Proportion of Total Population of the Study Area Born and Enumerated in the Same Parish in 1851.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N. born and Enumerated in enumerating parish</th>
<th>% of total pop. of parish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Grinstead</td>
<td>3070</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 which includes infants should be considered in relation to Table 4.6 which is a sample of the adult population of the area. Table 4.6 shows that + 34% of the total population of a parish were likely to be adults, therefore, 66% of the total figure would be children who were not of an age to make decisions about their place of residence. This leaves 4879 adults or 21% of the total population who were enumerated in their birthplace.

At this point the parish as a boundary should be reconsidered in the light of what has been revealed by the marriage choice and birthplace evidence. Initially, marriage choice suggested that the parish was an important boundary marker. Further investigation exposed the unreliability of the sources. Endogamous marriages in the period 1750-1850, using the term in its general sense accounted for a mean of 75-81% of all marriages in the study area. When the marriages were linked to the baptismal register for a sample of 9
parishes it was found that only 21.5% of the individuals participating in the marriages had been baptised in the parish in which their marriage was registered. Furthermore, the birthplace data from the census for the same sample of parishes showed that only 28.8% of the married individuals in those parishes were likely to be living in the parish where they were born. This section has also indicated that there was a wide-range in the rates of parochial endogamy and personal mobility. These variations could be the result of the spatial and social factors prevalent in the parish. The final phase of this section will look at marriage choice and personal mobility in relation to some of the spatial and social factors discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. It will examine mobility in relation to the economy, demography, settlement morphology, tenurial customs and geographic location of the parish.

It starts by considering two papers which examined some of the factors that gave some parishes a high rate of endogamy, but others in a similar area a low rate. The first of these studies is by Coleman. He suggests that endogamy was directly related to the population size of a given area. Small populations, Coleman suggests, were less able to satisfy their own demands for marriage partners, thus forcing those who wished to marry to seek a partner outside the parish. Parishes with a small population could be expected to have a low rate of endogamy. 24

Perry, writing on mobility in rural Dorset in the nineteenth-century, also felt that small parishes would be expected to have a low rate of endogamy, but his initial analysis of the marriage registers produced no such pattern. He writes of the period 1837-1886:

"Values range from 60 to 90 per cent, and no pattern is immediately apparent; both large

24 Coleman, loc.cit., p.114.
In order to look at the possibility of some pattern in the rate of endogamy Perry tested eight variables that might have affected it. Settlement patterns, he thought, might influence it, with dispersion working against endogamy by breaking the community into smaller units. He also looked at the relationship of the total population of the parish to the rate of endogamy, its regional location, its location in relation to a main road, the distance from the parish church to the nearest town or railway station, the number of parishes lying within three miles, its economy, and finally the literacy of the population. The level of the latter, he felt, was an indication of how far it was possible for those living at a distance to keep in touch without face-to-face inter-action. Perry used the incidence of those who signed the marriage register as an indication of literacy. This measurement may not be valid. Although it is commonly accepted that this measures literacy, it does not mean that all those who could sign their names could also read. His results showed that of the factors tested by regression analysis only the position of the parish to the main road and the settlement pattern were not significant.26

From the conclusions drawn by Coleman and Perry it is possible to formulate a working hypothesis, that the rate of endogamy in any parish will be related to the structure of its population, its socio-economic position and its geographical position within the communications network of the area and other centres of


26 Perry, loc. cit., pp.126, 128.
population. The following variables will be considered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous</th>
<th>Categorical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Growth Rate.</td>
<td>Type of Settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHS.</td>
<td>to main road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of owner-occupation.</td>
<td>Geographical Position in relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Parish.</td>
<td>to other parishes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The continuous variables were plotted on scatter graphs. These show that there is little relationship between the rate of endogamy and any of these variables. One positive relationship of parish acreage on the rate of endogamy in the first period, disappeared in the second. One is forced to conclude that the relationship in the first period is coincidental rather than linear. Similarly, the negative relationship of a high MHS with a low rate of endogamy seen in the first period also disappears in the second period to produce a random distribution.

The categorical variables were tested by chi and phi. The relationship of the occupational structure of the parish with its rate of endogamy showed a critical value of 1%. The geographical position of the parish had an 8% confidence level. The mean square contingency test on the relationship of the settlement type to the rate of endogamy gave $\phi = -0.01$; whilst that for the position of the parish in relation to the main road gave a slightly more positive result of $\phi = 0.28$. These somewhat random results lead to the conclusion that
unlike Coleman's and Perry's findings, no overall variables can be related to the rate of endogamy for the study area as a whole. Although these results could be caused by the data for the study area being less perfect than that used by Coleman and Perry.

This section suggests that the main deciding factor in choosing a marriage partner was proximity of residence at the time of marriage. Where the partners might have originated from before marriage will be examined in the following sections. These will start with the next administrative boundary to be considered - the county.

Marriage, Identity and the County

The preceding section showed that the parochial boundary was of much less importance in marriage choice or personal mobility than it at first appears. At the end of the section it was suggested that the patterns shown by those who can be proved to have come into a parish from outside, might go some way towards remedying the faults in the sources. This section looks at these patterns in relation to the county boundary.

Chapter 1 which discussed the function of the county and its role in the life of the individual, suggested that the county boundary was likely to be of less immediate relevance than the parish. Most of the county's legislative powers were administered locally by parochial officials. The county machinery was most likely to impinge on the life of the individual during a time of emergency, when the Lord Lieutenant of the County was required to raise the county militia, or make preparations against invasion. Therefore, the county may have been a more important signifier during the French Wars than at other times.

It was also suggested in Chapter 1 that the county as a
unit could inspire loyalty and corporate identity at times other than emergencies. Each of the counties in the study area had a separate identity from an early period. Kent, it was suggested, held a special place in the minds of its inhabitants, not only through being the gate-way to the Continent, but also through its retention of peculiar customs, such as gavelkind. Hasted’s panegyric to Kent has already been quoted in Chapter 1. He continues by outlining the advantages of Kent, its situation," so well adjusted to commerce and trade..." so that," this county owes, in a great measure, that wealth and abundance which is so lavishly diffused over every part of it, to its geographical position."27

Its inhabitants too, were special:

"From their continued intercourse with foreigners of all nations, the inhabitants are more open and liberal-minded than others... This produces a well-known hospitality and civility of manners among them, which extends to all degrees."28

Not only this but Kent was fair to all its dwellers:

"... in this county there are very few, if any such scenes of misery and wretchedness to be seen among the poor, as there are in many parts of England. Instead of which, a comfortable subsistence and cheerful content is found in most of the meanest cottages. From the freedom of its tenures and customs, the lands throughout the county are shared by almost every housekeeper in it, by which means the Great are restrained from possessing such a vast extent of domains, as might prompt them to exercise tyranny over their inferiors: and everyone’s possessions being inter-mixed, there arises an unavoidable chain of interests between them which entitles both one and the other to mutual obligations and entities."29

28 Hasted, op.cit., p. 3.
29 Ibid., p.11.
This egalitarian climate did not, however, produce insubordination among the natives:

"...though there is a freedom of spirit reigns in the breast of Kentishmen of every denomination, yet they nevertheless preserve among them a decent subordination: for there is not part of the kingdom, where the government of the realm and the laws and magistracy of the country are more cheerfully submitted to than in this county." 36

Hasted was unashamedly partial to his native county. As Everitt points out in his introduction to the reprint of Hasted's history, Hasted was "pure Kent". Born and educated in the county, married to a Kentish girl. He spent his entire life in the county surrounded by a circle of Kentish cousins and friends. 31

The early county historians of Surrey tended to come from outside the county. John Aubrey, one of the first was a native of Wiltshire. However, he included a letter from John Evelyn in his History of Surrey. The Evelyns were a Surrey family. John the diarist and author of the letter was born in the county. He wrote to Aubrey that "Surrey is the Country of my Birth; and my delight." 32

A later writer, W.T. Pike also felt that Surrey was a favoured place:

"...on all considerations it is one of the most favoured counties of England. Towns are well laid out and controlled as anywhere to, be found; natural scenery not to be surpassed." 33

30 Hasted, op.cit., p. 4.
31 A. Everitt, 'Introduction' to E. Hasted, op.cit., pp.x, xxxi.
The first county of historian of Sussex, Horsfield was an incomer. His work lacks the emotional involvement shown by Hasted.\footnote{T.W. Horsfield, The History, Antiquities and Topography of the County of Sussex, 1835, passim.}

This lack was supplied in the early twentieth century by W.V. Cook. He wrote:

".... to every Sussex man and woman there is something special and intimate in the affection we bear to that particular bit of earth where we were born. It is a right feeling and gives to our lives a background of beloved association and happy tradition which counts for more than some may think"

He continues:

"In few of our English counties is the spell of this local sentiment more powerfully formed by history and natural circumstances than Sussex."

He sums up his feelings thus:

"And to every Sussex man and woman her hills and combes, her woods and rivers, and her wide seabeaches are holy ground indeed."\footnote{W.V. Cook, The Story of Sussex, n.d., pp. 1-4.}

These extracts show that for the literate section of the population the county provided both a focus for identity as well as a feeling of corporate loyalty. This ranged from the 'delight' of Evelyn to the adulation of Cook. At a national level too, it was felt that the county was an important unit. The authors of the Registrar General's Reports on the 1841 and 51 census returns measured mobility in county terms. In 1841 it was found that; "The average for all England of those born in the county in which they are enumerated is 80.7 percent."\footnote{B.P.P. 1841 Census Return, 1, 1841-1843, p. 83.}

By 1851 the situation had changed. There was "an intimate blending of people together who were born in
town and in country; with the concentration of people in every county, and almost every district, who were born in other countries as well as other counties..."  

It might be expected that the importance of the county as boundary marker will diminish across the nineteenth century.

The following measures of inter-action will be considered in order to look at the county as a boundary-marker and its role in shaping local identity. Choice of marriage partners will be used, with personal mobility as shown by the census data and Poor Law Papers. It will start with the first of these by looking at marriage choice across the county border. This is shown figuratively on Maps 4.3 and 4.4 as well as on Table 4.9. The first column of figures in this table shows the absolute number of marriages which included a partner from outside the registering parish. The second shows the absolute number of those marriages in which the incoming partner was resident in the same county as the registering parish. The third and fourth columns express the absolute numbers in column 2 as a percentage of column 1 (column 3) and all marriages (column 4).

37 B.P.P., 1851 Census Return, 1, 1852-1853, p.c.i.
The Rate of County Endogamy as shown by Marriage Choice, 1750-1799 (percentage of all marriages.)

Map 1: The Rate of County Endogamy as shown by Marriage Choice, 1750-1799 (percentage of all marriages.)
4.4: The Rate of County Endogamy as shown by Marriage Choice, 1800-1849
(percentage of all marriages.)

For key see Map 4.1.
Table 4.9 County Endogamy as Shown by Marriage Choice 1750-1799

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N. of exo. marriages</th>
<th>N. of intra-county exo. marriages</th>
<th>3 Intra-county marriages as a % of all exo. marriages</th>
<th>4 Intra-county marriages as a % of all marriages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Grinstead</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.9 County Endogamy as Shown by Marriage Choice

1800-1849

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N. of exo. marriages</th>
<th>N. of intra-county marriages</th>
<th>Intra-county marriages as a % of all marriages</th>
<th>Intra-county marriages as a % of exo. marriages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.Grinstead</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tables and maps will be discussed in three ways. The first will consider them in relation to the results in the preceding section on parochial endogamy. The second will look at them with regards to the spatial location of the parish; whilst the third will look at actual patterns of inter-action between counties.

In the first section of this chapter it was suggested that between 5 and 8% of marriages which stated that both partners were resident in the same parish represented "true endogamy", i.e. both partners had been born in that parish. It was suggested that the origins of the remaining + 88% might be revealed through the patterns shown by marriages where one partner was known to be resident outside the
registering parish. Table 4.9 shows that 50-70% of these were likely to have come from the same county as the registering parish. This is in line with the conclusions drawn by the Registrar General in 1851, the overall proportion of intra-county marriages fell in the second period. However, the county and pays aggregates show that this was an uneven fall. Kent showing a significantly lower proportion of intra-county endogamy in the later period, but the rate for Sussex was rising. Similarly, the greensand ridge shows a greater fall in the later period when compared to the Wealden area. This is additional evidence of the increasing isolation of the latter area. The process is illustrated particularly well by Worth, where the proportion of intra-county inter-action rose by 17% in the second period. As might be expected border parishes like Worth show an overall lower rate of county endogamy in both periods. This is selective with the parishes on the eastern border showing more cross-county inter-action than those in the south.

How can these patterns be reconciled with the work on marriage choice that crossed the parish boundary? This showed an overall rate of endogamy of 75.5% of all marriages registered in the study area for 1750-1799, rising to 81% in 1800-1849. It was felt, however, that this masked much hidden movement. It was suggested that only 8% of the participants in the marriages in the first period and 5% in the second had been baptised in the parish that registered their marriage. The rest had moved across the parish boundary at sometime between birth and marriage. The problem is to find out the direction and extent of this movement. In order to try to solve this Table 4.9 has to be considered. It shows known inter-action based on the entries in the marriage register that give the residence of one partner as being outside the registering parish. Known movement shows that of the 1004 marriages involving an outsider
in the first period in 653 or 65% of these the outsider came from the same county as the registering parish. In the second period there were 830 such marriages, of which 493 or 59% of the incoming partners had not crossed the county border. In order to compare these figures and to gain some impression, albeit artificial, of the situation the following calculations have been made.

N. of marriages = absolute number of marriages in all the marriage registers for the study area.
N. of endogamous marriages = those marriages where both partners were 'of' the registering parish.
N. of "true endogamous marriages" = 8% of endogamous marriages for the first period and 5% of endogamous marriages in the second. These figures are taken from Table 4.3. where it is suggested that these is the rate of marriages that can be described as "true endogamy".
N. of known exogamy = all those marriages in which one partner comes from outside the registering parish.
N. of hypothetical exogamous marriages = N. of endogamous marriages - N. of "true endogamous marriages".
N. of intra-county marriages = number of exogamous marriages where it is known that the incoming partner had not crossed the county border.
N. of hypothetical intra-county marriages = 65% of hypothetical endogamous marriages for the first period and 59% for the second.

Total intra-county marriages = Known intra-county marriages + hypothetical intra-county marriages.
Table 4.10 A Calculation of Hypothetical Rates of Intra-County Inter-action, as Shown by Absolute Numbers of Marriages in the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1750-1799</th>
<th>1800-1849</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.of marriages</td>
<td>4238</td>
<td>4442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.of endogamous marriages</td>
<td>3203</td>
<td>3612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.of &quot;true endogamous&quot; marriages</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.of known exogamous marriages</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.of hypothetical exo.marriages</td>
<td>2947</td>
<td>3431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.of known intra-county mars.</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.of hypothetical intra-county marriages</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total intra-county marriages</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td>2517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This can now be expressed as a percentage of all marriages.
(Each is a discrete unit so that the whole does not add up to 100.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1750-1799</th>
<th>1800-1849</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endogamy</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;True endogamy&quot;</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known exogamy</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical exogamy</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known intra-county movement</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical intra-county movement</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total intra-county movement</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discussion will now move onto look at the direction that inter-action between the counties took. This is shown on Tables 4.11. The left-right diagonal on these tables shows the number of marriages in which the incoming partner came from the same county as the registering parish. This could be called a measure of county stability. It amounts to 611 or 61% of marriages in the first period and 488 or 59% in the second. These tables show some interesting trends. It was suggested in Chapters 2 and 3 that Surrey because of its position between London and Sussex might act as an intervening opportunity between the two. Both periods show, however, that marriage partner exchange was likely to be focussed southwards from Surrey into Sussex, whereas although Kent and Sussex also share a common boundary there was far less interaction between these two counties. In order to check this trend against the total population figures, the birth-place data from the 1851 census has been plotted on matrice Table 4.12.
**Table 4.11** County Inter-action as Shown by Absolute Number of Marriages in which One Partner was Resident Outside the Registering Parish at the Time of Marriage.

### 1750-1799

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Kent</th>
<th>Surrey</th>
<th>Sussex</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1800-1849

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Kent</th>
<th>Surrey</th>
<th>Sussex</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.12** County Inter-action as Shown by the Absolute Numbers of those who had moved from their Birthplace in the 1851 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Kent</th>
<th>Surrey</th>
<th>Sussex</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>3164</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>3978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>10608</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>11214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>5291</td>
<td>6399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3858</td>
<td>13947</td>
<td>5939</td>
<td>22844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map 2.5 Proportion of Population Enumerated in 1851 Living in the Same County as their Birthplace.
This table shows that in the case of the total population the trend is reversed with inter-action focussed from Sussex to Surrey. Two factors might account for this. One is the difference in the absolute number of parishes in the study area that lie in Surrey, (although the Sussex parishes are considerably larger than their Surrey neighbours). The other difference is that couples who married in Sussex settled in Surrey because of the better economic situation in the latter county. What is clear from this table is the strong county stability diagonal. 83% of the total population of the study area being enumerated in their native county. The parochial patterns for the proportions of population born and living in the same county in 1851 are shown on Map 4.5.

This map shows some expected trends. Caterham, for example, is surrounded solely by Surrey parishes and has a correspondingly high level of born-in-county residents. There are deviants from this pattern. Chaldon, Caterham's neighbour, has a much lower rate of born-in-county residents, as does Oxted another 'inland' parish. A breakdown of the birthplace data shows that both of these parishes had a considerable number of incomers from counties that did not border Surrey. Chaldon, for example, had incomers from as far away as Yorkshire, whilst Oxted had 7 incomers from both Lancashire and Wiltshire. On the whole, there is little evidence for the melting-pot of counties described in the 1851 Registrar-General's Report on the Census.

The final test of the extent of cross-county inter-action comes from papers engendered under the Poor Law. The documentation pertaining to the enforcement of the old Poor Law can be divided into two broad categories. The first covers the collection and distribution of relief - rate books and accounts. These
### Absolute Movement Across the County Border as Shown in Law Cases for Four Parishes

#### Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parishes</th>
<th>Born in County</th>
<th>Not Born in County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grinstead</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Annuals to and from the Sample Parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parishes</th>
<th>In County</th>
<th>Out of County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grinstead</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>299</strong></td>
<td><strong>245</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Certificates Issued and Received by the Sample Parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parishes</th>
<th>In County</th>
<th>Out of County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grinstead</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>201</strong></td>
<td><strong>183</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Marry Bonds Issued by the Sample Parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parishes</th>
<th>Father in County</th>
<th>Father Out of County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grinstead</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are valuable social documents, but will not be used to a great extent in this work. The second group deal either with illegal movement, for example, examinations and removal orders, or legal movement, documents such as certificates and indemnities. These documents describe different types of movement. It will follow, that they will also display different spheres of activity. Settlement examinations were statements taken by Justices to establish the parish of legal settlement. These describe life-cycle movement. Removal orders were issued to send paupers and potential paupers back to their parish of legal settlement. An examination, therefore, could be followed by a removal order. These classes of document are likely to show longer distance more random moves than certificates. The latter were guarantees of relief issued by the parish where the subject had legal settlement. Usually, they were issued to those with an assured livelihood in another parish, so are likely to describe short range movement. The following sub-section looks at these documents in relation to movement across the county border.

One of the main problems in using these documents is their patchy survival rate. This has proved to be the case in the study area. Some parishes possess good sequences of these documents, whilst others have none. Four parishes have enough data to make a worthwhile sample. These are Godstone and Oxted in Surrey, and East Grinstead and Worth in Sussex. In this section the documents are being used to look at movement across the county boundary. The breakdown of this movement for the various types of documents is shown on Table 4.13.

This table shows no distinctive preferences. These may become more apparent when the various documents are analysed in terms of distance and directional flow. What is notable in the table is that the examinations
taken under oath, contradict the pattern shown by the removal orders and certificates. This may reflect the difference in the type of documents. Removals and certificates may conceal much movement. Examinations, however, may reveal such movement as is obscured in the other sources. It is proposed, therefore to pay closer attention to them to answer two questions. At what point did the subject move out of the native county? Was this a circular movement in that the subject returned to the native county at some point? The point at which the subject left the native county is displayed on Table 4.14. It has divided the number of moves as described in the examinations.

Table 4.14 Number of moves taken to move out of the Native County as Shown in Settlement Examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. of Moves</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. of subjects</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that cross county moves took place early in the subject's migratory career. However, of the 26 examinations that record more than one move, 16 or 62% show that at some point the subject returned to the native county. This could have been as the result of a removal order rather than free-choice.

This short section on movement across the county border as shown by Poor Law Papers can be summed up as revealing more movement across the border than shown by marriage choice or movement from the birthplace shown in the census. How far this is due to the nature of the sources is debateable, but the result raises the question as to whether county loyalty was the prerogative of the wealthier, literate end of society. If so, does this mean that subsistence migration was more likely to cross county borders than betterment movement? There is some evidence that once the labouring section of the population became literate they too expressed their 'delight' in their native
counties. The following acrostic was written by the folk-singer Bob Copper's father. It is composed from lines taken from the many traditional songs he knew and sang in the late-nineteenth century. The first letter of each line spells out Life in Good Old Sussex.

"Let's visit the country for a while where
I can roam so free,
For there is peace and quietude and
Enjoyment from the breeze.

I love to hear the harmless birds sing in the
branches there
Naught can with them compare.

Glorious 'tis on a May morning
On Sussex downs to view
O'er hill and dale, midst gorse and thorn
Damped by the early dew

Oh country life of joy
Loud praises let us sing
Down by the old mill stream

So let us keep our country charms
Unscathed and clean and pure,
Serene in all its beauties,
Sustained by nature's lure,
Enthralled o'er hill and dale we'll go-
Xcept when it doth rain and blow."

On the other hand, the images which stand as symbols of county identity today, such as the oak leaf of Surrey, are part of a manufactured tradition. Usually conceived at the time of the foundation of the County Councils in 1888. Although the White Horse of Kent was the emblem of the Earls of Kent, and the oak leaf figures in the arms of the Howardian Earls of Surrey, the County Council Coats of Arms tend to include visual references to nineteenth-century notables now forgotten. Whether this self-conscious manipulation of county identity had any effect on the population is difficult to assess. There is some evidence from another source of county loyalty manifesting itself in a practical way. In 1972, the Local Government Boundary Reorganisation Act took

---

38 R. Copper, Early to Rise, 1976, pp. 140-141.
some parishes out of East Surrey and placed them in Sussex. 39

One of the parishes, Horley in Surrey, held a referendum to find out whether its inhabitants were in favour of this, 72% of those who voted elected to stay in Surrey. 40

On a more personal level, an elderly resident of the area refused to write Sussex as her address, "Surrey born, Surrey I'll stay" was her attitude, even though she as born and brought up in a parish where the county border merges into a common Wealden landscape of small fields surrounded by belts of woodland and areas of rough pasture. Similarly, the greensand ridge and chalk downlands pass imperceptibly from Surrey to Kent. Geological zones know no man made boundaries. The next section will look at marriage choice and personal mobility in relation to the pays or natural boundary. 41

41 Personal communication from Mrs. D. Jordan, Horne, Surrey.
Marriage, Identity and Pays

The man-made administrative boundaries of the parish or county were imposed on a series of natural boundaries which united parishes or counties in other different alignments. The geological zones which make up the study area were described in detail in Chapter 2. Briefly, these are running from north to south - chalk downlands, a greensand ridge and Wealden clay. It was further suggested in Chapters 2 and 3 that significant differences in the agricultural economy of these zones did not emerge until the second quarter of the nineteenth century. This section will look at whether this trend is reflected in marriage choice and personal mobility. It starts with the former by looking at the percentage of known incoming partners who came from the same pays as the registering parish. This is shown on Table 4.15 and Maps 4.6 and 4.7. Table 4.15 is compiled in the same way as Table 4.11. The first column of figures shows the absolute number of exogamous marriages. The second is the absolute number in which the incoming partner came from the same pays as the registering parish, the third expresses column 2 as a percentage of exogamous marriages, whilst the fourth expresses it as a percentage of all marriages.
M-6: The Rate of Pays Endogamy as shown by Marriage Choice, 1750-1799
(percentage of all marriages.)

For key see Map 5.1.
The Rate of Pays Endogamy as shown by Marriage Choice, 1800-1849
(percentage of all marriages.)

For key see Map 5.1.
Table 4.15 Proportion of Exogamous Marriages Where in the Incoming Partner Came from the Same Pays as the Registering Parish, 1750-1799

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Pays</th>
<th>1 N. of exo. marriages.</th>
<th>2 N. of exo. from same pays</th>
<th>3 % of pays marriages as a % mar. as</th>
<th>4 % of pays exo. mar. a % of all mar.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley G.S.</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham D.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon D.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst W.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Grinstead W.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge W.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone G.S.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne W.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield G.S.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield W.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield G.S.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted G.S.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge G.S.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield D.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey D.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham D.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham G.S.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth W.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.15 cont. Proportion of Exogamous Marriages Where the Incoming Partner Came from the Same Pays as the Registering Parish 1800-1849

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Pays</th>
<th>N.of exo. mar.</th>
<th>N.of mar. from same pays</th>
<th>Pays mar. as % of exo.mar.</th>
<th>Pays mar. as % of all mar.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley G.S.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.Grinstead W.</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone G.S.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield G.S.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield G.S.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge G.S.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield D.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham G.S.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>757</td>
<td>426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These tables and maps show several interesting but contradictory patterns. The first is related to the drop in the absolute number of exogamous marriages in the second period. This means that although the overall mean rate of intra pays marriages falls, the proportion of marriages that involved an incoming partner from the same pays rose. The mean overall percent of exogamous marriages for each pays shows that the greensand parishes were significantly less isolated in both periods. The downland parishes show a totally different pattern in the second period, with a low rate of exogamy coupled to a low rate of pays-endogamy. Wealden parishes remained both exclusive and isolated in both periods.
### Table 4.16 Inter-Action Between Pays as Shown by the Number of Marriages in Which one Partner was Resident Outside the Registering Parish

#### 1750-1799

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ending Pays</th>
<th>Downs</th>
<th>Greensand</th>
<th>Weald</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downs</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensand</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weald</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1800-1849

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ending Pays</th>
<th>Downs</th>
<th>Greensand</th>
<th>Weald</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensand</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weald</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hypothetical Marriages Expressed as a % of All Marriages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (1750-1799)</th>
<th>Hypothetical inter-pays marriages</th>
<th>Hypothetical intra-pays marriages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1750-1799</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-1849</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-1899</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table suggests that in the period between 1750-1799, between 45-52% of all marriages involved
The direction taken by the inter-action is shown on the matrix Table 4.16. These tables show the development of the greensand as a transitional zone. Receiving and sending partners into the other two areas, with very little inter-action occurring between the Downs and Weald. It can be said that in general, partners on the greensand were less likely to have the same ecological background as those on the Downs or in the Weald.

These findings have to be related to the first section of this chapter which suggested that the marriage register masked much hidden movement. It was hoped that work on the location of known incomers might reveal some of this. The section on the county showed how this might be calculated. Using the same method but substituting the pays for the county has led to the construction of the following table.

Table 4.17 Calculation of Hypothetical Movement Across the Pays as Shown by Marriage Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1750-1799</th>
<th>1800-1849</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. of marriages</td>
<td>4238</td>
<td>4442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. of endogamous marriages</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>3612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. of &quot;true endogamous&quot; marriages</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. of known exogamous marriages</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. of hypothetical exogamous marriages</td>
<td>2947</td>
<td>3431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. of known intra-pays mar.</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. of hypothetical intra-pays marriages</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total intra-pays marriages</td>
<td>2249</td>
<td>2176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intra Pays Marriages Expressed as a % of All Marriages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1750-1799</th>
<th>1800-1849</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Known intra pays marriages</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothetical intra pays marriages</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total intra pays marriages</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table suggests that in the period between 1750-1849 between 45-55% of all marriages involved
partners born in the same pays. It is possible that further patterns will be shown in the birthplace data from the 1851 census. The degree of intra pays movement shown in this is on Table 4.18 and Map 4.8.
Table 4.18 Proportion of Incomers from the Same Pays as the Enumerating Parish for the Total Population of the Study Area in 1851.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Pays</th>
<th>N. of Incomers</th>
<th>N. from Same Pays</th>
<th>% of Incomers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Grinstead</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>7778</td>
<td>3279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18 and Map 4.8 shows that between 20-48% of the population who had left their birthplace had moved to a location within the same pays as that birthplace. It also shows that the population on the Downs and the Greensand were more likely to make cross pays moves than those in the Weald. This could be due both to the greater area covered by the Weald, making for a greater stage of inter-action, as well as its relative isolation away from the urbanised north of the region. The direction taken by the inter-action is shown on Table 4.19.

This shows that not only did more movement take place across the Weald. It also had a greater number of out migrants into the other two pays. Most of these went into the greensand area. It has already been suggested that the greensand was either an intervening opportunity between the Weald and the metropolitan
Table 4.20: Movement Across Pays Boundaries as Shown by Absolute Numbers of Poor Law Examinations, Removals, Certificates and Bastardy Bonds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examinations In Pays</th>
<th>Examinations Out of Pays</th>
<th>Removals In Pays</th>
<th>Removals Out of Pays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Grinstead</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificates East Grinstead</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20: Movement Across Pays Boundaries as Shown by Absolute Numbers of Poor Law Examinations, Removals, Certificates and Bastardy Bonds
area, or a stop in a stepwise migration. The heavy concentration of Wealden born people in the greensand when compared to the number on the Downs suggests the former. As might be expected the downland and greensand areas received more urban and long-distance migrants that the Wealden area. This all points to a paradox on the Weald. On the one hand it was an isolated area, but on the other, more of its population were leaving it than in the other two zones. Chapter 3 described the parlous state of the Wealden economy. This would have acted as a pushing agent to out migration. It is possible that these out migrants returned to the area at a later stage in the life-cycle. Poor Law examinations might shed some light on this. The next sub-section will look at those documents in relation to the pays boundary. Table 4.20 shows movement across the pays boundary as shown by examinations, rmovals, certificates and bastardy bonds.

These tables show a similair pattern to those showing movement across the county boundary as illustrated by these types of documents. Life-cycle movement described in examinations shows that 62% of the subjects had moved away from the pays where they were born. Certificates show an opposite trend with 65% of the subjects moving within the same pays as their parish of legal settlement. The difference in these two patterns is probably related to the reason for issuing a settlement certificate. This was to allow the holder to gain lawful employment. An illustration of this comes from a certificate, dated 1717 from Worth in Sussex:

"Whereas John Driver of the parish of Westerham in the County of Kent above-said Weaver for the Bettering of his Livelyhood is desirous to Inhabit and Dwell in your said parish of Worth Now we the Churchwardens and Overseers of the Poore of the aforesaid parish of Westerham whose hands and seals are hereunto set doe According to a Late Act of Parliament Certifie and Acknowledge the said John Driver and his wife to Legally settled in our said parish of Westerham."

42 W.Sx.R.O. Par516/32/1/11
The relevance of pays to the individual must now be reconsidered. Whereas the county had a symbolic form that enabled the individual to identify with it, the pays had no such imagery, apart from the visible difference in landscape. For example, the high chalk downlands compared to low lying clay Weald. Nevertheless, local identity has been defined as a quality assimilated unconsciously as well as being a conscious phenomenon. Is this what George Bourne means when he writes that "the countryman is native to his denizen".43

If the eighteenth-century countryman and his surroundings were one, the influence of the landscape on identity might have been so subtle that its effect was never articulated. There is no documentary evidence that the displaced Wealdener looking down from the greensand ridge felt disorientated, or longed to be in the small tree-surrounded pastures of the Wealden clay lands. Yet landscape imprinting is strong in man. Personal experience shows a feeling of disorientation in a landscape radically different to that where I was born and brought up. Similarly, family histories often show what might be termed a 'homing instinct' in man.44

The effect of the pays boundary, which although it lacks the structural element of the parish or the county, could be both long term and subtle. In the case of some parishes in the study area, however, it is a boundary which is difficult to define. The parishes which include the greensand ridge, for instance, run from the foothills of the Downs onto the Wealden clay, but even though they include a range of soils and

43 G.Bourne, Change in the Village, 1912, p. 121.

landscapes, they provide a unique experience for their inhabitants. Whether this common experience welded the greensand area into a social area will be examined in the following chapter which looks at the actual location of incomers to the study area. The final section of this chapter will be a short summing up of the arguments presented in the preceding sections.

Conclusion

This chapter has looked at inter-action across three spatial boundaries. It has examined the effect of the parish, county and pays on marriage partner choice, birthplace movement and personal mobility shown in the different types of document relating to the administration of the Poor Law. The conclusion to this chapter will try to draw these elements together.

The parish was the first boundary to be examined. Initially, marriage partner choice gave the impression that this was constrained by the parish boundary. Further investigation suggested, however, that this masked whatever movement had taken place between birth and marriage. Very few marriages were between partners who had been baptised and married in the same parish. This not only destroyed the initial impression of the parish as a strong boundary, but it also led to the need to try to identify the possible origins of those who had moved from their birthplaces prior to marriage. Under the terms of this inquiry it became necessary to know whether they had crossed the county or pays boundaries. This led to the compilation of a set of hypothetical figures which were an attempt to discover this hidden movement. These were based on empirical evidence. The aggregate figures for actual and hypothetical movement is shown on Table 4.21.

It must be emphasised that these are artificial figures
designed to give an impression of the missing mobility and to compare the strength of the three boundaries. The observed figures show that the parish was the most influential boundary, whilst the hypothetical figures suggest that the county was more important. Before deciding whether any reliance can be placed on these results it is necessary to make another adjustment. The greater spatial areas of the county and pays mean that more partners are likely to be found within these boundaries than in the limited field of the parish. The figures must be standardised to allow for this. One way of doing this is by using a migration field based on concentric rings centred on one parish. The outer rings representing the county and pays. The area of these fields was derived by measuring each parish, county and pays in the study area and taking the average. This gave a parish radius of 5 miles, a pays radius of 45 miles and a county radius of 55 miles. As we now have a norm for one ideal parish, pays and county the hypothetical figures for movement were divided into their constituent parts. Marriages within the parish were divided by 19, and those for the county and pays by 3. This gave 23 marriages for the parish, 1143 for the pays and 1313 for the county. The working for the standardised figures is shown on Table 4.22.

It produces a situation in which the county remains a significant boundary but the pays slips in importance. At this point it should be re-emphasised that these figures are an attempt to get behind the hidden movement concealed in the marriage register. These figures need testing on other periods before they can be categorically accepted. If, however, the parish was the most important signifier, as the crude data suggests, does this mean that it is the most rewarding block to study? It will be remembered that the section which dealt with inter-action within the parish could find no causative pattern for either a very high or a
Table 4.21: A comparison of observed totals and percentages for endogamous and exogamous marriages with empirically derived totals, 1750 - 1850.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number of marriages</td>
<td>8680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of endogamous</td>
<td>6815</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of exogamous</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of intra-county</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of intra-pays</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hypothetical:              |         |            |
| number of "true endogamous"| 437     | 56         |
| number of exogamous        | 6378    | 85         |
| number of inter-county     | 3940    | 45         |
| number of inter-pays       | 3430    | 39.5       |

14.22 Standardised Figures for Marriages in the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Radius of circle</th>
<th>Radius of circle squared</th>
<th>Area of circle</th>
<th>Subtraction of area of circle from succeeding area</th>
<th>Area of band</th>
<th>Ratio of areas of band</th>
<th>Distance in miles</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>18025</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6 - 45</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3025</td>
<td>23025</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distance of band order
23
1143
1313

Number of incomers
Standardised = 43.3

Other data from the census showed a similar relationship between the birthplace of the father and the birthplace of the mother. On the whole, evidence from studies such as those on Orsog will be over a small area, parish thus becomes a component within a web of parishes, forming a block of common identity and experience. This leads to the need to identify communities with shared characteristics before deciding the spatial area which can be defined as local. The
very low rate of parochial endogamy. Each parish seemed to act in a random or unique way. This would seem to confirm that the individual parish study is the most efficient use of resources. But we know that this hides much hidden movement, and this movement probably crossed the parish but not the county border.

The birthplace data from the census showed a similar pattern. Few of those who had moved from the birthplace had moved out of their natal county. On the one hand, the parish is an island in a county sea. On the other hand, evidence from studies such as those on Otmoor suggest that interaction will be over a small area. The parish thus becomes a component within a nest of parishes, forming a block of common identity and experience. This leads to the need to identify communities with shared characteristics before deciding on the spatial area which can be defined as local. The next chapter will dissolve the barriers between the parish, county and pays to look at the range, direction, reciprocity and gender differentials which lie behind the aggregate trends shown in this chapter.
Chapter 5

THE LANDSCAPE OF MARRIAGE, IDENTITY AND SOCIAL AREA

Introduction

The previous chapter looked at marriage and interaction in relation to three boundaries - the parish, the county and the pays. This chapter will dissolve the boundaries in an attempt to identify "groups of linked communities," in order to define social areas within the spatial context of the study zone. The concept of a social area was used to good effect by Williams in his work on Ashworthy. He found that Ashworthy was closely linked in a socio-economic sense to other parishes in the area, and that this linkage could be measured by the amount of interaction between parishes. Some parishes, however, were more important to Ashworthy than others equi-distant to it. The former combined with Ashworthy to form a:

"territorial base for social and economic relations of an enduring kind within what may be called 'the Ashworthy area', so that Ashworthy became part of what may be termed a social area much larger than itself."

The identification of a social area was further developed by Wrightson and Levine in their work on Terling. On the one hand, they write Terling: "had its own integrity as a social unit', but on the other; "it did not operate in isolation, but inter-acted with the wider area of which it was part." It was possible to assess the size and components of this area by looking

---

1 C.V. Phythian-Adams, Re-thinking English Local History, Department of English Local History, Occasional Paper, 4th ser., 1987, p.44.

at the relationship of Terling villagers with outsiders. In order to do this they used a variety of sources which included courtship patterns, business deals and mortgage indentures. They found that the most intensive activity took place within ten miles of Terling. The bulk on inter-action occurred between Terling and its immediate neighbours. Although there was some longer distance activity with Colchester and London.  

The work by Williams, as well as that by Wrightson and Levine shows that the social area is a spatial zone which can be mapped in terms of social contacts. These social contacts are shown to be selective, with some parishes showing a higher level of inter-action than others at the same distance. Furthermore, the process of historical feedback as developed by Hägerstrand may mean that these parishes have been connected for a considerable length of time. This process was defined by Hägerstrand from his work on migration patterns in Sweden. He found that once an avenue of communication between two locations had been opened up, it persisted over time. Migrants from rural communities tended to go to the same destination each time, even though there were other locations equi-distant to the sending community. The continuance of this pattern over time was reinforced by migrants returning to the home base on visits as well as providing support for new entrants to the receiving area. Work on migration in Kingston-upon-Thames in the sixteenth and seventeenth century showed a similar pattern. Several generations of youths from one village were apprenticed either to masters from one particular family, or to masters whose origin was the home village. In the

3 K.Wrightson and D.Levine, Poverty and Piety in an English Village, Terling, 1525-1700, 1979, pp. 74-82.

context of the short range distance of marriage choice the kinship network could provide the feedback component which reinforced the courtship field.\textsuperscript{4}

This chapter will examine four aspects of personal mobility that might help to define a social area, as well as helping to explain the broad trends of inter-action shown in the preceding chapter. The aspects to be examined are the distance over which inter-action took place, the direction it took with its maintenance over time, reciprocity of inter-action between parishes. Lastly, it will look at the gender difference shown by personal mobility in the study area. It will start by examining the range of inter-action as shown by marriage choice and personal mobility.

**Distance and Identity**

This chapter will follow the methodology of Chapter 4 in that it will look at inter-action in relation to marriage choice. It will then look personal mobility as shown in the 1851 census. It will also use removals, examinations, certificates and bastardy bonds. It starts with the first of these - marriage horizons.

Work on the distance over which marriage partners were likely to be sought, for instance by Peel, Perry, or Millard\textsuperscript{5} shows that most incoming partners came from a


\textsuperscript{5}R.F. Peel, 'Local Inter-marriage and the Stability of Rural Population in the English Midlands,' Geography, 27, 1942, p.27.

(Footnote continued)
radius of 5-6 miles of the registering parish. This distance was probably commensurate with the distance that could be walked after work. It implies that marriage choice was likely to be on a nearest-neighbour basis. The courtship area as shown by marriage horizons, has been equated by Boyce, et.al. to 'neighbourhood knowledge',\(^6\) which suggests that it is a viable measurement by which to define a social area or an area which shared a common or local identity.

The aggregate marriage horizons for all the incoming partners listed in the marriage registers for the two periods 1750-1799 and 1800-1849 are shown on Figs. 5.1 and 5.2. These show a classic distance-decay pattern with inter-action diminishing as the distance from the registering parish increased. It can also be seen that there was a slight widening of the horizon in the second period. In both periods between 65-70% of all incoming partners were from a radius of 5 miles from the registering parish, and 75-85% from under 10 miles. The breakdown of the distances for the individual parishes showed five deviations from the pattern. In the earlier period Oxted and Westerham had a wider range of partners than the other parishes, with only 73% of their incoming partners coming from under ten miles, but 16% from over twenty miles. These were both greensand parishes. Westerham was a market town with strong links outside the area through the Woolf family. In the second period only 64% of the incoming partners

\(^5\)(continued)


Fig. 5.1: Distances Traveled by Incomers in the 1851 Census.
to this parish came from a radius of ten miles but 27% came from over twenty miles. This can be compared with East Grinstead the other market town in the study area, where 86% of incoming partners in the first period came from under ten miles, and 2% from over twenty miles. 78% of partners in the second period came from under ten miles, and 12% from over twenty. East Grinstead lay on the London-Lewes turnpike, so had as great, if not greater potential for inter-action as Westerham. That its marriage horizons were more restricted is further evidence of the isolation of the Wealden settlements when compared with the greensand parishes. In the later period Blechingley, for instance, drew 17% of its incoming partners from over twenty miles distant. Similarly, 27% of incoming partners to Warlingham on the Downs came from over twenty miles away.

Marriage choice in a pre-literate society depended on face-to-face inter-action to maintain courtship. Personal mobility as shown by census data did not need constant maintenance of inter-action, so was far more open to speculative or random movement in search of improved life chances. Fig. 5.3 is the aggregate movement as shown by the birth-place data in the 1851 census. It shows that the distance-decay mechanism disintegrates in the longer distance moves. It demonstrates admirably the difference between mobility as shown by marriage horizons and personal mobility as shown by the census. Nevertheless, four parishes showed a classic distance-decay process. All of these were in the Weald. Crowhurst, Edenbridge, Horne and Worth, with two other Wealden parishes, East Grinstead and Lingfield showing a more restricted range of inter-action than the downland or greensand parishes. Caterham and Tatsfield in the former area showed a wide range of inter-action with a quarter of incomers at
...coming from over twenty miles distant. Places from the marriage registers in parishes in the district at Blechingley and Waterham with no parishes having a high proportion of long distance...
Caterham coming from over twenty miles distant. The evidence from the marriage registers is paralleled by the census data at Blechingley and Westerham with these two parishes having a high proportion of long distance incomers. Indeed, of the greensand parishes only Nutfield drew less than 15% of its incomers from over twenty miles.

Mobility as shown by census moves usually took place as the result of an attempt to maximise employment opportunities. The movement illustrated by Poor Law cases was also usually an attempt to improve conditions. This movement divided into three classes of document is shown on Fig. 5.5. Except for the long-distant moves illustrated by examinations we can see that over half of all recorded moves took place within a radius of five miles, and three-quarters within ten. Thus, subsistence movement can be seen to be short-range.

When the figures are compared the wider range of inter-action shown in the census is very noticeable. How far this is due to the nature of the source in being more comprehensive and how far it is due to the improved transport infra-structure is debateable. This may be clarified when the directional bias and historical feed-back process are examined. What is clear from the analysis of the space over which inter-action took place is that it was mostly confined to an area of no more than five miles radius from any centre. If this is related to the objectives of the chapter it can be said that the communities we are seeking to identify will lie within a radius of ± 5 miles of each other. The next section will seek to refine this further by looking at actual locations in the process of inter-action.
Direction, Historical Feedback, Reciprocity, and Identity

Two studies on migration patterns have been chosen to illustrate the concept of directional bias. The first, by Patten, deals with apprentice migration in East Anglia. In his research Patten found that the migration fields of apprentice labour to Norwich was strongest to the north-west of the city. Similarly, Wrigley found in his analysis of the mobility of married women in eighteenth century Colyton that: "There appear also to have sectoral differences in the size of migration flows. A narrow belt of parishes immediately north of Colyton...contributed...a much larger number than were to be found in other sectors centred on Colyton." Patten was also concerned to test the other concept being examined in the section - the historical feedback process. This process has been revealed in many migration studies. "In Sweden, for example, it has been found, it could be regarded 'as a feedback process of historical continuity and, in consequence, there is a striking lack of variation, over time, in both distances and directions of travel.'" It occurs when a community favours inter-action with another community to the exclusion of other communities equi-distant to it.

This section aims to use the directional-bias of the

9 D. Mageean, Principal Themes in Migration Studies, 1982, p. 53.
study area with the historical feed-back process and evidence of reciprocity between parishes to define social areas, or groups of communities that might share a common identity. As the first section of this chapter has shown this will be short-range, probably within a five mile radius of an epicentre, but in order to look at the wider trends illustrated by personal mobility in general the longer distance movement will also be analysed. It will start by looking at the directional bias shown by marriage choice, census data and Poor Law Cases. In order to do this each known location of an incomer was assigned to its compass point, the percentage of incomers for each point was calculated and used then plotted onto a pie chart. Each section on this chart represents a compass point shaded according to the percentage of incomers for that point. In order to minimise the space used by these diagrams examples are given on Figs. 5.6-5.9. These are arranged into groups of parishes from the same pays.

The object of looking at directional bias is to identify potential social areas which might become evident from a strong bias to one direction rather than another, as well as the maintenance of this bias over time. A strong bias was held to be when the top rank compass point had at least 5% more inter-action attached to it than than the next in rank. In the aggregate analysis it can be seen that there was a 'strong' bias in marriage choice on the Downs to the north. Marriage inter-action on the greensand focussed west, whilst on the Weald it had either a northern or an east-west bias. The census data showed a different pattern. It should be noted at this point that whereas marriage inter-action actively involved two parishes, census data shows only population coming into the area. On the Downs the population was entering the area from the south-east, whilst on the greensand it came from
the west. On the Weald it moved in from the north. Settlement examinations show the subject entering from the south-east into the Weald, whilst certificates and removals show a western bias. These results seem at first to indicate a series of random movements round the area, but individual parishes show directional stability. The following parishes show continuity of direction in marriage choice:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Grinstead</td>
<td>South West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of these parishes, Blechingley, Crowhurst and East Grinstead show continuity with the census data, whilst a further three parishes show continuity between the 1800-1849 marriage choice and the census data. These are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These patterns are interesting. On the one hand inter-action focusses into the area, for instance, complementary east-west inter-action between Edenbridge and Crowhurst, or north-south between Godstone and Lingfield. On the other hand parishes on the periphery of the area inter-acted away from the core of the study area. Nutfield and Worth, for example, inter-act to the west. Whilst East Grinstead has more contact to its south-east. In terms of defining social areas it suggests that there will be a solid central core of shared experience and identity with deviations at the edges where the parishes form blocks with parishes from outside the study area. It will also be remembered that
Fig. 5b: Incoming population, 1851.
Inter-action was over a restricted area in space so that potential social areas are likely to be of a similarly restricted geographical nature.

The next sub-section will move on towards the identification of social areas by looking at the actual locations of incomers to the study area. In order to do this, as well as minimising the space used, this has been done by using Q analysis, which is a methodology for analysing social networks used by sociologists. It has been explained in detail in a recent paper by Scott. It uses a matrice of inter-action as a starting point. An example of this is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bl.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bl.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bl. = Blechingley
G. = Godstone
N. = Nutfield

Each figure in the matrice is then expressed as a percentage of total inter-action. At this point a cut-off point is decided on. Below this point inter-action is deemed to be insignificant. If, for example, 25% is used as a cut-off point we can see that inter-action between Blechingley and Godstone at 27.9% and 28.7% respectively will be significant. It is now possible to map this inter-action by using a scale for its intensity, or by showing only significant linkages.¹⁰

This is an over-simplified explanation and there proved.

Each Location is inter-locked with the study area. Lines show the direction of Linkage.
Map 5.3 Schematised Area of Intense Activity using a 20% cut-off point.

Several problems in using this method on the data from the study area. First, the social areas as defined are very small, and only in the area of north-east Kent have they been made larger. The social areas are drawn to include the catchment areas of some larger parishes, an assumption that is not always true. The large area of the north-west of the study area built up by the techniques of social area analysis is a result of the method's ability to detect areas of more intense activity. These areas are shown on Map 5.2. What emerges from this diagram is a series of blocks of 2-4 parishes that extend to a greater degree than other parishes at the same distance. For example, both show intense interaction from north to south, within this area, however, there are areas of more intense activity. Another intense band runs from the west to the north-east, again shown in the diagram. Another problem is the parish's position on the King's Highway through the Londesborough counties, as expected given the parish's position on the old London-Maidstone road. The former which is the most important of the place names along it are connected in a series of smaller areas, each of which is an area of intense activity. See J. Scott, "Trend, Repeat, and Network Analysis," Sociology, 22, 1, Nov. 1988, pp. 11-17.
to be several problems in using this method on the data from the study area. First, the social areas as defined by this method were not mutually exclusive. It was possible to link all the parishes in the study area into one composite social area. Second, even when a cut-off point as low as 15% was used, some parishes appeared to show a random selective process. Third, there was an imbalance of reciprocity, so that whereas one parish lay in the social area of another it did not follow that the same parish included the second parish in its own social area. Despite these problems an attempt has been made to map potential social areas. Map 5.1 shows the composite area built up by linkage. As can be seen it extends across all three counties and pays into the town of Croydon in the north to the isolated Wealden area in the south. Within this area there were, however, smaller areas of more intense activity. These are shown on Map 5.2. What emerges from this map are a series of blocks of 2-4 parishes that inter-acted to a greater degree than other parishes lying at the same distance. For example, Burstov, Horne and Worth show intense inter-action in the left-hand corner, but lock into the whole network. Similarly, Crowhurst, Lingfield, Edenbridge and EastGrinstead show and intense level of inter-action in the right-hand section. Another intense band runs east to west from Westerham to Nutfield. However, the peculiar shape of the elongated greensand parish of Godstone meant that it was split into three separate social areas, thus forming a bridge between counties and pays. This is to be expected given the parish’s position on the junction of the King’s Highway with the London-Lewes turnpike. It is, the former which is the most important route, as the communities along it are connected in a series of

intense activity blocks. The east-west orientation of the potential social areas extends into the communities away from the greensand ridge. Little very intense inter-action can be seen crossing the area from north to south. In all cases intense activity is on a nearest neighbour basis.

Thus we are left with a dichotomy. On the one hand the potential social area covers the whole of this corner of S.E. England, but on the other there are pockets of more localised intense social contacts within the wider area. These operated on a nearest neighbour process. If the first of these is accepted as defining a social area where like-minded people are linked, it is obvious that the spatial area of this study should be extended to include the peripheral areas. If the second option is used to define the potential social area, then a maximum of four parishes would make a sufficient spatial area of study.

The direction of the intense inter-action also suggests that different communities within a parish inter-acted in different ways. Godstone has already been mentioned. Limpsfield and Lingfield are also examples of communities in the same parish inter-acting in different directions. For example, in Limpsfield the community to the north of the greensand ridge focussed north, whilst the main settlement on the ridge was part of the strong band of east-west inter-action. It is obvious, therefore, that we should be dealing with communities rather than parishes as the base unit of examination.

It is also possible that the marriage field might differ from the subsistence/personal mobility field. It has already been shown that the latter had a wider range of distances and shows a different directional
Table 5.1: Reciprocity of Marriage Partners between Parishes in the Study Area 1750-1849.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Reciprocity of Population Between Parishes in the Study Area in 1851.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Tables 5.1-6.2

Bl. = Blechingley
Br. = Burstow
Ca. = Caterham
Ch. = Chaldon
Cr. = Crowhurst
Ed. = Edenbridge
G. = Godstone
H. = Horne
Lm. = Limpsfield
Ln. = Lingfield
N. O. = Nutfield
T. = Tandridge
Ta. = Tatsfield
Tf. = Titter
Tt. = Titsey
Wa. = Warlingham
We. = Westerham
Wo. = Worth
bias. The breakdown for individual parishes shows that the 'marriage' area only differed radically from the 'subsistence' area in one case. Godstone's marriage area was Lingfield and Tandridge in both periods, whereas its 'subsistence area' was Blechingley, Horne and Tandridge. Therefore, it is reasonably certain that in the majority of the parishes, the 'social areas' which have been defined by the data, were likely to have survived at least over the century 1750-1850.

The results shown in this sub-section may be further refined by looking at reciprocity patterns. This was done by plotting the inter-action between the parishes on two matrices, Tables 5.1-5.2. The matrices and maps show that the group of Surrey parishes on the Kentish border, Tatsfield, Titsey and Warlingham were isolated from each other as well as the rest of the study area. They also show the importance of Godstone's position at the centre of the area's communications network.

The figures for reciprocity compiled from the matrices show that whereas Godstone was the net gainer of population it lost marriage partners. Several other general trends emerge from the matrices. There are some parishes, for example Blechingley, East Grinstead and Limpsfield that were likely to gain marriage partners. Others, for example, Edenbridge and Tandridge were likely to send partners. The figures for population mobility show even clearer trends with the Wealden area showing a net migration loss as its population moved into the greensand or downland areas. Godstone in particular was absorbing population from the Weald. In order to look at this trend more closely the exchange of population between Godstone, Blechingley, Nutfield, Burstow, Horne and Worth have been extrapolated. This is shown on Table 5.3.

**Table 5.3 Pattern of Inter-action Between a Sample of 6 Parishes in the Study Area as shown by the Birth-place Data in the 1851 Census.**
Table 5.3 demonstrates the inequality of exchange between the greensand and the Weald. It also shows the selective nature of this inequality with Godstone receiving twice as many individuals from the Wealden parishes as its neighbours Blechingley or Nutfield. This raises the question as to whether Godstone’s position in the communications network made it a staging post in a stepwise migration process from the south of the study area, or whether the greater employment opportunities in this parish caused by the railway and the building of a rail-head settlement, pulled migrants into the parish. The table also demonstrates the potentially symbiotic nature of social areas. Each section needed the other in a socio-economic inter-locking mesh. It is equally possible, given this dimension, that the function of the nearest large town, Croydon, has been under-estimated. It is probable that the socio-economic life of the area was geared towards the market opportunities offered by that town. In order to look more closely at the role of the urban area in the study zone Table 5.4. has been compiled from the marriage registers. It shows inter-action between the study area and Croydon and London.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Sent to Parish</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Received from Parish</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 Number of Incoming Partners Registered as
**Being Resident in Croydon or London**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Grinstead</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two main trends are shown on this table. First, as might be expected, with the marriage ceremony customarily taking place in the woman's parish, men outnumber women as incoming partners by 4:1. Second, most inter-action with the urban area took place not with the most northerly parishes which were closest to it, but between Blechingley and Nutfield on the greensand, or East Grinstead and Lingfield on the Weald. Both of the latter lay on the London-Leves turnpike so had relatively easy communication with Croydon and London. Blechingley, although not directly on the turnpike had easy access to it. Nutfield was further from it, but we know from John Clement's diary that he made regular visits to the capital on legal business, or to sell cattle at Smithfield and rags to a rag dealer. Perhaps it is not coincidental that two of the Nutfield women marrying urban men came from the

---

11 S.R.O. 3140, Clement Papers, Diary of John Clement.
Clement family. Another four of the Nutfield women making similar marriages shared the same yeoman office-holding background as the Clements. Furthermore, one of the men resident in London but marrying in Nutfield had a local name. (Local in the sense of being a name that was not universal such as Smith, but was borne by a number of the parishioners in the registering parish). Similarly, at Blechingley six of the sixteen urban men marrying in the parish had local names, as did four of the men marrying into Lingfield. As far as the women in these two parishes were concerned, many of them had a background similar to that of the Clements of Nutfield. At Blechingley, for instance, one was the daughter of a wealthy butcher-grazier, with at least four more coming from yeoman families.

Two match-making processes can be seen at work here. One is that the daughters of yeomen were marrying men from outside their areas, whose initial contact had been made by their male relatives in the lawyer's office or the market-place. The other is the maintenance of contact with the native parish, as shown by the high proportion of local names borne by men living in the urban area but marrying in the rural parishes of the study zone. If the connection can be assumed either these men had moved away to work but returned to marry locally, or they had met their partners when visiting relatives in the parish. It is equally possible, but cannot be proved from marriage or surname evidence, that the women who were resident in London or Croydon but married in the study area, also originated from the rural parishes. If this was not the case, they represent some of the very small infusion of new blood, ideas and attitudes into the area. The whole suggests that even as late as the 1850s the study area was a relatively discrete unit.
How can the results of this chapter be equated with those of the preceding chapter which showed that the parish and county were relatively important boundary-markers in shaping inter-action. Reference has to made to Map 5.2. This shows that intense inter-action tended to be within parishes from the same county. Thus, the importance of the county as a boundary-marker is reinforced. Neither must the overall objective of this work be forgotten. That it seeks a workable definition of the 'local' component of local history and the identification in space of communities of like-minded people. How is this affected by the results of the preceding sections of this chapter? This show that on the one hand the social areas transcended boundaries to become regional areas. On the other hand, intense activity existed only between a maximum of four parishes. Which of these spatial areas represents 'localness'? The final stages of this and the subsequent chapters are designed to further seek out what constituted 'local'. The penultimate section of this chapter will look at another aspect of mobility which has a direct application to the discussion of boundary-markers, the mobility of women.

Marriage, Identity, and Women

The personal mobility of women has a direct relevance to the debate on the strength of administrative boundaries on local identity. In Chapter 4 which discussed the outline of this research it was suggested that women would hold a peculiar position in transmitting or maintaining a sense of identity. Furthermore, work on migration patterns has shown that in some societies women behave in a different way to men. The major work on this was done in the 1880s by Ernst Ravenstein, who wrote a series of papers on migration for the Royal Statistical Society. From these
papers, which were based on empirical evidence drawn from North American and European census returns, eleven Laws of Migration were compiled. Law 6 of these deals with female mobility: "Females are more migratory than males within the county of their birth, but males more frequently venture beyond." If this law is correct it has important implications for the evolution of local identity, as well as the way in which it was perceived or transmitted. It suggests that the county as a significant boundary-marker would be reinforced by the women of the community who were likely to have moved from their birthplaces but to have stayed within their natal counties.

Even those women who did not move would have had some contact with those from outside the natal parish or county. Part of this contact would have been through the more public nature of everyday life in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The women of a community would meet daily at the village pump or well, wash-stones, or bake-house. Those who were incomers were constantly in touch with native women, but how far these newcomers were integrated into the host community can only be conjectured. There is some literary evidence that assimilation could be difficult and often only at the expense of some compromise on the part of the incomer. In Lark Rise to Candleford, the author's parents were incomers, with the mother coming from a hamlet close to the village, but the father from some distance. The family always stood apart from the rest of the villagers. Although the mother was accepted, the father never became part of the village community. Even though the author's mother became a member of the host community she was better educated than her neighbours, so held different values and expectations to those held
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12Mageean, op.cit., p.22.
by the other village women. She passed these values onto her children who looked at village life with a perception that marked them off from their contemporaries.¹³

The mother-child bonding illustrated in Lark Rise is crucial for transmitting the idea of local identity to the next generation. The child assimilates the mother's speech, values and store of local knowledge through the exchanges of everyday life. The geographical and social background of the mother, was therefore, important to the child, husband, his kin, and ultimately the host community. Women, because of this special position as transmitters of local identity merit a section that examines their spatial movement in detail and compares it to that shown by men.

The main source used in this section is the 1851 census. Whilst this means that the moves illustrated are temporally static, there are advantages in using this source to look at the personal mobility of women that out-weigh this disadvantage. The other possible source, the marriage register has an in-built bias which makes it difficult to use for a comparison of male/female mobility. The trends shown by marriage horizons are indicative of female mobility. In order to explain this statement it has to be assumed that most couples adhered to the custom of the marriage taking place in the woman's parish, although it would have been the woman who moved to the man's parish after the wedding. In order to test this assumption the birthplace data was related to the place of residence of all married couples resident in a sample of nine parishes for the 1851 census.¹⁴ It was found that a
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¹³ P. Thompson, Lark Rise to Candleford, 1939, repr. 1985, for example, pp.20,42.
Figure 5.8: Age Pyramid Showing Adult Population in 1851, divided into Native and Non-native, where Native = born in the enumerating parish of Burstow.

Native Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Native Females</th>
<th>Non-native Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of adult females in each age band in 1851

Native Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Native Males</th>
<th>Non-native Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of adult males in each age band in 1851

Caterham

Native Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Native Females</th>
<th>Non-native Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of adult females in each age band in 1851

Native Male

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Native Male</th>
<th>Non-native Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of adult males in each age band in 1851
Figure 5.8: continued.

**Nutfield**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Native Females</th>
<th>Non-native Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of adult females in each age band in 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Native Males</th>
<th>Non-native Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of adult males in each age band in 1851

**Warlingham**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Native Females</th>
<th>Non-native Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of adult females in each age band in 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Native Males</th>
<th>Non-native Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of adult males in each age band in 1851
Figure 5.8: continued.

Horne

Native Females                  Non-native Females

Age in Years
61+
51-60
41-50
31-40
21-30
16-20

% of adult females in each age band in 1851

Native Males                  Non-native Males

Age in Years
61+
51-60
41-50
31-40
21-30
16-20

% of adult males in each age band in 1851

Limpsfield

Native Females                  Non-native Females

Age in Years
61+
51-60
41-50
31-40
21-30
16-20

% of adult females in each age band in 1851

Native Males                  Non-native Males

Age in Years
61+
51-60
41-50
31-40
21-30
16-20

% of adult males in each age band in 1851
Figures continued.

Worth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Females</th>
<th>Non-native Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age in Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of adult females in each age band in 1851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Males</th>
<th>Non-native Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age in Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of adult males in each age band in 1851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean of the parish figures showed that 10% of these couples were living in the wife’s birthplace. The birthplace data for the offspring of this 10% shows that 85% of them had borne their first and all subsequent children in the same parish. It can be presumed, therefore, that they had never left the wife’s birthplace. The birthplace data of the children for the remaining 15% shows that the couple left the wife’s birthplace to return after a few years. The majority of married couples in the sample lived either in the husband’s birthplace, or a location new to both. This post nuptial mobility makes it difficult to use the marriage register as an accurate measurement of female mobility. The census data, on the other hand, allows for male/female comparison. It also shows whether the woman had moved on her own in search of work, or as the member of a family. It also has the correct information for status and life-cycle analysis.

Throughout this section the same sample of nine parishes has been used. It will start by looking at female mobility patterns in relation to the parish boundary. The degree to which adult women remained in their natal parishes compared to adult men is shown on Fig. 5.8. This is a series of age pyramids for all adults. It compares those who have remained in their birthplaces to those that have moved. shows the age structure of those who have moved.

These show that as Ravenstein predicted, women were more migratory than men. Those women listed as resident in their birth-place were likely to be in the youngest age band - 16-20 years, or the oldest - over 60. In the first case the girls were probably too young to have

\[14\] These were Burstow, Caterham, Horne, Limpsfield, Nutfield, Tatsfield, Titsey, Warlingham and Worth.
left the parental home. In the second it suggests that either women born in the 1790s showed a greater tendency to stay within their native parish than those born after, or they had moved away to return in old age. All the parishes show a gap in native women aged between 26-35, the age at most risk of marriage. It can be inferred, therefore, that most women moved away from their birthplace prior to, or immediately after marriage. Those women in their 60s in 1851 would have been in this age group during the late 1820s and early 1830s, which was a period of severe economic depression in the study area. This might have been expected to have acted as a pushing agent on young couples to move them out of the area. Are these elderly women return migrants?

In order to test this, a regressive linkage exercise was carried out between the 1851 and 1841 censuses. This showed that 69% of the women were living in their birthplaces in 1841, so had probably never left it. It is the other 31% that are interesting, but where they had been or what prompted them to return to their native settlements can only be conjectured. Their civil status and position in the household are, however, given in the census. These can be used to help build up a picture of the condition of these women. 33% of them were single, 22% widows, whilst the remainder were married and living with their husbands. Two of the single women were described as paupers and were living as lodgers with families bearing a different name to themselves. One of the widows was in the same position, whilst the other was living with her daughter and son-in-law. Her daughter had been born in the same parish as her, but there is no record of either of their marriages in that parish. The daughter’s children were also born in that parish, but none of the family were present in the parish in 1841. As the son-in-law
came from another of the sample parishes it was possible to check if they were living there in 1841, they were not. Either they escaped enumeration in 1841, or all the generations had moved away in 1841 but were back in the parish by 1851. The elderly native married women show similar trends. Two of them who were absent in 1841 but present in 1851 were married to men described as farmers. One of these was born in the same parish as the wife, but the other came from Yorkshire. The latter couple had three adult children living at home, all born in the same parish as the wife, but absent in 1841. These two examples, both from the same Wealden parish, could be instances of the peculiar Wealden tenancy arrangements which lasted for a year and described in Chapter 2.

To conclude this short section on return migrants and the question as to why they returned in old age, can it be assumed that it was because they felt strong loyalty to their home parish? From the meagre evidence available the answer is probably no. They returned to get poor relief from their native parish. Who can say, however, whether a deeper instinctive wish to die and be buried in their home ground prompted them to return.

There were of course elderly indigenous men in the sample as well. The mean proportion of mature adult men living in their birth-place was 37% compared to 29% of women. The two parishes which topped the ranking for the highest proportion of both native men and women were Nutfield and Worth. Worth had 43% native women and 55% native men living in the parish in 1851, whilst Nutfield had 37% native women and 49% native men. Although the economies and land-holding structure of these two parishes were vastly different, they shared similar household organizations and rates of endogamy. Both were family orientated, inward-looking parishes.
The two parishes with the least number of native adults also shared similar characteristics. Tatsfield and Titsey on the Downs were both small, purely agricultural parishes. Lack of employment opportunities probably led to native adults leaving these parishes.

With regards to marriage, native women were more likely to be married than native men. A mean of 53% native women were married, compared to 37% native men. When native women are compared to incoming women it can be seen that incoming women were more likely to be married than native women. The high proportion of unmarried native women reflects the age pyramid. Native single women were less likely to be in paid employment than unmarried incomers. 70% of the latter were listed as being in employment outside the home, compared to 49% of the single native women. These tended to be the daughters and sisters of male household heads. Many of these girls would leave the birthplace when older, to seek work outside the native parish. Where they moved to should, if Ravenstein's predictions are correct, be within their native county. A mean of 68% of women who had moved from their birthplaces were still living in their native county.

It could be argued, however, that as most of the women who moved from their birthplaces were married this does not represent free choice of movement. It has already been mentioned that 70% of incoming single women were in paid employment. Their spatial origins can provide a check on the choices shown by married women. An analysis of these showed that a mean of 66% had moved within their own county. For the remaining 34% who had crossed the county border, there is some evidence that trans-county movement occurred during a specific stage of the life-cycle. Over half the trans-county migrants were under 30, compared to 39% of the intra-county
Evidence from the marriage registers discussed in Chapter 4 suggests that the youthful single trans-county migrants often returned to marry and settle in their own counties. The census data suggests, however, that the young single women in the study area were more innovative than Ravenstein's general conclusions suppose. This may have been due to the universal nature of the work associated with domestic service. Different houses may have had different customs, but basically the work was the same everywhere. The may not be true for different types of farming which needed differing skills and seasonal rhythms. The demands of arable or pastoral farming might make it less easy for men to cross pays borders than women.

An analysis of adult birth-place data shows little significant difference between the sexes in relation to pays moves. 42% of men who had moved remained in the same pays compared to 37% of women. Within these migrants there were, two groups that could truly be accounted outsiders. Those coming from an urban environment, or from a long distance rural location. Again, the data shows little difference between the sexes. 4% of men had an urban background, compared to 5% of women, whilst 12% of men were long distance migrants compared to 14% of women.

Long distance movement could still be contained within the county boundary. Did women show a narrower field of activity than men? Were they naturally more local? Table 5.5 shows the gender differential for the distances moved by adults.

Table 5.5 Comparison of Distances moved by Males and Females as Shown by the 1851 Census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 10 miles</th>
<th>10-50 miles</th>
<th>51+ miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This indicates that in the study area women had travelled further from the birth-place than men. Life-cycle evidence shows that those women moving longest distances had completed the move by the age of 35 years, but men were likely to have made the long distance move by the time they were 30. 59% of the women making long-distance moves were married. 22% of the remainder were in paid employment, usually some type of domestic service. Long distance male migrants were either agricultural labourers or farmers.

As far as directional bias and long distance movement are concerned there are five sending locations which stand out. These were, Berkshire and Suffolk which sent 17 migrants each, Ireland which sent 14 and Hampshire and Lincolnshire which sent 12 apiece. The migrants from Ireland were described as being in low capital self-employed occupations, which is in contrast to the smaller number of those from Scotland who were invariably professional or high-capital entrepeneurs. The pair of sending locations that sent most migrants into the study area - Berkshire and Suffolk- show some interesting trends in the distribution of migrants once they had entered the study area. The majority of women from the first county were single and went into domestic service, with some evidence of girls from the same village entering the same household in Surrey. Migrants of both sexes from Berkshire are to be found mainly on the North Downs. How far this inter-action with Berkshire was prompted by the fact that the rector of Titsey had been born in that county can only be conjectured, but there were three other Berkshire migrants in that parish and one in a neighbouring parish. Migrants from Suffolk show a different pattern. They usually consisted of a married couple plus an
adult relative. The men were all agricultural labourers, whereas the male migrants from Lincolnshire tended to be farmers who bought labourers from the same villages as themselves with them. Migrants from Suffolk and Lincolnshire favoured re-settlement in Wealden parishes.

These patterns pose some interesting questions with regards to movement across pays. The sending areas of Berkshire were like the receiving area sheep country with chalk downlands. Indeed, one of the migrants from Berkshire into the area was a shepherd. Migrants from the low lying claylands of Suffolk, however, moved to a similar environment in the Surrey Weald. This suggests that in order to measure the effects of different agricultural zones or pays on the perception of space it may be necessary to take a broader spectrum than the localised scene of the study area, and to ask some of the following questions - was it a two-way inter-action between the area, how had the link been established in the first place, was there some internal reason for it such as a land-owner with land in both area, or was it a natural link between similar farming regions? (One tentative link with Lincolnshire comes through the Monson family. Not only did they hold land just to the east of the study area, as well as in Lincolnshire, but Lord Monson was one of the principal mortgagees of the Gresham estates in Surrey). If some of these questions could be answered they would go a long way towards piercing together the picture of geographical space held by nineteenth century rural communities.

The reasons that lie behind short distance moves are easier to understand. The information as to where work might be found would be transmitted by word of mouth, or by the labourer going from farm to farm offering his services. There is some indication, however, that the
sexes had different preferences as to where they settled. Burstow born men, for example, outnumber Burstow born women in Horne, whilst at Nutfield women incomers outnumber all male incomers. This parish has already emerged as being insular, with a high proportion of native adult males resident in the parish in 1851. These stayers were blocking the entrance of outsiders by taking up all available space and work. Nutfield, in terms of land-holding cannot be described as 'closed' but it behaves as if it were. It has shut its boundaries, not by the manipulation of a resident landowner, but through natural economic and demographic processes. The 'closed' situation at Nutfield was not to last. In 1879 it got its own station and the hamlet of Lower or South Nutfield took on an economic life of its own. New houses were built. Villas for the wealthy were constructed as well as several rows of labourers cottages. A coal merchant's business, a brick-yard, and a hotel were developed near to the railway, whilst Wealden farmers from the hinterland started to deliver their produce to the station for delivery to London. By the late 1880s South Nutfield had broken away from the mother settlement to form a separate ecclesiastical parish.  

In so far as short-distance reciprocity is concerned, there is again evidence that there was an imbalance between the sexes. This especially marked on the Weald where men show a tendency to move into Horne but women to move away from that parish. Similarly, there was an unbalanced exchange between Worth and Burstow with twice as many women moving from Worth into Burstow as

---

15 This description comes from the reminiscences of elderly relatives. My great-grandfather started a haulage company focussed on the railway, his eldest son started the coal business; another son started a milk-round to serve the new villas, and yet another ran a timber haulage firm.
moved from Burstow to Worth. In this Wealden triangle Horne ended up the net-gainer of men, whereas Burstow had a surplus of women migrants. The lowest intake of both sexes was by Nutfield and Worth which is in line with the conclusions already drawn on these two parishes.

To conclude this comparative analysis of male/female spatial movement, it has been shown that as Ravenstein's law predicted, women were more mobile than men. They were more likely to have left their birth-place than men, but less likely to have changed their environmental background. If the greater spatial mobility of women over men can be accepted can they still be said to hold a special place in the transmission of local identity? Life-cycle changes suggest that the change of residence was peculiar to one stage of the female life-cycle - after puberty but before marriage. Marriage, when it took place was likely to be away from the parish of birth but within the natal county. Settlement after marriage was likely to be within the husband's parish, which was probably in a different pays to the one in which the woman was born, but again within the county of her birth. Thus, the county emerges as an important boundary-marker for the women. A fact that she would transmit to her children, so reinforcing county loyalty and identity.

Conclusion

Whilst the picture of static insular communities in the past is no longer accepted, spatial analysis of the choice of marriage partners with movement as shown by census data suggests that it was a relative mobility. Covering short distances, and constrained by symbolic boundaries. Most moves took place within a discrete local area, confined within territorial limits which
were greater than the area of the parish but contained within the county.

The aggregate amalgamation of marriage data with the census returns shows the following process. Marriage choice especially for the labourer who had no means of transport other than his feet, and no way of carrying on a courtship over a long distance, was dependent on the place of residence at the time of most risk of marriage. Although residential moves as illustrated by the census were likely to show wider spatial horizons than those of the marriage field, the most intense inter-action was between blocks of 2-4 communities acting on a nearest neighbour basis. On the whole this inter-action between these communities stayed within the county boundary. It was contained, however, within a looser framework which crossed county and pays boundaries to form, what might be termed a 'social region'. Within this region one parish, which lay at the heart of the communications network of the area, acted as a pivot or bridge between the different counties and pays. This particular parish, Godstone, was split into three distinctive communities, each with its own social area.

The findings of this chapter can be summed up as follows – inter-action was proved to be short distance. It had some degree of directional bias and maintenance over time but socio-economic conditions in some parishes meant that reciprocity of migrants was unbalanced. It was found that social areas of blocks of 2-4 communities nested within a social region which covered a wide spatial area. Long-distance movement suggested that the situation with regards to movement across pays boundaries may be more complex than hitherto shown. Furthermore, a comparative analysis of the different spatial patterns of movement shown by men
and women showed that where the migrant went was likely to be determined by the stage in the life-cycle of the individual.

These findings have to be related to the overall aims and objectives of this work. These are, firstly, the character of local identity as shown by inter-action across boundaries. This is connected to the identification of communities which share this identity. Secondly, the application of these findings to the study of academic local history. In so far as the first is concerned this chapter has raised many questions, especially as it has defined two competing social areas. One which dissolved boundaries, whilst the other was bounded by them. These can be reconciled if it is realised that the perception of space expanded or contracted depending on the life-cycle stage of the individual. Firstly, there was an actual level which started with the young child. This was comprised of the home. This space grew with the child to include the neighbourhood, hamlet, parish, neighbouring parish. This was space which could be felt and experienced. It was tangible with marked boundaries. This space is analogous to the social area of intense activity as defined by blocks of 2-4 communities sharing a similar identity. The second level was an intellectual plane. An idea that local space was contained within a greater space, the county or nation etc. This was space which could not be touched or experienced by the child but existed through the medium of others. At some point, probably during young adulthood part of this space, moved from an intellectual to an actual level. The young adult could make a choice which boundaries to cross or which to stay behind. The spatial dimensions of local identity, therefore, were different for different people at different ages.
How can this conceptual of the role of space on local identity be related to the overall objective of this work? The courtship field as shown by marriage patterns and personal mobility in the census shows that inter-action took place over a relatively narrow field. Intense inter-action was often confined to a few neighbouring communities in the same county. These communities, however, were part of a looser regional framework which included an urban centre and crossed county and pays boundaries. Spatial boundaries formed by the parish, county and pays have been dissolved. We are left with blocks of communities in a regional framework. This agrees with Phythian-Adams conclusions in Re-thinking English Local History. Cohen, however, suggests that identity is conferred by boundaries. Do the block of linked communities share an identity? It is possible that social boundaries contributed to this sense of identity. The next chapter seeks to clarify this further by turning to the first social boundary to be discussed, kinship and its role in the formation of local identity.

---

16 C. Phythian-Adams, Re-thinking English Local History, Department of English Local History, University of Leicester, Occasional Paper, 4th ser. 1, 1987, e.g. p.43.

CHAPTER 6

THE LANDSCAPE OF KIN

Introduction

The preceding chapters have looked at the role of spatial boundaries on local identity. Underlying this may have been a sense of belonging that was not rooted in place - but in people. Kinship and family loyalty may have shaped local identity to a far greater degree than the perception of space or place.

Over the last twenty years, however, the idea that the individual in the past was a member of a deeply rooted and extensive kinship network has undergone some modifications. The developments in the field of family history over the last two decades have been summed up by Cressy. He points out that the popular belief of a strongly kin-orientated society in the past received its first blow when Laslett published of The World We Have Lost. Laslett demonstrated that the nuclear family was the basic social unit in the past as well as the present. This created an interesting sociological paradox. It was generally thought that industrialisation had destroyed family networks to create a rootless society. If, however, the main unit of society in the past was the nuclear family, industrialisation could not have destroyed something which did not exist.


2 P. Laslett, The World We Have Lost, 2nd ed., 1979, repr., for example p. 72.
It was this paradox that Anderson set out to test on nineteenth century census data for the Lancashire mill town of Preston. He found that far from destroying family networks, industrialisation strengthened family bonds. In his sample from Preston, 23% of households consisted of nuclear families plus other relatives, with 86% of a further sample of households living within 400 yards of kin. Anderson also found qualitative evidence of strong kinship links - for example children were named after kin so that one name appeared in many generations of the same family, or sons followed fathers into the same factory or occupation. Anderson concluded:

"it does seem to suggest very strongly, that, in spite of migration, residential mobility, industrial employment and high mortality rates, most people managed to maintain relationships with their family, both the current nuclear family and the family as a web of wider kinship relationships"

Thus, on the one hand, Laslett says that society in the past was based on a series of discrete social units, whilst Anderson sees it as a web of inter-connected units. Anderson, it should be remembered, based his conclusions on nineteenth-century evidence whilst Laslett was concerned with the early modern period.

---


Chaytor, however, found a similar web of kinship in sixteenth and seventeenth-century Tyneside. Her paper in History Workshop Journal brought hot denials of any such networks from Smith and Houston, and Wrightson. They maintain that the kinship range in England was restricted and narrow, whilst Wrightson's work with Levine on Terling in Essex shows few dense kinship networks. They conclude that kinship ties were a relatively insignificant feature on the structure of a village. The same conclusion was reached by Macfarlane from his analysis of the diaries of Ralph Josselin. Stone too, sees kinship in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as under pressure from the church, state, and market economy.

These arguments can be countered by hard evidence. Prior, for instance, found strong kinship bonding throughout the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries in Oxford's Fisher Row. Mills found 66 pairs of related households out of the 326 households that made up the

---

10 K. Wrightson and D. Levine, Poverty and Piety in an English Village; Terling 1525-1700, 1979, p. 90.
village of Melbourne in Cambridgeshire in the nineteenth-century. Williams found that in nineteenth century Ashworthy, 25% of the households contained kin other than the nuclear family. Similarly, Curle found that in a population of 208 households in a Yorkshire village in the 1950s, 129 or 62% were cross-related. The relevance of these arguments to local identity is summed up by Strathern. She writes that "Villagers indeed seem to be embedded in a kinship network." A network "which binds villagers together is often experienced by outsiders as a boundary." Thus within the landscape there are boundaries other than administrative borders or ecological zones. These boundaries can be measured by the extent and depth of kinship ties within a community.

This statement pre-supposes that kinship networks will exist – i.e. there are grounds for questioning the conclusions drawn by Laslett, Wrightson et al. The first distinction to be made when considering these conclusions is the difference between the family as a household unit and the kinship group as a series of non-residential units. It cannot be denied that the basic residential unit of rural society in the late eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries was the nuclear family. The surviving examples of the vernacular architecture which would have housed the

13 W.M. Williams, A West Country Village; Ashworthy, 1963, pp. 50, 140.
labouring family show that this cannot have been otherwise. What is missing from many analyses of kinship in the past is the degree of relatedness between households, plus the quality of kinship relations. Kin do not necessarily have to live together — or even close to one another — in order to have a deep and supportive relationship. Migration patterns for instance, show that kin living away from the main family played an important part in helping young people to gain a footing in a new environment. Kinship was functional as well as emotional. It was in the kinship group's own interest to maintain contact between its members. The second point to be made is that the sources pre-dispose kinship density towards shallowness of depth and narrowness of range. The links between kin cannot be made because firm evidence does not exist to prove these links — even though it is obvious to the eye that they exist. Thirdly socio-economic conditions need to be taken into account when considering the strength of kinship networks. Chaytor, rightly criticises Wrightson and Levine for isolating family and kinship from the socio-economic and demographic life of the parish. It could be asked whether there are any socio-economic features in common between Josselin's parish and Terling, or between Ryton, Melbourne and Preston.

16Work done on apprentice migration to Kingston upon Thames shows that kin were often apprenticed to the same master or to relatives.

See also, M. Segalen, *Historical Anthropology of the Family*, 1986, p. 94.

17Chaytor, loc.cit., p. 28.

(Footnote continued)
This chapter aims to examine kinship networks - or the lack of them within the socio-economic structure of the study area. Its objective is to see whether kinship networks crossed parish or county boundaries or whether the geographic position of a parish made a difference to kinship density within it. It will also relate this to the main theme of this work, which is a method of identifying linked communities. The sources and methodology which will be used to do this will be discussed in the next section of the chapter.

Sources and Methodology

The sources used in this chapter are parish registers, census data, wills and diaries for a sample of parishes in the study area. Nominal Record Linkage will be used in a family reconstitution exercise. This in turn will be related to the 1851 census. From this a count will be made of all vertical and horizontal links traced in the sample parishes. The census will also be used to look at household types and the proximity of residence of kin. Lastly the depth of feeling towards kin will be estimated from the wills, diaries etc. extant for the area.

As stated in the preceding section, the sources pre-dispose the results towards a view that kinship networks in the past were shallow in depth and narrow in range. Family reconstitution is a flawed methodology which excludes a large proportion of the population. If, for instance, the starting point for the reconstitution is a marriage, all singletons are lost.
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Events registered in another parish mean that whole families can disappear. Often it is impossible to identify family members with any certainty because they have the same name and were born at similar dates. What is actually reconstituted is but a small fraction of the community - which should be treated as a sample of the total population of a parish.

Similarly, the census has its drawbacks when being used as a source for reconstructing kinship networks in the past. It gives a static picture whilst kinship was a fluctuating experience, with the kinship universe contracting and expanding depending on the life-cycle stages of its members. Bequests made in wills suffer from the same age-specific constraints as well as having a social bias towards the wealthier members of the community. The latter bias is also evident in other qualitative sources such as diaries. We do not know, for example, whether Josselin's 'lack of interest' in his kin was the result of his occupation or the norm in seventeenth century Essex.\(^{19}\) In view of these constraints in the sources other measurements of kinship will be used in the following chapter which may help to broaden the range of the inquiry. The chapter continues by examining the vertical and horizontal kinship links shown by the reconstitution of eight parishes in South East Surrey.

**The Landscape of Kin**

This section considers the depth and range of kinship links as shown in a series of family reconstitutions cross-referenced to the 1851 census. It starts by looking at the depth of kinship as illustrated by the

\(^{19}\)Macfarlane, *op.cit.*, p.154.
number of vertical links which can be traced in the parishes from 1750 to 1850. Vertical links are ascendent-descendent links. These are the result of tracing family histories through reconstitutions and in this case relating the reconstitutions to the 1851 census. The whole is seen within the context of the total population. Each individual in a family reconstitution that had known kin living in the parish was counted as one case. The total number of individuals so related was then expressed as a percentage of the parish in 1851. This is shown on Table 6.1.
Table 6.1 Proportion of Population in 1851 with Traceable Vertical Kinship Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. of individuals</th>
<th>Total Pop. of Parish</th>
<th>% of Pop. with links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>1553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows that in five parishes over a quarter of the population could claim vertical kinship links within that parish. Godstone, the buffer parish which connected the different farming zones of the area had a not unexpected low level of vertical linkage. The low level at Burstow on the Weald was unexpected. This could be due partly to inadequate registration in the late 1830s which made it difficult to cross-reference the parish register to the census - but it may also be due to the socio-economic conditions in the parish. It was a purely agricultural parish consisting of small tenant farms. These farms were held on the notorious Wealden annual dilapidation tenancies. This meant that the farms were regularly exchanged with others elsewhere in the Weald, with the farmers moving in and out of the parish from year to year. The lack of vertical linkage in 1851 may be due to this annual shift of population - the following year it is likely that the picture would be different.

Another factor to be considered is the range of the vertical links, i.e., how long had the links been in...
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existence. Figure 6.1 shows the number of families entering the parish each decade with vertical links that were traced backwards from 1851. This figure indicates that most of the families with traceable vertical links had been in the parishes for at least eighty years - and probably longer as these reconstitutions do not go any further back than 1750. (For instance the three families at Nutfield linked to 1750 can be traced back in that parish to the sixteenth century).

Table 6.1 in conjunction with Fig.. 6.1 suggests that in some parishes kinship links were extensive and deep. However, the density of kinship links in a parish at any one time could have been sparse. Horizontal links are very difficult to trace, so that the links shown are only a small proportion of the many ramifications of kinship existing in a village community.

Figure 6.2 shows the traceable horizontal links for the period 1750-1800. This figure shows that the range of horizontal links was broadest at Blechingley, Limpsfield and Nutfield on the greensand, and Horne and Burstow in the Weald. A broad kinship universe was expected at Blechingley, Horne and Nutfield, but the results from Limpsfield and Burstow are surprising in view of the low level of vertical links in these parishes. It suggests that at given periods of time, for example, the 1790s at Burstow or the 1800s at Limpsfield, there were extensive groups of kin that had no roots in the parish, but were part of a contemporary tightly knit kinship complex. These two parishes can be seen as parishes where at least for the early period, identity was vested in people rather than place. This is perhaps emphasised in Burstow by the existence of squatters' communities on its peripheral commons, which
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the 1841 and 1851 census returns show to be inter-related groups often with female household heads.

Table 6.2 shows the proportion of households in 1851 which had horizontal kinship links in the same parish.

Table 6.2 Proportion of Households in 1851 with horizontal links in the same parish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Households with Horizontal Links</th>
<th>% of total households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again Limpsfield shows a surprisingly high density of kinship with 30% of households related in some way. The overall trend is close to the related links found at Terling in 1671 which ranged from 39.3% - 52.5%. Wrightson and Levine describe these as a "loose" kinship network.20 "Loose", however, means that in three of the parishes in the study area 30% of the households were related to each other. When the inadequacy of the sources and methodology is taken into account it is probable that this figure was considerably higher.

20 Wrightson and Levine, op.cit., pp.85, 87, 89.
It should not be forgotten that part of the purpose of the reconstitution exercise was to see how far kinship links crossed boundaries. Table 6.3 shows the number of family units which shared kin across administrative boundaries.

Table 6.3: Number of Family Units Sharing Kin Across Administrative Boundaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1750</th>
<th>1760</th>
<th>1770</th>
<th>1780</th>
<th>1790</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blech.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsf.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutf.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsf.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warl.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two trends can be seen from this table. The first is that there was a peak in the 1770s when kinship networks crossed boundaries to a far greater extent than in other decades. The second is the high incidence of kin shared across boundaries at Blechingley, which was not on the county or pays border. This parish occupied a central service position within the study area, with an annual market and fair. It also had a good array of shops. These service functions may help to account for this trend by providing a marriage market for the area. The character of the links across boundaries is shown on Table 6.4...
Table 6.4: Spatial Character of Kin Links Across Boundaries 1750-1800

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Pays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that kinship links across boundaries were more likely to lie within the same county than the same pays. A further analysis showed that the links were likely to be short distance with 81% of kin shared across borders coming from neighbouring parishes. A further 6% from parishes one removed from the registering parishes. The bulk of the remaining 13% came from Croydon. The importance of this town as a marriage market for the study area was shown in Chapter 5. Many local families had relatives in Croydon with a reciprocity of goods or people between the rural and urban areas.

In conclusion it can be seen that the socio-economic context of the parish played a part in determining the extent of kinships links within that parish. Parishes where conditions favoured mobility, such as Burstow were likely to have a widely fluctuating number of vertical links but a broader range of horizontal links. Other parishes, for example, Burstow's Wealden neighbour Horne, where land was more likely to be owner-occupied, or its greensand neighbour Nutfield
where agriculture was not the sole occupation, were more likely to have a deeper more intensive kinship system.

When related to the spatial patterns discussed in Chapter 5, it can be seen that kinship-links that crossed boundaries were likely to show the spatial preferences shown in that chapter - i.e. staying within the same county but crossing the pays boundary. The bulk of the traceable kinship networks show that some parishes were more strongly kin-orientated than others. To put it another way - following Strathern's analogy of kinship networks forming a boundary to outsiders, some parishes had stronger boundaries than others. The parish hierarchy for this in 1851 can be seen on Table 6.5 which shows the number of households with vertical links i.e. those having roots in the parish, compared to the side of the number of households with horizontal or contemporary ties in the parish.

Table 6.5: Parish Hierarchy of Kinship Linkage in 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Vertical</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Horizontal</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table reinforces the supposition that Nutfield on the greensand was a parish where social and economic conditions combined to form a strongly kin-orientated society. Indeed, the greensand area as a whole was conducive towards this trend. Only Horne in the top half of the table comes from a different zone - the
Weald. The boundaries set up by kin were strongest in the greensand belt and weakest on the downs. Thus, even though the downland parishes were nucleated settlements with clusters of densely populated neighbourhoods it was likely that the neighbours in the centre were not related to each other. On the greensand, where there was a mixture of nucleated and hamlet settlement, neighbours were more likely to be related. The next section looks at where in relation to settlement patterns kin-clusters were found in the parish.

Kin and Residential Proximity

In his pioneering work on the town of Preston, Anderson showed that a high proportion of kin were living close to each other, if not actually in the same household. This section uses the same data as Anderson, census returns, in order to look at the residential proximity of kin in a rural setting. The first feature of kinship proximity to be examined is the incidence of households which contained kin other than the nuclear family. Table 6. shows the proportion of such households for a sample of 8 parishes.

Table 6.6. Proportion of Households in 1851 that included Kin other than the Nuclear Family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of all households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 Anderson, op.cit., p. 56.
It was expected that the proportion of households which contained extra kin would be less than at Preston. There, the expanding industrial economy produced conditions which were conducive to shared households. Anderson showed that migrants moved in to stay with established relatives when first arriving in the town, or parents lived with married children in order to act as child-minders whilst the mother worked in the factory. As can be seen in Table 6., two parishes achieved a level of kin-residence comparable to the 23% shown in Anderson’s sample for Preston. These parishes were Horne in the Weald and Nutfield on the greensand. Both of these parishes also had high levels of vertical and horizontal kinship links in 1851, showing that not only were there strong kinship ties between household but within households as well. These two factors may well be related. If several members of the same family lived close to each other the welfare of dependent members could be shared between them. Table 6.7 shows the range of relationships to the family head found in these extended households.

Table 6.7: Type of Relationship of Extra-Kin to the Household Head in 1851.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sib</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchild</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niece/nephew</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent in law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sib in law</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child in law</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table indicates that extra-kin or dependents were likely to be young - usually grandchildren or nieces and nephews of the household head. The census returns show that widowed families with young children often

\[22\] Anderson, op.cit., p. 84.
moved in with married siblings. This arrangement would give the mutual support which is part of the functional aspect of kinship. It also shows that the nuclear family was not as isolated in the past as some authors, Macfarlane, for example, suggest.23

It is possible, however, that the actual dwelling places of kin within a parish were at some distance, making day-to-day inter-action difficult. Both Anderson and Mills were able to show that not only did nearly a quarter of all households contain kin other than the nuclear family, but a high proportion of kin lived in close proximity to each other.24 In order to look at kin-residential proximity in South East Surrey three parishes, one from each pays, have been used as a sample and traced kin have been matched to traced residences and plotted on maps. (Maps 6.1 - 6.3). These parishes were chosen as they possess relatively good documentary sources, as well as being representative examples from each pays.

The maps shows that the distribution of kin is more random than that shown by Anderson or Mills. There were, however, some clusters of kin. For instance at Whitewood, Frogget Heath and Hedge Court in Horne. Kin clusters can also be seen in the Village and Mid Street in Nutfield, and the Village and Warlingham Common in Warlingham. As might have been expected kinship proximity is densest at Nutfield with kin living within yards rather than miles of each other, for example,

23A. Macfarlane, The Origins of English Individualism, 1978, for example, p. 139.
24Anderson, op.cit., p. 57.
Mills, loc.cit., p. 271.
Map 6.1: Residential Proximity of Kin in Horne
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their own landowners. For example, the 1831 census, in conjunction
with family reconstructions, shows John in the
village was employed as a servant named refreshing living with
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Groups C, K, and R. Horne is interesting in that the densest kin clusters lie on the commons of Outwood, Frogget Heath and Hedge Court. This suggests that these kin units had their origins in squatters’ communities who managed to gain a permanent foothold on the commons. A similar phenomenon can be seen at Warlingham on the common and Hamsey Green.

What is not illustrated on this map is the number of tradesmen who had relatives living and working with them who were listed as employees rather than relatives. For example, the 1851 census in conjunction with the family reconstructions shows that John Jupp the Outwood miller, was married to a Scott from Old Hall. He had a servant named Edward Scott living with him in 1851 and a grinder Edmund King who was related to both the Scotts and the Jupps. This example which shows kinship in action, can be multiplied several times over.

Although this section does not show strong tendencies for kin to be living with or near each other it does hint at an underlying functional kinship structure. The functional aspect of kinship will be examined further in the final section of this chapter when the perception of kinship networks forming boundaries that excluded outsiders will be considered.

**Kinship as a Boundary**

In *Kinship at the Core* Strathern suggests that kinship can form a boundary in a parish which excludes ‘outsiders’. In order for such a boundary to be recognised, kinship links must be active – i.e.– kin

must be seen to inter-act with kin, or kinship cannot be perceived as a boundary marker. It is, however, difficult to assess the degree of kin inter-action in the past from the sources available. Qualitative sources such as diaries can be used. These will be discussed in the final part of this section. Another more quantitative method of estimating the extent of kinship inter-action is by analysing the bequests made in wills. Wrightson and Levine used this method in their study of Terling. They show that most bequests made by testators in that parish were to the immediate nuclear family with no evidence of inter-action or affection for the wider kinship group. They also found that most debts and services were owed to non-kin rather than kin. They concluded that kinship was a relatively unimportant feature of society in seventeenth-century rural Essex. Bearing in mind Strathern's analogy of kinship making a boundary, it can be said that at Terling, kinship did not form a recognisable boundary marker.  

Part of the pattern of kin inter-action shown through bequests is caused by the biased nature of the sources. The main purpose of a will was either to dispose of property - land or moveable - or to provide for dependents. In the first case it was thought desirable that property - especially land - should remain in the family. In many families the land was legally disposed so as to make it impossible to do otherwise. Usually it could only pass down through the blood-line. Although the wife might be left the usufruct for life under the husband's will, there was usually a reversion clause on her death that left the land to the husband's nearest male relative. In other cases, customary land had to be

bestowed according "to the custom of the manor." For example, in 1812 David Ashdown of Limpsfield left his customary land to his youngest son James "according to the custom of the manor". In many transactions, therefore, there was no option but to leave the property to the nuclear family or the nearest male relative. In the second instance, dependants of the testator were also usually the nuclear or immediate family. These are just some of the drawbacks in using wills as a source by which to illustrate the extent of kinship inter-action in the past. It is possible, given these constraints, to use wills to way of measuring bequests to kin and non-kin, or to near and distant kin. Table 6. is an analysis of these comparisons made on a series of wills from Limpsfield in Surrey, dated between 1750-1850.

\[\text{S.R.O. 2186/1/26, Limpsfield Manorial Court Rolls.}\]
Table 6.8: Analysis of Bequests made in Wills Drawn up by the Inhabitants of Limpsfield, Surrey 1750-1850.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>N of wills</th>
<th>N of bequests</th>
<th>Consanguinal Kin</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Affinal Kin</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Total 23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sib in law</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sib</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Parent in law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchild</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Son in law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niece/nephew</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stepchildren</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsman</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle/Aunt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non Kin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend/Neighbour</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godchildren</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nuclear Family = 34%
Second Order = 11%
Distant = 17%

It should be noted that the wills from Limpsfield have two biases over and above those already discussed, which have contributed to the low number of bequests to wives, and the high number of bequests to distant kin. The first is that there were a disproportionate number of wills made by spinsters whose only relations were cousins or kinsmen. (Spinsters cannot leave property to spouses, children etc. but do leave it to nieces friends, neighbours or servants). The second is the will of Vincent Biscoe, Viscount Hylton who lived in the parish. He was very wealthy and left many token bequests to his servants and friends. The wills from Limpsfield suggest that like Terling kin were
relatively unimportant. 17 or 7% of the bequests at Limpsfield were to kin who lived in a different parish, but again Vincent Biscoe’s will inflated the number as he had considerable connections in the City of London and Somerset. There were two named debtors - both were related to the testator.

Loans of money were one way in which the wealthier members of a family could help their needier relatives. In return for this they would expect some service to be rendered - and the debt repaid. Personal account books, memoranda and diaries often note these transactions. The final part of this section will use these sources in two ways - firstly in a quantitative investigation which counts and compares the types and numbers of recorded inter-action between kin and non-kin, secondly in a qualitative manner to examine the intensity of feeling between kin.

There are five diaries or account books surviving for, or from locations near to the study area which were kept in such a form so as to allow a comparative count of inter-action between kin and non-kin. These are the diary of John Baker a solicitor who retired from London to Horsham in 1771, the account books, diaries, and family papers of John Clement snr. and jnr., from Nutfield in Surrey, the diary of Thomas Marchant an eighteenth-century farmer in the Sussex Weald who was related to that better known diarist Thomas Turner of West Hoathly, the diary of Clement Pain the nineteenth-century businessman great grandson of John Clement jnr. and the diary of William Ridge another eighteenth-century countryman from Sussex. (Unfortunately all these diaries except the Clement papers have been edited.)

28
relatively unimportant. 17 or 7% of the bequests at Limpsfield were to kin who lived in a different parish, but again Vincent Biscoe's will inflated the number as he had considerable connections in the City of London and Somerset. There were two named debtors - both were related to the testator.

Loans of money were one way in which the wealthier members of a family could help their needier relatives. In return for this they would expect some service to be rendered – and the debt repaid. Personal account books, memoranda and diaries often note these transactions. The final part of this section will use these sources in two ways - firstly in a quantitative investigation which counts and compares the types and numbers of recorded inter-action between kin and non-kin, secondly in a qualitative manner to examine the intensity of feeling between kin.

There are five diaries or account books surviving for, or from locations near to the study area which were kept in such a form so as to allow a comparative count of inter-action between kin and non-kin. These are the diary of John Baker a solicitor who retired from London to Horsham in 1771, the account books, diaries, and family papers of John Clement snr. and jnr., from Nutfield in Surrey, the diary of Thomas Marchant an eighteenth-century farmer in the Sussex Weald who was related to that better known diarist Thomas Turner of West Hoathly, the diary of Clement Pain the nineteenth-century businessman great grandson of John Clement jnr. and the diary of William Ridge another eighteenth-century countryman from Sussex. (Unfortunately all these diaries except the Clement papers have been edited.)
The recorded transactions in these diaries have been classified and counted with the results shown in Table 6.9.

---


S.R.O. 3140, Clement Papers, Diaries.


S.R.O. 3140, Clement Papers, Diary of Clement Pain.

Table 6.9 Kin and Non-Kin Inter-action as shown in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Diaries and Family Papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diarist</th>
<th>Visiting</th>
<th>Dining</th>
<th>Business Transactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kin</td>
<td>Non-Kin</td>
<td>Services Rendered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diarist</th>
<th>Debts</th>
<th>Gifts</th>
<th>Attended Funeral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kin</td>
<td>Non-Kin</td>
<td>Kin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clements</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Inter-actions = 210
Total Kin Inter-actions = 75 or 36%
Total Non-kin Inter-actions = 135 or 54%

It is obvious that this sample albeit small and biased towards the better off section of society, shows a strong trend towards inter-action with non-kin rather than kin, except when giving or receiving gifts, or bidding farewell to those departed from this life. It is possible, however, that visiting or dining with kin was too ordinary an affair to be noted down. The table also shows that except in the case of Thomas Marchant, non-kin were preferred for business transactions. The entries for this column under Marchant's name were mainly services rendered by him to kin or by his kin for him. There is a noticeable difference between the social circles of Baker and Marchant. Marchant was the
member of a tightly knit affective and effective kinship group whilst Baker was a newcomer to the district and depended heavily on his friends and neighbours from a similar background to himself to provide his social milieu. He also attended numerous public functions both as participant and spectator.\(^{29}\) Marchant too, as a Justice of the Peace, had a public persona, but usually went about his public business in the company of his cousins who were also on the bench.\(^{30}\) Another difference in inter-action with kin is shown in the nineteenth-century diary of Clement Pain. This indicates that the further in time and distance from the family's origins the stronger the link. He recorded 16 journeys to visit the family home and relatives in Surrey and Sussex in the year that he kept a diary.\(^{31}\)

There are two more nineteenth-century memoirs for the area, which although they did not record day-to-day inter-action do throw some light on kinship links. Henry Burstow was an impoverished shoemaker born in Horsham in 1811, whose memoirs were published as a charitable gesture towards the end of his life. He could record the names and occupations of his ancestors as far back as his great-great grandfather. He also left lists of the members of the Town Band and bell-ringing teams from 1766-1855. These contain some information on horizontal kinship inter-action. There were, for instance, always at least one kin group in each bell-ringing team, whilst in 1835 the Town Band contained three sets of kin all living in the same

\(^{29}\) Baker, *loc.cit.*, for example, p.79.

\(^{30}\) Marchant, *loc.cit.* for example p. 166.

\(^{31}\) Pain, *loc.cit.*, *passim.*
street as each other.  The other memoir also comes from Horsham and was written by Henry Michell a brewer in that town. He could only trace his lineage back to his great-grandfather but gives many instances of mutual services and obligations rendered by his kin.

The quality of kinship as shown by mutual aid is best illustrated by the Marchant diary. Marchant had a vast network of cousins spread across the Sussex Weald who provided sport and entertainment, services and succour. Some of the services were unexpected, for instance: 14.5.1714 "Lent old dog Porter to my cousin Turner of Old Land". Other services were supplied in times of crises; "Went to Pickwell to help get out one of my cousin's large oxen which was mired down." 7.1.1718. Or: "Sister Box very ill. My wife went to her." 8.12.1726. The most moving service that Marchant's kin performed for him was in 1728 when word came that there was a smallpox epidemic in Oxford, where Marchant's eldest son John was a student. Marchant's man was sent to fetch the boy but returned alone because John had already succumbed to the disease. The next day: "Thomas Elvey and Cousin Bett set out for Oxford with Mr. Martin's and Mr. Healey's men and my cousins Sarah Norton; William Marchant and William Lindfield as far as Leatherhead with cousin Bett and then returned." Although the family gathered round Marchant it was of no avail for the last entry in the diary reads: "Thomas Elvey and Marrian returned from Oxford and brought us the sad news that John Marchant died on Friday night last, about 11 o'clock."

---

32 H. Burstow, Reminiscences of Horsham being Recollections of Henry Burstow, 1911, pp. 9, 90-105.
The deep love Thomas Marchant bore for his children is repeated in many of the diaries. There is also evidence of deep and abiding love between siblings as well as parents and children. Although this inscription dates from before the start of this inquiry it refers to two ancestors of the Clement family - John and Robert Clement - who died within a month of each other in 1658 and shared both tomb and epitaph. Aubrey recorded this in the early-eighteenth century. Part of it reads:

"Two Brethren dear, a sad Event
Sinn begatt Death our Punishment;
Clement,inclement,rich and poore,
Death gathereth unto his Floore;...

John did out-run old Peter heere
He first came to the Sepulcher;
But Robert rested not til hee
Had run his Race, so dead they be..."35

The practice in the Clement family of naming the eldest son John and the second Robert persisted for many generations. Names and naming process is an indication of the extent and range of kinship which will be discussed in the following section. Before that the landscape of kin will be summarised and related to kinship as a boundary marker.

This section has been looking at kinship as an indication of the scope of individual inter-action as well as a spatial and psychological boundary marker. It has shown that vertical and horizontal kinship networks were stronger in some parishes than others. Some parishes had both strong vertical and horizontal kinship links whereas others had a number of kinship

groups with extensive contemporary ties but no 'roots' in the parish. A third group had a loose kinship structure with few vertical or horizontal links. Those parishes with strong vertical and horizontal links were also likely to have a high proportion of extended-kin households. But although there were some clusters of kin-related households living close to each other, most kin-residential proximity showed a random distribution. Kinship it was shown crossed spatial boundaries to a small extent. Shared kin were likely to be found in adjoining parishes. Kin were also shared across pays boundaries, but like the spatial preferences shown in Chapter 4, known kinship groups tended to stay within one county.

As well as crossing boundaries, kinship could also form a boundary against outsiders. A model of a parish where kinship formed a boundary would be one in which there was likely to be a choice of employment other than agriculture or a high proportion of owner-occupied land. It was likely to lie on the greensand rather than the Downs or Weald and to have a medium range of population size with a low MHS. Parishes which fit this model were likely to have a strongly kin-orientated society, with kinship operating as a physical and psychological boundary. In this type of parish, married children were more likely to stay in the same location as their parents, thus blocking the entrance of outsiders to jobs and housing. This self-perpetuating kinship system meant that paradoxically these parishes were also likely to have a strong place loyalty as well as loyalty to kin.

On the Downs and in some Wealden parishes the socio-economic conditions did not favour the persistence of deep vertical kinship structures, but it is possible that families remained in the area if not
in the same parish. It has already been pointed out that it is difficult to reconstitute the actual shape of kinship groups at any one time, therefore, an additional check is needed on the dispersal of families and the strength of kinship ties. Another way of dealing with these features is by looking at names. Fore-names can give some indication of allegiance to family traditions, whilst surnames can be used to look at stability in a parish as well as showing whether names crossed the same boundaries as shown in spatial patterns. The next section looks at the landscape of names.

The Landscape of Names

The preceding section looked at kinship as a measurement of social inter-action with relation to boundaries. It used Strathern's analogy that kinship itself can form a boundary against outsiders to show that some parishes had stronger kinship boundaries than others. In the parishes with strong kinship boundaries there were both multiple vertical and horizontal kinship links - suggesting that not only did families in these parishes have roots, but were also connected to a wide-range of contemporary kin as well. Other parishes, however, had few vertical links but many horizontal connections suggesting that families moved into an area en bloc, then moved on before the next generation had time to put down roots. Both examples indicate some degree of kin-loyalty, although in the first case it was also connected with place whereas in the second it was vested solely in people.

It was also suggested that owing to the inadequacy of the sources, actual kinship links are hard to grasp. One reason for this is the difficulty of linking
nominal data when many individuals with the same surname also have the same forename. Naming processes can be used in a positive way, as another measurement of the strength of kin loyalty. This chapter will be devoted to looking at the naming process which involves a choice - forenames, as well as the name which does not involve a choice - the surname.

**Given Names**

Comparatively little work has been done to date on the given name patterns of the past, although as Dupaquier points out the given name is "a free commodity with obligatory consumption", thus making it a universally important source.\(^3^7\) Dupaquier’s paper on the Parisian Vexin is perhaps the definitive work on the subject of given names in the past. It lays down "tacit rules" which should emerge from a study of given names.\(^3^8\)

Analysis of given names from English sources has not so far been as comprehensive as Dupaquier’s survey. Withycombe, the editor of *The Oxford Dictionary of Christian Names*, recognised that christian names are a way of showing family connections. Scott Smith who looked at naming processes in seventeenth and eighteenth-century England and America follows this theme by writing that; "The incidence of name-sharing


\(^{3^8}\)Dupaquier, *loc. cit.*
among kin is an index that taps the strength of bonds between relatives."

He stresses that the full permutation of kin that a child could be named after, should be known before any positive naming pattern can emerge. He came to the general conclusion that parents were less likely to name children after kin as the nineteenth-century progressed.

Two other papers on naming processes in the past, one by Harris and the other by Franklin, are more concerned with the structure of naming. They consider that names reflect societal attitudes. The iconography of names will be examined briefly during the course of this section, but its main objective is to see to what extent kin-consciousness is shown through naming patterns.

In order to do this the Christian names were extrapolated of all the members of the reconstitutions used in the preceding sections who bore the same given name as known kin. The result is shown on Table 6.

---


Ibid., p.xv.


Table 6.10: Kin-shared Names in 11 sample parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N.of Recons.</th>
<th>N.of Bapts.</th>
<th>N.of Names Shared with Kin</th>
<th>% of Kin Named Bapts.</th>
<th>Rate of Kin Names per Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main drawback to this method is that in the case of common names it is impossible to ascertain whether the name was given because it was a common name, or specifically for the family member already holding the name. A randomness test was used. This shows that the naming process was unlikely to have been a random process so that it can be tentatively assumed that the common names were after kin rather than a random choice. Table 6.11, which shows the type of relationships to which kin-shared names belonged shows that the system was self perpetuating with the eldest son/daughter being named for the respective parent. Some names were therefore constantly being reproduced.

Table 6.11 shows that in the reconstituted part of the parish almost every family had at least one member named for a relative - with over a quarter of baptismal names held in common with another member of the family. The reconstitutions only cover a proportion of the total population, but the standard error of sample suggests that a maximum of 40% and a minimum of 20% of

*Kolmogorov-Smirnoff Test. For working and explanation see appendix.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.11 Type of Relationship Shown by Kin-Shared Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father's Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldest Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Bl. 24 Br. 21 Ca. 35 G. 27 H. 7 Lm. 15 N. 8 Ta. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 5 Tt. 21 Tota. 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bl. 8 Br. 4 Ca. 5 G. 2 H. 1 Lm. 2 N. 8 Ta. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 2 Tt. 1 Tota. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Bl. 4 Br. 0 Ca. 1 G. 3 H. 0 Lm. 0 N. 1 Ta. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 2 Tt. 1 Tota. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bl. 5 Br. 3 Ca. 4 G. 7 H. 1 Lm. 4 N. 4 Ta. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 0 Tt. 0 Tota. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank U.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Bl. 2 Br. 2 Ca. 3 G. 0 H. 0 Lm. 4 N. 1 Ta. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 0 Tt. 0 Tota. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eldest Dau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Bl. 16 Br. 10 Ca. 23 G. 16 H. 3 Lm. 4 N. 10 Ta. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 3 Tt. 13 Tota. 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Dau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Bl. 7 Br. 2 Ca. 9 G. 2 H. 1 Lm. 0 N. 2 Ta. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 0 Tt. 41 Tota. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Daus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bl. 5 Br. 6 Ca. 4 G. 0 H. 1 Lm. 0 N. 1 Ta. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 0 Tt. 24 Tota. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bl. 6 Br. 1 Ca. 0 G. 2 H. 0 Lm. 3 N. 9 Ta. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 2 Tt. 27 Tota. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank U.K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bl. 1 Br. 1 Ca. 1 G. 2 H. 2 Lm. 2 N. 2 Ta. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 0 Tt. 10 Tota. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Kin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandfather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Bl. 5 Br. 1 Ca. 7 G. 3 H. 0 Lm. 3 N. 1 Ta. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 0 Tt. 26 Tota. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandmother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Bl. 3 Br. 1 Ca. 5 G. 2 H. 0 Lm. 2 N. 2 Ta. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 0 Tt. 17 Tota. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Bl. 12 Br. 4 Ca. 6 G. 8 H. 2 Lm. 0 N. 4 Ta. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 0 Tt. 38 Tota. 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Bl. 9 Br. 2 Ca. 1 G. 6 H. 1 Lm. 0 N. 2 Ta. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 0 Tt. 36 Tota. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great-uncle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Bl. 0 Br. 1 Ca. 2 G. 2 H. 2 Lm. 0 N. 0 Ta. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 0 Tt. 4 Tota. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Kin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandfather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Bl. 0 Br. 1 Ca. 1 G. 1 H. 0 Lm. 1 N. 4 Ta. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 2 Tt. 10 Tota. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandmother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bl. 0 Br. 2 Ca. 0 G. 1 H. 0 Lm. 1 N. 1 Ta. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 3 Tt. 10 Tota. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Bl. 0 Br. 3 Ca. 0 G. 1 H. 0 Lm. 0 N. 0 Ta. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 2 Tt. 6 Tota. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Bl. 5 Br. 2 Ca. 0 G. 0 H. 0 Lm. 0 N. 0 Ta. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 0 Tt. 18 Tota. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead Sib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Bl. 5 Br. 6 Ca. 6 G. 4 H. 1 Lm. 0 N. 1 Ta. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wa. 0 Tt. 34 Tota. 34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Godstone</td>
<td>H. Horne</td>
<td>Lm. Limpsfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln. Lingfield</td>
<td>N. Nutfield</td>
<td>Ta. Tatsfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tf. Titsey</td>
<td>Wa. Warlingham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
individuals in the total population of a parish were likely to be named after kin. Furthermore, Table 6.1 shows that there was a strong bias towards naming after paternal rather than maternal kin, with 415 or 61% of naming for known kin being after paternal kin compared to 268 or 39% for maternal kin. This may be due to an inherent bias in the sources which makes it easier to trace paternal kin who bear the same surname as the person named for them. It is noticeable that the father was more likely to bestow his name on the eldest son whilst the mother’s name was more likely to be spread around the birth order. This may indicate the relative importance of the two sexes in society. The male was concerned that his male heir should be easily identifiable and assured of entrance into society, as well as perpetuating the paternal line by continuing the family name. The female children, who would loose their own surname on marriage were considered not to need this identification.

Naming processes it has been shown, reinforced the model that some parishes had strong kinship boundaries whilst others had a looser kinship structure.

Surnames

The custom of a hereditary identifier added to the given name developed at an early date in England. These names have been studied at depth by for example, Reaney, Redmonds and McKinley. The latter deal with the history, origins, derivations of surnames on a county-to-county basis. This section does not intend to undertake so wide-ranging an investigation as the

\[42\] See for example, M. T. Lofvenberg, Studies in Middle English Local Surnames, 1942, passim.
English Surnames Survey but will look at two aspects of surnames other than their origin and derivation. It proposes to use the names firstly as an additional measurement of the stability of the parish by calculating the turnover of names across two centuries. Secondly, it will look at the distribution of names in relation to administrative and natural boundaries.  

Although the English Surnames Survey uses a variety of sources, this section is limited to parish register entries and the 1851 census returns, backed up by such other eighteenth and nineteenth name lists that have survived for the study area. The baptismal register will be used in preference to the marriage or burial register as empirical evidence suggests that this gives a wider sample of the total population. The registration and census lists will be correlated backwards to the 1664 Hearth Tax Return for Surrey.  

The use of the surnames listed in the parish register was pioneered by Buckatzsch. He summed up his findings in this paper as: "The main conclusion appears in fact to be, simply that throughout the three centuries surveyed, relatively large numbers of families were leaving the parish and being replaced by others with different names."  

---

G. Redmonds, English Surnames, Series 1, Yorkshire West Riding, 1973, passim.  
46 Ibid. 17, p. 66.
This does not mean that there are no names which are peculiar to one locality. McKinley writes that:

"In most English counties, the surnames present up to the nineteenth century retain a distinctly local character, in the sense that the same surnames tend to persist in each county over long periods, and that the effect on the composition of the surnames existing in most counties of the intrusion of surnames which have originated in other regions, and which have been brought in by immigration, is generally slight."  

This can be compared with Redmonds's findings in Yorkshire. He found that whereas in some parishes, for example, Swillington, there was considerable stability of names, in others, two-thirds of the names were new every fifty years.  

Watson, in his work on Cambridgeshire surnames reaches the conclusion that unless the parish had an unusually large population it was the most common names which would remain in the same parish over a long time span.  

This does not mean that the individuals who bore the same surname were related to each other. In surname studies it cannot be assumed that those bearing the same surname are kin - or even have a common ancestor - although in the case of an unambiguous locative name it can be assumed that an ancestor who originated from that place was shared by the holders of the name. General statements on the nature of kinship links in an area cannot be derived from surname evidence. Especially as in England, surnames are derived from the

46 Ibid., 17, p.66.
47 Mackinley, op.cit., p.441.
Table 6.1\textsuperscript{a} Length of Time that Surnames in the 1851\textsuperscript{b} had been in same Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>14*</th>
<th>-20</th>
<th>years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Based on 1813 Militia List.

\textsuperscript{b} S.R.O. 2727/1/48/91, Blechingley Parish Records, Militia List, 1813.
male descent line with the woman taking the man's name on marriage and the children bearing the father's name rather than the mother's. This means that names can disappear from the sources, although the holders of them — i.e. women — were still in the parish. Notwithstanding these constraints, names can give an estimate of the temporal turnover of individuals and family units in a parish.

In order to look at this turnover as illustrated by the surnames in the study area, the baptismal registers for ten sample parishes have been correlated to the 1664 Hearth Tax and the 1851 census. This forms a datum line for measuring how long the names had been in the parish which is shown on Table 6.12.

This table shows a clear trend for the smaller downland parishes of Caterham, Tatsfield, Titsey and Warlingham to have a low stability and high turnover of names — especially in the case of the last three parishes where 90% of the names had been in the parish for under 20 years. The three greensand parishes of Blechingley, Limpsfield and Nutfield show a high stability and low turnover of names. The high proportion of names that had been in the parish of Limpsfield for at least 60 years is interesting, in view of the fact that an earlier section of this chapter showed that this parish had multiple horizontal kinship links but few vertical links. It can be inferred, therefore, that there were no traceable kinship links between the 53% of names that had been in the parish for over forty years in 1851.

At this point Watson's hypothesis that it was the most common names that survived should be considered.

50 Watson, loc.cit, p. 31.
It is possible that in a parish with a small population there were insufficient holders of any one name to ensure its survival. A comparison of the most common names in 1750 was made with those surviving through until 1851. The result is shown on Table 6.13.

Table 6.13 Comparison of the proportion of common names (4+) surviving to 1851 with non-common names.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Common Names</th>
<th>Non-Common Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that in the study area it was not the most common names which were likely to survive but those held by a few.

The final task in this analysis of the stability of surnames was to estimate a decadal rate of turnover for names. This was done by dividing the timespan 1750-1830 into twenty year periods. (A twenty year period in the baptismal register means that those in the first period were likely to have passed out of the child-bearing phase by second period.) The names in each twenty year period were divided into the following categories — those names which appeared in both periods, for example, in both the 1750s and the 1770s; names which occurred in the first period but had disappeared in the second; and names which appeared in the second period but not the first — 'new' names. The rate of turnover therefore was the new names plus the lost names expressed as a percentage of all names. This is shown as a decadal average on Table 6.14.
Table 6.14 Average Decadal Proportional Turnover of Surnames in 10 Sample Parishes 1750-1830.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>1750-1769</th>
<th>1770-1789</th>
<th>1790-1809</th>
<th>1810-1829</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows a remarkable conformity of 40% turnover of names per decade in all parishes. It can be seen that the smaller the parish the higher the decadal turnover. This is in direct contradiction of Redmonds's analysis of names in West Yorkshire as he suggests that the smaller the community the greater the stability of family names. 51

The difference between Redmonds's sample parishes and those small parishes in the study area was in geographical position. Redmonds's parishes were isolated away from large centres of population and often physically separated from other communities by large tracts of moorland. The small parishes in the study area were close to large centres of population with good communication routes to the outside world.

The importance of communications on the rate of turnover is also demonstrated at Godstone which in 1851 had a far higher proportion of 'new' names than its greensand neighbours of Blechingley, Limpsfield and Nutfield. It was shown in Chapters 4 and 5 that Godstone was at the centre of the area's communications network.

51 Redmonds, op.cit., p.263.
To sum up this sub-section on the rate of turnover and stability in parishes as measured by names, it can be seen that in 1851 in some parishes a high proportion of the names had been present in that parish for at least a century. In Blechingley, Nutfield and Horne in particular nearly a quarter of the names in the 1851 census were present in those parishes for over a hundred years. These parishes form an inter-locking block in the west of the area, but have varying economic backgrounds so that it is likely that although they share a tradition of surname stability. It is also probable that these are different names. The next sub-section will see what proportion of names were shared between different parishes.

Surname Distribution

This sub-section continues the main theme of this work - boundaries. Its objective is to examine the distribution of surnames in relation to administrative and natural boundaries.

It was Guppy's work in the late nineteenth century which drew attention to the fact that were some surnames which were peculiar to one county. Redmonds's analysis of the surnames of the West Riding confirmed Guppy's findings. Redmonds found that even when a parish lay close to the county border it was rare for surnames to be shared across that border. Thus in 1851 at Bolton by Bowland, although there were 83 names which were new to the parish since 1812, only 21 of these came from Lancashire, which was closer to Bolton than its Yorkshire hinterland. All the new names were traceable to a five mile radius of origin. In his conclusion, however, Redmonds writes that: "County boundaries were not barriers and the normal turnover of
village population brought many names into the West Riding which originated in neighbouring counties."  

Neither his evidence, nor McKinley’s work entirely support this statement. McKinley drew the general conclusion from his analysis of Lancashire surnames that names tended to persist in one county over a long period of time. But he added the proviso that the sources predispose the results towards a county bias. In the main he reiterates the conclusion that a marked feature of English surnames is that they remain in the county of their origin.

These authors suggest that there is a strong tendency for surnames to be confined by the county boundary, but to extend over the parish border. It is indeed, unreasonable to expect given the population expansion of the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries that surnames would be limited by the parish. It has to be considered whether the number of surnames is finite, so that they become spread ever more thinly as the population increase. Or whether new names emerge to match the growth in population. It is improbable that surnames were exclusive to one parish in the nineteenth century, but in order to test this assumption, the parish boundary will be the starting point for this sub-section. The source used for this will be the 1851 census.

Table 6.15 shows the proportion of surnames which were unique to one parish in the study area. (This does not
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52 H.G. Guppy, Homes of the Family Names in Great Britain, 1968 repr., passim.
Redmonds, op.cit., p. 262.
53 McKinley, op.cit., p. 441.
preclude sharing with parishes outside the area).

Table 6.15: Rank Order of the Proportion of Surnames Unique to One Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N. of Names</th>
<th>N. Unique</th>
<th>% Unique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Limpshfield</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.Grinstead</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that Blechingley has the highest proportion of unique surnames. Although this parish does not have the highest population. (This might explain the number of unique names. More population could equal more names). As both Godstone and East Grinstead had larger populations in 1851. These parishes lie on the main London-Lewes road which has already been shown to be an important channel of population movement. These two parishes could have a more mobile population with a greater variety of names. This is only true to a certain extent as the essential factor in determining what proportion of names were unique to one parish was not the number of incomers, but the characteristics of the newcomers. An analysis of the unique names at Blechingley shows them to be unique because not only were they held by incomers, but the incomers were new to the district (born outside the area), so possessed no relatives with the same surname living nearby. The incomers to the
other parishes were more likely to have local names which were shared across the parish boundaries.

Blechingley was, however, unusual in having a large number of unique surnames. Most surnames were shared across two or more parishes. Map 6.4 gives the trends shown by the distribution of shared surnames, using a cut-off point of 35% sharing between two parishes.

This map reinforces the pivotal position of Godstone. All the parishes share a high proportion of names with that parish. It can be seen that surnames were shared along the greensand ridge on an east-west axis with radial lines northwards onto the downs, and south to the Weald. The county boundary was of relatively little importance to the pattern of shared surnames. 51% of shared names crossed the county border. 30% of these cross-county surnames were found in all three counties, but these include the ubiquitous names of Smith, Brown, and Wood. 48% of the cross-county names were shared between Kent and Surrey, with 20% shared between Surrey and Sussex. Only 3% were found both in Kent and Sussex. This reinforces the east-west bias of the distribution pattern. It also suggests that Sussex surnames were more likely to be shared with the Sussex hinterland to the south of the Sussex parishes being used in this study.

A breakdown of the origins of names peculiar to one county shows that these were likely to be locative - in a descriptive sense - usually referring to a topographical feature rather than a place. This is perhaps an indication of their extreme localness. Cross-county names show two trends - those names shared across the Kent-Surrey border tended to be locative in the sense of being place-names, whilst names shared
across the Surrey/Sussex border were more likely to be occupational. These differences raise several important questions. Firstly, are the names shared because they have spread or because they are part of a parallel evolutionary process? Secondly, if they are shared through diffusion when did this take place and in which direction? Earlier in this chapter it was suggested that a shared surname did not indicate shared relationship, but if the name was an unambiguous place-name it could indicate an ancestor that had originated from the same location. There are 13 such names shared between Kent and Surrey. All but four of these represent long distance movement, for example, Ireland and Galloway. Two of the remaining four are traceable to places in Sussex, with one each from Kent and Surrey. In the case of the latter the holder of the name was born in Surrey but living in Kent. He almost certainly had relatives still living in Surrey in 1851, so represents both short distance and recent mobility.

Names which are common in both Surrey and Sussex include one which Reaney attributes to a Surrey place-name origin, Bristow which is presumed to originate from Burstow in Surrey. One more, Apps, appears in early sources for Surrey, whilst Bish/Bysh, Feldwick, Jupp, Penfold and Steer all have early references in Sussex sources. One of the most 'typical' Surrey names, Killick has no provenance in Reaney. One might hazard a guess to this name being of ancient origin as Reaney gives an instance of Kill (Cille) being found in Domesday, so that it is possible that the name was once Killwick (i.e. an inhabitant of Cille's dwelling).

Other names common in Surrey in 1851 suggest origins from outside the county. Bashford, for instance, could be
connected to Ashford in Kent, whilst Cole and Dartnell have early references in Kent. Similarly, Coppard and Dungate both fairly common in Surrey in 1851 originated in Sussex, as does Sale or Sales, which by 1851 was common in Surrey and Kent but rare in Sussex.

The main Kent-Surrey route in this area runs along the greensand ridge. The last test of surname distribution is to see to what extent surnames crossed pays borders. An analysis of the shared surnames in 1851 shows that 26% were exclusive to one pays. Of these 90% were greensand-only names. These names, 120 in all, were cross-referenced to the marriage registers for the area. These showed that 41 of the names had at one time been found in Downland or Wealden parishes. This leaves a net of 79 names wholly exclusive to the greensand, compared to 2 on the Downs and 4 in the Weald. The greensand names were further cross-referenced to the 1664 Hearth Tax. This showed that 5% of the names were on the greensand at that date. The marriage registers show that a further 29% had been on the greensand for at least 100 years, whilst 68% had been there for over 50 years. This means that over half the greensand-exclusive names were well established in that pays by 1851. Most of the names which could be traced back to 1664 were derived from names or nicknames, usually the more unusual names such as Lawrence or Osborne.

When the findings in this section are related to those in the earlier section on surname turnover it can be
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55 Meekings, loc.cit., passim.
seen that the greensand not only had the highest proportion of unique names but it also had the lowest turnover of surnames per decade – despite its position at the centre of the communications network for the area. This section also shows that although a parish might have a large influx of newcomers it was the character of the newcomers that determined the extent of surname boundaries. If the newcomer came from outside the area the surname horizon was likely to be limited within the parish, whereas if the newcomers were local, bearing local surnames, the surname horizons were likely to spread over several parishes.

Conclusion

This chapter on the landscape of kinship and names was concerned to look at three types of boundaries – those formed by kin, administrative requirements and natural boundaries. It was found that kinship networks were likely to follow the patterns of spatial inter-action shown in the earlier chapters of this work. Being confined mainly to blocks of adjoining parishes which crossed pays but not county boundaries. However, the trends shown by kinship boundaries reinforced the general trends shown in Chapter 5 as although kinship networks were spatially confined there was a strong linkage to Croydon where many families in the study area had kin and business links. A further measurement on the strength of kinship boundaries was taken by using given-naming practices as a surrogate. These showed that across the whole area most families had a least one member bearing the same given name as a relative, on the Weald this rose to at least 2 per family. It was also seen that the eldest son was usually given the father’s name so that the system was self-perpetuating.
This analysis of the social boundaries formed by kinship has to be related to the overall objective of this work. It shows that kinship as well as naming practices emphasise the essential uniqueness of each parish but at the same time reinforce the spatial patterns shown in Chapter 5. They demonstrate that there were areas of intense kinship activity which were contained within a looser mesh of relationships that extended across a wider more regional area. The next chapter will extend the analysis on the effect of social boundaries on the formation of local identity to discuss the role of social-structure and religion on this.
CHAPTER 7
THE LANDSCAPE OF COMMON INTEREST

Introduction

This chapter looks at social boundaries, which although invisible, nevertheless existed in eighteenth and nineteenth century communities. The first of these boundaries was inherent in a hierarchial society where an unequal division of resources meant that various socio-economic groups lived in an uneasy alliance of blocks. The second boundary is one formed by religious affiliation, which could cut across social and spatial boundaries to form new alignments. Both socio-economic and religious groups were bound together in communities of common interest, a term which Adam Smith used in The Wealth of Nations to describe the socio-economic divisions of society. By 1824 the word 'class' was applied to these divisions, whilst ten years later J.S. Mill had divided society into three classes - landlords, capitalists and labourers.¹

This tripartite division is expanded by Newby. He defines the divisions as land-owner, capitalist farmer and labourer.² These definitions are a much over-simplified view of eighteenth-century village society. They exclude agricultural craftsmen and tradesmen, as well as non-agricultural occupations. The structure of society in the study area will be

¹R.S. Neale, ed., History and Class, 1983, p.3.
discussed briefly at the beginning of the next section. This chapter is mainly concerned to measure the strength of the boundaries set up by socio-economic and religious groups.

In order to do this, marriage patterns will be used as an indication of the exclusivity and strength of the various social groups. Houston points out in his definitive paper on occupational endogamy as seen through marriage: "Of the available indices of social inter-action, the choice of marriage partner is considered by sociologists to be an excellent indication of perceived social standing." He continues by suggesting that in "social terms, equality of parentage was felt to be a highly desirable precondition of marriage. Whom one married was, therefore, governed by the social structure of the community, which Macfarlane describes as "frozen into three or four endogamous blocks."

Equal status or interest whilst being desirable, did not preclude marriage taking place between those of different socio-economic or religious groups. These negative assortive marriages are valuable indicators of the strength of the common interest group in regulating the perceived standing of its members. It should be noted that marriage can also be a way of maximising life-chances. For example, in order to keep up his accustomed life-style, the penurious younger son of the gentry might well marry the daughter of a wealthy
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tradesman. In these cases, Macfarlane suggests, only the individual was socially mobile, whilst the family remained static. Religious 'out' marriage, on the other hand, could often result in ostracism, with the withdrawal of religious benefits, thus making the decision to marry into another group an ideological decision.

On the whole, it has been found that negative assortive mating was relatively rare in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Houston concluded that there was little overlap of marriage between socio-economic groups, indeed brides often married men from the same occupation as their father. Similarly, Crozier found total socio-economic endogamy in her study of middle-class marriage patterns in North London.5

There were, however, some notable differences in spatial behaviour between the different socio-economic groups. Both Houston and Crozier found that the higher the socio-economic group the greater the distance between the residence of bride and groom. This was caused by a lack of suitable partners locally, plus a greater opportunity for searching further afield for a potential mate. The absence of suitable partners might also force members of minority religious groups to go outside the home area for a mate. This means that a high degree of spatial exogamy is to be expected both in minority groups and the wealthier section of society.

Anderson, suggests in his paper on Victorian Marriage

5 Houston, loc. cit., p. 225.

Patterns that there might be a socio-economic differential in the age at first marriage or the rate of never married adults. He writes that middle-class marriage was late with a high proportion of never-married adults, whilst the proletariat were likely to have a low marriage age and low proportion of never-married adults. Conversely, craftsmen were likely to have outside constraints placed on early marriage by the requirements of their apprenticeship and the capital required in setting up a business.⁶

Age and spatial differences between the socio-economic groups will be examined briefly in a succeeding section of this chapter. Its main objective is to measure the strength of the boundaries set up by social or religious groups. In connection with this it will also look at occupational and religious dynasties, as well as the marriage patterns of a local power-base - the parochial administration. It will start by a short discussion of the problems presented by the sources when looking at the socio-economic hierarchy as shown through occupations.
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⁶M. Anderson, 'Marriage Patterns in Victorian Britain: An analysis based on registration district data,' *Journal of Family History*, 1, 1976, pp. 55-78, passim.
Sources and Methodology

The main source which will be used in this chapter is the marriage register. There is a problem in using parish registration for occupational data, as occupations were not always listed in the register. This is especially true in the study area, where it is rare for occupations to be listed in the marriage registers until Civil Registration was introduced in 1837. Unfortunately, once civil registration was set up, parish registration became increasingly unreliable. As access to the Civil Register is both restricted and expensive, the parish register remains the major source for marriage patterns on a local level. However, Benson and Wall suggest that: "ecclesiastical registration is more comprehensive in respect of marriages than it is for either births or deaths." 7

A further problem is that the 1837 Civil Registration Act made it possible for the nonconformists to be married in licensed chapels, thus removing evidence of their marriages from the Anglican registers. In the study area, the survival of the nonconformist registers is extremely low, making it virtually impossible to reconstruct their marriage patterns after 1837. Where possible other source material has been used, with cross-referencing to the 1841 and 1851 censuses. In sum the results amount to a sample of the socio-economic and minority religious groups of the area. Another problem arises with the choice of methodology. Is it

valid to compare the groom's occupation with that of the bride's father, when they are at different stages of their life and occupational cycles? If the groom's father's occupation is compared with that of the bride's father can it be certain that the groom will realise the same occupation as his father. An example of this might be a farmer's son working as a farm servant until he could take over the family holding, but whether he would do this would depend on his position in the birth-order - a younger son might remain an agricultural labourer all his life. Generally, each case where the son's socio-economic grouping differs from that of the father has been considered on its own merits by consulting trade directories etc. to see whether the son eventually entered the same occupation as the father. It is thus, by utilising such material as is available, that some tentative conclusions have been drawn on the nature of the boundaries formed by common interest groups in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The analysis will be preceded by a short discussion on the social structure of the parishes in the study area.

Social Structure

The parishes which made up the study area did not exist in isolation from the rest of England. It might be worthwhile considering some generalisations on the social structure of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, to see whether they can be applied to the study area. Newby's tripartite division of eighteenth century rural society has already been mentioned, with the observation that this may be an over-simplification as it makes certain assumptions that cannot be applied
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8Newby, op. cit., p. 12.
universally. Dominant landowners, for example, which make up the first division were not found in every parish. Some parishes had no resident landlord or squirearchy of any description. This was especially true in the old enclosed counties of Surrey and Kent. It meant that the yeomen and craftsmen rose to a social eminence locally, which they might not have achieved had there been a dominant landowner present in the vicinity. This was the situation in many of the parishes in the study, except for the eastern-most parishes in Surrey such as Titsey, Tatsfield, and Limpsfield where the Gresham/Leveson-Gower family held sway. The top part of society was by no means united, for instance, the Evelyns of Felbridge entered into litigation against the Kenricks of Blechingley in the eighteenth-century over the formation of a new borough at Blindley Heath.\footnote{U. Lambert, Gods t  one, 1929, p. 293.}

In the study area, yeomen are roughly equated to Newby's second division 'capitalist farmers'.\footnote{Newby, op.cit., p. 12.} It is true that in some parishes farmers consolidated their holdings, whilst some craftsmen built up large and profitable concerns, but in many parishes the holdings and profits were modest with little evidence of capital accumulation. Lack of capital was the overwhelming concern of the yeoman-farmer, John Clement of Nutfield.\footnote{S.R.O. 3140, Clement Papers, Diary of John Clement, for example see entry for June 14, 1759.} It can be assumed that the farmers of the Weald, trying to scratch a living from a few water-logged acres, were also crippled by lack of capital. Similarly, craftsmen can be divided into high
and low capital ventures. Some crafts and trades involved lengthy training with substantial capital outlay on premises and material - wheelwrights, blacksmiths and millers would come into this group. Tradesmen can be further divided into masters and men, with some industries dominated by the latter - bricklayers, plumbers or plasterers, for example, were invariably proletarians working by contract or piece. They had skill but used the capital of others to practice it. A further group were self-employed in occupations that needed only a low injection of capital to buy materials. These might include brush/broom makers, hoop-shavers, chair-bottomers, or sweeps. Socially these were probably on the same level as the labourer or farm servants. The aristocracy of the farm workers were the agricultural specialists, for example, carters, shepherds or herdsmen (all it will be noted, connected with livestock).

There was also another group, who although they lived in the parish were not necessarily part of the community. The domestic servants in the houses of the wealthy were, as the 1851 census shows, often born away from the area they worked in. Spatially removed from village life, isolated in the 'big house', they formed a sub-culture of their own. It can be seen, therefore, that behind Newby's tri-partite division of society lay many shades and gradations.

Newby further suggests that during the early years of the nineteenth-century the tensions of the labour market coupled with increasing prices widened the gap between the divisions of society, which culminated in the Swing riots of the 1830s. This was followed by a period of calm, during which the 'ideal' village was formed. Comprised of a "benevolent squirearchy,
children. Clement also hired a beggar woman for casual weeding and haying. The relationship between Clement and his work people seems to have been a purely business arrangement, with only one servant - a female domestic - staying with him for more than one year. However, the same harvesters were hired every year, although it is not clear how they supported themselves for the rest of the year - this was obviously none of Clement's concern.

Clement described himself as a yeoman rather than a farmer. His holding was a mixture of freehold and customary land. In neighbouring Blechingley an eighteenth-century church bell subscription list shows that farmers outnumbered "yeomen" by 2:1. Although this list, which dates from 1779, is top-heavy, as only the wealthy could afford to subscribe, it shows the extent of the upper socio-economic group in the parish, with 26% of the subscribers being described and gentlemen or gentry. The other subscribers include 3 publicans, 2 shopkeepers, but only one blacksmith - agricultural tradesmen being singularly absent from the list.

A militia list of 1813 for the same parish helps to expand the picture as this includes agricultural labourers and servants. This is analysed in Table 7.1.
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15 S.R.O. 6/12/1843/5, Blechingley Parish Subscription List for Church Bells, 1779.
Unlike the subscription list the militia list excludes the most wealthy section of society. Although there is a hint of their presence in the high proportion of 'servants', but it is not totally clear from the list whether these were all male domestics, or whether the term servant included farm servants. The list confirms the findings in the last chapter that Blechingley was a parish with a relatively low labouring population. But it presents a pyramidal shape for society in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with a broad base consisting of six layers with professional/gentry at the top and the labouring population at the bottom.

One section of society that is omitted from the scheme - which it should be noted is based on male occupations, are the poor. Their existence is known from the eighteenth and early-nineteenth century poor rate books. The social structure of a parish can be further assessed by using the rate-books to look at the ratio of recipients to rate payers.

This has been done for the parish of Nutfield. In 1797 the Poor Rate was collected from 41 rate-payers,

\[16\] S.R.O. 2727/1/48/91, Blechingley Parish Militia List, 1813.

\[17\] S.R.O. P26/8/3, Nutfield Parish Records, Churchwarden and Overseers of the Poor, Account and Rate Books, 1774-1844.
whilst the highest number of recipients, in September of that year was 33, a ratio of 1.2 rate-payers to poor. This ratio remains remarkably constant across the early-nineteenth century. In 1830 the rate book shows 46 rate-payers to 32 'poor', a ratio of 1.4 rate-payers to poor. Does this relatively high ratio of rate-payers to poor indicate that the parish was affluent? In order to arrive at a hierarchical rating of wealth for the parishes a series of Electoral Rolls dating from 1835 have been used, as the proportion of householders entitled to vote will give some indication of the relative wealth of each parish. Table 7.2 shows the ranking of the proportion of householders entitled to vote (the number of households being taken from the 1831 census). It also shows the proportion of those entitled to vote who did not live in the parish, as well as the type of holding which gave the franchise.

Table 7.2 Rank Order of the Proportion of Householders on Electoral Rolls dated 1835 for S.E. Surrey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N. on Roll</th>
<th>% Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limpfield</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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S.R.O. 38/1/1-17, Early Nineteenth Century Electoral Material.
Table 7.2 continued, Rank Order of Absentee Householders as Shown in Late Eighteenth Century Electoral Material for S.E. Surrey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Absentee</th>
<th>Proportion of Voters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2 Types of Holding on which the Franchise was Based from Late Eighteenth Century Electoral Material in S.E.Surrey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freehold of £50</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rental</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Blech.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Limps.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These tables show that although Blechingley and Nutfield seemed to be relatively affluent, they did not have the highest proportion of householders entitled to vote. As entitlement to vote was based on an annual freehold value of fifty pounds, or a rental of ten pounds per annum this suggests that the rate payers in these parishes were very modest men, with a small
division between them and the poor. But a wider division existed between the modest men and poor and the wealthy. Society, on these terms was divided into two - the rich who were entitled to vote and the rest who were not.

The electoral lists should be considered in relation to the 1834 Poor Law Report Appendix B1 (Part II) which comprises the answers to the rural questionnaire. Limpsfield, which had the highest proportion of enfranchised householders, reports almost full employment, with a falling poor rate, and labourers housed in good cottages with large gardens. This would seem to confirm Limpsfield's status as a wealthy parish with an equal allocation of resources and little division between the socio-economic groups. When it is realised how this state of affairs was bought about the picture changes. 25% of the labour force were described as non-parishioners 'lodging' in the parish - i.e. they were not chargeable to the Limpsfield poor rate. This ties in with other patterns of behaviour in the parish, with a large number of floating events in the parish register implying little permanent settlement. The Poor Law Report implies that the principal land-owner and the parochial clergyman were manipulating Poor Law Regulations in their favour, by preventing settlement of any who might become chargeable to the parish and a social nuisance.

Many of the non-parishioners in Limpsfield probably

19 British Parliamentary Papers, Report from His Majesty's Commissioners on the Administration and Practical Operation of the Poor Laws, Appendix, (Bl), Part II, Answers to Rural Queries with Indices, 1834, p. 483b.

20 Ibid.
came from Crowhurst, which was labouring under a considerable burden of rates paid to out-parishioners.\textsuperscript{21} Ironically, this very small parish had the second highest proportion of enfranchised householders, due to a disproportionate number of gentlemens' houses, with a lack of labourers' cottages forcing the labouring population to move away.

The deeper into the Weald one moves the more it becomes obvious from the Poor Law Report that the plight of the disadvantaged was significantly worse there than elsewhere in the area. It also becomes obvious that social groups which were divided elsewhere, were fused together on the Weald by shared poverty. In Lingfield, for instance, recent enclosure had exacerbated the problem. It was reported that farmers and poor law officers were at odds with each other with the farmers set to become paupers themselves.\textsuperscript{22} A state of affairs which was repeated again and again in this section of the Weald. On the Weald, therefore, poverty bound farmers and men together, whilst on the more affluent Downs the gap between them widened to culminate in a series of pre-Swing incidents in the Caterham area followed by Swing incidents at Limpsfield and Oxted.\textsuperscript{23} No Swing incidents were reported from the Wealden portion of the study area. One is tempted to attribute this to the homogenous nature of the relationship between farmers and labourers in this area, with both groups

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21}British Parliamentary Papers, Report from His Majesty's Commissioners on the Adminstration and Practical Operation of the Poor Laws, Appendix A, 1834, p. 464/174a.
\item \textsuperscript{22}Ibid., 22, p.465/175a.
\item \textsuperscript{23}Newby, op.cit., p. 40.
\end{itemize}

crippled by intense poverty.

Out of the misery and tensions of the 1830s grew the 'ideal' village. If this ideal existed in reality it should be evident in the 1841/51 census data. The occupational data for a sample of parishes has been divided into socio-economic groups, which are shown on Tables 7.3 and 7.4.
Table 7.3 1841 Census Socio-Economic Groupings for a Sample of Parishes, Taken from the 1841 Census Return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Burstow</th>
<th>Caterham</th>
<th>Horne</th>
<th>Limpsfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ag.Lab/F.S.</strong></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gen.Lab.</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmer</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<em>High Cap.<em>18</em></em></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Cap.</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gent./Prof.</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misc.</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4 1851 Census Socio-Economic Groupings for a Sample of Parishes, Taken from the 1851 Census Return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Burstow</th>
<th>Caterham</th>
<th>Horne</th>
<th>Limpsfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ag.Lab/F.S.</strong></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gen.Lab.</strong></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmer</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Cap.</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Cap.</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gent./Prof.</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fem.Domestic</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Dom.</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misc.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4 1851 Census Socio-Economic Groupings for a Sample of Parishes, Taken from the 1851 Census Return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Burstow</th>
<th>Caterham</th>
<th>Horne</th>
<th>Limpsfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ag.Lab/F.S.</strong></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gen.Lab.</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmer</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Cap.</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Cap.</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gent./Prof.</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fem.Domestic</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Dom.</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misc.</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* High Capital Outlay includes trades such as wheelwrights; saddlers etc.
Low Capital Outlay includes basket-makers, broom-makers, hoop-shavers etc.

Misc. includes Gamekeepers, Plate-Layers, Police.

In general, these tables reinforce the picture of the pyramidal structure of society, with a broad base of labouring poor at the bottom and an apex of wealthy gentlemen at the top. Although the top level of society is notably absent from the study area.

The socio-economic structure of the parishes in 1851 can be summed up as - the economy, apart from a few parishes, was based on agriculture and its ancillary industries, but with an increasing number of workers employed on the railways and Fullers Earth Pits. The social structure can be divided into six layers with the gentry/professional group at the top, and labouring poor at the bottom. There were fine variations between the position of the groups in the pyramid which depended on the location of the parish. In the Weald, where the farmers shared the labourers' hardships, the farmers were closer socially to the labourers than the high capital tradesmen and gentry. On the Downs and greensand, however, the gap between the farmers and men was wider. Conversely, the higher proportion of gentlemen in these areas meant that the less well-off farmers had less social potential than on the Weald. Although it is probable that many of the gentry and professional men were not full-time residents in the area, or strictly speaking, part of the community. This meant that the wealthier farmers and high capital tradesmen could become the social leaders of the village, whilst still deferring to the gentry or middle-class in theory if not practice. Whether there was any inter-mingling of these different socio-economic groups will now be discussed.
Marriage and Socio-Economic Interest

This section aims to look at the incidence of cross-marriages between the different socio-economic or common interest groups. The groups are defined by the terms used to divide the occupational data from the census into socio-economic blocks. A sample of 8 parishes has been used, amounting to 314 marriages in total.

The analysis of this sample shows that of the 314 marriages, 267 or 85% were between partners from the same socio-economic group which suggests strong boundaries between common-interest groups. Those marriages which crossed socio-economic divides were, except for one example, between labourers or labourers daughters and crafts/tradesmen or farmers and their daughters. Most upwards social mobility tended to be female, i.e. girls marrying a groom from a higher socio-economic group than their father. As social status was vested in the man’s occupation these girls were maximising their life chances.

One marriage broke through the barrier between gentlemen and the rest. This was between Jane Clement, a farmer’s daughter of Nutfield and William Casterton a gentleman from London. It can be inferred from this, that a real step-up the social ladder was achieved when a labourer’s daughter married a farmer, as there was potential for her descendants to rise even higher on the social scale. There are three such marriages in the sample, two on the Weald, and one from Nutfield on the greensand. The preceding section on the social structure of the area showed that in the Weald there was little difference in social standing between farmer
and labourer. Therefore, this leaves one marriage out of 314 which maximised all life-chances for the socially mobile partner.

There was no discernible difference in behaviour in the three counties - but the greensand had a mean of 8 negative assortive marriages, compared to 5 on the Weald and 2 on the Downs. On the greensand there were however, more potential partners to be found amongst crafts and tradesmen. The downland shows the most rigid social divisions. By 1851 these were exacerbated by the development of commuter villas in the area, as well as a change from labour-intensive arable farming to low labour intensive sheep-husbandry. This change is reflected at Warlingham where in 1841 54% of the labour force was in agriculture, this fell to 33% in 1851, whilst non-agricultural labour rose from 2 to 13%.

The high incidence of positive assortive mating in the sample parishes shows that the boundaries between the social groups were rigid in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. Another social boundary was formed by occupation. In the more distant past, craft guilds and trading companies regulated the marriages of their members by placing restrictions on the marriages of apprentices etc. These guilds and companies also provided a social context for their members. A reconstruction of the trading community of Kingston-upon-Thames in the early seventeenth and eighteenth centuries shows that marriages tended to take place between families from the same company if not the same occupation. Evidence from the nineteenth century shows that a similar situation existed in the

countryside with marriages between those in the same occupation producing 'dynasties' of farmers or craftsmen with county-wide ramifications.25

A cross-occupational analysis of the 314 marriages in the sample showed that excluding the labourers’ marriages only 14 or 4% were between brides whose fathers were in the same occupation as the groom. One of these marriages was between milling families, with another between drapers, but the rest were between farming families. This agrees with Everitt’s findings for late-nineteenth century Kent, where he managed to reconstruct some considerable farming dynasties which were both wide-spread and long-lived.26 In the study area, nine of the marriages between farming families plugged into a network of at least 29 other farming families who were related by blood or marriage. This network extended over eleven parishes, three of which were in Kent. It also had several connections in London. An analysis of the constituent parts shows that most of its members came from old-established yeoman stock, who had been in the area for many generations. They also represented the wealthier end of the farming scene, and it was from this group that the marriage into the next level of society was made.

It is equally possible that similar ‘dynasties’ of labouring families existed. In order to look at this possibility, a random sample of 12 labourers’ marriages has been taken from the same parishes as the farming dynasties. None of the labourers marriages could be proved to be related to each other in the same way as

26 Ibid., p. 320.
in labouring families. But there is some circumstantial evidence that dynamic networks of labouring families did exist. One such group from the sample included ten families spread across the neighbouring parishes of Limpsfield and Lingfield. This is shown on Figure 7.1. Another group consisted of seven families in Lingfield. In this first group there is evidence for the Cockerells daily marrying into the Cooper family at two different rates of time, as well as both Cockerells and Cooper

![Tentative Links Between Labourers' Families]

- Cockerell (Ln.)
- Cooper (Ln.)
- Lock (Ln.)
- Chandler (Ln.)
- Cooper (Ln.)
- Hollands (Ln.)
- Baker (Ln.)
- Lathom (Ln.)
- Payne (Ln.)
- Wickenden (Ln.)
- Ledger (Ln.)
- Clack (Ln.)
- Groombridge (Ln.)

H = Limpsfield
L = Lingfield

In order to look at social boundaries set up by office holding families, one parochial office has been noted as an example of that of churchwardens. (This unfortunately excludes non-conformists who might serve as ecclesiastical officials in the parishes, as well as labourers who often held the more physical posts as constable or pound-keeper). Four parishes have been used as an example for this exercise. Blechington and Limpsfield on the green sand, Caterham on the Downe and
the farming families - but there is some circumstantial evidence that dynastic networks of labouring families did exist. One such group from the sample included ten families spread across the neighbouring parishes of Limpsfield and Lingfield. This is shown on Figure 7.1. Another group consisted of seven families in Lingfield. In the first group there is evidence for the Cockerell family marrying into the Cooper family at two different points of time, as well as both Cockerells and Coopers marrying into the Lock family. The labouring networks tended to be more spatially limited than the farming dynasties, and there is no evidence that the networks transcended social boundaries.

Another social boundary was formed by those in authority in the parish - such as Poor Law Overseers, or churchwardens. Everitt described the habitual holders of parochial offices as 'core' or 'focal' families. He found at Gilmorton, Leics. that 5 related families held the office of churchwarden for 250 years. Similarly, in an urban context, it was found at Kingston-upon-Thames that some families monopolised borough and company offices in the seventeenth century. In order to look at social boundaries set up by office holding families one parochial office has been taken as an example - that of churchwarden. (This unfortunately excludes nonconformists who might serve in non-ecclesiastical offices in the parishes, as well as labourers who often held the more physical posts such as constable or pound-keeper). Four parishes have been used as sample for this exercise. Blechingley and Nutfield on the greensand, Caterham on the Downs and

---

27 Everitt, Landscape, op.cit., p.312.
Lord, loc.cit.
Burs tow in the Weald. Unfortunately the churchwarden lists for these parishes cover different lengths of time so that in the following table the actual number of families involved as churchwardens is given on the left whilst the right hand figure represents an adjustment as if the rate had continued unchanged over 100 years.

Table 7.5 N. of Families Holding the Office of Churchwarden in a Sample of 4 Parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Blechingley 1750-1850</th>
<th>Burstow 1820-1840</th>
<th>Caterham 1770-86</th>
<th>Nutfield 1774-1844</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1770-86</td>
<td>1743-1835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803-1835</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774-1844</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Column 1 = Actual N. of families.
   Column 2 = N. of families if rate had remained constant for 100 years.

This table shows that Nutfield was the parish with the strongest core of families. Of the 16 families which held the office of churchwarden over seventy years, six had more than one member serving in the office. A similar situation existed at Blechingley where 10 families had more than one member serving. This can be compared to one family each at Burstow and Caterham. At Burstow there was a great variety of office-holders, but at Caterham the same men served for many years at a time. By the 1830s in Caterham this office had been taken out of the hands of the villagers to become the prerogative of the wealthier section of the community. A similar trend can be seen at Blechingley in the 1840s when ‘new names’ appear in the lists.

In so far as inter-relatedness is concerned, 22 or 52% of the churchwarden families at Blechingley were related by marriage. In Burstow there were three
related groups, one of 12 families, another of 3, and the last of 2. At Caterham, however, only one marriage took place between churchwarden families, although at Nutfield 12 or 75% of the churchwarden families were related in some way. The connections do not stop there – as all the 'core' families at Blechingley, Burstow and Nutfield, except the two small groups at Burstow, were connected to each other by blood or marriage in a vast complex of 35 office-holding families. This is shown of Figure 7.2. The main connecting links were the Cuckseys, Hales, Roses and Russells. A non-office holding family, the Jewells of Nutfield acted as a link between Nutfield and Blechingley. The Jewells were an old-established yeoman family, which had by the eighteenth century died out in the male line (hence the lack of church wardens).

The church-warden hegemony was mostly farming families. The Cuckseys, Dodds, Russells, Hales, Clements, Kelseys, Aynscombes and Browns, were all long established farming families. But the network also included butchers/graziers, the Roses, Sayers and Selmes. Blacksmiths were represented by the Leighs and Holmans, and milling by the Dewdneys. It is also probable that the hegemony extended beyond these three parishes. The Aynscombes, for instance, had branches in Tandridge and Lingfield, whilst the Kelseys were to be found in those parishes as well as Crowhurst and Horne; and the Roses were well-established at Godstone.

There is also evidence that some members of the core came from families which had both been connected to each other and parish office holding for many generations. In Blechingley, for example, the first post-Reformation rector was one Chipping, who came from local yeomen stock. A Robert Clement of Nutfield was an
Fig. 7.2: Links between Churchwarden families in Beachley, Bursley and
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overseer of his will, and Chipping's daughter Philippa married a Malachi Dodd. All these names re-appear in the eighteenth and nineteenth-century church-warden lists.

Unsupported evidence also suggests that the hegemony spread across the county borders. The Aynscombes and Russells were to be found in East Grinstead in Sussex, whilst it is known from John Clement's diary that he had relatives in Rusper, Sussex. The hegemony was, however, confined to the greensand and Wealden zones of the study area, where it formed a solid block of interest which was difficult to penetrate.

Newby suggests that these interest blocks were spatial phenomena as well as social boundaries, with the labourers occupying the village centres whilst the farmers and gentry lived in the surrounding countryside. In order to test this assumption the dwelling places of the different socio-economic groups have been traced (as far as possible) for a sample of 8 parishes in 1851. (See Maps 7.1-6).

The first detail to emerge from the analysis is that the Wealden settlements did not have a centre but pockets of scattered settlement. In Burstow these coincide with the local commons, with most agricultural labourers living on Copthorne, Burstow or Outwood Commons or Wasps Green. Similarly, at Horne the labourers tended to live on Frogget Heath, and at Worth

29 S.R.O. 3089/6, Clements Papers, Diary of John Clement. See for example, entry of 30th Sept. 1742.
30 Newby, op.cit., p. 73.
Map 7.3: Residential Proximity of Classes in Horne, 1851
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Map 7.6: Residential Proximity of Classes at Warlingham, 1851

There are two further hypotheses that deal with spatial proximity. The first concerns the spatial decisions of positive assortative mating, i.e. that higher the social status the closer the marriage distances. The second hypothesis is that middle-class marriage was late with a high proportion of married adults, whilst proletarian marriage was earlier. See, loc. cit., p. 35.

Anderson, loc. cit., p. 315.

Anderson, loc. cit., pp. 63, 76.
either on the Worth portion of Copthorne Common or the hamlet of Turners Hill. This is in direct contradiction of the pattern shown on the greensand where most of the labourers lived in the village centre. This was also the case in the larger downland parishes, but in the smaller parishes the main bulk of the labouring population was to be found on commons and greens.

The analysis shows that there was, as Newby suggests, some spatial divisions between the socio-economic groups. The spatial gap was widest between farmers and the rest. At Limpsfield, for instance, gentlemen, labourers, and craftsmen, lived cheek by jowl in the village centre, but only one farmer was to be found there. Farms, of course, usually lie in the fields away from the village so that when spatial trends are related to social divisions it can be seen that the farmers were isolated from the other groups, whereas labourers and craftsmen were more likely to live in close proximity.

There are two further hypothesis that deal with behaviour that indicates a gap between the socio-economic divisions of society. The first concerns the spatial horizons of positive assortive mating - Crozier and Houston found that the higher the social status the wider the marriage horizons. The second looks at Anderson's hypothesis that middle-class marriage was late with a high proportion of never-married adults, whilst proletarian marriage was likely to be early with a low proportion of never-married adults.  

\[31\] Crozier, loc.cit., p.35.
Houston, loc.cit., p.216.
Anderson loc.cit., pp. 63,76.
In order to test the first hypothesis the spatial horizons have been compared of all the marriages in the sample where the grooms were either gentlemen or labourers. This showed that 12 or 7% of the 183 labourers' marriages were spatially exogamous, compared to 10 or 83% of marriages involving gentlemen. Furthermore, none of the labourers had chosen a bride from more than 6 miles away, or from a different background, whereas 5 of the gentlemen came from at least 20 miles distant and all had urban backgrounds. The three endogamous gentlemens' marriages were between partners from Limpsfield or Oxted where there was a higher proportion of gentlemen to the rest of society than in the other parishes - hence a larger pool of potential partners.

The second hypothesis will be tested by using census data to look at the proportion of never-married adults over 45, as well as the proportion of married : single per age cohort, divided into socio-economic blocks for three sample parishes. (The virtual absence of a middle-class in the area makes it impossible to test this part of Anderson's hypothesis) The proportion of never married adults is shown on Table 7.6.

Table 7.6 Proportion of Never-Married Adults in three sample parishes as shown in the 1851 census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Burstow</th>
<th>Caterham</th>
<th>Nutfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Lab</td>
<td>19 11</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>11 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cap*.</td>
<td>6 15</td>
<td>1 4</td>
<td>1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>9 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* High Cap. = Tradesmen/craftsmen who needed a large outlay of capital to set up in business. Examples are
blacksmiths, wheelwrights or drapers.

This table shows that taken overall the proportion of never-married agricultural labourers was higher than other groups, which is not in line with Anderson's conclusions. The patterns shown in this table are possibly linked to the discussion earlier in this chapter on the social structure of the area. This described the tensions and poverty of the 1830s, which is about the time that many of the labourers in this table would have been at most risk of marriage. Farmers, conversely, show a high level of marriage. This could be related not only to economic resources but also to the availability of housing. Farmers being more likely to have access to housing than labourers. The farmer might, however, have to wait to take over the holding. This might make for a higher marriage age in this group. Table 7.7 shows the age at which the proportion of single to married changed to a higher proportion of married cohort members to single.

Table 7.7 Age Group in which the change from more single members to more married members occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Burstow</th>
<th>Caterham</th>
<th>Nutfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag.Labs.</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cap*</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All women</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>25-29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See definition above.

This shows a uniformly high marriage age for agricultural labourers of over 30, whereas in two parishes the marriage age for farmers was exceptionally low between 20-24. It is possible, therefore, that the age at which farmers married was related to mortality patterns in the preceding generation. If the fathers
died young the son had an early opportunity to take over the family farm. An examination of the age structures of the parishes does not confirm this, as 13% of the population in the Wealden parish were over 50 compared to 11% on the downs and 12% on the greensand. It cannot be assumed that farmers were marrying earlier in Burstow and Caterham but late in Nutfield because there was a differential in the mortality rates in these two parishes.

The problem can be examined from the angle of the overall high marriage age at Nutfield. Earlier in this work it has been shown that this parish had a high rate of endogamy, a low MHS consisting of nuclear families with a large number of adult children living with their parents. It is tempting to assume that parental pressure was instrumental in raising the marriage age at Nutfield - either because the parents wished to keep the childrens’ wages within the parental household, or because the parents had experienced the depression of the 1830s and advised their children against early marriage. The latter option would be in line with Wrigley and Schofield’s theory based on the aggregate analysis of a nation-wide sample of parish registers related to real wages, which suggested that there was a relationship between the two but it was lagged by about thirty years. They conclude that this time-lag was the result of the parental view of life-chances being imposed on the children, so that if the parents married in a time of low real wages they would advocate late marriage for their children, no matter what the economic climate when the children wished to marry.  
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It is equally possible that what is illustrated here is the 'expectations hypothesis', i.e. people married earlier because they expected better conditions, rather than better conditions actually existing. Agricultural improvement, enclosure, the development of new industries etc. might lower the age at marriage because of the expectations of opportunities for employment and better wages. In the study area, however, the greensand was the most economically buoyant zone, but had the highest marriage age.

The actual explanation could be an amalgam of the two — that the age was lower in Burstow and Caterham because less of the population at risk of marriage were living in the parental household, but had left it to find work elsewhere. They were on their own, without parental perceptions of life chances, and seemingly nothing to lose by marriage — but much to gain — a home, help-mate etc. Those who stayed in the parental home, already had a home, as well as having to cope with parental pressure to stay single — with the result that they married later. In general, however, in the study area, agricultural labourers married later than other socio-economic groups.

This section can be summed up as follows, there were wide boundaries between socio-economic groups in the community which were rarely crossed. Marriage invariably took place between members of the same socio-economic group. The boundaries were reinforced by inter-married networks of occupational or office-holding groups which crossed parish but not social boundaries.

Not only did the socio-economic blocks fail to inter-mingle by marriage, they tended to be separate on the ground, as well as showing different behavioural patterns with regards to marriage. Gentlemen, for instance, chose mates from different backgrounds to themselves, often from a long distance, whilst labourers rarely searched for a mate more than six miles from their residence, and invariably found her from the same rural background as themselves. Similarly, agricultural labourers as a body tended to marry late, or not at all, whilst the other socio-economic groups married at an earlier age. Although it is true that the economic context of the parish influenced this behaviour, it is also obvious that society was firmly stuck in rigid lines that were rarely crossed. Social boundary markers were, therefore, very strong. The next section will continue this theme of invisible boundaries by looking at boundaries formed by religious alignments.

The Landscape of Common Interests - Religious Groups

This section aims to look at boundaries formed by religious affiliation. It will use the marriage patterns of three religious minority groups as a sample of nonconformist behaviour. It will also examine the social structure of the groups in relation to the Anglican community, as well as testing some of the hypothesis put forward in Everitt's pioneering work on rural dissent in the nineteenth century.

In this work, Everitt reaches several general conclusions about the nature of those communities most prone to dissent. Briefly, these are that nonconformism was likely to flourish where there was freedom from restraint - i.e. in communities where there was an open
freehold: a system of landholding; or where cottage industry freed the individual from the restraints of an employer; or in communities situated on waste or common land, or on a parish boundary where there was an ambivalent situation with regards to authority. Dissent also took root in decaying market towns where the land was likely to be much sub-divided, as well as on ancient cross-roads, and in new rail-head settlements. Everitt discerns two distinct and contrasting elements in the settlement patterns of dissenting communities—that dissent was to be found either in "communities of very early origin, or in areas of late settlement."
The latter included the forest clearance settlements, squatters communities, and the aforementioned rail-head settlements; whilst the former were settlements that had originated at a very early date. It is possible that this represents part of the same process with dissent entering an area with a new settlement, but taking root in old-established communities where conditions were right for it to flourish.

Most importantly in the context of this work, Everitt makes some generalisations about the county of Kent which can be applied to the rest of the study area. He writes:

"In the rural areas of Kent where Anglican churches were most numerous, namely the Downlands, the Old Dissent rarely established itself. Its stronghold was in the very large parishes of the Weald, where country people had several miles to walk to reach their church. The rural stronghold of rural Methodism, by contrast, was principally in areas where parish churches were relatively numerous, in

The next section, which is a brief history of nonconformism in the area will bear this statement in mind.

NonConformism in the Study Area

In his table based on the 1851 Religious Census, Everitt shows that the three counties in the study area are all near the top of the table for the highest proportion of Anglican sittings, Sussex ranking fourth, Surrey fifth and Kent eighth on this table. It would seem, therefore, that this area was not noted for its dissenting congregations. Although there were, as will be shown, solid cores of nonconformists descended from Old Dissent meetings. Evidence shows that the area was staunchly Protestant, for instance, in 1815 a petition was presented to Parliament from East Grinstead, protesting about the extension of religious toleration to Roman Catholics.

The earliest organised dissenting group in the area were the Quakers, who were based in the local market town of Reigate, but had members living in the surrounding villages that make up the study area. Reigate's meeting house was founded as a result of a mission by George Fox in 1655, although the ground had been prepared two years earlier by some of his disciples. A little later, in 1669, Anabaptists were reported as being active in Blechingley and Horne. The
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35 Everitt, Rural Dissent, op.cit., p. 11
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missionary incentive, in this case coming from the Horsham area of the Sussex Weald. It was on the Sussex Weald that the principle General Baptist meeting developed in the late seventeenth century. The first recorded meetings were held at Turner's Hill, a large hamlet of Worth parish in Sussex. Later the meetings moved to Horley, Surrey, and in the late-eighteenth century to Outwood, Surrey, into a classic boundary situation on a common where four parishes met. This meant that one parish could always claim that the meeting was being held in another's territory.

Elsewhere on the Weald, Strict rather than General Baptist congregations met. One of the earliest of these was at Dormansland in Surrey. The earliest recorded meeting of this group was 1775, but in 1791 this group moved to the larger settlement of Edenbridge. Later a group of Baptists from Dormansland recolonised the Outwood area in the 1830s after the General Baptists had become defunct. Another off-shoot of the Strict Baptists was to be found at Lingfield, where there were also General Baptist and Independent chapels, both founded in the late eighteenth century. Independents were also found in Horley and Edenbridge, and had gained a foothold on the greensand at Limpsfield, Nutfield, and Oxted by the 1820s.

It can be seen that the main meeting places for the nonconformists were to be found on the Weald, with no dissenting congregations reported from the downs. Thus far the results agree with Everitt's conclusions — but evidence from the minute books of the General Baptists, suggests that the congregations that

---

were drawn to the meetings were not exclusively Wealden, but came from the greensand and downs as well. So a distinction has to be made between meeting-place and congregation.

It is also noticeable that prior to the 1850s, Methodism had not taken root in the Weald. Although the Calvinist off-shoot of Wesleyan Methodism, the Countess of Huntington's Connexion was extremely popular at East Grinstead and Worth in the Sussex Weald in the early nineteenth-century. In general, however, it can be seen that Old Dissent flourished on the Weald, and to a lesser extent on the greensand. The 1851 religious census shows how this pattern survived into the mid-nineteenth century. Before discussing the patterns shown in the 1851 census, its reliability as a source will be assessed.

The religious census was taken on the 31st March 1851. It consisted of returns made by clergymen and pastors, who had to state the attendance figures for morning, afternoon, and evening services, as well as Sunday School figures. They also had to answer questions as to the nature of their place of worship, such as the date of its foundation, the number of seats, with the number which were free or for rent. As no explicit instructions were sent out, there was no uniformity of reply - some clergymen counted heads, others sent an estimate, often rounded up. The veracity of the returns were questioned even at the time of the census. Nonconformists were accused of inflating figures, whilst they in turn accused the Anglicans of packing the pews with outsiders to send up numbers. Apart from this, there is no way of knowing whether the same people attended the different services, or whether different people attended at different times. Because of this
difficulty, Everitt uses the number of sittings as a more reliable indication of the size of the congregation rather than the number of attendances. He considers that on the whole, the 1851 census is a reliable source — especially when read with Inglis’ paper on its reliability borne in mind.  

There are two versions of the census that can be used. One is the printed report and aggregate statistics issued as a Parliamentary Paper by Horace Mann. The other is the Mss. returns in the P.R.O., which any detailed project should use, as they often reveal both the attitude of the clergyman or pastor to his flock, as well as reasons for the low turn-out to any place of Worship on census Sunday. In the study area, for instance, exceptionally bad weather and a ‘flu epidemic were reported as depressing attendances.

The position with regards to nonconformist meeting places in the study area is that eight parishes had no nonconformist chapels. These were Caterham, Chaldon, Tatsfield, and Titsey on the Downs; Godstone and Tandridge on the greensand, and Horne in the Weald. The remaining eleven parishes all had a nonconformist meeting place of some description. On the Weald Baptists, or the Countess of Huntington’s Connexion predominated. There were two Baptist chapels in Burstow and Edenbridge, whilst Strict Baptists met at East

---
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Grinstead and Lingfield. Most popular at East Grinstead was the Calvinist Countess of Huntington's Connexion, which also had a chapel in neighbouring Worth. Independents were also found at East Grinstead, and this sect was found on the greensand at Blechingley and Westerham. Baptists met at Oxted and Limpsfield with the Town Missionary and Scripture Readers Society meeting at Nutfield. The one downland parish with a nonconformist chapel, Warlingham, was also the one Wesleyan Methodist congregation in the area. Founded in the 1830s it was to remain the sole Wesleyan representative in the area for at least another twenty years.

It can be seen from this brief description of nonconformity in the area, that on the whole the pattern of distribution agrees with Everitt's conclusions. The meeting places if not the congregations were to be found mainly in the large freehold Wealden parishes on waste-land and commons, or as in the case of the Quakers, in the local market town but drawing its adherents from the rural hinterland. The next section will discuss this Quaker group in more detail as well as examining the General and Strict Baptist congregations of the Wealden area, and the Independents who belonged to chapels on the greensand in the early nineteenth century.

Baptists, Independents, and Quakers in the Study Area

The history of the General Baptists in the area can be traced through the minute book of the Turners Hill/Outwood group which contains an account of their early years by John Plaw, who collected the information in the late-eighteenth century from elderly members of the congregation. He puts the origin of the group as
early as the 1660s, when there were two separate meetings, one in Surrey, known as the Outwood and South Park People, and the other in Sussex calling themselves the Turners Hill and Hoadley People. These two groups amalgamated in 1727 which is the date that the formal minutes begin. 42

Plaw lists the houses where the two groups met. The distribution of these sites, concentrating on the commons and heaths of the large Wealden parishes, confirms Everitt's conclusions about the nature of the terrain where dissent was likely to flourish. 43 A closer examination of the composition of the congregation shows that they were travelling considerable distances, from the North Downs and greensand to attend the meetings. An attempt to actually hold a meeting in a greensand parish, however, provoked a near riot, when the meeting was broken up by "loose idle fellows", incited by the parish constable. 44

The main missionary movement for these meetings came from the Sussex Weald or Kent. Contact was maintained with congregations at Bessels Green near Sevenoaks in Kent, and Ditchling in Sussex. Representatives from the group were also sent to the annual General Assembly in London, so that the whole group locked into a wider network.

The minute book shows that the General Baptists tried

42 T.R. Hooper, Surrey and Sussex Border Church 1650 to 1840, 1925, pp. 29-52.
43 Everitt, Rural dissent, op.cit., passim.
44 Hooper, op.cit., p.30.
to carry out the precepts of their religion to the best of their ability. They practiced total adult immersion, (usually in a farm pond), observed the ceremony of washing of feet and days of fasting and prayer, as well as partaking in the Lord's Supper. They tried to lead decent, honest, sober lives and to avoid public scandals. Drunkeness and fornication were punished by the meetings. Whilst the congregation took pains to keep its members out of the public eye by paying debts out of subscriptions, and helping those in need from specially set up funds.

Most of the members were yeomen/farmers or tradesmen who, as Griffell English's will of 1760 shows, were men of some substance. The congregation was literate, and possessed a library, donated by M.W.Ashdown of Dover in 1771. The membership was not always harmonious. Families were recorded as being at loggerheads, for example, an entry for 13.1.1773 reads: "Agreed that the defiance between John Budgen and his brothers and sisters be made up within a month" or 4.12.1771 "Inquiry to be made into scandalous reports of quarrels between John Budgen and Richard Holiday." 45

By the 1830s, the congregation was comprised mainly of elderly widows or single people. Failure to attract young and active members led to the group's demise. The last recorded meeting, on June 9th 1833, at Shepperds, on Outwood common, was attended by only five members. 46 This area was, however, a fruitful field for dissent. As the General Baptists disappeared their place was taken by a missionary movement of Particular Baptists

45 Dr. Williams Library, Mss. 38.84, The Church Book of the General Baptists Church at Turners Hil, Horley, etc.
46 Dr. Williams Library, Mss.38.34, loc.cit.
from Dormansland. By August 1834 they had whipped up enough enthusiasm to build and open a new chapel which survived for 150 years. Although in 1849 a temporary incumbent, Joseph Hatton of Wolverhampton, led a breakaway movement of 50 members to found a Strict Baptist Elim Chapel at Smallfield in the south of the area.

The Baptists had, therefore, cornered the market in Dissent in this corner of the Weald. On the greensand, the Independents took root as the result the early nineteenth-century Surrey Mission from Southwark. The Independent meeting-houses were to be found along the greensand ridge, with the main adherents again coming from the yeomen/farmer tradesmen groups.

Along the greensand ridge the Independents were rivalled by the Quakers, for although the Quaker meeting-house was at Reigate, it had members recorded in Nutfield, Blechingley, Godstone, Limpsfield and Westerham. It also drew members from the Wealden area to the south-west of Reigate - Charlwood and Capel for instance, but did not penetrate into the Baptist stronghold to the east. This suggests that there was a finite number of people susceptible to nonconformism, which in the study area led to a series of spatially discrete nonconformist blocks.

Like the Baptists and Independents, that most intellectual form of Dissent, the Quakers, tended to draw its support from literate middling families, yeomen/farmers, millers, shopkeepers and professional men. In the study area, therefore, the Old Dissent...
did not attract the labouring poor. It was those sects which grew up in the 1830s which attracted the labourers – partly because they perceived that the labourer needed to acquire literacy, so founded Sunday Schools in the area, which became instantly popular. The Countess of Huntington Connexion Sunday School at East Grinstead, for instance, had 400 scholars within a year of opening, including the occupants of the East Grinstead Poor House. Whilst the term Sunday Scholar appears in the census returns, written, one likes to imagine, with pride.

This section suggests that the Old Dissent and the nineteenth-century evangelical movement satisfied different needs, so attracted different sections of society. The Old Dissent assumed a certain degree of literacy amongst its members so attracted the more literate middle section of society. The newer sects promoted literacy so appealed to those who wished to learn to read and write as well as finding spiritual comfort. There is neither time or space to discuss the influence of the various denominations on local culture or politics, except to add that at Nutfield, the efforts of the "Mission" produced an aggressively articulate nonconformist community which caused the authorities no little anxiety when the national day school, sponsored by the parish church of SS. Peter and Paul was opened in the 1860s.

The extent to which these communities within
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communities set up boundaries will be examined in the next section. This will be preceded by a short discussion on the attitude of the dissenting sects towards marriage.

**Marriage and Dissent**

The dissenters themselves recognised the importance of marriage in propagating and maintaining their faith. They showed this by withdrawing religious benefits from those who married outside the persuasion. The General Baptist minute book, for example, reports that on 1728 John Savage was excluded from communion for marrying 'out', and it was not until 1744 that communion was restored to him. In 1750 the matter of mixed marriage was: "Strongly Debated, when all Agreed it to be a crime, but differed about ye manner of punishment, therefore referred it to ye next Church meeting and to call a Messenger or Two to settle ye present Affaire, if possible they cann." 

The Quakers too, adjured marrying out. To marry out was described as 'to depart from Friends.' In order to prevent this the monthly meeting investigated the credentials of potential marriage partners. Only if these were in order and parental consent was verified could the marriage proceed. Furthermore, a censorious eye was kept on the courtship behaviour of the young. Those keeping company with 'those not of our meeting' were suitably warned.
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The smallness of the congregations, however, often made finding a suitable mate difficult, so that either wider marriage horizons than found in the Anglican communion might be expected, or a higher proportion of never-married adults. The latter is true of the General Baptists, as the Outwood group literally died out through a failure to find suitable mates.

Not only were there less marriages than in the Anglican community, those who did marry are difficult to trace. It is true that the Quakers kept their own registers which can be consulted in the P.R.O., but prior to 1837 the other sects were legally bound to have their marriages registered in their parish church. In order to trace these marriages it is necessary to have a complete list of members which gives at least the wife's forename. It is also necessary to search through all the registers of an area, as some Anglican clergymen refused to marry dissenters or insisted on an Anglican baptism before marriage. This latter provides a valuable clue to nonconformist marriages, so that an adult baptism is worth checking against the marriage register and the nonconformist membership list. Where one Anglican clergyman refused to marry dissenters his neighbour might undertake the task. The eighteenth century curate of Horne, for instance, had no compunction about marrying dissenters, travellers, or tramps, thus creating a surplus of 'floating events' in his marriage register.

After 1837 nonconformist chapels could be licensed to perform marriages, but as has already been mentioned, the marriage registers for the chapels in the study area are not available for consultation, so that it is

54 P.R.O. Class RG Non-parochial Registers and Records.
difficult to reconstruct the marriage pattern after 1837. What follows is, therefore, an indication of some tentative trends, rather than a complete reconstruction of dissenting marriage patterns. The analysis starts by discussing the question of 'out-marriages', which although they constitute the most important measure of religious solidarity, are in fact virtually impossible to trace unless actually mentioned in a minute book.

Over a period of 100 years the General Baptist minute book records only one out-marriage, but it is extremely likely that other marriages took place with those not of the faith who then converted to become Baptists. What can be measured, however, are matches between known nonconformist families with those whose names do not appear in the membership list. Spatial patterns can also be measured, as well as marriages between chapel elites, for like the Anglican communion the Old Dissent had a hierarchial structure.

The analysis starts with the Turners Hill/Outwood General Baptist marriage patterns. The minute books show that for the years 1730-1830 there were 208 adult members. From this pool of potential marriage partners it has been possible to trace 46 marriages, i.e. 22% of the total membership. The remaining 78% were either married outside the area, never-married, or widowed. Thirty or 65% of the marriages traced represented matches between known General Baptist families. Ten or 34% of the marriages were between partners living in different parishes, but only one was a long-distance match, the rest were between parishes grouped around the meeting-houses. The one long-distance match is worth further mention, as it was between Nathaniel Palmer of Oxted and Jane Thompson of Sandwich in Kent. Palmer was delegate to the General Assembly in London
for several years so that it is possible that the initial contact with a Sandwich family was made through a delegate from Sandwich to the Assembly.

Although Palmer was not a member, there were three networks of inter-married families in the Turners Hill/Outwood congregation. One network was comparable to those shown in the Anglican community, encompassing sixteen families in nine parishes. This is shown on Fig. 7.3. Eight of these parishes were in the Surrey Weald or Greensand, with the last located in Sussex. Four of the families in this network had members who were ministers, elders or deacons, but the top of the hierarchy were represented in a smaller network of four families. This included Griffell English of Turners Hill who founded the group, and Robert Sales of Limpsfield who left a sizeable legacy to the meeting. It is obvious, from the degree of inter-marriage, that the meetings not only provided spiritual comfort for its members but also gave them a relatively exclusive social context.

The Baptist network spread across the Surrey Weald and greensand, but the next group under discussion, the Independents were found only on the greensand running from west to east, - Reigate, Redhill, Nutfield, Blechingley, Godstone, Oxted, Limpsfield, Westerham, and Brasted, with an outlier on the North Downs at Titsey, and in the Kentish Weald at Edenbridge and Haver. The constituent parts of this group are known only from a fragment of baptismal register in the P.R.O. which has been used as a reference point from

---

55 The Surrey Mission, loc.cit., passim.
56 P.R.O. R.G.4.2213-2214, Register for the Independent (Footnote continued)
which to trace the marriage patterns. For the years 1812-1836 the register lists 30 potential marriages (i.e. parents of children baptised), of which 13 or 43% have been found. As no membership list has been traced it is impossible to ascertain whether these were between Independent families, but only 2 or 15% were between partners who did not live in the same parishes. The two exogamous marriages were between neighbouring parishes. There is some evidence for a network of families related by marriage, which given time would have evolved to a size similar to that seen in the General Baptists. As it is, it includes five families covering three non-contiguous parishes - Burstow, Nutfield and Oxted. No evidence exists for an elite network.

The Quaker elite on the other hand, is well documented, with its ramifications dealt with in detail by Williams. This section looks only at those marriages involving families living in the study area. These amount to 20 marriages dated from 1771 - 1837. All were between known Quaker families, but all except one involved partners living in different parishes. These spatially exogamous marriages show a totally different pattern to those shown by the General Baptists or indeed the population at large, as Quakers from the study area were marrying westwards - taking partners from Capel, Charlwood, Reigate, Dorking, Guildford, and Godalming. It is possible to reconstruct a network of sixteen families in thirteen wide-spread locations, but concentrating on Nutfield in the west and the Capel/Charlwood/Dorking area in the east. Many of these

(continued)
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Fig. 7.3: Links Between General Baptist Families
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families had members of both sexes who acted as Elders.

The family associated with Nutfield, the Danns of Werks Farm, have already been mentioned. John Clement's diary and account book shows that he transacted much farming business with Dann. The list of poor law overseers for Nutfield also shows that Dann served several terms in that office. This suggests a paradox in that Dann took an active part in local affairs, although his social focus was away from his home parish, based on the meeting-house at Reigate, or his relations spread across the western weald.

The final aggregate summary shows that of the 79 dissenting marriages traced, 63% were between members known to be of the same faith. This can be compared to 85% endogamy for socio-economic group. Does this suggest that the boundaries between socio-economic groups/classes were stronger than those formed by religious alignments? The result could of course be related to the inadequacy of the nonconformist sources. Boundaries existed but could not be traced. It is clear that the smaller sects like the General Baptists had difficulty in finding suitable mates so that nonconformist marriage patterns could be determined by demography rather than faith or boundaries between faiths.

Conclusion

This chapter has shown that in the late-eighteenth and

58 S.R.O. 3089/63 Clement Papers, Diary of John Clement, for example see 1744.
59 S.R.O. P26/8/3 Nutfield Parish Churchwarden List, for example see 1783/4; or 1788/9.
nineteenth-centuries the boundaries drawn by socio-economic grouping or class were exceptionally rigid. Social mobility by marriage was limited, especially for men. Following the sociological assertion that marriage is an excellent indication of perceived social-standing, it can be seen that the boundaries that existed between the different elements that made up the social structure of a rural community at the beginning of the nineteenth-century were both perceived and maintained. Occupational boundaries were less rigid, but farmers tended to inter-marry so that dynastic networks of farmers developed. Similarly, the parish office-holding elites also locked into inter-related networks which formed a block of ‘core’ families that had been in the area for many generations. These networks were difficult to penetrate from outside. Similar networks existed in the nonconformist congregations, especially among the Quakers. Demographic reasons, however, probably meant that the smaller sects found it impossible to find suitable partners, so that the boundaries between the members of one faith and the general population were crossed.

When related to the overall aims and objectives of this study it can be seen that the rigid boundary formed by the social structure of society in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries was a strong unifying factor. Common interest was powerful in bestowing identity. It was also a universal factor that could unite communities from a wide and diverse area. Religion, too could form strong boundaries against outsiders, but religious groups were numerically more compact. Both social and religious boundaries point to the conclusion that a broad rather than a narrow spatial and social conception of local history should
be sought. The penultimate chapter of this work will move from the effect of boundaries on local identity to look at the mechanics of its transmission and maintenance. It will look, firstly at the dialect of the study area, then move on to look at its material and popular culture.
Introduction

Earlier in this work it was suggested that local identity and the perception of space was partly the result of conditioning received by the child at an early age. Acquired through the commerce of every-day life with the mother. The transactions of this commerce took place firstly by the in-put of symbols. Later, when the child had learned to speak and comprehend the spoken word it took place through the medium of language, i.e. a pattern of words and sounds transmitted from sender to receiver.

In order for the transmission to function effectively the receiver and sender must share a common comprehension of at least part of what is being transmitted. The receiver and sender who share this comprehension will form part of a larger group that gives the same meaning to the same set of sounds. This group forms a language community. The language community can be national or local, depending on the set of words and sounds used to draw the boundaries. Some words and sounds are universal, easily understood across regional boundaries, or sometimes even comprehensible across international frontiers. Other words are peculiar to one locality with nuances of meaning that can only be fully appreciated in that locality or local community. It is these words which are important in the context of local identity - how it is formed- and how far it extends. As Downes suggests, where one lives is a social characteristic that affects
the use of language.¹ Milroy in his work on socio-linguistics goes further than this. He writes that dialect can be a means of projecting social identity, with vernacular features persisting in the face of attempts to standardise speech.²

Before discussing dialect in the study area the term dialect needs to be defined. North in his paper on 'Surrey Dialect Research' defines dialect as:

"non-standard variety of language developed in other social environments and in particular geographical areas independently of, although often in relationship with, the standard."³ A more practical working definition is – that dialect embraces all facets of language, lexical, pronunciation or accent and syntax. All these features are subject to change and development. In total, dialect is not a fossilised form of speech, although it can have embedded in it words which have become fossilised because the object they refer to has become obsolete. (This is especially true of agricultural terms.) Neither is dialect confined to the elderly. It is to be found in all types of society, urban as well as rural. It is spoken by all age groups. Above all it is vital, and like all living things it is subject to change. Despite the ephemeral quality of dialect it can be measured by recording words and speech patterns. Those patterns held in common by different communities can be counted. From this process, dialect areas can be mapped. These are geographical localities with discernible linguistic boundaries or isoglosses.

Geographically based dialect communities do not exist in isolation from the socio-economic and cultural

features of an area. Wakelin writes that "the study of folk speech must be closely linked to the study of folk-life, customs, festivals, and artefacts." 4

This chapter aims to examine both the folk-speech and the folk-life of the study area. Its objective is to define dialect and cultural areas. Once these are defined it will see if these cross administrative or geographical boundaries, or whether they are rooted within a limited locality.

Language and Locality

In view of the locality-based structure of dialectology, it is not surprising that linguists have already addressed themselves to the question of dialect boundaries in relation to administrative and natural boundaries. The findings of four of these studies will be discussed. These are studies by Downes, Milroy, North, and Wakelin. 5

All these writers accept that dialect is rooted in locality, but is also part of a wider continuum of language development. Where they diverge is on the extent and limitations of dialect areas. Downes suggests that dialect areas are likely to be formed on a 'nearest neighbour' basis, but adds that unless some physical barrier intervenes, speakers from different areas will be able to understand each other. 6 Milroy sees the territorial limits of speech areas drawn in

5 Downes, op.cit., passim.
Milroy, op.cit., passim.
Wakelin, op.cit., passim.

6 Downes, op.cit., p.23.
terms of personal contacts or networks. These personal networks whilst crossing both administrative and geographical boundaries, do not, in Milroy’s experience, cross political or religious boundaries.\(^7\) (Milroy was working in Northern Ireland so his conclusions are probably not universally applicable)

The last pair, North and Wakelin, are especially interesting, as they have based their conclusions on the same source, the work-books of the Survey of English Dialects (S.E.D.) North concludes from his work that: "no county can have a consistently and rigidly defined dialect of its own." \(^8\) Wakelin, however, states: "As far as dialectical divisions are concerned, political and administrative boundaries appear to be of greater significance than geographical ones." Some linguistic boundaries, he points out, are based on the territories of the Saxon kingdoms. Watling Street in particular, marked off different tribal sets and is an important dialect boundary. Geographical boundaries, even rivers, are not so important. Rivers, in fact, acted as a means of communication rather than a barrier.\(^9\)

The difference between the two writers is in degree. If Wakelin’s theory is correct the area that North worked on, Kent, Surrey and Sussex should show dialect boundaries that coincide with the Jutish and South Saxon boundaries but are undeterred by physical features like the Weald or Downs. North’s conclusions will be discussed in detail later on in this section, but they do tend towards this division.

It can be seen that several competing hypothesis emerge

\(^7\) Milroy, op.cit., pp. 12-14.
\(^8\) North, Surrey Dialects, loc.cit., p. 153.
\(^9\) Wakelin, op.cit., p. 10.
from the work of the four authors. One is that dialect areas and administrative boundaries coincide, although the administrative boundary is not necessarily the same boundary as today. On the other hand speech communities could be limited by physical barriers, but cross administrative boundaries behind these barriers. It is equally possible that there are no clear dialect boundaries but a shading of one dialect into another; or the boundaries will be human boundaries set up by religion or politics. Recent research by Milroy also shows that there are class-based, occupational and life-cycle dialect areas. These will not be dealt with in this inquiry which is concerned primarily with dialect as part of the identity of a geographical space.

The hypothesis stated above can equally well be applied to popular culture or folk-life. North, in his paper on the 'One-way Plough in S.E. England', suggests that the linguistic and artefact boundaries coincide. This paper will be discussed in detail later in this chapter. It indicates that there were different traditions and ways of working in different areas that can be mapped through the words describing them. In fact, for many areas, folk-life in the past exists only through words describing obsolete objects. In his paper, North quotes Richard Weiss who says that these objects contain subjective personal references that embody the distinctive feeling of the 'home' area. This concept is important to the idea of local identity and will be discussed in the final section of this chapter.

Sources and Methodology

Dialect can be studied in two forms, the written or the

\[^{10}\text{Milroy, op.cit., pp. 19-20.}\]
\[^{11}\text{North, One-Way Plough, loc.cit., pp.55,58.}\]
\[^{12}\text{North, One-way Plough loc.cit., p. 55.}\]
spoken word. To study dialect in the past one is totally dependent on the written form. This has to be gleaned from documents such as wills, probate inventories, parish records, letters etc., or vernacular literature. This inquiry has gleaned a few words from these sources.

Another source that it is possible to use for dialect evidence in the past, is the fruit of eighteenth and nineteenth-century antiquarian interest in local customs and language, which led to the compilation of local glossaries and dictionaries. The usefulness of these lists is limited. The compilers rarely gave the actual location where the word was recorded. Several of these compilations exist for the study area. Granville Leveson-Gower, the 'squire' of Titsey in Surrey contributed two lists of Surrey Provincialisms and Words to the English Dialect Society. These words were garnered mainly from his work on the Godstone Bench. Their usage is illustrated by reference to three works on rural England, only one of which was actually about Surrey. Leveson-Gower did not believe that Surrey had a dialect of its own, and thought that such as there was was fast disappearing by the 1890s.\(^{13}\)

Sussex was perhaps better served by its antiquarians. Cooper's Glossary of the Provincialisms in use in the County of Sussex, first published in 1834, makes some attempt to assign the words to East or West Sussex. Cooper says that there are two distinct dialects in Sussex. The dialect of the eastern side of the county bearing a close resemblance to that of the Weald of Kent, and the western side being very similar to that spoken in Hampshire and other western counties.\(^{14}\) The

\(^{13}\) G. Leveson-Gower, Surrey Provincialisms, 1875, passim.

\(^{14}\) W. Durrant Cooper, A Glossary of Provincialisms in Use in
early date of the first edition makes this a more useful collection than that for Surrey. A second collection of Sussex words was published in 1875 by the Vicar of Selmeston, W.D. Parish. Like Leveson-Gower he believed that progress and Americanism would eliminate dialect. Apart from the words he collected himself, the dictionary was augmented by the work of other reverend gentlemen, and the Brighton Custumal. Again if he had recorded the actual locations of the word the dictionary would be infinitely more useful to this inquiry.

The Rev. Parish also collaborated with Dr. Shaw to publish The Dictionary of Kentish Dialect in 1886. Kent already had a published dialect collection, The Alphabet of Kenticisms by the Rev. S. Pegg, published in 1735/6. This has been used by Alan Major to augment the latest edition of Parish's Dictionary.

Wakelin shows that many archaic words survive in dialect, and although the pronunciation of these words has undergone modification "there is a close-link between present-day speech sounds and their antecedents". This link makes it possible to use material from the S.E.D. in order to look at the dialectical boundaries for the study area in the eighteenth and nineteenth-centuries. The Survey, which both North and Wakelin used, will be backed up by field-work in the study area.
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the County of Sussex, 1834, passim.
15 W.D. Parish, A Dictionary of the Sussex Dialect, 1875, pp.ix-x.
16 W.D. Parish and W.F. Shaw, A Dictionary of the Kentish Dialect, 1888, passim.
18 Wakelin, op.cit., p.106.
The Survey of English Dialects, which resulted in The Linguistic Atlas of England, was a gigantic undertaking conceived by the late Professors Orton of the University of Leeds and Dieth of the University of Zurich. They sent field-workers, armed with a questionnaire of 1300 questions to interview and record the responses of the elderly residents of 313 rural locations. This was carried out between 1948 and 1961 - before the advent of easily portable recording equipment, which meant that the responses were taken down in the International Phonetic Alphabet, with only the more interesting specimens of dialect being taped.

As a source, the S.E.D. is both imperfect and biased. (It is also in need of a follow-up programme to monitor dialect development in the S.E.D. locations.) Its imperfections lie mainly in its selectivity. Firstly, urban areas were ignored so that it dwelt wholly on matters agricultural. Secondly, the rural localities were selected on the basis of having had a constant population of at least 500 for one hundred years, and having been unlikely to have been contaminated by outside influences. Although this means that in so far as size is concerned similar settlements can be compared, it is not possible to compare the vocabulary of large villages with small- or to follow the course of cross-fertilisation of language through outside contact. Thirdly, the subjects chosen for interview were invariably elderly men. This was done on purpose, as research had shown that women modify their speech to the standard far more readily than men. (Women were only included to answer some of the household questions). It means that the gender differential cannot be looked at in depth - neither can the modifying process of women's speech patterns be examined. The elderly were chosen as it was thought that they were the most likely residual dialect

Wakelin, op.cit., pp.51-55.
speakers. Research by Labov has, however, shown this to be a false assumption. His work shows that young men are the heaviest dialect users. They are the section of society most actively seeking to identify themselves as natives. In using the elderly, however, the S.E.D. has preserved obsolete farming terms that might otherwise have been lost.

The use of a questionnaire to get responses, rather than observation and conversation can be criticised as it looses the spontaneity of living speech. Evidence from Milroy and the field-work carried out for this study shows that ordinary conversation produces words that the questionnaire had not covered. Moreover, these words are being used actively in real situations. The structured interview set up a barrier between sender and receiver. Some responses were obviously bowdlerised for the interviewer. Lastly, objections have been raised to the subjective and impressionistic method of transcribing the responses. This relied on the field-workers accuracy and ability to comprehend and record unfamiliar words and sounds without normalising them.

Although the S.E.D. is a flawed source, it is also the most valuable archive of English dialect in existence. The volumes containing the basic material have been the subject of considerable research. The most notable in the context of this study being by North, who has worked on the dialects of Kent, Surrey, and Sussex. This chapter is but an appendix to his full and better qualified linguistic analysis of these dialects. It does not aim to look at linguistic morphology; neither will it dwell in depth on the accents of dialect. North has already dealt with these subjects in his thesis and

---

20 Milroy, op.cit., p.7.
21 Milroy, op.cit., pp.139-170.
22 Wakelin, op.cit., pp.55-56.
The geographic area that will be covered in this chapter also diverges from North's county wide analysis. This inquiry will look only at the dialect of selected locations in the three counties. One of these locations, Outwood, lies in the centre of the study area. The others have been chosen because of their proximity to Outwood and the county borders. These are, Farningham, Kent, which lies on the north side of the North Downs, Goudhurst in the Kentish Weald, and Warnham in the Sussex Weald. Additional material comes from Nutfield on the Surrey greensand, Horne in the Surrey Weald and Charlwood in the Surrey Weald.

The methodology will be that the words will be divided into universal, unique or paired/shared words. Universal words are words which are common to all the locations. Unique words are words which are found in one location only. Paired/shared words are words which are shared between two or more of the locations. All these categories can be linked with locations outside the area, making it possible to map these links. The pairing process, therefore, will be important in the context of local identity and the perception of space, by showing whether the shared words indicate the existence of dialect areas, and if so whether these dialect areas cross administrative or geographical boundaries.

Universal Words

These are words shared by all the locations. In many
cases the words are also shared by most of the informants interviewed by the S.E.D. field-workers in Southern England, although the pronunciation of the words differed from location to location. In order to understand these different accents it is necessary to be a trained linguist with a comprehensive grasp of the International Phonetic Alphabet. With practice, however, it is possible to read the responses in order to categorise the words. In view of this a simple exercise was carried out on a sample of 10 words to look at shared pronunciation. These words are shown in Table 8.1.

Table 8.1 A Sample of Ten Words Used to Examine Pronunciation Morphology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outwood Fields</th>
<th>Farningham Fields</th>
<th>Goudhurst Fields</th>
<th>Warnham Farms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmyard Farmyard</td>
<td>Farmyard Farmyard</td>
<td>Paddock Paddock</td>
<td>Cess-pool Cess-pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cess-pool Cess-pit</td>
<td>Sack Sack</td>
<td>Whippens Whippens</td>
<td>Wagon Wagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sack Sack</td>
<td>Whippens Whippens</td>
<td>Wagon Wagon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whippens Whippens</td>
<td>Wagon Wagon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagon Wagon</td>
<td>Ladder* Ladder*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladder* Ladder*</td>
<td>Grubbing Grubbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grubbing Grubbing</td>
<td>Grubbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Stalk* Sacred Stalk*</td>
<td>Thatcher Thatcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aim was to identify any possible non-random shared pronunciation. Non-random being defined as four or more shared pronunciations. If this was taken on a county-wide basis the following results were obtained.

Table 8.2 Number of shared pronunciation by county.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Berks</th>
<th>Cornwall</th>
<th>Devon</th>
<th>Dorset</th>
<th>Hants</th>
<th>Kent</th>
<th>Somerset</th>
<th>Surrey</th>
<th>Sussex</th>
<th>Wilts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24* These words either have the same pronunciation qualities, or are the word used for the same implement or action. For example, wagon, ladder, or thatcher, stalk.
Broken down into actual locations the possible non-random shared pronunciations were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.3 Non-Random Shared Pronunciation Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farningham, Berks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warnham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton, SX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckland, Berks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton, SX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Harting, SX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursley, Sy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Harting, SX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Clandon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a check on these patterns, ten more words were taken from *The Linguistic Atlas of England*:

- Apples
- Chair
- Cold
- Colt
- Dew
- Fire
- Life
- Onion
- Sight
- Yellow

These words produced the following possible non-random locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.4 Non-Random Shared Pronunciation Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farningham, Kt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudhurst, Kt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warnham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton, SX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudhurst, Kt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farningham, Kt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outwood, Sy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmham, SX.Walton, Sy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton, Kt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton, SX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursley, Sy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appledore, Kt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldharbour, Sy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outwood and Warnham share possible non-random pronunciation patterns with each other as well as with Sutton and East Harting in Sussex. This may be one possible dialect area. Owing to the selective nature of the source it is doubtful whether much significance can be attached to this.

Universal words had different accents and came from all

categories of responses in the Survey. Some categories were, however, more universal than others. Terms referring to farm work and equipment tended to be more exclusive to one locality. This may be due to the biased nature of the informants, most of the elderly men who were interviewed were farm labourers or farmers. On the other hand this could indicate that farming terms were more rooted in one place than other words. Social and household terms for instance, had become wholly universal by the time that the Survey was taken. Again this may be due to the biased nature of the informants - or it could reinforce the theory that women are more linguistically adaptable than men. Universal words made up the majority of the words in the S.E.D. work-books. There were, however, some words that were unique to one location.

Unique Words

Unique words fall into three different types. Firstly there are some words meaning the same thing, that are different for each location. Secondly there were words which were unique to one location whilst the other three locations shared the same word. Thirdly there were totally unique words i.e. those words found in one location only in Southern England.

The first type of words comprised 26 responses. This is a negligible proportion of the total 1300 responses, but important nevertheless in indicating possible cultural differences between the locations. All except three of the twenty-six words refer to farm equipment and work, or farm animals. The three exceptions are words for brewing tea, crunching apples and describing someone whose feet turn out. Eight of the remaining words refer to farm equipment; seven to parts of animals or instructions to working animals; and four to work instructions. Some of the words are similar, others were self-evident. Most of the words would have been easily understood out of their native area. The
The first of these terms deals with ploughing equipment. North, in his paper on 'The One Way Plough in South Eastern England', describes in detail the different ploughing terms and types of plough used in Kent, Surrey and Sussex. The maps in his paper show a clear linguistic and artefact boundary that corresponds with the Surrey/Kent border but divides Sussex into two. North points out that the Kentish plough was being used on all types of soil. Its distribution cuts across geological and topographic formations in the region. It was also used on all types of farm - large and small-downland and Wealden. The paper states that the type of plough that was peculiar to Kent and East Sussex was used in this area from the fourteenth century onwards. Whether it was a native development or an introduction from the Continent is open to debate. This writer is not qualified to enter this debate either on linguistic grounds, or as an agricultural historian, but will make two observations. Firstly, the Kentish plough is known to have been used in one location in Surrey, Walton. This may be a coincidence - but Walton emerged in the 10 word pronunciation test from The Linguistic Atlas, as a possible non-random pronunciation link with Farningham, Kent. Walton lies on the North Downs, possibly within a Kentish settlement area. North's maps which show the linguistic and artefact boundaries of the one-way plough, show that the western boundary of the one-way plough almost coincides with the boundaries of the Kentish and South Saxon Kingdoms, which is in line with Wakelin's theory that the linguistic isoglosses of England coincide with the Saxon kingdoms. It is a temptation, therefore, to see the one-way plough not as a fourteenth century continental

26 North, One-Way Plough, loc.cit., pp.49-64.
27 North, One-Way Plough, loc.cit., p.64.
(Footnote continued)
## Table 8.5: Discrete Unique Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictionary Meaning</th>
<th>Outwood</th>
<th>Farningham</th>
<th>Goudhurst</th>
<th>Warnham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plough-shaft</td>
<td>Propstick</td>
<td>Trapstick</td>
<td>Bat</td>
<td>Leg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Hook</td>
<td>Fagging Hook</td>
<td>Brushel</td>
<td>Endbill</td>
<td>Swapple-h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim a Hedge</td>
<td>Hedging</td>
<td>Brushing</td>
<td>Cutting</td>
<td>Trimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin Out Crops</td>
<td>Plucking</td>
<td>Single 'em</td>
<td>Settle 'em</td>
<td>Thinning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
introduction but either as a purely native development peculiar to the Kentish kingdom, or as a much earlier introduction from the Continent, when England was still divided into Saxon kingdoms.

To return to the list of unique words, an interesting transition can be seen between two of the words given for the shaft of the plough. Bat was given at Goudhurst in Kent. Leg was the response for Warnham in Sussex. The augmented Kentish dictionary says that bats was often used instead of leg (of human). It suggests that at one time Goudhurst and Warnham shared the term leg but bat was a later development emerging at the time when the term bat equalled leg. This illustrates the changing and vital qualities of language.

The next sub-section will look at words which three of the locations share but the fourth does not. The scores for these words (i.e. words that are the odd-man out):"}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outwood</th>
<th>Farningham</th>
<th>Goudhurst</th>
<th>Warnham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of these words were found elsewhere in southern England; others were totally unique and not found elsewhere. 6 or 17% of the words at Outwood were totally unique. 7 or 20% at Farningham, 5 or 23% of the words at Goudhurst and 8 or 38% of the words from the Warnham list.

Only one of the unique-to-Outwood words appears in Leveson-Gower. The same questions that produced these words were also given to one Nutfield informant, who is also an elderly male connected with the land. There was some deviation from the Outwood responses. In some cases this took the form of the word from the other three locations. This was often the standard form of the word. In other cases, however, a word that was
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Wakelin, op.cit., p.10.
different to all S.E.D. responses was given. (It might
be added that the informant, who actually knew the
Outwood informants and was able to identify them from
the biographical information given in the S.E.D., was
slightly incredulous at some of their replies. He went
so far as to suggest that they might have been having
some fun at the expense of the S.E.D. field-worker)

Five of the words unique to Farningham appear in the
Kentish Dictionary, but three of these have a
different meaning. The same is true of the two words
from the Goudhurst-unique words which are in the
dictionary. One word from Warnham is in the Sussex
Dictionary but several of the words given by the
Nutfield informant are in the older Sussex Glossary.
This could be due to the more rigorous collection of
dialect in Sussex, or the Nutfield informant speaks an
older form of the dialect than Leveson-Gower collected
from Godstone and Titsey.

One of the words which the Nutfield informant gave
which was different to the other locations is worth
discussing, even though the difference is very small.
This was using the word follow for fallow. The
informant was most insistent that this word was follow
and explained that some people call this fallow. All
four locations in the S.E.D. give fallow (although
Outwood had lea as an alternative). Leveson-Gower gives
foller, but the earlier Sussex Glossary gives voller or
vollow. Evidence from two parish registers for Wealden
Surrey shows that the v and f were interchangeable in
the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, as
for example shown by the surname Farnham often
appearing as Varnham. This again suggests that the
Nutfield informant, although he used f instead of v

---

29 Parish, Sussex Dialect, op.cit.
Leveson-Gower, Glossary, op.cit.
gave an older variant of the word than the S.E.D. informants. (The *f*-*v* sound was very pronounced in the informant's elder brother, born in 1896. A good example of this was vurt = ferret)\(^{30}\)

When the words were put into types it was found that words which referred to animals or parts of animals topped the list of words unique in the sense that one location had a different word to the other three, at Outwood, Farningham and Goudhurst, but at Warnham the words were more likely to refer to equipment. All these terms for equipment which were peculiar to Warnham were shared with other locations in Southern England. The number of words were which totally unique to one location are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Unique Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outwood</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farningham</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudhurst</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warnham</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The words were:

**Outwood**
- Beazled (exhausted)
- Blevetts (mushrooms)
- Good-looking (pretty)
- Proud-flesh (loose piece of flesh by finer-nail)
- Quick of the lips (corner of the mouth)
- Slapping-post (gate-post)

**Farningham**
- Earlywig (earwig)
- Hangers (hinges)
- Huckleberries (bilberries)
- Pismire (ant)
- Scag (peat)
- Sway-gog (see-saw)
- Vomp (retch)

**Goudhurst**

**Warnham**

\(^{30}\)R.A.H. Nutfield.*
Durrant Cooper, *Sussex Provincialisms*, op.cit., p.84.
O.R.H. Nutfield. *
*A list of informants is given in appendix.*
Graze (munch an apple)  Flooring (cut timber)
Hewing (cut timber)  Guggle (throat)
Shallow-water (ford)  Lathes (gate-bar)
Spade-it-up (dig)  Nopping (cut timber)
Tin te tan (see-saw)  Norvickers (knee straps)
                    Straw Hive (skep)
                    Pouds (boils)

As can be seen some of these words are merely different ways of expressing actions, or common words which may have been fashionable during the informants' youth or at the time of the interview. Some of the words are more interesting than others. These will now be discussed.

Outwood

Beazled (exhausted) This word appears in both the Kentish and Sussex Dictionaries but not in the Surrey lists. The word is not in the O.E.D. but it is in Joseph Wright's English Dialect Dictionary, where it is ascribed to Kent, Surrey, and Sussex.31

Blewetts (mushrooms) This word is not found in the nineteenth-century lists and dictionaries. The O.E.D. defines it as a type of edible mushroom, giving the earliest reference to it as 1839. It is not in Wright, and the Nutfield informant was most sceptical about this response.32

Quick of the Mouth. This expression is not listed in

---

Major, op.cit., p.7.
R.A.H., Nutfield.
any of the reference works. It could be a version of crick/corner.

Farningham

Huckleberry (bilberry) This is not in the nineteenth-century word lists, but is given as a synonym for Bilberry (vaccinium myrtillus) in Grieve's Herbal. Grieve points out that this is the version of the synonym that crossed to America, but the O.E.D. claims the word is a corruption of whortleberry that originated in America. It gives the earliest reference as 1670 from New York, and as the word is not in Culpeper's Herbal of 1643 it is possible that it is an early trans-Atlantic import. The word is not in Wright.

Pismire (ant) This is not in the nineteenth-century word lists. The O.E.D. says the word is Scandinavian in origin, which correlates with Wright who ascribes the word to Lincolnshire. The S.E.D. has four other location using this word for ant, all of these are in Berkshire.

Scag (peat) This word does not appear in any of the reference works.

Vomp (retch) This word does not appear in any of the reference works. It could be a corruption of vomit.

---

33 M. Grieve, A Modern Herbal, 1931, p.100.
N. Culpeper, Complete Herbal, 1643.
Wright, op.cit., p.523.
Goudhurst

Tin te tan (see-saw) The Kentish Dictionary gives the meaning balance to this word. This comes from the author's collection of words which implies that it is still in use. The O.E.D. also gives the definition of balance for this word.\textsuperscript{35}

Warnham

Guggle (throat) This word is not in the nineteenth-century word lists. The O.E.D. has a reference to it dated 1680. It is not in Wright. The word is probably a corruption of gullet or gargle.

Norwickers (knee-straps) This does not appear in the nineteenth-century word lists or the O.E.D. or Wright. The word probably refers to the place of origin of the straps as other locative names appear for these articles, for example, Yorkers.\textsuperscript{36}

Pouds (boils) This word appears in both the Sussex Glossary and the Sussex Dictionary, although the author was unable to identify or verify its usage. Wright dates it from 1721, but it is not in the O.E.D.\textsuperscript{37}

Words that are totally unique to one location are very rare. The linguistic area as defined by the S.E.D. would be larger than the parish or village community. The S.E.D. is, however, a limited source. The structured

\textsuperscript{35}Major, op.cit., p.113.
\textsuperscript{36}Orton and Wakelin, op.cit., p. 774.
\textsuperscript{37}Durrant Cooper, op.cit., p.67.
interview situation lost many of the uncensored words that emerge during conversation and observation. Short conversations with the field-work informants (names and biographical details in appendix) produced the following non-standard words.

A fetching  Drink fetched from the farm or pub for the farm-workers.
Cooty  Lousy. Not in reference works.
Cotchel  Half a load of hay. O.E.D. defines this as the grain left in the sack after emptying. Wright ascribes the word to Berkshire and Wiltshire.
Horse-Daisies  Ox-eye Daisy. Will be discussed later in this chapter.
Pikey  Gipsy. Will be discussed later in this chapter.
Scattle-cats.  People arguing. Will be discussed later in this chapter.
To scoon  To peer at. Not in reference works.
Shacking  Walking fast. Not in reference works although Wright has shackle referring to chickens running.

These words show that the Surrey dialect is alive and in everyday use amongst the indigenous population. It also suggests that each village had an altogether more varied vocabulary than the S.E.D. evidence suggests. On the whole, however, the data from the S.E.D. shows that although there were linguistic differences between individual communities, these communities rest in a wider linguistic area which may be defined by comparing patterns shown by paired and shared words.

Wright, op.cit.
Map 8.1: Potential Areas of Dialect Sharing as Defined by Pronunciation and Word Sharing
Map 8.2a: Location of Terms Bogeyman or Blackman

Map 8.2b: Location of Terms used for Kindling Wood
Map 8.2c: Location of Terms Whortleberries or Hurts

Map 8.2d: Location of Terms Pods or Shucks
Map 8.2e: Location of Terms Wimble or Whim-Wham

Map showing the location of terms Wimble or Whim-Wham in the counties of Sussex, Somerset, Kent, and Hants. The map illustrates the distribution of these terms within the counties, with an emphasis on their shared location.

The analysis of these terms produced a pattern within the four locations, with scores as follows:

- Wimble: Sussex,
- Whim-wham: Hants.

It is observed that the two locations furthest from each other, although the vast parish of Worth and a Leonard's Forest lie between them. It is possible that if the B.E.D. had covered a closer mesh the distinct areas might show a much clearer pattern. The word-pairing reinforces pronunciation pairing. When the two are combined, a visible linguistic area is produced as shown on Map 8.2f.

This map provides some evidence towards confirming Blackman's hypothesis that the Saxon kingdoms formed important linguistic boundaries as these areas correspond roughly to the Kentish and South Saxen kingdoms.

A selection of the more unusual words that are shared outside the four locations have been mapped in order to test this assumption. Maps 8.2a-e.

The words used for this are:

- Wimble / Whim-wham
- Kindling wood
- Whortleberries / Whorts
- Wits / Whacks
Paired and Shared Words

Paired and shared words are not the same as universal words. Paired and shared words were not held in common by all the locations but shared either between two or more of the four locations or shared with other localities in Southern England. The analysis of the S.E.D. produced 51 pairings within the four locations, with scores as follows.

Table 8.6 Paired words Score
Outwood --- Warnham 23
Outwood --- Goudhurst 9
Farningham --- Goudhurst 6
Goudhurst --- Warnham 5
Farningham --- Warnham 3

The most obvious linguistic pairing is between Outwood in Surrey and Warnham in Sussex. These two locations are in terms of distance the two that are closest to each other, although the vast parish of Worth and St.Leonard's Forest lie between them. It is possible that if the S.E.D. had covered a closer mesh the dialect areas might show a much denser pattern than they do, as it is the word-pairing reinforces the pronunciation pairing. When the two are combined a possible linguistic area is produced as shown on Map 8.1. This map goes some way towards confirming Wakelin's hypothesis that the Saxon kingdoms formed important linguistic boundaries as these areas correspond roughly to the Kentish and South Saxon kingdoms.

A selection of the more unusual words that are shared outside the four locations have been mapped in order to test this assumption. Maps 8.2a-e.

The words used for this are:
- bogeyman/blackman
- a selection of words for kindling wood
- hurts/whortleberries
- pods/shucks
wimble/whim-wham

Map 8.2a shows the distribution of the term bogeyman/blackman. The latter term is found only in a triangle in Surrey and Sussex with an outlier in Somerset. The various words for kindling wood are shown on Map 8.2b. This shows an interesting pattern with a strongly marked tendency for bavin/bevin to border the Thames in the north and to be confined by the Weald in the south. In Kent this word was recorded in use in 1735 and the compiler of the augmented dictionary heard it in use in the 1970s. Pimps, the word for kindling used in Sussex occurs in both the Kentish and Sussex dictionaries. As pimp is a so-called Celtic sheep counting numeral it is possible that the word could refer to the number of faggots tied up in a bundle.

The distribution of pod/shucks, Map 8.2c, is well defined, with Map 8.2d, hurts/whortleberries, showing a similar distribution pattern. Finally, Map 8.2e shows the distribution of the terms wimble/whim-wham for a thatcher's rope-twister. Whim-wham covers a triangle defined by Warnham-Outwood-Goudhurst and is exclusive to the Weald.

This section will end by looking at three words from the field-work carried out in contemporary Surrey that are shared with other locations. These are pikey, Horse-daisies and scattle cats.

Pikey as a synonym for gipsy appears in both the Kentish and Sussex dictionaries. It was also the answer to the S.E.D. question, "What do you call those dark-skinned people who move about the country in

39 Major, op.cit., p.79.
40 Parish, Sussex Dialect, op.cit., p.95.
Major, op.cit., p.79.
caravans? " at East Clandon and Coldharbour in Surrey, Denton, Warren Street, and Appledore in Kent and Horam in Sussex. The origin of the word is a good example of how the meanings of words become transposed. Pikey was originally applied to those who tramped the turn-pikes. This puts a limit on its antiquity of not earlier than the early-eighteenth century. By the nineteenth-century it had come to mean gipsy rather than tramp, and by the mid-twentieth century it had become a term applied to any untidy or dirty looking person.

*Parish, Sussex dialect, op.cit., p.62.

Grieve, op.cit., p. 248.

J.E.B. Nutfield.*

J.Britten, A Dictionary of English Plant Names, 1886, p.141.
possible sources of derivation. The *Sussex Glossary* has the word *sclat*—to beat with violence, which the compiler thought derived from the French verb *eclater*. The is one possible derivation of scattle. The *O.E.D.*, however, has *scat*—to harm or injure—deriving from the Old Norse—*scathel*. This is another possible derivation of scattle. Both of these derivations mean the expression is of some antiquity.\(^{42}\)

These words are not only evidence of the vitality of the indigenous Surrey dialect, despite the heavy influx of a dormitory population into that county. They also show that some of the words being used in every-day conversation are of very ancient origin. Words, it might be added, that were not picked up by the more structured approach of the *S.E.D.*

To return to the typology of paired/shared words—this fell into two main categories—words referring to farm equipment and those dealing with parts of the human body. The high proportion of words referring to farm equipment agrees with the conclusions which North drew—that linguistic and farming-tradition boundaries coincide. North's paper on *The One-way Plough* in S.E. England shows that there were two main dialect and artefact zones in the south east. These did not coincide with the county or boundaries or with natural zones, but formed a third landscape. This landscape of language will now be discussed with reference to the movement patterns of population as shown in Chapters 4 and 5.\(^{43}\)

\(^{42}\) *Wright*, *op.cit.*, p.248.
Some of these derivations mean the expression is of some antiquity.\(^{42}\)

---

*Sussex Glossary*, *op.cit.*

\(^{43}\) *North*, *One-Way Plough*, *loc.cit.*, pp.23,58.
This section aims to define dialect and cultural areas in order to examine whether these areas were constrained by boundaries - either man-made or natural. Through this, it is hoped to gauge the strength of these boundaries in shaping local identity in the past. It is also hoped that these dialect/cultural areas will help to measure the degree of perception of these boundaries.

The first spatial boundary to be measured is the administrative boundary of the ecclesiastical parish. The S.E.D. responses give a score of 245 words, or 19% of the total 1300 responses that were unique in some way to one of the four locations. The remaining 81% of responses were shared with one of the other four locations or outside the area. The vast majority of the responses were universal.

Outwood and Farningham topped the list of unique words with 28% each of the 245 words; Goudhurst and Varnham both had 22% of these words. Across the whole spectrum of responses, however, each location could only muster 5% totally unique words, (i.e. 19% divided by 4) This means that in so far as dialect was concerned the parish/short-distant locality was not an important boundary marker. There is a proviso to this - as living dialect shows much more local exclusivity than shown by the S.E.D. It is probable that in the past each community - in its everyday life - had a range of words which were peculiar to that community, but these cannot be measured.

These conclusions have to be related to the findings on inter-parochial movement discussed in Chapter 4. These showed that the majority of adults had moved from the parish where they had been born, but usually only a short distance, and usually within the county of birth. A dialect area which crossed parish boundaries would be in line with this. There were, however, some exceptions to this. Chapters 4 and 5 show that some parishes were
much more inward looking than others, showing a high level of endogamy and native born population living in the parish after adulthood. One of these parishes was Nutfield. The field-work informants who were natives of this parish show that they often use older variants of words than those used by the S.E.D. informants, which suggests that the more inward looking the parish the more exclusive its dialect is likely to be.

On the whole, the evidence suggests that the language landscape was wider than the parish. Language crossed the parish boundaries - although each parish or community had words which belonged only to that community. These words, by the time the S.E.D. was taken in the 1950s, constituted a small proportion of the total vocabulary of a community. In the past, it is likely that these words represented a far greater proportion of that vocabulary. This would not have prevented one community from understanding and being understood by its neighbours. Linguistically each parish or community nested within a group that shared the same vocal characteristics. Whether these nests crossed the county boundary will now be examined. Table 8.7 shows the county scores for all shared words that were in the least unusual, (i.e. it omits all common universal words).
### 4.3a: Proportion of Words Shared by Farningham, Kent and Other Counties

![Map of counties showing proportion of words shared by Farningham, Kent and other counties.]

### 4.3b: Proportion of Words Shared by Goudhurst, Kent and Other Counties

![Map of counties showing proportion of words shared by Goudhurst, Kent and other counties.]
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8.3c: Proportion of Words Shared by Outwood, Surrey and Other Intesties

8.3d: Proportion of Words Shared by Warnham, Sussex and Other Villages

Highway between Berkshires and North Kent. Goudhurst in the Kentish Weald is much more exclusively Kentish.

Warnham in the Sussex Weald shares over half its words with other locations in Sussex. Table 8.7 gives a range of 55% of under 10% words shared with six places (of course this number as the relative size of place). One origin to the present day that is of note is the Great Southern Road which was thought to have a linguistic feature.
Table 8.7 County Scores for Shared Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Outwood</th>
<th>Farningham</th>
<th>Goudhurst</th>
<th>Warnham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hants</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table and Maps 8.3a-d show that Outwood which lies close to both the Kent and Sussex borders shares words equally with its own county Surrey and Sussex, but not Kent. Farningham which shares a quarter of its shared words with other Kentish locations has nearly as many shared words with locations in Berkshire. This link probably owes its origin to the River Thames providing a highway between Berkshire and North Kent. Goudhurst in the Kentish Weald is much more exclusively Kentish, whilst Warnham in the Sussex Weald shares over half its words with other locations in Sussex. Table 8.7 gives a mean of 37% of unusual words shared within the same county as the recording location. This low county mean does not owe its origin to the proximity of the locations to the border. For example, Outwood and Warnham are almost equi-distant from the border but Warnham has a far stronger pairing within its own county than Outwood.

Maps 8.3a-d illustrate these trends. They show that Sussex and Kent were more linguistically exclusive than Surrey. These two counties constituted separate Saxon kingdoms with Surrey as a buffer zone between them. This helps to confirm Wakelin’s thesis that the linguistic boundaries of England follow the the Saxon kingdom boundaries. Wakelin’s theory that rivers were a valuable communications channel is also confirmed as shown by the linguistic pairing of Kent and

44 Wakelin *op.cit*, p. 10.
Maps 8.4 a-d: Proportion of Words Shared Between Parishes

Farningham

Goudhurst

Outwood

Warnham
Berkshire. Whether this was the result of early settlers pushing up the Thames, or the result of a later development cannot be ascertained. On the one hand, Everitt, shows how the early Saxon settlers used the river valleys as entrance points to inland areas — but on the other hand the 1851 census return shows migrants from Berkshire moving into northern Surrey and Kent.

Maps 8.4a-d show the proportion of shared words for each location separately. Map 8.4b shows that not only was there a riparian link between Kent and Berkshire but there was also a link between downland villages. Uffington, Buckland, Walton-on-the-hill and Farningham are all downland settlements linked within a dialect community. Similarly, the language area shared between Surrey and Sussex lies entirely within the Weald.

A test was run on the Surrey/Sussex Wealden triangle which checked the 1851 census return for Burstow, which contains the S.E.D. location of Outwood, to see how many incomers came from this triangle. The result was that 115 incomers came from this triangle compared to 313 from outside it. One hundred from the triangle came from neighbouring Worth; two came from the Warnham area, but there no incomers from the Sutton/East Harting area or the Thursley/Coldharbour/East Clandon area. Language could, therefore, be shared without any actual inter-action taking place.

The language area shows a grouping which is older than the parish or shire. It owes its origin to the different linguistic backgrounds of the early Saxon settlers. The boundary formed by the Saxon kingdoms is especially obvious when linguistic evidence is correlated with the material culture of the area. In

45 A. Everitt, Continuity and Colonization, The Evolution of Kentish Settlement, 1986, for example, p. 71.
his paper on the Kentish one-way plough North shows how the linguistic and artefact boundaries coincide. He writes: "The lexical differences between east and west (Sussex and Kent) are linguistic reflexes of a more basic material cultural boundary." 46

The material culture of the area will be discussed in the next section.

---

46 North, One-Way Plough, _loc.cit._, p. 63.
The Landscape of Material Culture

Introduction

In his paper on 'Geography and Folk Life', Buchanan suggests that cultural phenomena reflect the essential character of a region more faithfully than landscape. Material culture can, he writes, provide awareness and insight into the basis of regional personality. Cultural phenomena, material or ideological, has evolved out of a need to come to grips with the landscape. In the case of farm implements Jenkins writes: "Custom and tradition has dictated that a particular type of tool is best for a particular region."

Similarly, seasonal rhythms and traditions grew out of the demands of different terrains, farming practices and economy. The customs and equipment of the fisher-folk of the Sussex coastal plain, for instance, are likely to be different to those of the downland shepherds from the same county. Culture, material and ideological, is likely to show a tendency to stay within the natural rather than the man-made boundaries.

---

Methodology

The typology of the artefacts of the past is a science which needs specialised training. To appreciate the finer details of the construction and design of farm implements demands practice and a trained eye. This section, like the preceding section, is an appendix to the work of those who have this eye – notably David North and Geraint Jenkins. North has examined both the agricultural terminology and the different types of farming artefacts found in the counties of Kent, Surrey and Sussex. He concludes from this evidence that there is a clear-cut east-west division in both artefacts and terminology.

This section will not embrace so wide a field as North’s work, but will look at the design and distribution of three artefacts, the bill hook, the farm wagon and the smock or round frock worn by the farm-workers.

The Bill Hook

This is a wooden-handled cutting tool with a hooked end. The S.E.D. responses for this tool given for the four locations used as markers in the preceding section were:

Outwood Fagging Hook Farningham Brushel
Goudhurst Bagging Hook Warnham Swapple.

The Nutfield response was fagging hook. This is a corruption of faggoting hook which describes the tool’s main function in cutting small wood for kindling, hedging or hurdling. The term also appears in a

\[\text{______________}\]

49 Jenkins, Craft Industries, op.cit., passim.
50 North, Aspects, loc.cit., passim.
Fig. 8.1: Kentish Billhooks

Fig. 8.2: Surrey Billhook

Fig. 8.3: Sussex Billhook

1\:\:3 = 12\:\:\text{inches}
blacksmith's invoice dated 1884 for that parish. The term bushel appears in a probate inventory of 1764 for Caterham. This parish, was like Farningham a downland settlement. The farm in the inventory possessed four of these tools. The S.E.D. produced 17 variations of nomenclature for this tool from the 92 responses from Southern England. The term bill-hook was the most popular response accounting for 38% of the replies. Most of the terms were descriptions of the tool's function.

Not only did the names for the tool vary, the shape of the tool itself varied from district to district. This was due to the local nature of its manufacture. Until the late-nineteenth century it was made by the local blacksmith who adapted its shape so that it could deal with the vegetation of the local area. Size, shape, and weight varied according to the demands of the locality. These local designs persisted into the era of mass-manufacturing. The factories produced the shapes traditional to an area and did not attempt to try to sell designs alien to a locality. A farm equipment catalogue of 1905 has illustrations of 42 different shapes of bill-hook, all made to meet local demands. Standardisation of the tool was slow to catch on, which meant that the ancient local forms survived for many years after the tool was no longer made locally.

The ancient forms, designed as they were for specific ecological conditions, should relate to geographical rather than administrative areas. Nineteenth-century illustrations show, however, that Kent, Surrey, and Sussex, used different shapes of bill hooks for the same type of vegetation and work. Kent favoured two

---

52 S.R.O. P/26/6/21/18, Nutfield Parish Records, Churchwardens' Accounts.
53 The Bourne Society, The Inventory of Caterham Court Lodge, 1764, Local History Records, XIV, 1978, pp. 36-37.
54 Jenkins, Craft Industries, op.cit., pp.xvi, xix.
types of the tool. Fig. 8.1. Although there is no nineteenth century illustration of the Surrey tool a Nutfield informant, R.H. uses the bill hook made for his father in the 1870s. This is straighter than the Kentish example, less hooked and lacking the accretions of the Kent bill hook. Fig. 8.2. It resembles the Sussex hand-bill whereas the Sussex bill-hook has a very pronounced hook. Fig. 8.3.

Although the known examples of the tool are catalogued by county, this is probably misleading as the distribution of these tools was not county-wide but restricted to one parish, or a group of parishes that shared the services of a blacksmith. The retention of the traditional design was reinforced by the passage of the blacksmith’s craft from father to son. The 1851 census returns for a sample of 9 villages show that in six of them the blacksmith’s shop was a family concern; moreover the same family often had two forges in the same village. In three cases this family network extended over more than one village. The Adams family had forges in Limpsfield and Titsey – whilst the absence of a smith in neighbouring Tatsfield suggests that they did the smithing for that village as well. Furthermore, the more populous village of Warlingham could only muster one smith, so it is possible that the Adams family also did the work for that village. The Adams’ forges were in the north of Limpsfield whilst another family concern, "the Jarretts", had a forge in the southern end of that village. There is some evidence that links them to Stephen Dennis the Caterham blacksmith. A similar network existed on the Weald. The Leigh family had two forges in Burstow, whilst another branch of the family worked a forge in Godstone.

Whilst it cannot be proved from the material evidence, it is probable that three small tool areas existed in this corner of S.E. Surrey. One is a downland area which included Warlingham, Titsey, Tatsfield and the northern
part of Limpsfield. The southern end of that village had links with Caterham; whilst on the Weald the Leigs' forges at Outwood could conveniently serve Burstow, Horne, the southern parts of Blechingley, Godstone and Nutfield. (It is possible that the tool used by the Nutfield informant came from this group as his paternal grandmother was a Leigh.) The Post Office Directory for 1866 enlarges these groups. The Jarretts had extended their interest into neighbouring Oxted, whilst the Head family had opened forges in south-west Godstone at Blindley Heath and Dormansland in Lingfield. The lack of a smith in neighbouring Tandridge meant that either the Leigh complex or the Heads did the smithing for this village.

The conclusion to be drawn from this section is that the design of small-tools was likely to extend beyond the single parish, because of local conditions and the kinship networks of those making the tools. Tools of a similar design were likely to be found in a group of four or more contiguous parishes. The evidence from the locations of the blacksmiths suggests that in the study area this distribution was linked to terrain with one group servicing the downs and another the Weald.

Four villages in the study area did not possess a smithy. These were the four least populous parishes and were low down on the service hierarchy. The Post Office Directory for 1866 shows that the same four settlements also lacked wheelwrights' shops. The next section which discusses the distribution of the different types of farm wagon will consider whether these parishes fitted into a large equipment grouping which was identical to that seen for the distribution of small equipment.

The Farm Wagon

The four wheeled farm wagon was a relatively late introduction to farm life. It probably evolved from the long distance carrier's carts of the seventeenth-century. It represented a deceptively simple piece of equipment, which hid an extremely complicated structure and method of construction. This process was usually carried out in the local wheelwright's shop, which is lovingly described in George Sturt's book of that name.  

In his book Sturt suggests that the probable range of a wheelwright's service area was five miles. This meant that the wheelwright knew the terrain of every farm in that area and modified his work accordingly:

"And so we got curiously intimate with the peculiar needs of the neighbourhood. In farm waggon, dung-cart, barley-roller, plough, water-barrel, or what not, the dimensions we chose, the curves we followed (and almost every piece of timber was curved) were imposed upon us by the nature of the soil in this or that farm, the gradient of this or that hill."

Although each wagon was bespoke by a particular farm there was also a degree of standardisation imposed upon their construction. Wagon wheels had to be standardised locally so that they would fit into the existing wheel-ruts on unmetalled roads. Evidence from surviving examples of wagons shows that this standardisation was very local. Three Sussex wagons, built c 1880, and used at Hove, Midhurst and Horsham, have wheel-tracks of 62 inches, 70 inches and 65 inches.

57 G. Sturt, The Wheelwright's Shop, 1934, passim.
58 Sturt, op.cit., p.17.
respectively, whilst a wagon from Dorking, only ten miles from Horsham, had a track of 68 inches. This means that the distance over which a wagon was expected to travel was very limited.

Whilst the dimensions of the wagons varied from area to area, Jenkins shows, that there were four main types of wagon found in Kent, Surrey and Sussex. All of these conformed to a basic type - The South-Eastern Box Wagon. This wagon had a deep rectangular body with large wheels. Jenkins divides this basic type into four sub-types; 1) Kent Wagon, 2) Sussex Wagon, 3) Surrey Wagon, 4) Transitional Wagons.

The Kent Wagon was the classic South-Eastern Box Wagon, with medium-sized wheels, a fairly deep body with pannelled sides with wide side-boards and ladders fore and rear. This type of wagon was found in Kent, East Surrey and East Sussex, with its distribution extended along the North Downs as far west as the Guildford area. The Sussex wagon was very similiar to this but had a taller body with a deeply waisted form and lacked the ladders. This type was found mainly in West Sussex, and often had a removable body. The Surrey Wagon was the type of wagon George Sturt made. It is misnamed, however, as it was only found in the far west of Surrey and was much more popular in Hampshire and South Berkshire. It was characterised by very small wheels, a shallow body and spindled rather than pannelled sides. The two transitional types took characteristics from both the Kent and Surrey wagons. The first type was found around Dorking. It was similiar in shape to the Kent wagon but had the spindle sides of the Surrey wagon. The other transitional type came from Loxwood in Sussex. This had pannelled sides, but the unwaisted shape of the Surrey wagon.

-----------------------
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Map 8.5: Distribution of Farm Wagon Types

- Kent Type
- Surrey Type
- Transitional
- Sussex Type
Map 8.5 shows the distribution pattern of these wagons. This map indicates that the westward distribution of the Kent wagon stretches much further west than the distribution of the Kentish one-way plough mapped by North. The distribution of the Kent wagon crosses county boundaries as well as pays boundaries - for it was used on downland and in the Weald. The Sussex wagon was exclusive to that county, although the Surrey wagon intruded into the north of western Sussex. This too was found on all types of terrain - although modifications were made to all these types to suit the lie of the land. The Surrey wagon represented a western tradition. Jenkins places it with the Central Southern Box Wagons rather than the South Eastern types. It is possible, therefore, that its appearance in Surrey is an outlier of a traditional type originating in the west of England.

One difference that has not been discussed but which is important in the context of local identity, is the traditional colours that were used to paint the wagons. Wagons used in Sussex were painted blue with a red under-carriage; those used in Kent were painted stone coloured; whilst those from Surrey were light brown or buff. This colour zoning meant that instant recognition of the native county of any wagon was possible.

Even though a degree of standardisation was imposed on the wheelwrights by local conditions, the traditional working practices were reinforced by the family-based structure of the wheelwrights' shops. The 9 sample villages show that in 1851 four of these had family run wheelwrights' shops, with the possibility of three
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networks crossing parish boundaries. The Reading family of Caterham had another family member working in Godstone. The Charmans and the Quickendens who were related by marriage worked in Godstone, Horne and Oxted, whilst the Wallis family had shops in Lingfield and its neighbour across the county border in Kent - Edenbridge.

The wheelwrights' service areas were, the Reading family supplied the northern part of Godstone and Caterham, plus Chaldon which had no wheelwright, and perhaps Gatton and Chipstead. The Charman-Quickenden complex spread over Blindley Heath in south Godstone, Horne, Oxted, and probably Tandridge which had no wheelwright. To the west of this the Wallis family network included Lingfield, Edenbridge, plus Crowhurst which had no wheelwright.

It should be noted that the greensand settlements of Blechingley, Godstone, Nutfield, and Westerham lie outside both blacksmith and wheelwright networks. The portion of these parishes which lie on the greensand ridge were well served - each had a blacksmith and a wheelwright plus other services which made them self-sufficient.

This section shows that the settlements in the study area shared the same basic type of wagon. The Kent wagon being found across the whole study area. Within the different counties the design underwent some modification. The wheel-tracks were likely to be different sizes, which meant the wagon could not be used easily outside of its native area. Furthermore, each county favoured a different coloured superstructure for the wagon - a practice which was akin to a county livery. This suggests a certain degree of identification with the county on the part of the farmers who commissioned the wagons. This county livery extended into the clothes worn for work. The next section will discuss the patterns and distribution of
the rural worker's traditional garment - the smock or round frock.

The Smock or Round Frock

No rural artefact is so evocative of a vanished arcadian idyll as the smock. This garment has come to represent the simple but free life of the peasant. Those who wore it are seen as ignorant but honest rustics whose way of life, though basic, was good and wholesome.

The function of the smock was, however, prosaic in the extreme. The garment was designed to keep out the more unpleasant aspects of rural life. It was a weatherproof protective garment for men in the fields. It was constructed in such a way as to give maximum shelter from the wind and rain, being shirt-like in shape with pockets. Large enough to wear over layers of clothes it had a double thickness of cloth over the shoulders for additional protection plus narrow openings at the neck to keep out the wind.

Documentary evidence suggests that it developed on the Surrey/Sussex border in the early eighteenth century. The earliest written evidence of its use in Surrey is 1710. By 1797 it was still unusual enough for Marianne Thornton to remark upon it, although it had appeared in some of Morland's paintings by then.

Its use in the study area is well attested. The Blechingley Vestry Minute Book records that in 1814 round frocks were supplied for a boy in service at Doghurst. Forty years later in 1851, The Times
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66 A. Buck, 'The Countryman's Smock,' Folk Life, 1, 1963, pp.16-34.
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reports that when the villagers of Godstone visited the Great Exhibition, the men were wearing their best white frocks. Recollections of Caterham in the 1850s also recall the men of the village wearing smocks, notably when eight of them acted as pall-bearers at the Rector's funeral. The smock was being worn in downland settlements well into the 1870s. Mabel Roffey could remember her grandmother making smocks for Farmer Budgen of Tollesworth Farm in Chaldon in the 1870s. This latter case seems to be evidence of the class-less nature of the garment, worn by workers and farmers alike. Half a century earlier Stevenson remarked on the Wealden farmers wearing the smock to market. In fact, he writes, wearing it with pride. It is likely, in view of the cost of the garment, 9s-18s, that it was worn only by the farmers and the better paid agricultural specialists such as carters or shepherds. Nutfield informant R.A.H. could not recollect anyone wearing the garment or it being mentioned by any of his older relatives. He said that the elderly labourers wore a sack split open across the shoulders when it rained. It is probable that this was the practice of the poorer labourers in the more distant past as well.

Today the smock is noted for its intricate needlework. Such decoration was, however, a late development. The early examples have only the gathering with no ornamental stitching. These early examples were simple
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shirt-like garments. Examples can be seen in the Stubb's picture 'Haymakers'. Buck suggests that the lack of ornamentation in the Surrey examples coupled with the simple construction of the characteristic smock, points to this type as being one of the earliest. An exhibition of smocks held in the Guildford Museum showed that there were three types of smocks in this part of South East England. Type 1 was heavily ornamented with deep panels of gathering, closely stitched with bands of different varieties of embroidery. This was a late type found mainly in Sussex. Type 2 was shirt-like with little gathering and light stitching. This was the earliest type of smock and was found only in Surrey and Sussex with a few outliers in Kent and Hampshire. Type 3 was a transitional type of garment with more gathering than the early smock but no ornamental stitching. This was found mainly in West Surrey and on the Surrey/Hampshire border.

Many men seem to have possessed two smocks. The one used for best was invariably white whilst the everyday smocks were coloured - with different areas favouring different colours. Blue smocks were worn in West Sussex and Surrey, whilst brown was favoured on the East Surrey/Sussex border. These colour schemes have parallels with the wagon liveries, as those wagons from the area where the wagons were painted brown also had brown smocks, whilst Sussex wagons and smocks were blue.

Whilst it is clear that the smock developed on the Surrey/Sussex border where the earliest form of undecorated garments survived long after elaborately stitched smocks had become the norm elsewhere, it is not possible to trace a network of smock-makers.

73 G. Stubbs, 'Haymakers', painting in the Tate Gallery.
crossing this area. Most smocks were made locally by the wives of the men who wore them, or by local specialists such as Mabel Roffey's grandmother.  

The surviving examples of their work indicate that East Surrey and Sussex shared a common style of smock which Kent did not possess. This coincides with the linguistic boundaries of the area which show that Surrey/Sussex have more paired/shared words than either Surrey/Kent or Sussex/Kent. Kent, therefore, stands in isolation.

**Landscape of Material Culture - Conclusion**

The three artefacts used to look at the distribution of material culture show the following trends, small tools were made by local craftsmen who designed them to meet local demands. Traditional forms persisted mainly because the craft or science of making the tools passed from father to son. Although these traditional forms are classified by county this is misleading, as the distribution of small tools of similar design was likely to be found within a group of about four villages. These villages usually lay within the same ecological zone.

Larger artefacts such as farm wagons, were likely to have a greater degree of regional standardisation. Local conditions and traditions imposed certain dimensions on the wagons. In the study area, the farmers were likely to be using the same basic type of wagon - but these wagons would be different to the eye as they were painted in different colours for each county. The distribution of the type of wagon used in the study area had a boundary that lay further west than the linguistic boundary shown in the first section of this chapter. It crossed both county and natural boundaries - but the latter boundary caused some modifications in

---

the design of the wagon.

The colour of a smock was an indication of the origin of the wearer. The border area of Surrey and Sussex had a unique design of smock which was found in all types of pays. Kent does not share this design or colour of smock so that in this case linguistic and material culture boundaries coincide.

The artefacts that make up the material culture are part of man's response to the world he lives in. Their form helps him to come to grips with nature and life. They are practical expressions of his needs. The ideological expressions of these needs - the customs and rituals which try to make sense of the world will be discussed in the last section of this chapter. Before that section the material and the spiritual will be bridged by a short section on an object which symbolises both the material and the spiritual worlds - grave-markers.

**Grave-Markers**

In this context the term grave-marker is being used for any feature erected to mark a grave. The form this took can tell the observer something about the beliefs and ideas of those who commissioned them. They are also often the only examples of folk-art that have survived. In order to distinguish what might be termed folk-art, a distinction had to be made between the neo-classical work commissioned by the rich from professional sculptors and copied by local masons, and work which had obviously sprung from a local inspiration. On the one hand this meant that the fine workmanship of the Colecom family of Merstham which is found on many of the grave-markers of the area had to be left out, because it has its origin in a neo-classical idiom. On the other hand the sinister humanoid head-stones of Kent can be included as they show no tutored influence, but are primitive expressions of mourning.
One of the earliest known forms of grave-marker in the area is a grave-board. This was a wooden rail between two upright posts which resembles the head-board of a bed. The shape may have been intentional—suggesting that the incumbent underneath was not dead but merely sleeping—or it may have been the easiest way for the village carpenter to erect a memorial. The rails were usually painted white so that they stood out.\footnote{T. Jenner, 'Deadboards', \textit{The Historian}, 2, 1984, p. 20.}

Although wooden grave-boards were found all over the south east—the earliest known example, dated 1658, comes from Sidlesham in Sussex. Aubrey observed them at Esher, Farley, Gatton, Mickleham and Ripley. There is also evidence that they were popular in urban settings as well as rural. Until a relatively recent date these rails could be seen in all the parish church-yards in the study area, as well as in the Baptist burial grounds at Outwood and Lingfield. This traditional form of grave-marking continued in use until the early years of this century. Inscriptions on the rails show that they were erected by all sections of society, although they varied in style and expense.\footnote{F. Burgess, \textit{English Churchyard Memorials}, 1963, pp. 21, 117.} Some writers suggest that wooden boards were used because they had a life-span of about three generations which was the limit any individual could expect to be remembered. Undertakers account books show, however, that the boards were cleaned, re-lettered and re-painted at regular intervals so that they would survive the ravages of time. The use of wooden grave-boards can be seen as a regional custom with a bias of popularity towards Surrey and Sussex.\footnote{Jenner, \textit{loc.cit.}, p. 21.}

The popularity of this form of grave-marking in the

\footnote{Jenner, \textit{loc.cit.}, p. 21.}
latter county is attested by the fact that its form was imitated in stone in Sussex. The earliest known imitation comes from East Grinstead and is dated 1703. Later the stone copies of wooden grave-boards became the characteristic shape for grave-markers in this area. Such was the popularity of the shape it was even imitated in cast-iron. A parallel can be seen in this example with the persistence and popularity of the early simple shape of the smock in the area where it had originated.

In Kent an idiosyncratic type of stone grave-marker developed. This was a life-sized humanoid stone which looked like a hooded figure standing over the grave—an image that was strengthened by human faces scratched on the front of the stone. These stones haunt churchyards all over Kent but are particularly numerous in the Medway Valley. They extended as far east as Westerham on the Surrey border, but once across the border the shape loses its human quality to become a squat, very thick block about two and a half feet high. This type of marker is found at Blechingley, Caterham and Warlingham in Surrey, and Westerham in Kent alongside the hooded-figure markers. Surrey churchyards also show a preference for body stones. These covered the body of the grave mound. Good examples are to be found at Blechingley and Godstone, where there is an example in stucco; and Chaldon where the body-stone links a neo-classical head and foot-stone.

As far as the form of the grave-marker is concerned it
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can be seen that there was both a regional and a county tradition. The wooden rail was found across the South East but its stone counterpart was found only in the corner of Sussex that adjoins the Surrey and Kent borders. The Kentish hooded figure head stone developed independently of the wooden-rail, the earliest example coming from Faversham in the 1660s. This form spread west-ward to influence the Surrey masons who produced a debased form of the stone.

The faces on the hooded figure stones could vary widely in the quality of workmanship, from a few scratched lines to elaborate reliefs. Many faces carved on Kentish stones were reduced to geometric essentials. Kentish work in general shows a marked tendency towards abstract design, for instance, an early representation of an hour-glass at Blechingley has been reduced to a geometric pattern when the same design crossed the border into Kent. 83

The hour-glass with its iconographic associations with the mutability of time was popular across the study area, but other images had a more local appeal. Flowers, either in swags, garlands or panniers, or as representations of cut or plucked blooms were popular across an area from Reigate to Limpsfield in the east, and Reigate south to Worth in Sussex with an outlier in the Penshurst area. 84 In the corner where the three counties met, flowers were often used in conjunction with cherubs which were either angelic, as at Worth, or represented dead children as seen at Lingfield. 85

Kent and the western part of Sussex favoured religious motifs rather than the more secular images of the south east corner of Surrey and Sussex. The subjects of some
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these scenes are unique to these two counties. Representations on head-stones of the Noli Me Tangere, and the Flight into Egypt, are found only in Kent and Sussex. Resurrection scenes which feature a falling pyramid are also peculiar to these two counties. 86

Other local characteristics existed in the choice of ornament on the head-stone. For example, although the death's head or skull was a universal image on grave-stones it was not found in churchyards of the Worth area in Sussex. 87 In Surrey, two parishes, Oxted and Tandridge, share a series of relief masks that are not found elsewhere. The same two parishes also share a series of Romanesque cross-slabs with Titsey and Brasted in Kent.

The conclusions to be drawn from this discussion are that there were three main groups of local ornament in the area. One group included Reigate extending east along the greensand ridge to Limpsfield and south and south-west across the Weald to Worth and Penshurst. Another group included Oxted, Tandridge and Titsey. The third group covered Kent and West Sussex.

The Surrey ornaments have an iconographical emphasis on the life of the individual being commemorated. This is perhaps best summed up by a series of stones from Blechingley which show the dead person's tools - this includes a schoolmaster with books and crossed quill-pens. 88 Whether the different images found on the stones represent different values and attitudes amongst the population of the area is difficult to judge. A decorative head-stone would have been commissioned by the wealthier members of the community. These would probably have been yeomen or the wealthier tradesmen.

86 Burgess, op.cit., p. 198.
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Once erected, the decoration was seen by the whole community so that the communal eye became accustomed to its imagery. Religious scenes could, therefore, have had a didactic purpose as well as commemorating the dead. Whereas the Surrey decoration of flowers and cherubs was more individual.

The ideas behind the iconography can only be conjectured. The customs and rituals which marked the passing seasons are ideas translated into action. These will be discussed in the last section of this chapter. Once again these will be seen in the context of boundaries - man-made or natural.

The Landscape of Traditional Belief

Introduction: Aims and Objectives

This section does not intend to discuss the development of the little tradition, or the relationship of popular culture to the exploitation of the labourer by capitalism. Nor does it set out to analyse the psychological or anthropological structures of traditional beliefs. It aims instead to look at the geography and types of local beliefs familiar in the study area, and to relate these beliefs to the linguistic boundaries discussed in the first section of this chapter.

It will look at two types of traditional customs and beliefs. Seasonal markers and rituals, and beliefs associated with geographical locations. The first of these - customs and rituals which mark the passing seasons of the year come from a tradition that is found in varying forms in almost every society. Such customs help to provide a sense of continuity with the past, as well as giving a sense of belonging to a community or group. They were also a means in the past, of rationalising natural events so that they could be
understood by the unlettered. Whether they are seen as part of the little tradition, popular culture, or folk-lore, traditional local customs have a role in the struggle to understand events and cycles which seem to have no rational explanation. Moreover in the past, they often gave a formal structure to relationships within the community, thereby helping to maintain the balance of society both by emphasising its structural hierarchy, as well as providing a safety-valve of expression when the world was turned upside down.

Sources

As local traditions were usually passed on through word of mouth, documentary sources describing them are scarce. There are occasional references to those rituals sanctioned by the church or civic authority in churchwardens' accounts or borough minutes etc. Other written evidence comes from diaries, memoirs, letters from the more educated members of society who observed these events. There are also national and local antiquarian collections which mention local traditions, such as The Gentleman's Magazine or the nineteenth-century county notes and queries. Lastly there are the oral reminiscences and observations collected from the local communities.

The first of these sources is likely to give only the bare-bones of the ritual, the cost and the amount collected at the gathering, with perhaps the clothes worn by the principle actors and the names of those who wore them. The other sources put flesh onto the bones by filling in the details of what actually happened. There are several drawbacks in these qualitative sources. The memoirs etc. start the problem. Although they may record faithfully what the observer thought he saw or heard they are impressionistic and subjective. The nuances of the affair may have escaped the observer - or small hidden rituals may have been omitted - whilst the observer only recorded those public parts of
the ritual that he was allowed to see. The antiquarian collections compound these faults by repeating the memoirs etc. Both of these add to the confusion that can be caused by a non-critical assessment of the oral sources.

The main problem in using oral sources as evidence for local tradition is that today we are dealing with a literate rural community who are subject to a daily barrage from the mass media. Whilst the informant may retail a local custom in good faith, much of what is 'remembered' has actually been seen on television; read about in a book or magazine, or learned at school. This bias in oral sources taken today may go some way towards explaining the seemingly universal nature of calendrical rituals and local customs, for as Simpson says in *Folklore in Sussex*, most of the stories from Sussex can be matched with other parts of England as folklore is seldom unique. This does not mean that there are no genuinely local beliefs or legends, but these are usually linked to topographical features or large-scale man-made structures. It should be added that the corner of S.E. Surrey, Kent and Sussex which makes up the study area is singularly lacking in these features. It is also lacking in local traditions - to such a degree that incomers who believe that customs are a necessary part of rural life are manufacturing their own traditional customs which the indigenous population ostentatiously ignore. A similar phenomenon was seen by Strathern at Elmdon. She observed that the incomers' expectations of what life in the countryside was about, was significantly different to the expectations held by those born in the countryside. The latter let events grow naturally without any organization whereas the former wanted structured events. This could help to account for the

90 For example a road race held on Easter Monday in the parish of Nutfield, "revived", from the 1930s.
lack of local traditions in the study area, as they could have evolved, existed, and disappeared without anyone remarking or recording them.

The few that have been recorded will now be discussed starting with those customs and rituals associated with the calendar or passing seasons.

\[91\] M. Strathern, *Kinship at the Core*, 1981, see for example, p. 43.
Calendrical Customs

These are best documented for Sussex so that this inquiry is likely to show a spatial bias towards that county. Most of the seasonal customs recorded in that county came, however, from the fishing community of the coastal plain, so do not apply to the agrarian hinterland.

In the agrarian community the year started with wassailing or howling in January. 92 This was the custom of going into the orchard and making a hideous noise by singing, firing off guns, or banging tins. The function of this ritual was ostensibly to ensure a good crop for the following year. Those who performed the ritual were rewarded with nuts and the wassail bowl of mulled ale or wine. The custom was found in all three counties, although in Kent it was called 'youling'. 93 This may be a description of the event or a corruption either of Yule or giuli the Saxon name for that time of year. 94 The Gentleman’s Magazine for 1782 says that at Warlingham in Surrey the event took place in early spring when boys went into the orchard to whip the apple trees. A similar ritual took place in neighbouring Keston in Kent. 95

The next known calendrical custom for the area is Old Lady Day in March which was the traditional moving day for tenant farmers on the Weald. 96 As will be seen this was the exact opposite to those who were customary

96 R.A.H. Nutfield.
tenants on the greensand or downs whose tenancies invariably began in October or November. Good Friday, too, was important in the Weald - this is shown through the various marbles matches held on that day - despite objections by the church. Marbles were played all over the Weald but the most notable match was at Tinsley Green which straddles the Surrey/Sussex border, and is still a venue for marbles on Good Friday. It is tempting to see the Tinsley Green match as evolving out of county rivalries in the area. Also from Tinsley Green, Outwood, and Nutfield comes the practice of shouting 'smugsy' at noon on Good Friday and pocketing the marbles. This is probably a way of paying lip-service to the church by ending the match at the time the crucifixion was popularly supposed to have taken place; but as Good Friday was the favoured potato planting day in the area it may have been because the men wanted to get back to their gardens.\textsuperscript{97}

Parish perambulations took place at Whitsun. The example from Godstone has already been described in the first chapter of this work. The next date to be celebrated as a marker is St. Swithins Day in July when a gathering was held at Horley to the west of the study area.\textsuperscript{98} In August Harvest Home suppers are recorded from the early eighteenth-century in Surrey and Sussex.\textsuperscript{99} These were followed by the manorial courts being held in October, so that new tenancies were taken up in October on the greensand and downland parishes.\textsuperscript{100}

Traditions connected with the last quarter of the year are better recorded for the area. Guy Fawkes or November 5th was enthusiastically celebrated throughout
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the area, with bonfires, processions and the ringing of church bells. Later in November, on St. Clement's Day, November 23rd, the blacksmiths of the area held a feast and fired their anvils with explosive charges. This was followed two days later by a gathering on St. Catherine's Day at Horley. In December there were more examples of wassailing, and from Chaldon in Surrey on the North Downs comes a recollection from Mabel Roffey of Goodings on St. Thomas Eve, December 21st. On that day the poor of the parish would have leave to beg round the farms and would receive a gallon of wheat and little gifts of clothing from the farmer's wife. 101

This then is the scant evidence of the calendrical customs of the area. Such records as there are show a remarkable homogeneity, crossing both administrative and natural boundaries. The customs of the area are interesting, however, in their concentration on the period November - January, when the farming year was at its ebb. The rituals also concentrate on two types of symbolism and action - fire and giving. Undoubtedly there was a ritual which involved fire and light at this time of the year long before Guy Fawkes bonfires became popular. Effigies feature in the St. Clements celebrations as an effigy of a blacksmith would be hung outside the room where the blacksmiths held their feast. The same custom was carried out by the shoemakers on St. Crispins Day - New Style October 25th, or old style November 5th. Old style St. Clements was November 11th or Martinmass. In Friesland and North Holland this is celebrated by torchlight processions and gifts. Children carry lanterns to each house to

Brand, op.cit., p. 189.
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The origins of these festivals of light that mark the vaning of the year probably pre-date their Christian accretions. This supposition is strengthened by B.L.Ms.Cotton tib.Br.fol.8, which is an Anglo-Saxon calendar. This shows November or Blodmanath as the month of bonfires. The popularity of Guy Fawkes bonfires in the study area may owe something to the staunchly Protestant nature of the area - but it may also hold folk-echoes of an earlier past which came from the Saxon fore-bearers of the indigenous population.

The next section will discuss the beliefs held by the indigenous population that are associated with specific geographic locations.

Beliefs Associated with Place

Evidence for this type of tradition is if anything scarcer than the evidence for calendrical rituals. This is partly due to the lack of outstanding topographical or man-made features in the area and partly to the fact that many local legends and tales are known only to a few people living in that locality and have not been collected. The few such legends that have been collected are firstly two legends associated with St.Leonard's Forest which lies to the west of the area in the Sussex Weald. The first of these is that monstrous snakes are found there. The second, which was written down in 1836, is that a headless phantom haunts the forest. This phantom springs onto the back of unsuspecting horsemen and wrestles with them. This legend has a counterpart in Surrey as it is claimed

\[\text{Sing a Sint Maarten Liedje so that they can earn a sweet, orange or snooppje.}\]

\[\text{Personal observation.}\]

\[\text{Owen, op.cit., p. 68.}\]

\[\text{Simpson, op.cit, p. 37.}\]
that a headless horseman crosses the top of Horne Court Hill every night at midnight. From Rainham Kent, which lies just to the east of the study area comes a similar legend which says that a phantom coach with headless horses, driven by a headless coachman and containing a decapitated passenger passes through the streets at midnight. The Rainham example is associated with an actual historical personage - Christopher Bloor - who was decapitated - whilst the St.Leonards phantom is known as Squire Paulett. The Horne Court example is unnamed and unexplained. Was it a story put about by smugglers in the eighteenth-century to keep snoopers away or are all three examples dimly remembered echoes of the sacred groves of the Saxons containing the heads of defeated enemies?

The next two legends concern the Danes - a nation which does not figure widely in the historical evidence for the area. The first of these legends is that it is popularly thought that the hamlet in Worth called Turners Hill was so named because it was where Alfred turned back the Danes, with the help of the women of the hamlet who turned out wearing their husbands' cloaks to swell the numbers of Alfred's army, to frighten the Danes away without a fight. Later the unfortunate Scandinavians were overtaken by Alfred and killed and buried at Daneshill in the same vicinity.

These legends are an interesting blend of an attempt to rationalise the explanation of place-names mixed up with historical events from a different era plus a tiny grain of historical truth. The section of the
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legend about the women has an eighteenth-century counterpart which actually happened. This was when the women of Fishguard in Wales wore their red shawls as cloaks and marched along the cliffs giving the impression of an army of red-coats in order to thwart a French invasion. This part of the tale was probably grafted on after newspaper reports of this event. The kernel of truth may come if Alfred or Wessex is transposed from defender to aggressor. This legend could refer to some incident in the eighth-century when Wessex was expanding its influence into the South Saxon area. Perhaps belief that a Sussex mile is longer than a Surrey mile might also come from a far distant past - when the three counties of Kent, Surrey, and Sussex were separate kingdoms with different units of land measurement.

The last local belief comes from the Kent/Surrey border and is a contemporary illustration of the power of the border as an invisible barrier. It concerns a crash on the M25 motorway in December 1984 in which thirteen people were killed. This took place exactly on the county boundaries, which has given rise to some modern local folk-lore which came into existence as early as two weeks after the incident. There are two versions of this legend. Both concern a phantom lorry with a wide-load. The Surrey version is that the Kent police were moving a wide-load down this section of the motorway and had speeded it up because they wanted to reach the border to pass it on to the Surrey police. When it met the patchy fog endemic on this section of the road it slowed down suddenly and the first car hit it. As the load was undamaged it was taken on down the motorway in order to prevent an inquiry as to why it had been speeding in the first place. It then disappeared. The Kent version is that the load was stationary on the border because the Surrey police had
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not turned up. After the accident the Surrey police
took it on down the motorway because it was their fault
that it was stranded on the border. There is no
evidence whatsoever for these allegations, but it shows
an attempt to explain a catastrophic event. It
also shows the potency of the county border on modern
imagination. Will the lorry reappear on the county
border? Is this a modern fable which has counterparts
elsewhere in the country or will it remain a local
legend? Questions that only the future will answer.

The sparse evidence from the customs and rituals of the
area suggests that there was very little that was
'local' either to parish', county or pays. Most customs
and legends had counterparts in all of these, but this
may be due in part to the debased nature of the
sources. Although customs and legends hint of an origin
in the distant past there is very little to connect
them with the linguistic boundaries shown earlier in
this chapter. There is, however, some evidence of a
magical quality attached to the line of the county
boundary. This can be seen in the ancient custom of
playing marbles on the border of Surrey and Sussex and
the modern motorway story about the Kent/Surrey border.
The conclusion to this chapter will draw together the
linguistic, material and ideological culture of the
area.

Conclusion

This analysis of the linguistic and cultural boundaries
of the study area has been concerned to see whether
these crossed administrative or man-made boundaries. It
also examined the relationship of these boundaries to
local identity. It was suggested at the beginning of
this chapter that local identity and the perception of
space was probably maintained by the women of the
community who transmitted these perceptions to the next
generation through the medium of language. The child
would not only absorb the mother’s values but would also mimic her speech — so that the mother’s way of speaking would be maintained through time.

It was shown in the previous chapter that although women were more mobile than men they were less likely than men to leave the county of their birth. Therefore, it was expected that the linguistic boundaries of the area would coincide with the county boundaries. The analysis of the linguistic boundaries shows, however, that this was not the case. These did not follow the county boundaries but probably relate to boundaries that were formed before the county boundaries came into existence. Kent stands linguistically alone whilst Surrey and Sussex share considerable linguistic similarities. In view of Wakelin’s hypothesis that the linguistic boundaries of England can be related to the Saxon kingdom boundaries this suggests that the linguistic boundaries relate to the Kingdoms of Kent and the South Saxons with Surrey as a buffer zone between them, but having more in common with the South Saxons than the Kentish kingdom. The engrained nature of the linguistic patterns is suggested by the fact that the 1851 census return shows little actual face-to-face interaction between the two communities which share these linguistic similarities. This lack of face-to-face evidence is due in part to the selective nature of the S.E.D. Linguistic similarities radiate outwards in density from any one centre so that a closer net of informants would produce a closer mesh of shared responses. This mesh would have extended beyond the parish boundary, which was not an important linguistic boundary marker — although each community had a range of words which were peculiar to itself. These words were often of very ancient origin and some of them might not have been understood outside the immediate area of their usage.

Linguistic boundaries crossed natural boundaries in Kent — but the trend shown in Surrey and Sussex was for
shared patterns to concentrate in the Weald. In some cases this sharing included the Kentish Weald. This pattern is different to that shown by the spatial patterns of face-to-face interaction which suggests that the pays was not an important boundary. Again this may be due to the selective nature of the S.E.D. locations, as well as the fact that the bulk of the questions were on farming matters which were likely to respond to different ecological conditions.

North in his work on the Kentish one-way plough shows that in the case of that implement linguistic and artefact boundaries are the same. In this paper, he suggests that artefacts used everyday came to have a subjective meaning for the user containing connotations and memories of the 'home' area. An area which shared a tool-type would, therefore, be a 'home' area for that tool and its users.

The 'home' areas of small tools was very localised - covering about four parishes and closely allied to networks of local craftsmen. These groups tended to lie within the same pays as each tool was designed to deal with a specific type of vegetation. Larger artefacts, such as the farm wagon, conformed to a basic type but also underwent modifications to fit them for different types of terrain, or local standardised traditions. Farm wagons (and probably other vehicles as well) were, however, painted a different colour for each county. This perhaps shows some degree of county identity. A parallel exists with the working-smocks of the men which were also made in different colours for different areas. These last two artefacts were relatively late developments, so that identification with the county was probably also a fairly late development - although it has survived into the twentieth century as the modern motorway fable shows.

This is unusual in being unique to the area. On the

110 North, One Way Plough, loc. cit., pp. 49-64.
whole, traditional customs and beliefs tend to be remarkably homogenous across the area. On the other hand folk-art as illustrated by grave-markers shows some county preferences.

To sum up this chapter the question has to be asked as to how the individual in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries spoke, what he believed and how he related to his surroundings and the boundaries these formed. In this period the people of the study area spoke a dialect which was a blend of words that came directly from an earlier language frame-work, and standardised speech forms. Many of the archaic word survivals were terms referring to farm implements. These tools were designed to suit different conditions found in the area. They were made and distributed over a localised area which included about four parishes and covered an area of about five miles.

The same spatial area can be seen as the home area of farm wagons and carts. The wagon was the same basic type for each village but each county favoured a different colour paint for the wagon's superstructure. This means that the colours in the landscape were subtly different in each county, as the colours of the mens' smocks also varied. The blue of the Sussex smocks and wagons would have been much more easily visible than the browns of the Surrey smocks and wagons which would merge into the vegetation and ploughland.

Similarly, by the eighteenth-century the grave-yards of the study area were different to the eye in each county. All had the white painted graveboards which fixed the gaze - but in the East Grinstead area these were also made of stone and iron whilst in Kent the hooded-figure gravestones drew the eye; whereas in

111 Often modern tales such as this reappear in other areas. The "finger on the roof rack" is a good example of this. So far I have not heard the motorway version from elsewhere.
Surrey the glance was directed downwards to squat thick stones. All these visual images, the colours and the shapes, impressed on the brain of the illiterate individual in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century a series of codes that told him he was in his home area.

Lastly there are the traditional beliefs and customs which the individual heard, or took part in as a member of a community. These show conformity across the area—but this may be misleading as many local traditions may have escaped collection. This is especially true of the beliefs and rituals connected with child-birth and women's ailments, which may never have been mentioned except between women, and so escaped collection by the nineteenth-century folklorists. On the other hand the universal nature of the tales etc. may lie in the common Germanic origin of the indigenous population of the area.

It can be seen that the cultural artefacts of the area divide into two. These are analogous to the area of loose inter-action defined in Chapter 5. Language and beliefs are regional—held in common across parish, county and natural boundaries. Material artefacts, however, incorporated features which distinguished the county or even the parish of origin. These different landscapes are connected with the antiquity of the features. Language and belief represent an older landscape than the material objects used as markers in this section, and point to a common origin for the indigenous population. They also show a continuum of tradition, a tradition maintained through the women whose speech patterns were passed onto their children. The material culture is a newer landscape which shows how the perception of local identity could be measured by visual images. The distinguishing colours of the wagons and smocks show that one area could be perceived and seen to be different to another. This consciousness of boundaries is still evolving.
How can the role of women be reconciled to the paradox that the language which they were passing onto the next generation was shared across the county boundary whereas Chapter 4 shows that although women were more likely to move from their birth-place this was not likely to be across the boundary of the native county. Part of this paradox is caused by the masculine bias of the S.E.D.. The words used by men were more likely to cross county boundaries as men were more likely than women to move across the border. If a closer density of locations had been used for the dialect collection it is possible that the effect of parish or county boundaries might have been more evident. The main Nutfield informant, however, used words which were recorded in the lists for nineteenth-century Sussex but not for his own county of Surrey. This again may be due to the sources as the Sussex dialect was collected earlier and with more rigour than the Surrey dialect. It might also be related to the fact that the informant's parish, Nutfield, which was an inward looking parish was likely to maintain an old form of dialect. Interestingly, the informant was born and raised in Outwood, the S.E.D. location, although both his parents were natives of Nutfield until they married. It seems that the informant took his speech patterns from his parents rather than his contemporaries in Outwood - more specifically he took them from his mother as his father, a farmer, was likely to be in the fields all day when his son, the informant was learning to speak. The informant has a kinship network that spreads over the Surrey Weald. He can usually call on his kin to provide support and services, for it is a very dense and kin-conscious network. The members of this network speak the Surrey dialect in some degree, and although they feel engulfed by the incomers to the area they know they belong to that corner of Surrey.
CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSION

Introduction

The aim of this research project has been to define the geographic space occupied by communities in the past, by looking at the twin themes of belonging and boundaries. Through the concept of local identity it has had the overall objective of relating the findings to a definition of the 'local' component in local history, in order to suggest viable research areas for the future. It has carried out these aims and objectives by measuring the strength of local identity or 'belonging' in terms of inter-action across six boundary markers. These boundaries were the parish, the county, the pays, kinship, social-structure and religion. The strength of these boundaries in forming local identity or bestowing a feeling of 'belonging' was calculated by looking at the degree to which marriage choice and personal mobility patterns were constrained by them.

The conclusion to this work will draw together the various boundaries in a historical analysis of the results. It will move on to make generalisations from these results which can be used to build models or formulate working hypothesis to use on other data, locations, and time-spans. The results will also be discussed with relevance to the research viability of academic local history.

Historical Analysis

This section will start with some comments on the relationship of the study area to national trends during the period under review. In general the situation in the study area for the period 1750-1850
was one of economic decline, as its agriculturally
based employment structure could not compete with the
productivity or high real wages of the industrial areas
of the north of England. The brief respite during the
French Wars was neither so great nor so marked as
commentators such as Cobbett suggest. Furthermore, the
changes in land-use during and after the wars had a
long-standing deleterious effect on employment
prospects, especially in the Weald where land used for
arable in the war reverted to rough grazing with
consequent loss of employment. Unlike the northerly
section of the study area, the Weald was not subject to
outside pressures on its land. Whereas the Downland and
the greensand were exposed to outside market forces as
builders and developers came into competition with
farmers for what was to become a prime resource in the
south east, space. Pressure from the metropolitan area
became more marked when the improved transport
infra-structure made it possible for businessmen to
commute daily to the city. Even before the development
of the railways, the existence of a fast coach service
along the turnpike, as well as numerous carriers plying
between the study area and London or Croydon, shows
that there was a strongly entrenched rural-urban
inter-action within the area. This operated on a supply
and demand basis, with communities in the study area
looking to the metropolis for services, whilst the
metropolis and Croydon were a captive market for
produce from the study area. The ties between the rural
and urban communities were strengthened by the fact
that many families had kin living in the urban
environment. Before moving on to look at the deeper
implications of personal mobility in the study area
this section will examine some of the socio-economic
developments in the area during the period 1750-1850.

^W. Cobbett, Rural Rides in the Counties of Surrey, Kent
and Sussex etc. 1830, 1958 edition. Ed., E. Martin, for
example, p.221.
At the start of the period under examination the area was almost wholly agricultural, except for pockets of Fullers Earth being worked at Nutfield on the greensand ridge. The importance of these workings on the socio-economic structure of this community should not be under-estimated. Nutfield showed a unique socio-demographic pattern, with a high rate of endogamy and a low MHS, as well as a large number of native born adults living in the community and a strong kinship network system. There is also evidence of a general stability of population for a long period prior to 1750. The discrete inward-looking, socially closed situation was at its most effective from about 1800 onwards. This was to last until the 1880s when the southern end of the parish was developed as a residential area. A comparable but more long term situation can be seen at Worth on the Weald, which was an agricultural parish with a large number of small owner-occupied holdings worked by the household head and the eldest son.

Although these two parishes had similar characteristics, the general socio-economic scene in the area was one of divergence and change as the nineteenth-century progressed. At the start of the study period the agriculture was mainly arable in all types of pays, whilst although arable cultivation was intensified during the French Wars, it was not until the 1830s that real differences started to appear between the agricultural zones of the area. The Downland area reverted to sheep husbandry, whilst the marginal land brought into cultivation on the Weald returned to grazing. The landscape in the Weald became one of small fields of arable crops interspersed with pasture. The reintroduction of livestock husbandry in both areas heightened the economic plight of the labouring poor, as livestock husbandry was much less labour-intensive than arable farming. This disruption
of employment prospects did not result in a massive out-migration from the area, but merely a re-shuffling of population around it. In the Weald the response was more towards self-sufficiency than migration, with the piece-meal enclosure of common edges or roadside verges by the cottagers. This leads to the consideration of the negative or positive aspects of enclosure, as it was noticeable in the study area that ad hoc enclosure sent up the ratio of owner-occupiers and small landholders to large holdings with tenant farmers, whilst Parliamentary enclosure displaced them, thereby causing much economic distress, for example, in the Downland parish of Warlingham or in Lingfield in the Weald. In the case of the former, retrenchment was possible through the development of a lime-burning business, as well as the growth of the service sector to supply the needs of the growing number of wealthy incomers to the area. By the end of the study period, the socio-economic fortunes of the north and the south of the area had diverged. The downland area to the north responded to the market forces of the metropolis, the greensand expanded its non-agricultural industries, but the Weald became increasingly more isolated and dependant on agriculture.

Turning from the general overview of the historical development of the area to the consideration of the main themes of this work, belonging and boundaries. The next sub-section will discuss the results of measuring the strength of spatial and social boundaries through the medium of marriage choice and personal mobility.

Patterns shown by marriage choice suggested initially that the parish was an important boundary. Subsequent work on the parish register showed that this was not the case. The marriage register concealed whatever movement had taken place after birth and before marriage. The statement 'of' a parish was fact of
residence and little else. Most partners had originated in a different parish to that where their marriage was registered. Census data confirmed this. Most adults had moved from their birthplace. This left the problem as to their possible origin and which boundaries they had crossed. Using the origin of known incomers in a marriage it was seen that most of these came from the same county as the registering parish, but from a different pays. This empirical evidence was used to give an impression as to the likely origins of the unknown mass that had moved from their birthplaces. These hypothetical figures suggested that for marriage choice the county was a more important boundary than the parish or the pays. Again the census data confirmed that adults tended to stay within their native county. Evidence from removal orders and settlement certificates showed a similar pattern, but examinations taken under oath to establish the parish of legal settlement, showed a more wide-ranging field of activity.

Further analysis of the distance, direction, feed-back process and reciprocity in the area was used to define potential social areas, or communities of like-minded people sharing a local identity. It was shown that these would lie within a short distance of each other, with a restricted field of inter-action, operating on a nearest neighbour basis. Potential social areas were comprised of groups of 3-4 parishes with an intense level of inter-action. These blocks of intense inter-action nested within a wider regional framework of loose inter-action which crossed pays and county boundaries. The key to defining the extent of the wider area was the identification of a core location which acted as a link between counties and pays. This was Godstone, which lay at the heart of the area’s communications network.
Also central to this is the role played by the nearest large town to the study area, Croydon. Many of the population living in the study area had family or business connections there. The market and communications network of the area focussed on it. Carriers took local produce to sell there, and a bus service took people to buy goods in its shops. It provided services, employment and marriage partners for the area. It was integral to the social and economic life of the area. Could a community of like-minded people be defined by identifying such a centre? Is there also a case for redefining a pays as the area around such a centre rather than as a farming zone?

Alternatively, the pays could be defined in terms of other characteristics. The Weald is a good example. It is a well-defined geographical region, but within it are a variety of soils and habitats. It also had little uniformity of land tenure or inheritance patterns, whilst its agriculture was indistinguishable from other pays in the study area until the mid-nineteenth century. Its inhabitants crossed its boundaries with impunity to live elsewhere, but it was different. Stevenson and Caird write of its independant but conservative farmers. Honest, hard-working and suspicious of new ways and strangers. The independence of the Wealderner was manifested in other ways. Nonconformism and dissent flourished there. Its people clung to old forms of inheritance, such as Borough English. Their independance may have been encouraged by the lack of nucleated settlements, whilst the surreptious enclosure of commons and roadside edges led to more self-sufficiency for the cottagers than in the other pays. Despite its proximity to London the Surrey
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Weald remains an area of isolated farms and hamlets. Today and in the past, it provided an experience for its communities that was different to that shared by the communities on the greensand and Downland.

Thus the examination of inter-action across spatial boundaries seems to have resulted in a paradox, with on the one hand, the county seeming an important boundary-marker, but on the other seeming to dissolve within a regional and geographical framework. To resolve this paradox it is necessary to return to the concept of actual or intellectual space, and to suggest that the blocks of intense inter-action which usually lay within the same county represent the former, whilst the wider regional context is part of the latter. The analogy continues with the difference noted in artefact areas with an extremely localised small tool area of production by one craftsmen for several communities, or a family network of craftsmen working in neighbouring communities. This can be compared with the large tool area such as represented by the farm wagon, which had a basic regional form but also possessed local variations wrought by local conditions, as well as a different colour for each county. Similarly, each county favoured a different coloured smock, so that when a farmer travelled 'abroad', or sent a wagon to a 'foreign' market, its county of origin was instantly recognisable.

These spatial strands can be brought together into the following process - local identity was most intense within a block of four communities. In many cases there was a continuity in this grouping, although in some cases there was an imbalance in the inter-action, with one community always acting as receiver rather than sender. These blocks of intense inter-action lay within a wider regional area of low activity. Within this regional context there is evidence from mobility
patterns as well as marriage choice that the county was strong symbol of identity. When the individual left the primary area of inter-action to move into the secondary area it was the county which conferred identity. It was, as Cohen writes: "consciousness of community... encapsulated in perception of its boundaries."  

Within these communities were social boundaries which could either bestow a sense of belonging or place constraints on inter-action. The first of these social boundaries to be examined was kinship. It was found that about 25% of the population of the area had vertical kinship links (although this may have been higher owing to the inadequacy of the sources). Whilst about 30% of the population in any one decade had kin living in the area. Spatially, kinship networks show a trend similar to that shown in the analysis of inter-action across spatial boundaries, in crossing parish or pays boundaries, but staying within the county border. Kinship was at its densest between neighbouring communities with 81% of cross-boundary kinship links occurring between neighbouring communities. It was also found that the socially closed parishes of Nutfield and Worth had the densest kinship networks, as well as a strong stability of surname survival.

Surnames provided an interesting control on the patterns of inter-action. Although these showed a wide distribution it was obvious that some surnames were more 'local' than others, so that whereas a parish such as Godstone had a high ratio of incomers to native population, these incomers were local people with local names, whilst its neighbour, Blechingley had an influx of non-local names from people who had originated from outside the area. In general, however, the greensand
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ridge had a marked stability of surname survival when compared to the other two areas. This was partly because economic conditions in that area favoured stability, as well as encouraging movement into the zone from outside.

Cutting across both spatial and social boundaries were common interest blocks which formed other boundaries. The social-structure of society in the eighteenth and nineteenth-centuries was rigid. Marriage choice shows that this boundary was immutable, with common interest blocks reinforcing their strength through inter-marriage. A similar pattern can be seen in religious common interest blocks with a high rate of doctrinal endogamy, or failing that, a high rate of never-married members in small religious sects. Quakers, especially, married within their own persuasion.

When the strength of common interest boundaries are considered it is necessary to ask whether these boundaries were the most important factors in forming identity? If this is the case, whether there is a way of locating these blocks in space because they are universal, inherent in the institutional and structural context of society. If the sense of belonging was conferred by the membership of a section or class of society it had no spatial element which can be termed local. But one of the aims of this work has been to identify the space occupied by like-minded communities in the past. Should each class or section be treated as local community? If this is the case can there by any spatial element defined as 'local'?

To answer these questions we have to consider that one of the prime facts to emerge from this research is that no spatial or social block could exist without another block. Thus the labouring class could not exist without
a capitalist employer. Similarly, religious nonconformity could only exist if there was a religious conformity by which to define it. One of the keywords to emerge from this study is symbioses. The next section will draw together the conclusions as well as suggesting keywords, hypothesis and models that can be tested on other data and periods of time.

Keywords, Hypothesis and Models

This research project has been based on a methodology that tested hypothesis. This in turn has generated empirical research which can be used to formulate hypothesis or models for future research. Ideally this research project should have continued to test these models on other data and locations, but the constraints of time and money prevent this.

It is proposed in this section to suggest some areas that could benefit from further investigation by building on three keywords that are prominent in this study. These are community, symbioses, and process. The first of these is the most important. It is obvious that groups of like-minded people are linked not as entire parishes but as separate communities within the parish. Each parish could be split into several communities that inter-acted with each other and communities in other parishes to a greater or lesser degree. Internally these communities were made up of blocks of common interest which formed other boundaries - but in turn each block needed the other in order to exist. Externally too, different types of community needed each other - thus the rural community needed the town as a market and a service centre, whilst the market town or urban area needed the rural area for produce and surplus labour. This supply and demand situation leads to the symbioses which is the second keyword. It is this symbioses that adds the wider
dimensions of the regional field of inter-action. The close-knit intense inter-action between local groups of communities did not exist in isolation but was part of a wider-ranging process which expanded or contracted depending on circumstances. Finally, although the patterns of intense inter-action showed a certain degree of immutability, it is obvious that they were indeed part of a process that responded to external socio-economic forces as well as to internal trends. This was particularly well illustrated at Nutfield where the following process can be seen, of an agricultural community in the 1750s with a rate of endogamy comparable to the other communities in the area changing after the opening up of the Fullers Earth workings in the 1740s led to an influx of outsiders. This was followed by a long period of relative stability with a high rate of endogamous marriages and native born adults remaining in the community, with a correspondingly high density of kinship networks. In the 1880s, however, the opening of a station in South or Lower Nutfield reversed the socially closed nature of the community. This concept of a socially closed community is one which will be developed elsewhere as it needs to be seen within the context of 'open' and 'close' parishes as a whole, as well as within the framework of proto-industrial communities.

If we return to the idea of local identity, with belonging and boundaries, this research has shown that identity or belonging was likely to be strongest within a network of up to 4 communities, but these communities were part of a regional community which existed within a loose symbiotic framework. The next section will relate this to the overall objective of this work - the definition of the 'local' component of local history with the identification of viable spatial units of research.
The Local in Local History

Chapter 1 contained a brief historiography of local history. It suggested that the larger the unit the more likely it was to be treated as an academic study, whereas single community studies were more likely to be the preserve of the informed amateur local historian. This section attempts to answer the question as to whether this is the most efficient use of resources of time, academic and intellectual endeavour and research grants.

It can be seen that this research has raised as many questions as it has answered. This is partly due to the constraints of time and money, but it is also partly due to the realities of historical research, which should not be seen as an isolated academic exercise but as part of an information process. In order to realise this last aim it is necessary to have a viable research time-table as well as a manageable unit. This leads us back to the question as to whether the 'local' in local history should be a micro or single parish/community/manor in-depth study. The patterns of inter-action and inter-locking shown in this research suggest that 'local' was in fact not one community but several - therefore a single community study is not so much local as unique. The several communities needed each other, so were incomplete without each other. It seems to me that single community studies represent a luxury which the inadequate research resources of today cannot support. (Although this would of course depend on the questions being asked.) I think that it is difficult to generalise from a single example. An in-depth study of the economy of a thirteenth-century manor tells us much about that manor but little or nothing about its neighbours. We can not assume that they will show the same pattern. A more viable research unit would be at least four communities, as these would be local rather
than discrete.

These local communities, however, inter-locked into a wider regional community of which they were an integral part. A viable and realistic macro-study should, therefore, be regional rather than county or pays based, especially as a regional overview would help to dissolve the artificial boundaries created by the sources available for use. It is only when these boundaries are dissolved that their strength becomes obvious - thus whereas the county gave an identity or focus for its members - this was not perceived by them until seen within the regional context. Regional in this sense does not mean an artificial grouping of counties together such as the East Midlands, but the symbiotic framework described in the earlier section of this chapter.

In the final analysis, therefore, no boundaries existed between a closely-knit group of communities on the ground. They fused into one 'local' community, but when the inhabitants moved out into the wider regional community they 'belonged' to their county of origin. Thus, only through more broadly based regional studies which can be seen within the context of the many and various communities that made up the region, can the local component in local history be further defined.
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### Appendix 1 Data from Chapter 3

#### POPULATION GROWTH FROM 1801-1851 FOR EACH PARISH IN THE STUDY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>1801</th>
<th>1811</th>
<th>1821</th>
<th>1831</th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1851</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>3509</td>
<td>1544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>V.</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Grinstead</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>2659</td>
<td>2792</td>
<td>3322</td>
<td>3555</td>
<td>3768</td>
<td>3994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>1149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>2163</td>
<td>2140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>15131</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- D = Downs
- G.S. = Greensand
- W. = Weald

#### Mean Household size for the Parishes in the Study Area taken from 1801 and 1851 Census Data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>1801</th>
<th>1851</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Grinstead</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titsey</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- D = Downs
- G.S. = Greensand
- W. = Weald
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>N in Agriculture</th>
<th>% of those in employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>SR.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstow</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>SR.</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterham</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>SR.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaldon</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>SR.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowhurst</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>SR.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Grinstead</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>SX.</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edenbridge</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>K.</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godstone</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>SR.</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horne</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>SR.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpsfield</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>SR.</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingfield</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>SR.</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutfield</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>SR.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxted</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>SR.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>G.S.</td>
<td>SR.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatsfield</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>SR.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titssey</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>SR.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlingham</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>SR.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerham</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>K.</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>W.</td>
<td>SX.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

D. = Downs  
G.S. = Greensand  
W. = Weald  
K. = Kent  
Sr. = Surrey  
SX. = Sussex
Appendix 2 Data from Chapter 6

Kolmogorov-Smirnov One Sample Randomness Test on Christian Names in a Sample of 11 Parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>35</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of this test is to determine whether an actual distribution is significantly different from a randomly selected distribution. The figures in Row A are the numbers taken from the baptismal register, whilst those in Row B were taken from a random numbers table with a pin. The difference between the two is significant at the 0.05 level. This means that in 5 cases out of 100 the result would be random selection rather than pre-determined choice.

Appendix 3 Dialect Informants from Fieldwork in Chapter 8.

Main Dialect Informants


Secondary Dialect Informants

Spatial and Social Inter-action in S.E. Surrey, 1750-1850

Evelyn Lord

Abstract

One of the central problems facing academic local historians is the extent of the spatial and social space occupied by communities in the past. This is crucial to the definition of the 'local' component in local history. This thesis works towards using the space occupied by communities to define 'local' by measuring the effect of 6 spatial and social boundaries on 19 contiguous but socially and topographically diverse rural communities in S.E. Surrey, Sussex and Kent.

Patterns of inter-action are mapped in relation to the administrative boundaries of the parish and county; the natural boundary of the pays; and the social boundaries formed by kinship; social structure; and religion. Finally, these boundaries are dissolved to form social areas. The sources used contain elements that describe movement - the chief of these are marriage registers and census data, with a qualitative dimension added by diaries and family papers. Nominal and linguistic material is also used, as well as artifacts, whilst the whole is set within the socio-economic context of the area.

The social areas defined by inter-action show a remarkable resemblance to those shown by dialect, material culture, surname distribution and kinship networks. The main characteristics of these areas are that they extend over at least 4 communities which share an intense level of activity. These communities nest within a symbiotic framework of looser activity that goes beyond the study area to include market towns and an important urban centre.

Three keywords emerge in the study. The first of these is community - many parishes consisted of several communities reacting in different ways so that this is a more relevant description of groups of people on the ground than parish. The second is symbioses - each community was an integral part of the whole. The last is process, as the patterns of inter-action were not stable but responded to internal and external stimuli. In the final essence, the 'local' component in local history is defined as up to 4 communities set within a loose regional framework. A viable research area for local historians should consist of at least 4 communities as single community studies are unique rather than local.

This work contributes both to the study of continuity and change within communities, as well as to the historiography and practice of local history.