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INTRODUCTION
"We do not understand ourselves because we do not yet know what we have been and hence what we may be becoming". 1.

At a time when the future of academic research is the subject of much debate the family historian is obliged to justify his study, not only in the context of other historical enquiry, but also within that of present day needs. It is therefore perhaps appropriate to reiterate Peter Laslett's assertion that, only by looking back in time can we understand some of the social problems which arouse so much attention today. 2.

The study of the pre-industrial family is meanwhile, of undoubted relevance to the economic and political historian for, besides acting as a social focus, the family formed the basic economic unit in the community and consequently had many characteristics in common with other public institutions. The ties which existed between individual members of the family served, moreover, as a model for political relationships and helped to condition the individual's role in society at large.

Within the last two decades the history of the family has been revolutionised. As part of a growing interest in the study of "mentalité", the attempt to penetrate into the consciousness of men and women living in the past, there have been a number of works devoted to family attitudes and values. Lawrence Stone's study of the development of the affective, nuclear family between 1500 and 1800 is perhaps the most notable of these. 3.

Other historians have concentrated on particular aspects of family behaviour such as bastardy or matrimonial disputes. 4.

On the statistical side there have also been several significant developments. The influence of French demographers has been particularly important in popularising the technique of Family Reconstitution, a process entailing the "bringing together of scattered information about the members of the family to enable its chief demographic characteristics to be described as fully as possible." 5. Reconstitution permits a far more detailed appraisal of the demography of a community than aggregate records and makes it possible to trace in depth the fortunes of individual families over several generations. Another technique, pioneered this time by English historians, is the use of Population Listings. The potential of such records was made apparent in the early 1960's when Peter Laslett and John Harrison published their findings on Clayworth and Cogenhoe. 6. Their results demonstrated that the population was surprisingly mobile in pre-industrial England, that the frequency of remarriage was high and that the typical family was nuclear in character. Of these the last was especially important, for it had long been assumed that the ideal family structure in the past was far more complex than it is today. Despite their obvious strengths both reconstitution and the

use of census data have met with a certain amount of criticism. As J.L.Flandrin pointed out, the former is in a sense "nothing more than a demonstration of the fertility of couples", the latter merely "a snapshot of the occupants of accommodation in a given locality at a given time." 7 Furthermore, unless supplemented with qualitative material, it is quite possible that information based on aggregated data may actually distort our impression of society in the past.

Since the 1960's the results from Clayworth and Cogenhoe have been confirmed by a number of community studies and by the establishment of an English "Standard" using data from 100 pre-industrial settlements. 8 From the initial concern to assess the impact of industrialisation and to ascertain whether household structure varied from one region to another, family history has acquired an added sophistication by combining the analytical tools of the sociologist with the data of the historian. In particular it has become increasingly evident that, rather than adopting a synchronic approach, it is important to consider the

8. For the results from the study of 100 English Communities see:-
   For the results obtained for individual communities see:-
development of the family over time. Even though the historian may be unable to trace more than a small portion of the individual life-cycle, by controlling for factors such as age and the number of children it is possible to "transform the skeleton of synchronic data" and to obtain as balanced a picture of reality as possible. Moreover, the family-cycle approach provides a framework for the merger of demographic and quantitative data on the one hand, and social, cultural and psychological information on family behaviour on the other.

One of the main aims of this thesis is to obtain a synthesis between the available statistical and qualitative evidence by considering the development of the family from a social rather than a purely demographic viewpoint. At the same time it is hoped to establish a link between the family historian and the urban historian. Until recently the former has been more concerned to establish national characteristics than to examine the impact of local circumstances upon family life. The community studies which are available tend to concentrate on statistical evidence and, for the most part, deal with rural settlements. Urban historians, meanwhile, have generally confined their interest in social structure to an examination of occupational and office-holding hierarchies and, despite an interest in general demographic trends, have tended to neglect the basic unit of society, the house and workshop.

Given the need to examine the changing size and composition of the household as a function of the life-cycle rather than considering its structure at any one point in time, one of the main themes throughout this study will be the development of the domestic group from its formation to its dissolution and the effect of socio-economic factors

11. Phythian-Adams' work on Coventry marks a departure in devoting much attention to the domestic environment. C.V.Phythian-Adams, op. cit.
upon that development. The second theme, meanwhile, will be to examine the individual life-cycle, for whilst the family as a whole passed through certain clearly defined stages, its members played a variety of overlapping roles. Attention will be focused on the customs surrounding certain crucial points in the individuals' career. The demographic aspects of the life-cycle will also be dealt with in some detail, for issues such as the age of leaving home and of marriage had obvious implications for the development of the family as a whole. It is not intended to examine the man's progress through the occupational and civic hierarchies in any detail. Nevertheless, it is important to be aware of the effect his advancement within the community at large had on his domestic environment. A number of recent studies make it clear that our picture of family life would be very incomplete without an awareness of the importance of female employment and of how the woman's position amongst her neighbours varied according to her marital status and the stage she had reached in the life-cycle. We also need, therefore, to consider what opportunities the woman had to work outside the home and how this would have conditioned her role within the family.

The third theme to be adopted concerns the relationships which existed between individual members of the household and, beyond its bounds, between distant kinsmen and neighbours. Individual sentiments are notoriously difficult to gauge. Nevertheless, it is possible to ascertain what types of behaviour were considered as normal and what expectations and obligations existed between friends and neighbours.

The characteristics and limitations of many of the documents which have been consulted will be referred to when appropriate. At this point

---

I intend only to mention the most widely used sources, namely wills and court records on the qualitative side and parish registers and population listings on the quantitative. To obtain as broad a view as possible of contemporary attitudes all the extant wills proved in the local courts and in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury between 1500 and 1639, 785 in all, and a large number of the ecclesiastical court records dating from 1540 to 1650 were examined. The former are of undisputed value as one of the few documents to give any insight into personal feelings. However, probably less than 5% of the adult population ever made a will. In using probate records one must not, therefore, assume that what was typical of the élite was necessarily true of the majority of society. It is unfortunate that only a handful of documents relating to the Salisbury town courts and none of the Quarter Sessions records for the city have survived for this period. Nevertheless, a wealth of material can be obtained by studying the cases involving defamation or marital disputes which were dealt with in the Bishop's Consistory Court. As the proceedings described in the Act Books are very brief I have concentrated on the witnesses' accounts which are related in the court's Deposition Books. Although few domestic disputes would probably have reached the courts, these accounts provide considerable evidence concerning contemporary attitudes to the family and a lot of incidental information about daily life.

No attempt has been made to carry out a full-scale reconstitution in Salisbury. The size and mobility of the population precludes such an analysis. Nevertheless, the three parish registers have been used in conjunction with other records in order to investigate a number of

demographic issues such as the age at first marriage, the rate of remarriage and the frequency of childbirth. Two of the parish registers, those for St. Martin's and St. Edmund's, begin in 1559, the third in 1570, whilst the register for the Liberty of the Close dates from 1564. There are a number of gaps in the records, the most notable being that between 1605 and 1622 for St. Martin's. The detail provided by the clerks varied from one parish to the next, yet occupations were not normally given and it was only in the seventeenth century that they began to note both parents in the baptismal registers.

The other major quantitative source used in this study is a series of population listings for the parish of St. Thomas, known as Easter Books. As much of the analysis which follows will be directly or indirectly related to evidence gained from these records and as they are comparatively unknown as a source I propose to devote the rest of this Introduction to a discussion of their significance to the social historian. 

In essence, the Easter Book was a ledger used to record the names of all parishioners of communicable age who contributed to a parish tithe at Easter. Occasionally additional collections were also recorded. Several of the Books from St. Thomas's, for instance, noted the offerings gathered during Lent; others the tithes which remained unpaid from the previous year or what were known as "casualties", the dues of strangers.

14. Cross-checking using wills and other records reveals that the entries between 1560 and 1584 in the St. Edmund's registers should in fact be dated according to the preceding year.
15. S.C.A., St. Thomas's Records Nos. 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46 & 48. The torn fragments of several more books exist, as does a later record dating from the early 1640's. The 1607 list is incomplete and starts at West Catherine Street rather than at Fisherton Bridge.
16. A discussion of how and why the Easter Books were compiled is given in Appendix One.
who had communed but were not listed in the Easter Book itself. 17.

A total of 14 books dating from 1574 to 1607 have been used for this study. They were compiled on a household by household basis and, whilst the order of individual properties varied slightly, the collectors evidently followed a recognised circuit which began on the southside of Fisherton Street and ended at Fish Row. For each household the clerk noted the householder and his wife (not specifically named); the additional members of the group with, in some cases, a note of their relationship to the head; and the amount contributed by each individual .... or at least by those of independent means .... towards the Easter collection.

As it is uncertain whether or not the Easter Books were compiled at one fixed point in time they fail to meet one of Laslett's criteria for the "ideal census". 18. They are also imperfect in several other respects. The division of one household from another is not always clear. In 1593 and, to a lesser extent, in 1596, 1601, 1602 and 1603, the individual members of many households were bracketed together, but otherwise presumptions have to be made based on the order of names. To ascertain

17. In 1582 - 3 21s 1d was noted amongst the Churchwardens' receipts "as casualties of such as receaude the communion and not doune vpon the Easter Booke". The sums under this head were generally between 2d and 6d and in most cases presumably represented the fixed levy rather than the additional privy tithe. (Intra, p.321.) H.J.F.Swayne ed., The Churchwardens' Accounts of St. Edmund and St. Thomas, Sarum, 1443 - 1702, 1896, p.281.

whether a widow or a solitary male were householders in their own right or members of another unit is particularly difficult and, although external evidence and comparison between different books has eliminated many ambiguities, it is possible that in some years the number of individual units may be slightly overestimated.

The delineation of households is obviously facilitated when the relationship of each member of the household is specified. However, cross-checking illustrates that servants were not always labelled and many kinship links, which would otherwise remain obscure, are revealed by external evidence. Any estimates of the size of the servant population or the number of extended households must therefore be treated as minima. Additional information is rare. Ages were never given, whilst occupations were noted sporadically. Yet even when additional sources are used it is still only possible to establish the profession of about a third of the householders in St. Thomas's.

Apart from these deficiencies, the main reason why the Easter Books cannot be compared with the listings used elsewhere is that they do not cover the entire population. Only those people that were "fit to use the sacrament" were expected to pay Easter dues. During the Reformation it was agreed that Confirmation should be celebrated when a child was of sufficient discretion and ability to repeat the Lord's Prayr, Creed and Catechism, rather than at seven as had hitherto been customary. The first communion however, could be delayed for some time after this. 19.

The Ecclesiastical Canons of 1603 which stated that,

"the minister, churchwardens, questmen and assistants of every Parish Church and Chappel shall yeerely within fortie dayes after Easter exhibite to the Bishop or his chancellor, the names and surnames of all the Parishioners, as well men as women, which being of the age of sixteene yeeres, receiued not the communion at Easter before",

provide a guideline for the minimum age of the houseling population. 20.

However, in practice it seems likely that communion was initially celebrated at any point between the ages of 14 and 17.

The evidence from Salisbury does not allow for a more precise definition of the age of first communion. In the light of the early-seventeenth century canons it is significant that when Sara Clerk and her daughter were presented for recusancy in 1637 it was noted that the latter was 16 years of age, whilst the following year a second daughter was presented who would have been just under 16. 21. It seems logical that people would only have been accused of nonconformity when they were considered old enough to participate fully in the rites of the established church. However, whilst 16 may have been officially accepted as the age of spiritual maturity, the 17 year old maid who claimed that she had never taken communion may not have been unusual. 22. It is unfortunate that the ages of so few of the youths who were listed in the Easter Books can be established. A number appeared for the first time in their early twenties .... possibly they had been in service and subsequently returned to their parental home. But there are also occasional examples

---

I am grateful to Mr. W. Ingram for pointing out this reference to me.
21. S.D.R., Subdean of Sarum, Churchwardens' Presentments, 1612-1639, (Unfoliated.)
11.
of sons and daughters who were first recorded at ages ranging from 14 to 17. Without knowing exactly when people normally took first communion it is difficult to estimate the proportion of the population which would have been excluded from the Easter Books. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to accept 16 as the norm and, in the light of other studies, to assume that the proportion below this age formed roughly a third. 23.

To ascertain the exact proportion of the population covered by the Easter Books is complicated by the fact that certain groups were inconsistently enumerated. This applies in particular to apprentices who only appear in any number in the books for 1585, 1593 and 1594 and, even then, were generally numbered rather than named individually. Their omission elsewhere was presumably due to the fact that younger communicants without an income were paid for by the head of the household. The 1574 listing provides the best evidence for the operation of this system for it is unique in giving a sub-total besides many of the households to indicate the presence of certain additional occupants. The total for these 'extras' is larger than one would expect had they simply been apprentices and, as an unusually small number of adult offspring were recorded that year, it seems reasonable to infer that the clerk only bothered to name those people who were actually responsible for payment.

Apart from the omission of children and apprentices in certain books, both groups for which the numbers can at least be estimated, can we assume that the rest of the population was comprehensively covered? Cross-checking reveals occasional errors, but external evidence suggests

that very few householders would have been consistently omitted. The mobility of servants makes it difficult to assess how faithfully they were recorded. However, the annual totals are sufficiently alike to dismiss the fear of substantial underregistration. The one remaining doubt is whether the poorest inhabitants would have been included. There are several indications that the Easter collection was in some way linked with contributions to the poor rate. It is significant that according to an order of 1663, "every person rated to the poor" was expected to pay a groat for themselves and their families towards the Easter collection. Two years earlier, an extraordinary rate for repairs had been levied based on "two months pay as men are rated to the poor", and in St. Edmund's in 1661 it was agreed that "communicants that pay towards the relief of the poor and are able to do so" were to give 2d in return for their communion tokens.

Can it be inferred that those on relief would have been excused all parochial obligations including the mandatory Easter duty, or were they only exonerated from the more exceptional levies? With few documents listing the very poor it is difficult to establish how many parishioners escaped the Easter levy if any. As a rough guide the Easter lists were compared with the list of householders in St. Thomas's who were given relief during the plague of 1604. Of 123 of the latter, 81 can be traced in the Easter Book of 1603 which, with the inclusion of another eight ambiguous cases, formed 72.4% of the total. It has been estimated that in any one year between 15 and 20% of all householders were newcomers to the parish or

26. S.C.A., S/161. It should be emphasised that in a year of exceptionally adverse conditions the numbers on relief obviously rose well above normal.
were setting up home for the first time.  

If allowance is made for a similar turnover between 1603 and 1604 then the proportion of plague-households which cannot be accounted for drops to about one in ten. With just over 440 households in the parish (the Easter Book total plus an element for the 'missing' plague-households), this means that at most only about 4% of all householders and, in view of the fact that household size apparently increased with wealth, a slightly smaller percentage of the total population, would have been excluded from the Easter Books on the grounds of poverty.

Even if the poorest citizens did escape the Easter levy, the Easter Books should not be dismissed as a biased source for it is clear that the net they cast extended fairly deeply into the social structure.  

Many communicants were certainly too poor to pay all their dues and in 1603 alone almost a third of those listed contributed less than a groat. Rebates and delayed payments were common and, although the latter could lead to prosecution, the wardens from St. Thomas's obviously adopted the lenient attitude of their fellows in St. Edmund's where it was specified in 1624 that, whilst certain people were to be sued for outstanding dues, "as to such as being very poor yet would pay somewhat of their rates the churchwardens are to use their discretion in taking part only".  

Although the Easter Books are not directly comparable with the censuses described by Laslett they can, nevertheless, be used for a number of

27. Infra, p. 79.
28. We should bear in mind at this point Dr. Slack's suggestion that although roughly 5% of the population were on relief in 1635, the proportion officially considered to be 'poor' was closer to a third. Paul Slack, Poverty in Early Stuart Salisbury, Wiltshire Record Society, Vol. XXXI, 1975, p. 6.
29. Nearly three-quarters of the householders who were on relief in 1604 were rated below this level and whereas the average contribution per head in 1603 was 7.2d, for members of the poorer sub-group it was only 3.4d.
30. Swayne, op. cit., p. 177.
demographic purposes. The number of children per household is impossible to determine, yet a considerable amount of information can be obtained from a study of the adult population alone. It is possible to correlate the distribution of communicants with that of wealth and to consider the significance of variations in the numbers of servants and kin. Moreover, rough estimates of the total population can be made by making allowances for the section under communicable age.

Even with a group of listings we are forced to rely heavily on results obtained at fixed points in time. As Laslett points out, such a series is still only "a collection of still photographs and they cannot be used as if they were movie strips". Yet with a selection of data the chances of the results being skewed because of abnormal conditions are obviously minimised. It is because they provide a facility for comparison at different dates and because they enable us to see something of the transformation of the household from one year to another that the Easter Books are so valuable.

As the Easter Books span a period of little more than thirty years we obviously cannot hope to obtain more than a limited glimpse of the developmental cycle of the family or to chart any long-term changes in the structure of the household. Much of the analysis which follows will, in fact, be in the nature of a micro-study centered on the later decades of the sixteenth century. Nevertheless, the use of qualitative material dating from between 1500 and 1640 has helped to set this analysis into a context and to determine whether contemporary attitudes to the family and to individual groups, such as women and children, fluctuated in response to religious and economic change.

In order to develop the subject of the Family and its social environment, it is intended to concentrate initially on a comparative assessment of the structure of the household and then to consider the development of the family and of its individual members .... the married couple, children, servants and resident kin .... over time. Having focused on the domestic group it is then proposed to move outwards and to examine the role of the wider kinship network and the relationships which existed within the neighbourhood. First however, we obviously need to know something of the town in which the people we shall meet lived and worked. The first section of this thesis will therefore be devoted to a brief study of the economic fortunes of Salisbury during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.
CHAPTER ONE

SALISBURY 1500 TO 1640:

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL BACKGROUND
FIGURE 1:1 EARLY MODERN SALISBURY: THE PARISHES AND THE WARDS

1. St. Edmund's Church
2. St. Thomas's Church
3. St. Martin's Church
4. Bishop's Guildhall
5. Cathedral

--- Parish Boundaries
----- Ward Boundaries

1. Milford
2. St. Edmund
3. St. Thomas
4. New Street Ward
5. Bugmore Meadow

THE CLOSE

Harnham
FIGURE 1:2  EARLY MODERN SALISBURY: THE STREETS
THE SETTING

The town of New Sarum had been established at the confluence of five rivers during the episcopate of Richard Poore between 1217 and 1228. By the end of the thirteenth century the late medieval structure of three parishes and four wards was already in evidence. The oldest of the three parishes, dating from before the foundation of the town, was St. Martin's. Its church lay outside the city ditch and it included amongst its parishioners people from the manors of Milford and Winterbourne Ford. Being semi-rural in character and including within its bounds the area known as Bugmore Meadow, it was the least densely populated of the three parishes and also the poorest.

By contrast, whilst St. Edmund's and St. Thomas's both included a number of poorer streets, such as New Street to the south of the town or the backstreets around St. Edmund's church, they also contained an equal share of the market streets and, consequently, a share of the town's wealthiest citizens. In St. Thomas's for example, lay a chequer, known by the late sixteenth century as Bower's Chequer, which, like the neighbouring market frontage commonly described as the "Ditch", had attracted some of the leading medieval merchants. The parish also contained the rows where the butchers and fishmongers had their standings and the High Street, noted by Leland as a particularly fair street, which included several large inns such as the George, the Angel and the Rose.

1. See Figures 1:1 and 1:2.

2. A detailed analysis of the distribution of wealth is given in Chapter Two.

The other street singled out by Leland, Castle Street, lay partly in St. Thomas's and partly in St. Edmund's. It backed onto the Avon in the west and for this reason attracted a number of dyers and brewers. By the sixteenth century the street also included the town houses of several prominent gentry families, like the Webbes and the Penruddocks, besides many poorer cottages. The other notable streets in St. Edmund's were Blue Boar Row and Queen Street to the north and east of the market place. These again contained some of the larger merchant's houses including the home of John Aport, a fifteenth century mercer.

The market itself was divided into a number of centres for the sale of different commodities. Besides Butcher and Fisher Rows, where permanent shops had rapidly replaced the temporary stalls set up during the thirteenth century, oats and vegetables were sold around the Poultry Cross to the south of Oatmeal Row and corn at the north-west corner of the market place. A Cheese Cross, built on the corner of Minster Street in the early fifteenth century was the centre for hucksters of dairy products and fruit. On the eastern side, sometimes called the Yarn Market, commodities other than food were sold, whilst a cattle market was held near the east end of New Street at Barnard's Cross.

Lying apart from the commercial centre of the city it is possible that St. Martin's had less in common with St. Thomas's and St. Edmund's than with the suburban areas of Salisbury. Not that the latter were particularly large in the sixteenth century. On Speed's plan of Salisbury, dating from 1611, the city appeared to be largely contained by its medieval earth ramparts, although there were a few houses in Milford, to the north and east, and to the west along Fisherton Street. The Milford settlement had been in evidence before Poore set up his new town, whilst Fisherton Anger began to develop soon after its foundation.
Fisherton Street had originally formed the main exit from Salisbury and, in consequence, attracted a number of inns and taverns. Little, however, is known of the economy of this or any of the other outlying areas. It seems likely that they were predominantly rural in character with perhaps a number of alehouse-keepers, a few clothworkers and, in common with most suburban areas, large numbers of vagrants who crowded into the slums and wandered into the city itself to beg.\textsuperscript{4} The city authorities were obviously alarmed by the latter and in 1629 made an unsuccessful attempt to annex Fisherton, Milford and East Harnham, which lay to the south. Their independence, it was reported, caused "great disorders and many inconveniences to the cittie in Innes, alehouses, poore people and in trades".\textsuperscript{5} However, apart from this attempt, the council appear to have had little to do with the suburbs.

The other area not yet mentioned, was the Liberty of the Close, which lay to the south of the High Street. Although primarily the home of various ecclesiastical dignitaries, it contained a number of laymen. Craftsmen from the Close, for instance, were occasionally enrolled in the Tailors' Guild. Relations between Town and Close fluctuated according to the city's dealings with its overlord, the Bishop. In the early seventeenth century relations were perhaps at their least harmonious, for it was considered unjust that the Close should have few poor of its own to provide for and yet should contribute very little to the town's poor. In the 1650's, as part of a continuing legal battle with the Bishop, an attempt was made to draw the Close under the city's jurisdiction. The inhabitants naturally protested, complaining that

\textsuperscript{4} There is evidence of clothworking in Fisherton in 1602 when a plea was made for the relief of poor weavers. \textit{H.M.C. Var. Coll., VI}, 1901, p.73.

\textsuperscript{5} S.C.A., Ledger C, fol. 348v.
they consisted "of about sixty families who have only a dwelling there and no benefit of trade or tavern, inn or alehouse there." The figure of sixty suggests a population of between 250 and 300, not to mention an unknown number of choristers, canons and vicars who lived in the vicars' commons. Unfortunately, although some members of the Close appear in tax lists and probate records, there is little quantitative evidence about the people who dwelt within its walls. For the most part, therefore, we must confine our analysis of the population to the three city parishes.

**PROSPERITY AND DECLINE: CONTRASTING OCCUPATIONAL STRUCTURES**

In trying to set our discussion of Family Life into an economic context it is particularly important to be aware of the contrasts between Salisbury's occupational and social structure at the beginning of the sixteenth century, before the town's fortunes began to wane, and a century later when the citizens faced a number of crises.

Like Coventry, Salisbury could be ranked with the 'big five' Bristol, York, Norwich, Exeter and Newcastle in the later Middle Ages. In 1332 and 1334 the town was placed ninth in order of wealth and sixth in terms of population in 1377. Salisbury still occupied this position in the 1520's but, as Hoskins remarked, this was the "zenith of its importance as a commercial centre". Although retaining the political, social and ecclesiastical prominence of a provincial capital a hundred years later, its industrial and commercial base had withered, By 1576

---

it had dropped to thirteenth or fourteenth in the urban hierarchy and the population, estimated at roughly 8,000 in 1524, had fallen to about 7,000 in 1596 and 6,500 in 1625.

During the Middle Ages Salisbury's importance rested on its dual role as a cloth-manufacturing town and a distributive centre. The prosperity of its cloth industry dates from the end of the fourteenth century, when the main areas of the Wiltshire industry, to the north and west of the county, also began to flourish. In many respects however, the Salisbury industry was more akin to that of the kersey-producing area to the east than to that of north Wiltshire. Rather than being dominated by a small group of large scale clothiers the industry was carried out by a multitude of weavers and small clothiers. The finished cloths, chiefly rays and kerseys, in contrast to the traditional west country broadcloths, were sold to merchants in Salisbury and exported via Southampton. Although by the end of the fifteenth century more and more Wiltshire woollens went to London, Salisbury also acted as an important distributive centre for the rest of the county. As a result, the mercantile element, from whom the town's leading citizens were drawn, was particularly strong during the later Middle Ages. Their trade was mainly with France and Spain, importing wine, iron, fruit, fish, oil and woad through Southampton, and to a lesser extent Lymington and Poole, in return for cloth. Links with Southampton were particularly important and there is evidence of investment there in both property and shipping. Salisbury merchants were also large scale property owners in the town itself. In 1455, for instance, William Swayne held as many as 23 tenements and shops, John Hall another 16. During the same period a number of Salisbury properties
were also held by merchants from other areas who traded through Southampton and used Salisbury as a market for their perishable goods. 9.

Although somewhat different in character, the fortunes of the Salisbury cloth industry matched those of the rest of Wiltshire during the Early Modern period. Despite spells of depression in the 1520s and 1530s, the reign of Henry VIII was one of prosperity. The 1550s and 1560s, however, were difficult years. Currency reform raised the price of cloth abroad and trade slumped as a result of Religious Wars and the fall of Antwerp. Exports had only just attained their former level when crisis struck again in 1586. Although less severe than the earlier slump this ushered in a new period of depression. The cost of wool rose out of all proportion to the gradual advance in cloth prices and complaints about the poor quality of the cloth hindered exports further. The turn of the century witnessed a new wave of prosperity, but again it was short lived. The Cockayne Project and European Wars between 1618 and 1648 brought fresh disaster to Wiltshire. In the cloth producing towns chronic depression hit the multitudes of poor weavers and clothworkers. A petition to the Quarter Sessions in 1620 mentioned that over 130 looms in the county were known to be idle and that at least 2,600 weavers and spinners were unemployed. 10. Three years later textile workers complained of exploitation by the clothiers who "at their will have made their workes extreme hard and abated wages what they please". 11.

Whilst the cloth industry struggled from one crisis to the next, Salisbury suffered additional problems with the decline of the port of Southampton. This effectively ended the era of the great Sarum merchants.

11. H.M.C., Var, Coll. VI, 1901, p.94.
By the 1570's only one merchant was using the port on any scale and he went bankrupt in 1577. The clothiers turned instead to the London market. At the same time the manufacturing side of the industry was revolutionised. Attention was transferred from kerseys to broadcloths and Salisbury adopted the traditional broadcloth organisation dominated by a minority of wealthy clothiers. As the town's mercantile magnates disappeared a new oligarchy of manufacturers was thus established, the first known clothier to rise to the mayoralty being elected in 1577. However, the clothiers' days were also limited. Although the West Wiltshire industry ultimately recovered by developing new products and fresh markets, the Salisbury industry clung to the older methods and thus, inevitably declined.

In a letter written in 1626 the poverty of the citizens was attributed to the fact that "the city hath noe staple trade in it". Contemporaries were quick to point to the demise of the cloth industry as the root of their many ills, yet Salisbury had never been entirely dependent on woollen cloth. Still in the field of textiles, linen had been produced on a modest scale since the fourteenth century and silk and lace were manufactured in the seventeenth century. To judge from the prominence of the Tailors' Fraternity, tailoring had been amongst the leading crafts since the early Middle Ages and leather workers, although less well documented, had always formed a significant group and were one of the leading occupational categories by 1600. Above all, despite the decline of overseas trade during the second half of the sixteenth century, Salisbury still had an important regional market and supplied a number of services to the neighbouring area. In a plan to

12. The best account of the cloth trade is found in Ramsay, op. cit., See also V.C.H. Wilts. IV, Chapters 5 & 6.

13. S.C.A., Box 4, No. 65A.
extend the navigation of the Avon in 1623, John Taylor mentioned the
 carriage of bricks and tiles from Sarum to Southampton, Bristol and many
 other places.\textsuperscript{14} Salisbury joiners are known to have worked as far afield
 as Dorset and Somerset and local tanners to have traded as far north as
 Beverley.\textsuperscript{15} Moreover, as one would expect of a Cathedral and an assize
town, Salisbury had an important function in supplying the needs of the
many visitors to the area. In 1597 brewers complained of their need for
extra malt because of

\begin{quote}
"the greate throughe fare repayring of strangers to thassizes
 and sessions, market people and resorte for musters over
 and besydes the multytude of theinhabitants therin."\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

By 1686, with beds for 548 travellers and stabling for 865 horses,
Salisbury far outstripped the other towns in Wiltshire.

Occasional references in the early Corporation Minute Books reveal
the variety of occupations which were carried out in Salisbury. 38 crafts
were mentioned in a list of guilds which met in 1440, 34 in a list of
1503.\textsuperscript{17} By 1612 the different individual occupations numbered at least
50 and, to judge from the balance between them, the town was already
changing in character from an industrial to a social centre. Something
of this transformation can be seen by comparing the status of individual
trades at different periods.\textsuperscript{18} The late medieval occupational structure
is encapsulated in a memorandum of 1503 detailing the order of the crafts

\textsuperscript{14} John Taylor, "A Discovery by Sea from London to Salisbury" in
\textit{The Worckes of John Taylor the Water Poet}, 1869 edn., p.27.

\textsuperscript{15} V.Chinnery, "Some Notes on the Members and Products of the Salisbury
Joiners' Company in the Early Seventeenth Century", \textit{Hatcher Review},

\textsuperscript{16} S.C.A., Q/136/B; 8L.


\textsuperscript{18} See Tables 1:1A, 1B, 1C, 1D & 1E.
### A: The Number of Craftsmen Contributing Towards 50 Armed Men, 1474

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craft</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weavers</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullers &amp; Shermens</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiths</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubbers</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanners</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchers</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornmongers</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeepers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pewterers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B: The Order for the St. Osmund's Night Watch in 1503

- Smiths
- Carpenters, Joiners, Bowyers, Fletchers & Sawyers
- Masons & Heliers
- Butchers
- Cooks
- Saddlers &
- Tanners
- Dubbers, Glovers & Dyers
- Barbers, Chandlers, Hatters & Cappers
- Fishmongers
- Goldsmiths, Painters & Brasiers
- Bakers
- Brewers
- Innholders & Vintners
- Two Constables & their Fellowship
- Corvesors
- Skinners
- Tuckers & Shermens
- Weavers & their Pageant
- Tailors & their Pageant
- Mayor & Brethren
- Armed Men
- Merchants & their Fellowship
- Two Constables & their Fellowship

### C: The Stock of Various Crafts in 1524

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Craft</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanners</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubbers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weavers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1: THE OCCUPATIONS OF WILLMAKERS: 1500 - 1639

(% of those of known occupation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1500 - 1569</th>
<th>1570 - 1639</th>
<th>1500 - 1639</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victualling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E: OCCUPATIONS IN ST. EDMUND'S BAPTISMAL REGISTER: 1620 - 1629

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victualling</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Gentry</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Yeomen</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the annual St. Osmund's night procession. Starting with the Smiths, Woodworkers, Masons and Heliers, the idea was obviously to parade the humblest craftsmen first. Not that these were necessarily the smallest groups. When the guilds were asked to contribute towards the cost of sending armed men to France in 1474 the Smiths were the fourth largest of eleven occupational groups enumerated. Next in the procession came the Butchers and the Cooks, the former with 14 members in 1474 and one of the eight crafts whose stock was assessed for the lay subsidy in 1524. Curiously the Bakers, who by the seventeenth century were certainly a less significant group than the Butchers, were nearer the end of the procession just in front of the Brewers, Innholders and Vintners. Between them and the Cooks were a miscellaneous group: Saddlers and Tanners; Dubbers; Glovers and Dyers; Barbers; Chandlers; Hatters and Cappers; Fishmongers; Goldsmiths; Painters and Brasiers. Of these crafts the Dubbers and Tanners were both represented in 1474 with 21 and 13 members respectively, and both were assessed in 1524. The only others in this middling group to be noted in the subsidy were the Fishera and the Barbers, both having stock worth £3.

Two more leather working groups followed the Innholders, namely the Corveysors, who had stock worth £6 in 1524, and the Skinners. Then came the first of the clothworkers on whom the late medieval city was so dependent. The Tuckers and Shermen were listed with 30 members in 1474, but possibly this did not represent the whole craft, for although they may have declined during the interval, as many as 61 master fullers and 31 journeymen had attended a council meeting in 1420.

20. Ibid., fols.120-1.
Visually the climax to the St. Osmund's procession began with the pageants of the Weavers and the Tailors. There is no evidence concerning the former, but the Tailors are known to have processed with a Giant attended by three "black boys", a man playing "the divell's part," a hobby-horse and, perhaps the only representative of women in the procession, Maid Marion. 23 In the Middle Ages the Weavers were evidently a prosperous group, and a number of individual weavers were able to deal in cloth besides manufacturing it. In 1420 there were known to be at least 81 master weavers and 207 Journeymen in Salisbury, whilst in 1474 they headed the list of 252 craftsmen with 66 representatives. In the same list 44 tailors were named and, to judge from the lists of men attending the guild councils, their numbers rose steadily during the early sixteenth century. The Tailors and Weavers were unique amongst the Salisbury crafts in being specially chartered as socio-religious guilds. Both fraternities owned a large amount of urban property and in 1525 they were each assessed on stock worth £8.

After the frivolity of the guild pageants the procession ended in solemnity with the Mayor and his Brethren, clad in their ceremonial scarlet and crimson, and the Merchants and their fellowship. Amongst the latter would have been men like William Webbe, John Stone and Thomas Coke, assessed at over £500 in the 1520's, large scale property owners and prominent members of the city council. Indeed in the early sixteenth century the council was drawn largely from the mercantile class, both Corporation and Guild Merchant merging into the socio-religious guild of St. George. Little is known of this fraternity or of its links with the merchants, but it is perhaps symbolic that the suppression of the George Guild in 1548 marked the end of the heyday of the large merchant

magnates. By the early seventeenth century, although the reformed Merchants' Company included some of Salisbury's leading citizens, the term no longer applied to men with such widespread trading connections, but to a group which included clothiers, drapers, goldsmiths, apothecaries and embroiderers. Wills can only be used as a rough guide, yet it is surely significant that, whilst 43% of all willmakers of known occupation between 1500 and 1569 were merchants, only 14% were designated thus in the next 70 years. The early seventeenth century successors to men like Webbe and Stone, were despite their comparative wealth, on a level with the brewers, a fairly humble group in 1503 but forming a strong pressure group in political affairs by the 1620s.

The realignment of the various trades and, in particular, the rise to prominence of the victualling element, can be seen by examining a list of Free Citizens compiled in 1612. The list, including 59 different crafts and 496 individuals, was drawn up in order to record the contributions made towards the cost of incorporating the city in 1612. The contributors were listed under craft headings followed by, "the names of suche as are able to geve, have lyves in the Towne and have geuen nothinge...... and lastlie the names of the poore persons of euy(r)e company that deserve well in respecte of their behavior to be of the companies and ar not able to geve anye thinge," 24.

The inclusion of both able and poorer men suggests that the list was fairly comprehensive. However, the free citizens formed only a portion of the town's adult male population. If the wage-earning sector were added to the analysis the balance between different crafts might be substantially altered. It is possible to make a very rough estimate of

24. Between the same dates the victuallers rose from 4.4% of all willmakers of known occupation to 12.6%.

the proportion of the population who held the freedom of the city. If one assumes that the total population was about 7,000, as contemporaries reported in 1596, and subtracts a third for children, this leaves nearly 4,700 adults. Allowing for a slight excess of women would give us approximately 2,300 adult males of whom just over a fifth appear in the 1612 list. The proportion seems low when compared with groups of freemen in other towns. In Tudor York, for instance, they formed about half the adult males, in early Stuart Norwich about a third. 26.

There are, however, several significant omissions from the list which, if included, could raise the proportion to just over a third. Although it was noted that the Corporation of Tailors donated £10 and the Weavers £6, individual members of these crafts were not mentioned. 27.

Judging from the lists of men attending the guild councils there were at least 48 master tailors in Salisbury at this date. In earlier records the weavers always exceeded them in numbers and, despite the slump in the cloth trade, they may still have been the larger of the two. Certainly even by the second half of the seventeenth century weavers were still prominent and in a list of men recruited as free citizens between 1662 and 1669 they formed the third largest group after the shoemakers and clothiers. 28.

Besides the master weavers and tailors the 1612 list also appears to have omitted some of the town's élite. Of 106 men assessed for the lay-

27. Their exclusion and the fact that they were apparently not granted new ordinances when the other crafts were reorganised in 1612 was undoubtedly due to the fact that, already possessed of chartered liberties, the two crafts had supposedly some measure of protection against foreigners.
28. The respective number of recruits being 42, 38 and 25. The tailors fortunes must have waned by this date for they numbered only seven.
subsidy of 1611 only 65 appeared as free citizens (61.3%). The remainder includes a number of landed gentry and some of the more prominent members of the town council, men who may possibly have made earlier contributions towards incorporation. Of 73 councillors known to be present in 1612 28 were not listed amongst the free citizens. Some were ex-mayors, like Thomas Grafton, Zachary Lyming and Bartolomew Tooky. But others were junior councillors of modest standing who were less likely to have contributed in advance.

Whilst the 1612 list fails to give a complete picture of the freeman class it does, nevertheless, provide important evidence about the early seventeenth century economic structure. In all 31 different craft groups were mentioned. Some of the humblest crafts boasted only a couple of members; the ropers and stocking makers with two each; the wiredrawers and painters with three. At the other end of the scale were the Merchants with 47 members, the Smiths with 42 and the Shoemakers with 41. When grouped according to categories the victuallers and leather-workers, with 115 and 114 members respectively, predominated. Textiles and clothing, as Table 1:3 illustrates, are well down the list, but were the weavers and tailors included it is possible that they would occupy the position above the metal workers, if not the head of the list itself. Textiles were certainly the second largest group in terms of recruits in the 1660's.

Besides giving some idea of the numerical strength of various occupations, the list also hints at their relative financial positions. Within a given craft the donations varied widely. One linen-draper could afford only 3s 4d. Other members of the Merchants' Company contributed £5. However, the average sums paid by each craft point to a clear distinction between the mercantile and victualling sectors on the one hand, and the woodworkers, builders and some of the very small groups

29. P.R.O., E/179/199/354. The total given here omits women and the Close.
30. See Table 1:2.
31. See Table 1:4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>No. Free Citizens</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>1611 Tax Payers</th>
<th>% Per Craft</th>
<th>Office Holders</th>
<th>% Per Craft</th>
<th>Mayors</th>
<th>% Per Craft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merchants, Mercers, Grocers</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apothecaries, Goldsmiths, Linen Drapers,</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upholsterers &amp; Embroiderers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewers &amp; Maltsters</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanners</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers, Curriers &amp; Cobblers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothworkers &amp; Sherman</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parchmentmakers &amp; Glovers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollen Drapers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberdashers &amp; Feltmakers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchers</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armourers, Cutlers, Smiths &amp; Ironmongers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pewterers &amp; Brasiers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishmongers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddlers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiners &amp; Wheelers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Free Citizens</td>
<td>% Total</td>
<td>No. 1611 Tax Payers</td>
<td>% Per Craft</td>
<td>No. Office Holders</td>
<td>% Per Craft</td>
<td>No. Mayors</td>
<td>% Per Craft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopers, Sevyers, Bellowmakers &amp; Turners</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber-Surgeons</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons, Tilers &amp; Plasterers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandlers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire Drawers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flax Dressers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardmakers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collarmakers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture Drawers &amp; Painters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocking Makers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innholders &amp; Vintners</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>406</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Victuallers</td>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Free Citizens</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 1611 Tax. Total Payers</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Per Office Craft Holders</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Per Craft</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Free Citizens</th>
<th>1611 Tax. Total Payers</th>
<th>% Per Office Craft Holders</th>
<th>% Per Craft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Victuallers</td>
<td>Leather</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1:4 THE AVERAGE CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY EACH CRAFT IN 1612

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Crafts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£2</td>
<td>Brewers (£2 4s 2d); Woollen Drapers (£2 6s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1</td>
<td>Merchants (£1 7s); Fishmongers (£1 2s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10s</td>
<td>Tanners (12s 5d); Chandlers (11s 10½d); Dyers (13s 4d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6s 8d</td>
<td>Bakers (7s 6d); Clothworkers (7s 1d); Butchers (8s 9d); Barbers (6s 8d); Haberdashers (9s 5d); Innholders (8s 7d).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5s</td>
<td>Smiths (5s 6d); Pewterers (5s 8d); Flaxdressers (5s 1d); Collarmakers (5s); Shoemakers (5s 10d); Parchmentmakers (5s 10d); Saddlers (6s 3d).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5s</td>
<td>Carpenters (2s 6d); Joiners (2s 9d); Coopers (3s 7d); Masons (3s 10d); Wire Drawers (3s); Cardmakers (4s 9d); Ropers (3s); Picture Drawers (3s 11d); Pinners (4s 3d); Stockingmakers (4s); Cooks (2s 10d).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on the other. They also reveal variations in status within occupational categories. Of the victuallers, for instance, only the cooks averaged less than 6s 8d, although a few butchers were also of lowly standing and were included amongst those unable to give anything. Despite being numerically on a par with the victuallers, the leatherworkers belonged to the middle ranks, the shoemakers, saddlers, parchmentmakers and glovers contributing a mean of between 5s and 6s 8d. The tanners however, were evidently more prosperous and were set along with the chandlers and dyers in the group paying between 10s and £1. Amongst the heavier crafts the metal workers seem to have been the wealthiest. One man paid 30s, another 20s and several 10s, whilst on average metal workers were set at 5s and over. Amongst the woodworkers and builders however, it was rare to find anyone contributing more than 5s.

That the sums paid in 1612 can be taken as a fairly accurate guide to the prosperity of individual crafts is made clear by examining the numbers of subsidy men and office-holders in each group. In all 56 of the free citizens (11.3%), held civic office, 26 reaching the mayorality. Over half the brewers listed and all the woollen-drapers, both groups contributing an average of £2 or more, can be found amongst the office-holding élite, whilst roughly a third of the merchants, fishmongers and dyers, again amongst the more generous contributors, held office. Of the 'missing' occupations very few tailors or weavers are known to have belonged to the corporation. Like the shoemakers, smiths and parchment-makers they were numerically strong, but few were of sufficient wealth to become prominent civic figures. In fact of the 114 leatherworkers only nine were councillors of whom two, notably tanners, became mayor. Apart from these two, a father and son, and the 14 merchants and six brewers, the only other men in the list to become Mayor were a butcher, John Benger; a fishmonger, Richard Godfrey and two members of the Smiths' Company. The 65 free citizens who contributed to the 1611 Subsidy were
similarly distributed.

The merchants and victuallers formed two-thirds of this group, the latter significantly including none of the bakers or cooks and only three butchers. The leather-workers included: eleven subsidy men, of whom eight were tanners; the metalworkers four and the textile workers two.

From the analysis of the list of free citizens a number of conclusions can be drawn. By the early seventeenth century Salisbury evidently included a wide diversity of occupations, although nothing was produced on a scale to replace the ailing cloth industry and, at the freeman level at least, the occupational structure was heavily weighted towards the service industries. The numerical and financial importance of the victualling sector and the large numbers of shoemakers, tailors, smiths and builders, who clearly served a wider area than the town itself, reflected the situation in many other regional capitals. However, were we able to look beyond the level of the freeman, the picture might be rather different. Whilst it is impossible to ascertain the size and composition of the wage-earning class, it seems likely that the cloth industry still accounted for the largest group of employees. The occupation's of the city's numerous poor were biased significantly towards textiles. The poor men who petitioned for licences to sell victualls in order to support themselves, or for money with which to buy stock in the 1630s, included a number of weavers and clothworkers, and it was to crafts such as spinning, spooling and carding that paupers were set on work in the 1620s.

One exercise which gives some indication of the occupational structure for society as a whole is to examine the crafts listed in the St. Edmund's baptismal register between 1620 and 1629. As table 1:1E shows, although leather-workers and victuallers were still prominent, textiles headed the list with 89 representatives, of whom 77 were weavers. After the weavers, labourers with 50 representatives, shoemakers with 19 and tailors with 13, formed the largest individual groups. The occupational structure of the three parishes possibly varied - St. Martin's, for instance, may have contained an unequal share of the city's wage earners - yet the evidence from St. Edmund's suggests that, although Salisbury was predominantly a social centre by the seventeenth century, large numbers were still dependent upon the failing cloth market.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH IN THE 1520s

Having pointed to the leading crafts at the beginning of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and having briefly mentioned those occupational groups from which members of the corporation were most frequently drawn, we need to consider the social structure of Salisbury in a little more depth and to ascertain the proportion of the population which might, at different dates, be described as the city's élite.

Most studies of the wealth structure of early modern towns take as a point of departure the Lay Subsidy of the 1520s,

33. This was the only parish to mention occupations and the one decade in which the latter can be established for the majority of men listed.
### Table 1:5 The Distribution of Taxpayers and Taxable Wealth in 1524 and 1525

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1524</th>
<th></th>
<th>1525</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men Taxed In Both Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>394.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>5623.8</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>217.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>220.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>524.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>373.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>340.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>486.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 99</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>872.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1225.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 +</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1270.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>598</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>6018.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a subsidy which is unique amongst the Tudor taxes in its comprehensive assessment, and yet possibly less reliable than has often been assumed. The surviving returns for Salisbury include the preliminary levy on all those assessed at £40 or more in 1523 and the two main instalments of 1524 and 1525.34. On the assumption that at least a third of the adult male population would have escaped assessment, Hoskins suggested that the total population at this date numbered about 8,000.35. Exeter, contributing only £3 more in 1524, was of similar size and reveals marked similarities in the numbers assessed at various levels.36. Thus, whereas 6.6% of Exeter's taxpayers were assessed at £40 and over, the corresponding proportion for Salisbury was 6.7% in 1524 and 7.1% in 1525.37. The results for both Exeter and Salisbury, illustrate the very unequal distribution of wealth so typical of towns at this date, although of the two Exeter was marginally the more imbalanced. Over three-quarters of its taxable wealth was owned by just under 7% of the taxable population. In Salisbury, the same group held about three-fifths of the town's wealth.

34. P.R.O., E/179/259/16; E/179/197/160; E/179/197/154.
37. The upper estate may even have been larger than this. Whilst 78 people paid the preliminary levy in 1523, many obviously had their contribution substantially reduced for only 40 men in 1524 and 43 in 1525 were assessed at £40 and over. See Table 1:5.
At the opposite end of society some 70% of the taxpayers in Salisbury owned a mere 10% of the taxable wealth. The numbers assessed on wages amounted to 48.7% in 1524 and 42.5% in 1525, the mean being similar to the corresponding proportion for Exeter, namely 45.8%. Possibly all those assessed at under £5, 74.5% in 1524 and 66.2% in 1525, should be considered as wage-earners. For contemporaries there was certainly little distinction between the so called wage-earner and those men with the lowest assessments on goods, for a number of people were taxed on property one year and on wages the next.

The distribution of taxpayers in the 1520s reflects the topography of the city. The subsidy was collected by wards rather than by parishes. Market and New Street, the two central wards, contained the majority of those assessed in 1525 and accounted for over four-fifths of the taxable wealth. The former included 226 taxpayers who paid £148 between them; the latter 175 men paying £113. Next in order came Martin with 109 men paying £52 and finally Mead with 59 taxpayers who contributed only £11. Surprisingly although it contained fewer taxpayers, it was New Street rather than Market which had the lowest proportion assessed at under £2. In Mead, the least densely populated of the four wards, wage-earners exceeded those paying on goods.

38. See Table 1:6.

39. Unfortunately this cannot be checked in 1524 for there is no separate heading for New Street Ward in the earlier instalment. Whilst it has been possible to identify a number of the ward's inhabitants, the illegibility of a section of the 1525 list makes further comparison difficult. The discrepancies in the ward totals in 1524 and 1525 suggests that a number of men from Mead and Martin should also be included in New Street.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>New Street</th>
<th>Martin</th>
<th>Mead</th>
<th>Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total No. Taxpayers</strong></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. Assessed on Wages</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. Assessed on Goods</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxable Wealth in £</strong></td>
<td>3308</td>
<td>2355</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It has often been pointed out that the valuations in the 1520's subsidy give no more than a relative picture of personal wealth. That this was particularly true at the top end of society can be seen by the way in which many of the assessments were deliberately reduced, not only between 1523 and 1524, but also between 1524 and 1525. Henry Acton a merchant, for instance, was assessed at £300 in 1522; £180 in 1524 and £120 in 1525; a fellow councillor, Henry Goldstone, at £60, £40 and £30 respectively. Whilst this tendency may not seriously distort our picture of the relative size of different social groups, more alarmingly is the fact that of 587 named men who appeared in 1524, only 248 (42.2%) reappeared the following year.

In discussing the problem of similar discrepancies in Rutland and Buckinghamshire, Julian Cornwall suggested that most of those omissions were deliberate, for natural wastage, through death or migration, would account for at most 10% of the population. His results reveal that only about two-thirds of all those taxed in the 1520s appeared in each individual instalment, a proportion similar to that obtained in Salisbury. It seems logical to assume that many of those appearing once only simply could not afford to make two contributions in under a year, for as many as 63% of the men listed in 1524 only were wage-earners, whilst another 25% were assessed at under £10. However, in challenging Cornwall's assertion

40. For this analysis only legible entries have been counted. The proportion would in fact be nearer a half (51.2%) if one included those who possibly changed ward.

41. Julian Cornwall, "English Population in the Early Sixteenth Century", Economic History Review, Second Series, xxiii, No. 1, 1970, pp. 32-36. That there was a deliberate policy of replacing certain taxpayers is also suggested by the fact that the numbers drawn from the town itself were remarkably similar in both instalments.
that the variations were due to deliberate omission rather than natural wastage, Hollingsworth suggests that a higher omission rate for the poorer element may simply be indicative of higher death rates and higher gross migration. 42.

Whilst some of the wage-earners who escaped a second levy were replaced by men of similar standing, by 1525 the burden had shifted slightly in their favour with only 58.5% of all taxpayers in 1525 being assessed on wages or goods of £2 or less in contrast to 70.2% in 1524. To compensate, the band between £3 and £40 increased from 22.5% in 1524 to 33.2% the following year. However, as table 1:5 illustrates, omissions occurred at all levels of society, the men assessed at between £100 and £200 being particularly notable in this respect, with only a third of their number occurring twice. One wonders how far men like Thomas Chaffin who was assessed at £100 in 1523 and £120 in 1525, but was not mentioned in 1524, or Robert Wodlock, assessed at £133 6s 8d in 1523 and £120 in 1525, were able to make use of their position on the town council in order to secure exemption?

Although the weighting of the various groups altered slightly, the collectors apparently made some attempt to apportion the subsidy in a similar fashion in both 1524 and 1525. The discrepancies certainly do not undermine the general impression of a pyramidal society in which the bulk of the town's wealth was held in a few hands, a framework which it is important to bear in mind.

42. T.H. Hollingsworth, Historical Demography, 1969, pp. 49-51. On the basis of the evidence for natural wastage in St Thomas's, discussed in the following chapter, we should expect to find that roughly four-fifths of the taxpayers in each list contributed twice rather than the observed two-thirds. A certain amount of deliberate omission does therefore seem feasible.
when we turn to examine the family and the neighbourhood. At the top of society was a small group of families, bound together by intermarriage and sharing common interests in trade and government. Whilst, they had more in common with the élite of other towns or the country gentry in certain respects, they were by no means divorced from their fellow townsmen. The links between men of different ranks were many. Rich and poor lived and worked side by side; they shared in communal and religious festivities and they were bound together by ties of patronage and charity.

RICH AND POOR IN LATE SIXTEENTH AND EARLY SEVENTEENTH CENTURY SALISBURY.

It has been suggested that by the seventeenth century society had become even more polarised and that the gap between rich and poor was widening. But we should not automatically assume that whilst the poor increased in numbers, the élite grew steadily richer. If anything in Salisbury, rich and poor alike were relatively poorer by 1600, yet because society was subject to a number of serious economic and social pressures contemporaries were perhaps more aware of their social differences than they had been a century earlier.

The question of the poor was one which aroused particular concern during the early seventeenth century. Yet with perhaps at least a third of the population too poor to be included in the 1520s subsidy and nearly half the taxable population assessed on wages, we can appreciate that the complaints made in the 1620s of nearly half the population needing relief did not

represent an entirely new situation. Throughout the sixteenth century the proportion of the population in potential danger of being forced below the poverty line must have been fairly constant. But only when a series of crises occurred, as in the early seventeenth century, did the threat become a reality.

The Corporation Minute Books reveal a growing awareness of the poor from the 1570s onwards. The problem was a twofold one. On the one hand, the declining cloth trade meant that an increasing number of Salisbury men were unable to maintain their families. On the other, the town faced a growing influx of strangers entering in search of food and work. In 1598 alone, 192 vagrants were turned away from Salisbury. In dealing with these two elements the authorities followed the line of national policy in distinguishing between deserving and the able-bodied poor. The order of 1572 to expel all vagabonds, vagrants and idle persons was the first of many attempts to stem the flow of able-bodied paupers. In 1580 and in 1595 views were taken of all houses containing more tenants and inhabitants than "thought convenient", and in 1597 enquiries were made of newcomers and their ability to work. In the new constitutions drawn up after the town was incorporated in 1612 freemen were forbidden to let property to foreigners who might become chargeable to the city. In 1622 further restrictions were placed on taking


45. Ibid., fols. 62, 150v, 156v.

46. Ibid., fol. 222.
servants or journeymen from outside the city. However, none of these measures had the desired effect. In 1636 it was still complained that the "poor of the city are much increased and the number needing relief far greater than in tymes past", a situation contemporaries blamed on "the drawing in of strangers to inhabit the city and by tradesmen putting forth and sending of work out of the city". As Dr. Slack has pointed out, whilst poverty became an increasing problem from the 1570s onwards, it became critical during periods of dearth and plague. At the end of the sixteenth century, for instance, a number of bad harvests created a serious shortage of "all kinds of grayne and butter and cheese and other victuells". The price of wheat, set at 5s a bushell in November 1596 had risen to 8s the following January and complaints were heard of engrossing and wasting grain. Conditions amongst the native poor were harsh enough - in St. Edmund's, for instance, burials had reached twice their normal level in 1597 - without the inevitable influx of country people in search of food.

Eight years later crisis hit again when a particularly severe outbreak of plague wiped out nearly a sixth of the population. Between May 1604 and May 1605, the peak months of the epidemic, £590 was spent on the relief of the poor, three times the normal amount. In 1627, at the height of another epidemic, 2900 people, virtually half the population, were on relief. Although less

47. Ibid., fol. 285.
48. Ibid., fol. 397.
severe in terms of mortality than the 1604 outbreak, the crisis hit a town which was already struggling after a series of bad harvests and faced with mounting unemployment in the textile industry.

In 1604 and 1627 plague had the effect not only of disrupting all social and commercial life, but also of exacerbating the gulf between rich and poor. The market effectively ceased to function and the town was cut off from the outside world. All public feasts were cancelled, and plays, private music and drinking in alehouses were officially prohibited. Those who were wealthy enough to do so fled from the town. Ivie noted how within 4 days in 1627,

"as many persons of the city that had any friends in the country that would receive them into part of their houses or barns did fly as it were out of an house on fire; in so much did they load forth of goods and wares above three score carts a day until all of any ability were gone".

The poor who were left behind, notably the group most susceptible to plague, were hit financially, as trade came to a standstill, and socially, as they were cut off from their kin and forbidden to find solace in the alehouses. Tensions inevitably resulted.

The methods adopted to deal with the problems of poverty and plague have been discussed in detail by Dr. Slack so it is unnecessary to dwell on the subject here. What is important to bear in mind is the fact that, although the corporation established a number, innovatory measures, both to cut down the numbers of poor and to find alternative means of supporting them,

they still depended on the upper ranks of society for contributions towards parish relief and towards the implementation of their policies. The corporation storehouse, designed to help provision the poor, and the brewhouse founded in order to finance a scheme to set the poor on work, collapsed for a number of reasons. But part of the problem lay in the fact that, the middle and upper ranks of society were also experiencing economic difficulties at the beginning of the seventeenth century, and could ill-afford these additional costs.

The size and status of the urban élite is particularly difficult to establish. By the 1620s there were possibly fewer men at the wealthiest end of society than there had been a century earlier. Certainly, given the disappearance of the merchant magnates who were so prominent in the early sixteenth century, the town élite as a whole can be assumed to have been relatively poorer. Unfortunately, although the later Tudor subsidies can be used to establish the names of some of Salisbury's more prominent citizens, they give no real indication of their individual wealth. Lacking other evidence we must therefore resort to the opinions of contemporaries.

Perhaps in view of the problems facing the town in the early seventeenth century, the authorities were unduly pessimistic, but it does seem to have been widely felt that there were simply not enough wealthy men in the city to cope with the cost of poor relief and taxation. In 1623 John Taylor remarked that,

51. It has been suggested that even by 1576 Salisbury's property was shared by fewer people and came partly from those having connections outside the city.

"your city is so much over-charged with poore, as hauling in three parishes neere 3000 besides decayed men a great many and that those few which are of the wealthiest sort are continually overpressed with sustaining the wants of the needy". 52.

Three years later in a letter written to the Earl of Pembroke, it was complained that in the last subsidy 47 men had been assessed at 20 shillings, 68 at £3 and under and 34 at £4, while five of the "best ability" had left the city leaving only 18 men able to bear the charge of 100 armed men. 53.

Who were these men of the "best ability"? With a total population of roughly 6500 it would appear that less than 10% of all adult males contributed to the subsidy and that the élite group formed only just over 1%. Perhaps they can be equated with those men assessed at £40 or more in the 1520s or certainly with those at £100, for they must have formed a similar proportion of the adult male population. Examination of the actual subsidy referred to in the letter reveals that there were in fact 174 taxpayers in the town itself, another 24 in the Close. 54. The 25 individuals, 22 men and 3 women, assessed at over £5 included eight of the leading members of the corporation. Several of the others were noteable Wiltshire landowners who had property in Salisbury but may have been unwilling to contribute towards urban charges. In the letter it was significantly pointed out that the cost of furnishing the armed men would be "grevous alsoe to them, having their meanes in the country at large, where they are also charged".

53. S.C.A., Box 4, No. 65A.
54. P.R.O., E/179/199/386.
Such men may also have been unprepared to serve as officers on the town council.

Whilst Salisbury experienced nothing like the social and institutional crisis which occurred in early sixteenth century Coventry, there is evidence of considerable strain within the city council by the early seventeenth century. Signs of disillusion can be traced from the 1580s onwards. The ordinances dealing with absenteeism, and failure to take up office were reissued in 1582, 1603 and 1609, and lists of men fined for such offences appeared with increasing regularity. Between 1600 and 1612, in particular, comparatively few men entered the council and many of these failed to attend an assembly until several years after they were first called to office. But numbers had been dropping since the 1570s with a consequent rise in the proportion of councillors attaining the rank of Mayor and a decrease in the average interval between this stage, and first entering the council. Between 1520 and 1579 the average interval had been 14.8 years. During the next 50 years it dropped to 10.2 with some of the most rapid promotions occurring in the decade immediately before Incorporation. Possibly there was also a tendency to appoint men to the "Forty-eight" at a younger age than had been customary, for by the end of the sixteenth century the average period spent in office had extended by about seven years.

55. Ledger C, fols. 76, 174 and 203v.
56. See Table 1:7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>No. Entries To Council</th>
<th>Average Per Annum</th>
<th>Entrants Reaching The &quot;24&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520 - 1529</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530 - 1539</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540 - 1549</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550 - 1559</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560 - 1569</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570 - 1579</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580 - 1589</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590 - 1599</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 - 1609</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610 - 1619</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620 - 1629</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630 - 1639</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Average No. Years Before Mayorality</th>
<th>In Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1520 - 1579</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580 - 1629</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Behind these trends seems to have been a growing resentment at the cost of holding office. As early as 1579 an attempt was made to persuade the Bishop to allow ex-mayors to sit as commissioners of the peace in order that they "may have some preferment and countenance in respect of their travell and charde: and that those called to the office may be encouraged to take it up". 57.

Another document, dating from the end of the century, mentioned the fact that a number of foreigners had set up shop in the city, yet were able to escape the charge of office and of taxes and other burdens. These strangers, it said, "and suche as refuse to be of the company are growen to be of the better estate soe as nowe they have not aboue one or two of the company able to undergoe the charde besides such as formerly haue byn mayors". 58.

In the hopes of reducing the number of foreigners who resorted to the town and of restoring the diminishing credit of the Mayor and his brethren, the council pinned its hopes on gaining a charter of Incorporation. 59. On a note of desperation it was exclaimed in 1607 that "our compayne weareth away and will not be renewed withoute a new Incorporation" 60.

57. S.C.A., Ledger C, fol. 50v.
58. S.C.A., Box 4, No.6/2.
60. Incorporation also represented the chance to free the city from the Jurisdiction of its overlord, the Bishop. During the sixteenth century, despite periodic disputes, the citizens managed to keep a great deal of administrative business in their own hands. But they were sensitive to the fact that their's was a divided jurisdiction and grievances over such issues as the wording of the mayor's oath and the description of the mayor as the "Bishop's Mayor" in the 1590s encouraged the council to challenge the Bishop's liberties.

As a result of Incorporation the jurisdiction of the Bishop was confined to the Close. However, he retained his authority as Lord of the City, from whom all lands were held and his Court Leet and Court of Pleas continued to be held. Despite the settlement, friction was still in evidence. The Bishop challenged the validity of the town's charters in the 1630s; the Corporation tried to acquire another charter in 1666 in order to affirm their position. See VCH. Wilts. vi, pp. 94-104, 105-119.
However, the benefits of the town's new status were limited. Several new men were recruited in 1612 to build up the number in the council, and in the new Constitutions drawn up in 1612 a series of fees were established to remunerate the Mayor and other officers. Nevertheless, people continued to be fined for refusing to take their seat on the council or to seek official discharge. In 1623 it was agreed that,

"no person from henceforth shall be absolutely dispensed withall from bearing the office of mayor but for some certain tyme as shalbe concevyed by the common council"

and in 1630 the limits to the fines for those refusing office established in 1612, £40 for a Mayor and £20 for an alderman, were dropped leaving the matter to the Mayor's discretion. Possibly, as at least one contemporary appreciated, one of the main reasons why the office holding system was strained was that it had become customary to appoint relatively young men to the mayorality. In a letter written in the 1620s John Ivie referred to,

"the many poore shopkeepers that are drawne from hire traites in hire youth to supply that plase to the ruen of many". 62.

Undoubtedly the burden of office-holding was all the more onerous if assumed too soon in a man's career, but the Corporation did nothing to implement Ivie's plan to turn instead to the "ancients".

The council's quest for Incorporation, first mentioned at a meeting in June 1589, was seen not merely as a means to revitalise the town government, but as a general panacea.

Although the decline of her staple trade received most emphasis, Salisbury's other crafts were also reputed to be struggling by the turn of the century. Their plight was described in a petition addressed to the King in 1603. The citizens, it pointed out, were much poorer than their predecessors,

"the causes thereof as we conceive have byne that all trades therein decayed .... for that city hath not such privilege and incorporation as other cities have whereby the government of the mayor and his brethren is very little in respect of other cities", and that "secondlie there is no incorporation of any trade or other means to exclude strangers as Londyners and others from setting up their trades within the city, to the decay of those that always have lyved as apprentices and otherwise within the city and have borne the burden of all charges of the same". 63.

The complaint was not new. In Elizabeth's reign a letter from "the middell estates of the said city" complained of their distress whilst foreigners escaped the burdens of urban life. 64. Nor, despite the fact that it was finally ordained in 1612 that no one except free citizens should trade in the city, was the problem completely settled even then. In 1617, for instance, complaints were sent to the Privy Council concerning several Londoners who had shops and servants in Salisbury but did not actually live there,

"by reason whereof they are not beinge at any charge of housekeepinge, subsidie, or any office in Sarum having already utterly undone and overthrown many tradesmen there and doe daylie so hinder and prejudice the petitioners as they shall not be able to sustaine themselves and their families". 65.

64. S.C.A.,Box 4, No. 48. The "middle estates" represented here included mercers, silkmen, haberdashers, grocers, drapers, pewterers, shoemakers, gloves and others. Ten of the sixteen signatories were officers.
Without Freemen's registers or detailed craft records it is difficult to verify the citizen's complaints. In the one craft which did record apprentices and freemen the numbers of men admitted to the guild remained fairly steady until 1600 when the drop in numbers should possibly be attributed as much to the disruptions caused by plague as to anything else. The numbers of apprentice indentures were also steady with only a slight drop in the 1600s and 1610s. However, whilst the Tailor's guild apparently maintained its numerical strength, there is some evidence of internal pressures. Only a handful of men ever directly refused to take up office in the guild, but from the 1570s onwards one finds an increasing number of men fined for absenteeism, quarrelling or for open contempt towards the guild elders. On several occasions purges were held on particular offences. Between 1575 and 1580, for instance, 20 men were fined for absenteeism and lateness, and 24 more in 1591, whilst in 1582 15 men were fined for refusing to wear their gowns. On two occasions there were also references to general disorder. In August 1578 fines were laid down for those disobeying the wardens because,

"heretofore and at this present tyme mutche variance and vnquietnes hathe growed amonge vs the bretherne of this compania by meanes that diverse, stubborne, vnquiet and disobedient parsons of or companie have refused to obei and reverentlie use themselves to the wardens of this companie"

Seven years later the complaint was reiterated.

66. See Table 1:8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. Admissions To Guild</th>
<th>No. Masters Who Become Wardens</th>
<th>Average No. Years Before Becoming Warden</th>
<th>No. Apprentice Enrollments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1570 - 1579</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4 17.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580 - 1589</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4 17.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590 - 1599</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5 27.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 - 1609</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5 35.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610 - 1619</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9 42.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620 - 1629</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9 47.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630 - 1639</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640 - 1649</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unfortunately the earliest guild records are too brief to allow any conclusions about the nature and frequency of offences during the first half of the century. However, it is interesting to note that cases of contempt, of unlawful trading and of offences concerned with the running of the guild seem to have been far more common, or at least more frequently reported, in the 40 years before 1600 than in the period between 1600 and 1650. The offenders were generally junior members of the guild, although from time to time ex-wardens were fined or even disfranchised. Whether one can equate the failure to comply with guild regulations with a decline in the guild's fortunes is, of course, debatable. But the tailors do provide an interesting parallel with the civic élite where again tensions seem to have mounted from the last quarter of the sixteenth century onwards.

In the 1540s Leland spoke of Salisbury as a city with "many fair streates" and a "very fair and large" market place. Nearly 200 years later Defoe visited "a large and pleasant city", where despite the fact that it was "without any particular manufacture", the people "were gay and rich and have a flourishing trade, and there is a great deal of manners and good company among them". In between the visits of these two travellers we witness a city which, in the eyes of John Taylor, had the potential to develop new and prosperous markets but was "as it were at the last gasp, the poore being like Pharoahs leane kine, even ready to eat up the fat ones".


By the 1620s, when he visited the city, Salisbury's staple trade, upon which so many depended, had reached its lowest ebb; her other crafts faced injurious competition, the population had fallen and whilst the middle and upper ranks struggled against the increasingly heavy burdens of urban life, the other half of the population struggled merely to survive.

But was the picture really one of quite such gloom? The main evidence for Salisbury's 'decline' comes from a number of letters and petitions designed to gain certain ends, albeit incorporation, county support during years of plague, discharge from the burden of providing armed men or permission to set up a common brewhouse. It was obviously in the interests of these schemes to paint the blackest of pictures. However, when they wanted to the authorities could, with due civic pride, emphasise their more positive achievements. Despite the fact that incorporation did not suddenly cause a reduction of the poor or prevent outside competition, the citizens plainly saw 1612 as some sort of divide between the 'bad old days' and a hopeful future. In one document, probably dating from the reign of Charles I, a contrast was drawn between the era of mixed government before James I's charter and the days of the new régime. Amongst the credits it was pointed out that, "the trade of dronkeness is almost given of their it being hard and rare to take a dronckn man in an alehouse or inne in the city"; that, "whereas 500 beggars were rambling up and downe the city ... there is not at this tyme one beggar neyther in nor of the cittie that goeth abegging"; that "there is not any poore person of the cittie that is totally impotent but hath sufficient relief" and that, "there is not any child of poor parents of 6 years old or younger if it be capable but is set to some kind of work or other" 71.

71. S.C.A., Box 4, No. 40.
Dr. Slack's description of the problems faced by the Corporation in implementing their schemes for poor relief makes it clear that this letter was as unduly optimistic as some of the other documents were pessimistic. But it does emphasise the need for caution. The city undoubtedly faced many problems from the middle of the sixteenth century onwards, but it was by no means unique in this respect. The economic history of Salisbury is in itself of considerable interest and merits further attention. However, in the context of this investigation our concern should be, not so much with the way in which the Corporation and the guilds weathered the various crises, but to consider how far they disrupted daily life and to ask whether relations between kin and neighbours deteriorated during periods of slump or whether adversity drew people closer together; whether, as the population decreased in size and wealth, the structure of the household changed in any way and how far the role of women was dependent upon the town's economic fortunes.
CHAPTER II

POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE

IN LATE SIXTEENTH CENTURY ST. THOMAS'S
In succeeding chapters our concern will be to consider the development of the household overtime. First however, it is important to determine the composition of the average household in Salisbury and to see whether it differed markedly from that in early modern communities. As much of the evidence will be drawn from the St. Thomas's Easter Book it is also necessary to assess how far that parish can be taken as a model for the rest of the town.

In Salisbury we are not faced with the wide variations between rich and poor parishes that characterised towns such as York, Bristol and Exeter. Nevertheless, it is important to be aware of a number of dissimilarities which existed between different parts of the town. It has already been suggested that whilst St. Martin's, the semi-rural parish, must have been the least prosperous of the three, St. Edmund's and St. Thomas's would have been fairly similar in character. The estimates for the population in the 1630s seem to bear this out. St. Martin's housed little more than a quarter of the city's population, whilst the total for St. Thomas's was only marginally higher than that for St. Edmund's. However, it cannot automatically be assumed that the distribution in the late sixteenth century was identical. Moreover, an examination of the distribution of the city's élite, of the impact of poverty and plague and of the value of property in different parts of the city makes it clear that the picture of two very similar parishes and one 'odd man out' is far too simplistic. Not only does the balance between the three parishes shift according to the criteria adopted, but in looking at a variety of sources it can be appreciated that certain distinctions should be made between individual streets and chequers.

1. Dr Slack estimates that the population in the three parishes in the 1630s was as follows: - St. Thomas's - 2561 (37.3%), St. Edmund's 2321 (36.7%); St. Martin's - 1785 (26.0%).

Paul Slack, Poverty & Politics, p176.
The distribution of the city's élite, which in this instance has been determined by looking at the number of taxpayers and officeholders in each parish, is particularly illuminating. It is impossible to make a complete survey, yet the limited results available suggest that the margin between St. Thomas's and St. Edmund's may, in fact, have been considerably wider than initially supposed. One of the major limitations in this study is that the lay subsidies were invariably organised by wards rather than by parishes. Unfortunately there is no evidence of the size of the population in each ward in the later sixteenth century. Nor is it easy to relate the wards to the three parishes in order to gauge the relative wealth of the latter. We can assume however that, as most of the streets in St. Thomas's lay in the two wealthiest wards, Market and New Street, the parish must have contained a greater proportion of the élite than St. Edmund's and notably more than St. Martin's which was confined to the wards of Martin and Mead.

Whilst it is impossible to estimate the exact number in each parish, a rough guide to the distribution of taxpayers can be obtained by comparing the lists of subsidy men in the later sixteenth century with the householders recorded in the Easter Books. In 1594 as many as 44% of the city's taxpayers (excluding the Close), can be traced as residents in St. Thomas's, whilst in 1599 the proportion was 47.4%. Clearly, unless St. Martin's share of the taxpaying population was no more than a tenth, there could not have been an equal distribution between the other two parishes.

Many of the taxpayers in the later Tudor subsidies were members of the 'Forty-eight' or the 'Twenty-four', the two chambers of the City Council.


3. See Table 2:1. Although it contained a majority of subsidy men, they were not inevitably the wealthiest taxpayers. The mixed character of St. Thomas's is demonstrated by the fact that it contained proportionally more men assessed at £10 than Market ward, the wealthiest ward, but also more of the £3 men.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men Assessed At:</th>
<th>St. Thomas</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>New Street</th>
<th>Martin</th>
<th>Mead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 +</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Land</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1598</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The parish of residence can be ascertained for over 80% of the men who took up office between 1580 and 1609. Over half lived in St. Thomas's, nearly a quarter in St. Edmunds and under a tenth in St. Martin's. Undoubtedly the evidence is biased in favour of St. Thomas's for neither of the other parishes had comparable listings to help establish places of residence. The proportion from St. Edmund's was possibly closer to a third, but again it certainly could not claim an equal share with St. Thomas's.

The lack of comparable records means that there is also far more evidence concerning the occupational structure in St. Thomas's, although even there the number of men who can be identified is lamentably small. Only about half the free citizens listed in 1612 can be categorised according to parish, of whom nearly two-thirds came from St. Thomas's. With a majority of the town's taxpayers and office holders one would also expect St. Thomas's to include some of the wealthiest tradesmen. Certainly over half the members of the Merchant's company dwelt there.4 However, none of the other occupational groups appear to have been so unevenly dispersed. Where trades are mentioned in rentals and terriers the overriding impression is one of heterogeneity. With the exception of Butcher Row, and to the lesser extent, Fish Row, none of the streets or chequers were dominated by one particular trade. The heavier crafts, were slightly more in evidence on the outskirts of the town and weavers, shoemakers and other humbler craftsmen were also more likely to congregate in the backstreets.5 However, in any one street one generally finds a mixture of occupations and of degrees of wealth. In the High Street merchants and gentry lived close to

4. None of the merchants can be traced in St. Martin's, although the dwelling place of 14 remains unknown.
5. Under a third of the men associated with the building, wood and metalwork trades are known to have come from St. Thomas's.
shoemakers, joiners, fletchers and tailors. In Endless Street, further away from the centre, goldsmiths, clothiers and brewers were represented along with bakers, shoemakers, chandlers and barbers. Even in Butcher Row one comes across a few men besides victuallers.

As a rough guide to the distribution of the poor in Salisbury one can compare the numbers on relief at different dates and also, on the assumption that the poor would be most severely affected, the parochial burial rates during periods of exceptional mortality. Attracting a majority of the élite one might expect St. Thomas's to be least troubled by poverty and plague. Yet it clearly had to contend with large numbers of poor and appears to have been no less immune to the effects of a crisis than the rest of the town. The bad harvests at the end of the sixteenth century, which led to abnormally high mortality rates, are a case in point. Contrary to expectations it was not St. Martin's which appeared to be hardest hit.

In 1597, at the height of the dearth the number of burials recorded in St. Edmund's nearly doubled when compared with average annual rate from 1588 to 1594, whilst the burials in St. Thomas's rose by 82.5%. By contrast the level in St. Martin's rose by only 15.9%. Well over half the burials that year were in fact recorded in St. Edmund's, compared to 22.1% in St. Thomas's and 18.8% in St. Martin's. Moreover, of the 230 names listed in the St. Edmund's register, 78 were significantly labelled as paupers.

In the plague year of 1604, when as many as 1131 burials were recorded in Salisbury, St. Thomas's was particularly severely hit, the number of burials in the parish rising over sevenfold, compared with an increase of some 4½ times for the rest of the town. Yet once again St. Edmund's accounted for


7. For crude figures see P. Slack, Poverty & Politics, p168.
a majority of the registered deaths, namely 43.8% compared with 31.4% for St. Thomas's and 24.8% for St. Martin's. Moreover, almost half of the money spent on relieving the sick between May 1604 and February 1605, went to the poor in St. Edmund's. Thirty years later, when the poor were listed in a census, it is estimated that of the population in St. Edmund's 6.6% were in receipt of alms compared with 3.2% and 3.6% in St. Thomas's and St. Martin's. One is forced to conclude that although poorer housing was dispersed throughout the town and although St. Edmund's may have housed a third or even more of the civic elite, it possibly also included the largest share of the urban poor.

8. A certain degree of caution is needed when comparing urban registration statistics for the inhabitants did not necessarily use their own church. Judging from the annual averages for the 1570s and the seven years between 1588 and 1594 St. Edmund's always accounted for nearly half the burials of the city; St. Thomas's for between a third and a quarter and St. Martin's for just under a third.

Whether or not St. Thomas's and St. Edmund's were similar in size in the late sixteenth century their demographic experiences were clearly different. During periods of normal mortality burials still exceeded baptisms in St. Edmund's, so that the parish must have been heavily dependent on an influx of immigrants to maintain its size. St. Thomas's on the other hand could rely more on natural growth, for baptisms generally exceeded burials. This distinction should be born in mind when considering the question of migration.

9. A further list from St. Martin's of those considered to be poor but not in receipt of alms emphasises that the proportion near the poverty line in each parish would have been far higher. Slack suggests that one reason for the higher proportion of almsmen in St. Edmund's was that a number of couples representing the unemployed and the underpaid were included, in with the impotent poor. If this were so it seems curious that the proportion of households on relief headed by couples was actually marginally lower in St. Edmunds than in St. Thomas's. P. Slack, *Poverty & Politics*, p.176.
The inadequacies of the records used so far make it difficult to do
more than sketch briefly some of the differences between the three
parishes. But by studying a source from a slightly later date, an
assessment towards the Royal Aid and Supply of 1651, a much broader
picture of the social topography of the town can be obtained. Using
the assessment which listed both owners and occupiers, it is possible
to compare the average annual rent, not merely in each parish, but also
in individual chequers. Inevitably the highest rents were charged on
properties to the north and south of the Market place (the areas cross-hatched
in Figure 2:1), and on those adjacent to the main exit routes - Castle
Street, Fisherton Street and Winchester Street. As one moves away from
the centre of the town the rents get progressively cheaper. The average
annual rent in St. Edmund’s and St. Thomas’s was very similar. In the
former it was £4.15, in the latter £4.24, whilst in St. Martin’s it was
only £2.65. However, St. Edmunds included many more properties rented
at under £3 a year than St. Thomas’s. The presence of a number of
particularly large houses by the Market place undoubtedly weights the
final result.

10. S.C.A., Box 9, No. 3 C.

11. The assessment was made on a ward basis, but because of the subdivision
into chequers it is possible to distinguish between the parishes as well.

12. The number of taxpayers in each being 440, 434, and 266 respectively.
People assessed on gardens, goods or vacant property have, in this
instance, been omitted. It has been assumed that the men and women
paying on rents represent individual occupiers, although in a few
cases, when the sum was apportioned between a group, the tenement was
possibly held jointly.

It is uncertain exactly how comprehensive the tax was. Using a
multiplier of 4.75 gives a total population of between 5500 and 5750.
When compared with the estimated population of 6867 in the 1630s it
is clear that only a small minority of householders can have been
excluded. The distribution of taxpayers also reflects that of the
total population in the 1630s, roughly three-quarters in each case coming from St. Thomas’s and St. Edmund’s.
FIGURE 2:1 AVERAGE ANNUAL RENTS BY CHEQUER IN 1651

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of Chequer</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Fisherton Bridge</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Dolphin Chequer</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Gauntlet's Chequer</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>S. Butcher Row</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>S. Fish Row</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Oatmeal Row</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Butcher Row</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Gaol Chequer</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>White Bear Chequer</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>White Hart Chequer</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Castle Street</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>White Horse Chequer</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Blue Boar Chequer</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Swanton's Chequer</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Three Swan's Chequer</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Three Lion's Chequer</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Parson's Chequer</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Three Cup's Chequer</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Black Horse Chequer</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Vannard's Chequer</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Griffin Chequer</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Stone's Chequer</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>The Greencroft</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Trinity Chequer</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Mr. Stephen's Chequer</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Rolfe's Chequer</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Next Chequer</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Chequer by Barnard's Cross</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>St. Martin's to Bell Corner</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Bell Corner to Drakehall</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ST. EDMUND

ST. MARTIN

ST. THOMAS

KEY

- £5.5 +
- £4 - 5.5
- £3 - 4
- £2 - 3
- £1 - 2
From Figure 2:1 one gets the impression that, whilst the rents in St. Edmund's varied considerably, the value of housing and thus, by inference, the status of the inhabitants, in St. Thomas's was comparatively uniform. However, even in the latter, there were many gradations in wealth. To consider the average rent in each chequer alone obscures the distinctions which can be made between individual streets. In Dolphin Chequer, for instance, where the average rent was just over £5 a year, properties on the Ditch and in the High Street, to the north and west, were worth considerably more than those in New Street and Catherine Street to the south and east. A comparison of the average rents mentioned in various Corporation and Chapter rentals confirms that New Street contained some of the cheapest properties in the town, along with the streets below St. Edmund's churchyard, the area above Castle Gate and Brown and Tanner Streets. Yet even in these streets there were one or two large properties which served to even out the average rents.

The tendency for rich and poor to live in close proximity is made clear when one studies the distribution of taxpayers and officeholders on a street basis. Although this can only be attempted for St. Thomas's it seems reasonable to assume that the other parishes would have been similarly integrated. Something like a sixth of all the householders in St. Thomas's contributed to the lay subsidies in the 1590s. In 1594, when the proportion was 17.5%, and in 1599, when it was 16%, the distribution was clearly weighted in favour of the market streets. In Oatmeal Row over half the householders were assessed, whilst in the Ditch, Bower's Chequer, Castle Street and Butcher Row the proportion was also greater than average.

13. See Table 2:2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1594</th>
<th></th>
<th>1599</th>
<th></th>
<th>1574 - 1607</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taxpayers</td>
<td>% a.</td>
<td>Taxpayers</td>
<td>% a.</td>
<td>Office Holders</td>
<td>% b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatmeal Row</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bower's Chequer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ditch</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. High Street</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Street</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher Row</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Catherine St.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Catherine St.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Row</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. High St.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Gate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under The Churchyard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. New Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. New Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Chequer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lion Chequer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricket's Corner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Churchyard</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a. = % of All Householders.  b. = % of Male Householders Only.)
However, it would be wrong to assume that all the central streets were equally attractive to the élite. Not one subsidy man resided in Bricket's Corner or the Churchyard in either year, and in 1599 only about one in twenty householders were assessed in Fish Row.

The streets with fewest taxpayers included New Street and White Horse and Blue Lion Chequers but, perhaps surprisingly, not Crane Street, the extension of New Street to the west of the High Street. This street did contain a number of humble dwellings and can in many respects be counted amongst the backstreets. But, also included one or two exceptionally large houses such as the property destined to become the Workhouse in the 1620s, which had been held by the Cokes and the Chaffins, prominent merchant families, in the early sixteenth century and was purchased by John Bailey, one of the wealthier councillors, in 1578.

The contrast between the different sections of the High Street demonstrates how varied the fortunes of the householders could be in any one street. There were roughly twice as many subsidy men on the west side of the street than there were on the east or in the southern portion by the Close Gate. Although the actual sums on which people were assessed is only a rough guide to their standing, it is interesting that men paying on £10 or more resided not only in the Ditch, Bower's Chequer, Castle Street and West High Street, but also in Fish Row, Crane Street, Catherine Street and White Horse Chequer.

The distribution of officeholders in the parish resembles that of taxpayers. During the period from 1574 to 1607 at least one councillor appeared in every street, and men who reached the mayorality in every street but New Street and Fisherton Street. But again they congregated chiefly in the central streets. Nearly a third of the individual male householders who appeared in Oatmeal Row between these dates were or would become councillors.
Bower's Chequer, West High Street, the Ditch and North Fisherton Street were also above average, the mean for the whole parish being 6.0%. Of the forty mayors who resided in the parish during this period (2.34% of the male householders), 29 came from the Market Streets or from West High Street or Castle Street. The highest proportion resided in the Ditch and Bower's Chequer. Castle Street contained slightly fewer than might be expected but a number of its larger properties were held by members of the country gentry rather than by prominent civic figures. The number of officers residing 'Under the Churchyard', an area not normally included amongst the wealthiest streets, is surprisingly high. For several of the officers this represented a temporary home before moving elsewhere in the parish.

In any one year it is possible to establish the professions of little more than a third of the householders in St. Thomas's. As with the town as a whole, the overriding impression is of a wide range of occupations in most streets. In 1593, for instance, whilst the householders on the Ditch included three tailors, four merchants, a haberdasher, an innholder, a cook and a cutler, in West Catherine Street, one of the less prominent streets, there resided a shoemaker, a butcher, a cutler, a Chandler, a weaver, a glover and a similar number of tailors. As might be expected large numbers of merchants and victuallers congregated about the Market, although they were found in other parts of the parish too. Men associated with heavier trades, such as ironmongers, carpenters and masons, were more likely to dwell in the backstreets and in particular in Catherine Street. In 1603 nearly three quarters of the known woodworkers, over half of the metalworkers and all the men associated with the building trade were found in New Street, Catherine Street and the Chequers. Members of the leather and
clothing industries were more evenly dispersed, although tailors were particularly prominent in the area below the Churchyard and, to a lesser extent, in the High Street.

It is unfortunate that the evidence concerning occupations is biased towards the wealthier professions. It would be particularly interesting to know something of the residential patterns of the numerous clothworkers who dwelt in the town or of a humble group such as the shoemakers. If we turn to the very poorest inhabitants though, the material emphasizes once again, that rich and poor were by no means rigidly segregated. One guide to the distribution of the poor is the list of infected households kept by the overseers of the poor during the epidemic of 1604[^14]. Studies of the impact of Bubonic Plague in other towns have shown that the poorest streets and parishes were generally hardest hit[^15]. Not only were rat fleas, the main transmitters of the disease, less likely to be found in better quality housing, but the rich were able to escape to the countryside at the first signs of sickness. Through cross checking with the 1603 Easter Book it has been possible to locate 81 of the 123 households listed by the overseers from


[^15]: In his discussion of epidemics in Bristol Paul Slack demonstrates that, although no class was immune from the effects of plague and the disease moved haphazardly, the poorer parishes and streets generally had the highest casualty rates. In Exeter and Norwich too, parishes on the outskirts of the town were conspicuous for their exceptionally high mortality rates.

During epidemics associated with harvest crises, when malnutrition was an aggravating factor, the disparity between rich and poor was even greater. Sometimes the wealthiest parish in a town was scarcely affected at all.

St. Thomas's between May 1604 and February 1605. Significantly two-thirds of these properties were situated in New Street, Catherine Street and the Chequers. A few of the householders came from the centre of the town, John Bastard and John Pounce from Fish Row for instance, or William Linche of the Ditch. But they also seem to have belonged to humbler households with normally only one or two resident adults.\(^\text{16}\).

Whatever approach is adopted it is clear that rich and poor streets should not be too rigidly defined. Nevertheless, it is important to be aware that, in general, the householders in Castle Street, West High Street and the main Market streets were likely to be wealthier than their counterparts in New Street, the Chequers, Catherine Street and the Churchyard. Such a distinction is useful when we turn to the size and composition of the household. If St. Thomas's was the wealthiest of the three parishes it presumably contained some of the largest properties and had a greater servant density and possibly rather more extended households than the other two parishes. But it also had its share of poorer dwellings and could suffer severely during times of crisis. When trying to evaluate the evidence concerning the household in the context of the town as a whole we need therefore, to distinguish not so much between the three parishes, clearly a somewhat arbitrary division, but between the centre of the town, where most of the elite congregated, and the peripheral areas. The results from New Street and the Chequers may provide a much fairer guide to the typical household in Salisbury than those obtained for St. Thomas's as a whole.

\(^{16}\) Slack estimates that the average number of inmates, including children, in the households on relief in Salisbury, \(^4\) 411 in all, was only 3.2. He presumes that the mean was so low because some inmates had already died and other had fled. However, the evidence from the 1603 Easter Book demonstrates that even before the onset of the sickness these households were likely to be smaller than average.

THE DEMOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

Not only is it vital to be aware how representative the parish of St. Thomas's was, but one should also consider whether conditions during the years covered by the Easter Books were abnormal in any way. As already intimated the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were a period of relative economic decline. It was also a period in which one might expect to find considerable demographic disruption, especially during the 1590s, when there was a large influx of immigrants and very high mortality during the years of dearth, and also during the first decade of the seventeenth century when the 1604 epidemic wiped out about a sixth of the population.

External evidence suggests that in their coverage of householders the Easter Books were fairly comprehensive. Moreover, because the numbers of additional members of the household did not vary widely from one book to the next, we can assume that they provide a fairly accurate gauge to the total adult population. The one problem in comparing population changes on an annual basis is that apprentices were only consistently recorded in 1585, 1593 and 1594. However, it is possible to make certain adjustments by taking the mean number of apprentices for these three years (155), and adding this to the annual totals. Using the adjusted figures a brief appraisal can be made of how, in aggregate terms at least, the population responded to external change. For the twelve books between 1582 and 1603 a mean of 1221 adults a year has been obtained with a range from 1144 in 1590 to 1298 in 1596. Quite why there should have been such a significant drop between 1585 and 1590, is uncertain. That there were actually slightly more households in 1590 suggests that it may be due to underregistration. During the

17. See tables 2:3 and 2:4. The total for 1574 has been left uncorrected as a number of offspring seem to have been included in the totals for apprentices. Supra, p.11.

18. The number of households must always be taken as an approximation for the dividing line between one unit and the next is not always apparent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Total Adult Inhabitants</th>
<th>Minus Apprentices (+ 155)</th>
<th>Corrected Streets Listed in 1607 Only (+ 106)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td></td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>1206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>1294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1269</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>1263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>1251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>1254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>1191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEANS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>Total Adult Inhabitants</th>
<th>Minus Apprentices (+ 155)</th>
<th>Corrected Streets Listed in 1607 Only (+ 106)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1574 - 1603</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582 - 1603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>1221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582 - 1607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean 1582 - 1607</td>
<td>Total Adult Inhabitants (Minus Apprentices)</td>
<td>Mean 1582 - 1607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1582 1585 1590 1592 1593 1594 1595 1596 1599 1601 1602 1603 1607</td>
<td></td>
<td>1607 1607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ditch</td>
<td>78 92 83 73 72 70 78 76 79 (68) 89 73 79 78 84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bower's Chequer</td>
<td>70 68 77 (64) 65 75 78 71 78 (59) 65 71 71 69 (59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatmeal Row</td>
<td>26 (20) 23 31 25 33 29 28 (22) 28 29 28 (21) 26 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher Row</td>
<td>40 39 (35) 38 (33) 44 45 43 44 39 45 (34) 40 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Row</td>
<td>48 43 53 43 46 48 56 (54) 51 51 48 (42) 44 49 56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricket's Corner</td>
<td>12 9 9 17 11 11 8 (7) 16 13 14 12 13 12 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Street</td>
<td>82 85 (61) (68) 81 103 83 74 99 83 91 78 93 84 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. High Street</td>
<td>59 56 64 (47) (46) 66 (45) 61 61 60 62 65 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. High Street</td>
<td>44 (27) (29) 39 43 52 55 50 50 42 45 49 41 44 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Gate</td>
<td>32 (25) 39 28 29 36 31 (27) 36 31 28 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>24 26 27 27 23 28 23 23 23 23 (20) 26 22 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>27 32 25 25 27 (23) 28 28 30 27 26 (23) 24 27 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Street</td>
<td>51 (34) 45 (37) 48 59 69 56 61 53 53 45 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Catherine St.</td>
<td>81 98 84 (71) 77 86 84 76 83 86 82 76 (73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Catherine St.</td>
<td>62 66 64 61 65 58 64 60 62 72 64 57 (49) 61 (48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Chequer</td>
<td>77 79 78 74 75 70 84 84 83 86 78 (63) (64)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lion Chequer</td>
<td>63 (48) (43) 55 56 69 78 74 72 80 66 53 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. New Street</td>
<td>73 73 (67) 74 75 82 79 79 72 71 73 (63) (65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. New Street</td>
<td>65 79 89 57 57 57 70 66 57 67 56 (53) 70 65 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchyard</td>
<td>11 8 11 14 8 (7) 12 11 16 13 10 10 11 11 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the Churchyard</td>
<td>50 53 45 46 53 62 56 49 57 (42) 52 (44) 46 51 57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1074 1060 1051 (989) (1015) 1139 1185 1108 1143 1096 1099 (1000) 1036 1040 (625)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{( ) = Less than one standard deviation below the mean.} \\
\text{___ = Greater than one S.D. above the mean.}
\end{array}
\]
1590s there seems to have been a steady rise in the adult population until 1599 when, probably as a result of the sudden increase in the burial rate from 1595, the numbers fell back to 1251. A second drop between 1601 and 1602 is less explicable for the burial rate had decreased by 1601. Again it may reflect the quality of the enumeration, although this time both the number of households and of individual inhabitants decreased.

Despite the variations apparent in Table 2:3, the annual totals are significantly alike to suggest that underregistration was never an overwhelming problem. Moreover, apart from the slight drop in the number of inhabitants at the end of the period of dearth in the 1590s, the longterm effects of abnormal mortality appear to have been minimal. It is unfortunate that the one book after the 1604 plague is incomplete and only by restricting the analysis to the streets actually covered in this list is it possible to make any comparisons. With a corrected total of 731 adults in 1607 and a mean for the same streets between 1582 and 1607 of 722 it is clear that even this book is really too late to give any indication of the impact of exceptional mortality upon household structure. Within two years of the final plague deaths the adult population seems to have re-established itself.

At this date towns were generally very resilient to disease and although the natural increase accumulated over a number of years could be wiped out by a severe epidemic, the surplus population in the countryside facilitated rapid recovery. In nearby Romsey the crisis deaths of 1580, 1597 and 1612 were replaced within two years, four years and five years respectively. In Colchester, although nearly half the population was lost in 1665-6, the recovery was so rapid that by March 1666 only a third of the housing still remained empty. Possibly the most serious


long term disruption would be amongst the section of the population below communicable age, for it has been established that the impact of bubonic plague diminished with age.²¹

Had there been a listing immediately after the crisis one would obviously expect to find far more evidence of population loss. In Christchurch, Bristol, where another series of Easter Books exists, the number of communicants had dropped by 17.4% a year after the epidemic of 1575, whilst comparison between books dating from 1601 and 1604 reveals a loss of 26.1% after the plague in 1603. Some of the losses, however, were only temporary and a number of people missing in 1576 had reappeared by 1579. Although Christchurch was much smaller than St. Thomas's, the Bristol evidence intimates that Salisbury's recovery after 1604 may have been unusually fast. By 1579 the number of communicants in Christchurch was still 5.7% lower than it had been in 1575. Yet over a similar interval the adult population in St. Thomas's had risen by 2.8%. The wealth of the parish may account for this, although Christchurch included a section of two of Bristol's main highways within its bounds and was certainly not amongst the poorest of the twelve city parishes.²²

22. Slack, The Local Incidence of Epidemic Disease, pp. 54-57.
THE DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNICANTS IN ST. THOMAS'S

Having suggested that the total adult population in St. Thomas's did not vary significantly during the years under discussion is it possible to determine any changes in the size or composition of the household over time? Just as the total population needs to be adjusted to take account of the irregular enumeration of apprentices, so we need to correct the mean number of adults per household by adding 0.37, the average number of apprentices per household in 1585, 1593 and 1594. This gives a mean of 2.86 adults per household for the 13 years between 1582 and 1607 and a range from 2.71 to 3.03. As Table 2:5 shows, the fluctuations between individual books are not very significant in the light of what we know of external conditions. Despite the adjustment to the results, the three years when apprentices were noted still had some of the highest adult densities. Possibly the quality of the enumeration in these three books was better in other respects as well.

Whilst the inadequacies of the material, and in particular, the omission of children, makes it difficult to estimate the total population in the parish or to contribute directly to the ongoing debate on household structure, the Salisbury evidence can, nevertheless, be put into a context by looking at the average number of adults per household obtained in other studies. This in itself poses certain problems for the definition of adults and children varies according to the type of listing used. Although the age of first communion probably varied it can be assumed that the inhabitants recorded in St. Thomas's Books, and likewise in other lists of houseling people, would have included all those of 16 and over. In several population listings ages are actually specified so there is no problem in defining the 16 plus group. But in many studies
### TABLE 2.5 MEAN ADULT DENSITIES BY YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Uncorrected Mean</th>
<th>Minus Apprentices</th>
<th>Corrected (+ 0.37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1583</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean of Means**
- 1582 - 1607: 2.59, 2.49, 2.86
- 1585, 1593 & 1594: 2.99, 2.62, 2.99
of household size a number of those classified as "children" would undoubtedly have been over 16, whilst a small proportion of servants and apprentices would have been below communicable age.  

Comparative estimates of the size of the adult population can be obtained using the results for Clayworth and Ealing. In 1676 154 of the inhabitants in the former were defined as children (38.4%), yet according to the vicar 165 parishioners were too young to communicate (41.1%). In this instance the number of adults per household will be marginally lower if communicants are used as a guide. In Ealing, where the population can be broken down by age, the mean adult density is, by contrast, slightly higher if 16 is taken as a dividing line rather than adopting Laslett's definition of children. The age structure of the two communities may not, of course, have been typical. Yet the similarities between the results do suggest that estimates of the adult population based on lists of communicants are unlikely to vary significantly from those made using complete listings and that, although derived from a variety of sources, the results for seven Early Modern communities presented in Table 2:6 can be used to make a number of tentative comparisons.

Whether or not the urban household was any different in size from its rural counterpart, it is clear that distinctions can be made between individual city parishes. In St. Mary's, Leicester, for instance, where another series of Easter Books provides comparable data, and in four of the Cambridge parishes studied by Nigel Goose, there were fewer adults per household than in St. Thomas's. But these were not wealthy parishes. On the other hand, the unusually large number of adults in the average household...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Mean Household Size</th>
<th>Children As % Total Population</th>
<th>Mean Density Of: Adults</th>
<th>Children Of &lt; 16 As % Total Population</th>
<th>Inhabitants Mean Density Of &gt; 16</th>
<th>&lt; 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1582 - 1607</td>
<td>St. Thomas's Salisbury 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586 - 1590</td>
<td>St. Mary's Leicester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593 - 1596</td>
<td>Christchurch Bristol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594, 1595</td>
<td>St. Michael's Coventry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1523</td>
<td>Coventry 2.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>Ealing 3.</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>38.64</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>37.23</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620's</td>
<td>Cambridge - 4.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>40.19</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Clayworth 5.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>38.40</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>41.15</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Clayworth</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574 - 1821</td>
<td>English Standard 6.</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2:6 FOOTNOTES

1. The results for St. Thomas's, St. Mary's, Christchurch and St. Michael's represent the mean proportions derived from a number of lists of houseling people. (These lists are described in Appendix One). The other results are based on age or on Laslett's definition of 'Children'. For St. Thomas's the corrected mean is given.

2. C.V. Phythian-Adams, op. cit., using adjusted results given on p. 243. The enumerators distinguished between houseling people and children. Mr. Phythian-Adams suggests that the upper age limit of childhood was probably about twelve although it is questionable whether this necessarily marked the age of reaching spiritual maturity. pp. 228, 292.


4. N. Goose, op. cit., The results have been adjusted to account for four parishes only.


household in Christchurch, Bristol must be due to the fact that nearly three-quarters of the communicants in the parish dwelt along two of the town's main highways. Despite the severe crisis which hit the town in the 1520s, the adult density in early sixteenth century Coventry was higher than that obtained for St. Michael's, a parish covering nearly two-thirds of the city, 70 years later. Yet many of the city's smaller houses had been depopulated by 1523 and the number of children was exceptionally low. The mean household size was therefore actually well below the English Standard.

In estimating the total population in St. Thomas's a number of assumptions need to be made. To use the standard English multiplier of 4.75 would give a mean population for the years 1574 to 1603 of 2038, a result very similar to that obtained if it is assumed that 40% of the inhabitants would have been too young to be enumerated, namely 2048. (25.) However, as the adult density in St. Thomas's is higher than that in Laslett's 100 communities, it would seem reasonable to adopt a slightly higher multiplier. A mean household size of 5 for instance, would give an average population of 2145, although even this may be too low. In 1597 contemporaries claimed that there were 7000 citizens in Salisbury. If the distribution between the three parishes in 1596 reflected that of the 1630s, when St. Thomas's and St. Edmund's both contained 37% of the population and St. Martin's 26%, then the 447 houses recorded that year would have to be multiplied by 5.95 in order to reach the total of 7000. (26.)

25. In Ealing in 1599 37.3% of the population were under 16, whilst Gregory King's estimate for the same group was 40.6%. (Laslett, 'The Study of Social Structure', loc.cit., p.194). In Laslett's study of 100 communities the mean proportion of 'children' was 42.6% (Laslett, Household and Family, p.148). These proportions may, however, be slightly too high for the late sixteenth century. Wrigley and Schofield have estimated, for instance, that at the turn of the century the proportion of the population under 15 was roughly a third. A third, however, would only give a total population for the parish of 1844. (E.A. Wrigley and R.S. Schofield, 'The Population History of England, 1541 - 1871, A Reconstruction, 1981 pp. 217 - 528.

26. Supra, p. 50.
Without knowing whether the proportion of children in the parish was greater than the English Standard, whether the distribution of inhabitants throughout the town was similar in the 1590s and the 1630s, and how accurate the contemporary estimate was, the discussion must remain hypothetical. Yet it does seem likely that, although the mean for the town as a whole may have been close to the English Standard, the typical household in St. Thomas's would have been rather larger than the accepted norm.\(^{(27)}\)

Although it has been established in a number of studies that there was a link between wealth and the size of sibling groups, labourers for example tended to have fewer resident offspring than craftsmen and gentry less than husbandmen, the number of children in the population was not apparently the most crucial variable in determining mean household size.\(^{(28)}\) Even though the St. Thomas lists are incomplete, it is therefore still possible to make some assessment of the affect of wealth upon household size and to enlarge upon some of the distinctions already noticed between different parts of the parish.

Given the concentration of some of the most expensive properties around the Market Place it is not surprising to find that streets like Castle Street, Butcher Row, the Ditch, Bowers Chequer and West High Street were consistently above average in terms of the number of adults per household.\(^{(29)}\) On the other hand, on the outskirts of the parish, and by inference in a large part of St. Edmund's, and St, Martin's, houses with only one or two resident adults predominated. There could also be

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{27. See Table 2:7 for estimates of the total annual population.}
\footnote{28. P. Laslett, \textit{Household and Family}, p.155 and N. Goose, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 370.}
\footnote{29. See Fig 2:2. The crude totals from which this data is drawn are given in Appendix Two.}
\end{footnotes}
### Table 2:7 Estimates of the Total Population in St. Thomas's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Corrected Adult Totals</th>
<th>Assuming Children = 33.3% Popn.</th>
<th>Assuming Children = 40% Popn.</th>
<th>Using Multipliers Of: 4.75</th>
<th>Using Multipliers Of: 5.0</th>
<th>Using Multipliers Of: 5.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>1220 *</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>2416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>1287 *</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>2145</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>2422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2070</td>
<td>2463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2057</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td>2576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1256 *</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>2093</td>
<td>2033</td>
<td>2140</td>
<td>2547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>1269 *</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>2115</td>
<td>2090</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>2618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>2105</td>
<td>2161</td>
<td>2280</td>
<td>2713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>2163</td>
<td>2123</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>2660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>2085</td>
<td>2138</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>2678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>1254</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>2090</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>2205</td>
<td>2624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>2511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>1787</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>2047</td>
<td>2155</td>
<td>2564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>(731)</td>
<td>(1097)</td>
<td>(1218)</td>
<td>(1207)</td>
<td>(1270)</td>
<td>(1511)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean Adult Totals</th>
<th>Mean Assuming Children = 33.3% Popn.</th>
<th>Mean Assuming Children = 40% Popn.</th>
<th>Mean Using Multipliers Of: 4.75</th>
<th>Mean Using Multipliers Of: 5.0</th>
<th>Mean Using Multipliers Of: 5.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1574-1607</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>2145</td>
<td>2553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* These years have been left uncorrected. *)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Mean No. Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. S. Fisherton Street</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. W. High Street</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Crane Street</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Close Gate</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. S. New Street</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. White Horse Chequer</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Blue Lion Chequer</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. E. Catherine St.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. W. Catherine St.</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The Ditch</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. E. High Street</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. N. New Street</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Bricket's Corner</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Butcher Row</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Bower's Chequer</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. N. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The Churchyard</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Under The Churchyard</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Castle Street</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Oatmeal Row</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Fish Row</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
marked variations from one side or end of a street to another. On the east side of the High Street, for example, there was nearly one person fewer per household than on the west.

Some distinctions which are obscured by simply considering the mean adult density are made clear when one examines the distribution of households with varying numbers of inhabitants. The simplest division that can be made is between houses with only one or two residents adults and those with three or more. For the purpose of this discussion the two types will be termed as "simple" and "complex" households, terms which should not be confused with "extended" or "simple nuclear" households. To some extent the division reflects that between the homes of employers and employees. The former were more likely to have resident servants and thus, larger households, the latter to reside in humbler dwellings composed simply of the married couple and their offspring.

Although the population was slightly above average in 1585, 1593 and 1594, it seems best, given the problem of apprentices, to concentrate on the results for these three years. Taking the mean proportions for the sample years, 52.3% of all households in the parish were simple and 47.7% complex. A brief comparison of the average adult density in the homes of subsidy men and of the recipients of relief in 1604 confirms that there was a link between household size and wealth. In 1594 for instance, 93.4% of the taxpayers in St. Thomas's belonged to the group heading complex households, but of the 81 households affected by plague

30. Not all the simple households were, of course, confined to the conjugal unit. A number were headed by a single person who lodged a kinsman, a servant or some other unrelated adult.

31. On comparing the results from the smaller sample with the uncorrected results for the whole period it appears that it was chiefly the homes containing two or more adults which were affected by the inclusion or omission of apprentices. The proportion of solitary householders remained the same. See Table 2:8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>% Simple</th>
<th>% Complex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. High Street</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher Row</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ditch</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatmeal Row</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Street</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bower's Chequer</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Row</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Gate</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under The Churchyard</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Catherine St.</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. High Street</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. New Street</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Street</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Catherine St.</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricket's Corner</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Chequer</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. New Street</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lion Chequer</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Churchyard</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
only 8 had 3 adult residents. However, social status was clearly not only the variable. Sometimes, for example, it was only due to bereavement that a property appeared amongst the simple households.\(^\text{32}\).

The distribution of simple and complex households by street confirms the earlier results. West High Street and Butcher Row contained the highest proportion of the latter, with 80% and 79% respectively, North New Street, Blue Lion Chequer and the Churchyard the highest proportion of the former. Complex households are in a majority in all the streets with a mean of over three adults per household, except for East Catherine Street and North Fisherton Street. The averages for these two were distorted by the presence of a few exceptionally large properties. For instance, the home of a family of millers in Fisherton Street, the Wards, consistently included between six and ten adults, whilst the result for Catherine Street is weighted by the usually large homes of John Provost, an innholder, and James Gally, a glover.

Generally one is more likely to find larger properties such as those set amidst a group of smaller ones than long rows of one particular type. Some impression of the variety of housing in a small neighbourhood can be obtained by looking at part of Castle Street in 1585. Starting at the southern end of the street, the list commenced with a solitary male, Gabriel White, who, to judge from the title he paid, was fairly prosperous. Then came Thomas Eyres and his wife with four servants and another couple with two. The fourth property had three adult inhabitants, the next, owned by Francis Vaughan belonged to the small group of households with six or more resident adults. His\(^\text{32}\). In early sixteenth century Coventry variations in household size have been linked with the assessments for the 1522 assessment and the annual rents. The results lead to the conclusion that wealth was "the single most important determinant of composition and household size". The poorer cottagers paid less than 6s rent and the men assessed at nothing in the subsidy generally had households of less than three. Those paying more than 50s rent or assessed at over £50 had a MHS of over seven.

neighbour was a solitary widow and she was followed by three single men. Two had one servant each, the third, the schoolmaster, apparently lived alone. Although the average rents above Castle Gate were far lower than those to the south, the houses, did not, as one might expect, get progressively smaller as one moves further out of the town. The northernmost property, belonging to Nicholas Ansell, contained eight communicants, whilst three doors away was another house with eight and a third with six resident adults. Obviously in a street such as New Street, and possibly too in St. Martin's and the area to the north of St. Edmund's, there would have been less variety than was evident in Castle Street. But in general there was considerable integration between rich and poor and between "simple" and "complex" households.

A number of the larger properties containing six or more adults were inns or the homes of country gentry. Such houses can be found in every street, apart from the Churchyard and Blue Lion Chequer, at some point between 1574 and 1607, and they were comparatively numerous in Fisherton Street, the Ditch, Bower's Chequer and Oatmeal Row. Houses with more than ten adults were extremely rare, although possibly in the days of the great merchant magnates one would have expected to find slightly more. In Castle Street, there were two outstanding residences, the town house of Catherine Webbe, where the extraordinary number of 32 adults were listed in 1593, and the residence of Edward Pennardock which consistently contained 12 or 13 communicants. Both were important Wiltshire landowners who possibly only used their Salisbury homes on a temporary basis, for in some years they were missing from the lists. Another of the largest households, the home of Giles Estcourt, who represented the city in Parliament, emphasises the intermingling of rich and poor, for it lay in New Street amidst a group of otherwise fairly humble dwellings. 33.

33. See Table 2:9 for the distribution of different sized households by street.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Adult Only</th>
<th>2 Adults</th>
<th>3 - 5</th>
<th>6 - 10</th>
<th>11 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Proportion of Households Containing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ditch</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bower's Chequer</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatmeal Row</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher Row</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Row</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricket's Corner</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Street</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. High Street</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. High Street</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Gate</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fisherton Street</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Fisherton Street</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Street</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Catherine Street</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Catherine Street</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Chequer</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lion Chequer</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. New Street</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. New Street</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Churchyard</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under The Churchyard</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the other extreme were the properties containing one solitary adult, some 11% of the total for the period between 1585 and 1607.\(^{34}\). Inevitably the majority of those dwellings lay in the backstreets. In 1585 and 1593 nearly a third of the households in North New Street contained a single adult.\(^{35}\) The area by St. Thomas's Churchyard also included a large number of smaller properties, often only held at will, where solitary adults resided. Nevertheless, it should be emphasised that properties containing one adult only were not necessarily the homes of the very poor. In many cases the householder was only temporarily without adult companions (one who had been recently bereaved for instance, or a young craftsman who had set up shop before marrying), or he himself only remained briefly in the parish. Thus almost a third of the solitary householders present in 1593 had either disappeared or extended their household by the following year. Whilst it is impossible to give an exact figure, it seems likely that less than one in every hundred householders would have lived without another adult for periods of more than five years.

That it was exceptional to live alone is emphasised when we turn to consider the experience of the individual. In any one year only about one in every 25 men and women lived without adult companions,

\(^{34}\) The proportion may be too high as there is a danger that those counted as solitaries may, in some cases, have been lodgers in another household. Moreover, even in 1593 when the occupants of individual units were frequently bracketed together the households containing no more than one adult still amounted to roughly one in ten.

\(^{35}\) In this respect New Street can be contrasted with the Chequers where couples were more common than 'solitary' adults. A number of the 'solitaries' possibly dwelt in one room only in tenements such as that in New Street, which apparently contained "seven small rooms let out to several poore persons below the stairs" and six similar rooms above stairs.

(S.D.R., Parliamentary Survey, 1649, No. 11, fol. 34)
although, some would undoubtedly have had resident offspring. In the "Standard" English Community it has been established that just over one in every hundred inhabitants dwelt entirely alone and it seems reasonable to assume that the proportion in St. Thomas's would have been similar. About a quarter of the communicants in the parish shared with one other adult, whilst, roughly half, belonged to households of between three and five adults. At the other extreme roughly one in every twenty communicants dwelt in the largest houses containing six adults or more. Although it is impossible to determine the number of households containing children or the average size of sibling groups, the material obtained so far can be used to consider in what sort of household the average child would have been brought up. The type of domestic environment experienced during childhood is important for it has direct bearing on the reproduction of society over time. When setting up his own home the individual will generally try to recreate those conditions which he experienced during the years of primary socialisation, a period in which, as Laslett points out,

"parents and their entirely dependent children are perpetually in company, a condition in which interaction between human personalities is at its most intense, and the human grouping at its solidest." 38.

For most sixteenth century children, the medium sized household composed of the conjugal unit plus one or two servants would have been

36. 5.6% of all households in Laslett's 100 communities contained one inhabitant only, a proportion slightly lower than that of 6.2% established for Cambridge and 8.2% for Ealing. The percentage of the population living alone in the latter were 2% and 1.64% respectively P. Laslett, Household & Family, p.76 & N. Goose op. cit, p.364.
37. See Table 2:10.
TABLE 2:10 PROPORTIONS OF THE ADULT POPULATION LIVING IN DIFFERENT SIZED HOUSEHOLDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Adult</th>
<th>2 Adults</th>
<th>3 - 5</th>
<th>6 - 10</th>
<th>11+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Proportions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1585, 1593 &amp; 1594</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>28.4</th>
<th>48.6</th>
<th>16.5</th>
<th>3.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585 - 1603</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the norm. The chances of losing at least one parent before leaving home were high, yet re-marriage was common and in consequence comparatively few households were headed by single people. Even if the surviving parent failed to remarry, it would have been rare to be brought up in a house containing one adult only, or indeed to belong to a household where there was no mixing of different age groups or of the sexes. All male households were particularly unusual. Discounting the solitary males, just over one in every 100 homes contained adult males only. All female households were more common and slightly longer lived. Again discounting the 'solitaries', roughly one in every twenty-five households contained no adult males. Well over half the child population would have been able to mix with adolescents, in the form of servants or apprentices an experience which several commentators thought far from desirable. A number may also have briefly shared a roof with their parents' unmarried siblings or with elderly grandparents, although the Salisbury evidence confirms that to live with kin was comparatively unusual.

THE FLUIDITY OF THE URBAN HOUSEHOLD

During the period of primary socialisation most individuals would be faced with a constantly changing environment as mortality and mobility combined to create a situation in which a given household might be

39. On average between 1574 and 1607 81.3% of all households were headed by a married couple, 12.9% by single women and 5.8% by single men. See Table 5:9.

40. William Gouge, for instance, warned that some servants were corrupt and apt to lead the children astray. William Gouge, Of Domestical Duties, 1622, p.595.
transformed from "simple" to "complex" from "nuclear" to "extended" and back again within the space of a few years. A couple of examples will serve to illustrate the point. In 1574 John Bricket, a cutler, lodged two extra inhabitants and in 1585, six. After his death in 1587 his widow took over a somewhat reduced household. She shared with only one other adult in 1590, 1593 and 1594 and was apparently alone in 1592. By 1601 however, the house contained six adults again, including the widow's daughter and a son and his wife. In Fisherton Street, meanwhile, the number recorded in the home of Leonard Ward fell from ten in 1585 to three in 1590, when his widow headed the list.\textsuperscript{41} The total fluctuated between three and seven during the occupancy of his son William, and by 1607 included only the latter's widow and three male servants. As will be discussed later, there may have been some correlation between the age of the householder and the changing composition of his household, elderly parents and unmarried siblings for instance, being more commonly found as co-residents at the beginning of the domestic cycle than at the end. However, the adult density was probably less closely linked to the developmental cycle than that of children.

The fluidity of the household has obvious implications when we turn to consider the links between individuals within that unit. It has often been pointed out that, as a result of high infant and child mortality, affective links between parents and their offspring were much weaker than they are today.\textsuperscript{42}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{41} Three of the inmates in 1585 were apprentices, a category omitted in 1590.
\item \textsuperscript{42} Lawrence Stone, \textit{op. cit.}, p.82.
\end{itemize}
How much less likely then must it have been for close ties to develop between the transitory, non-related members of the household? The same point can also be made when considering the relationships between neighbours. Just as the individual members of a household might change from one year to the next, so people would be accustomed to a fairly rapid turnover of neighbours and to the regular appearance and disappearance of complete households.

The mobility of urban populations is a phenomena which historians now tend to take for granted, it being accepted that, were it not for a regular influx of immigrants many early modern towns would have declined rapidly in size. Yet comparatively little is known about the mechanics of migration, about, for instance, the number of families which would have entered a town each year or about the length of time they would have remained there. Some of the earliest studies of migration in the past were based on the evidence given by witnesses in the ecclesiastical courts. In Canterbury, a town only slightly smaller than Salisbury, by the seventeenth century and likewise afflicted with a declining economy, Peter Clark has shown that as many as two-thirds of a group of male deponents had been born outside the city and that fewer than one in ten had never made a significant move during their career.

To concentrate solely on depositions however, is to give a very incomplete picture, for court witnesses were generally drawn from the older, stabler residents in a community. It is significant that in Salisbury under a quarter of the deponents appearing between 1560 and 1650 had been in the city for less than ten years, and only just over

---

43. P. Clark, "The Migrant in Kentish Towns, 1580-1640", in Crisis and Order, eds. P. Clark & P. Slack.
a tenth for less than five. There were indeed a number of very stable families in Salisbury. Yet there was also a steady stream of poor people in and out of the town and a fairly regular turnover of servants. With the exception of a small group of the latter, however, these temporary residents were rarely called as witnesses.

A more realistic picture of mobility in the past can be gained if we turn to the study of population listings for two Nottinghamshire parishes, Clayworth and Cogenhoe. In ten years, between 1618 and 1628, there was a turnover of more than half the population in Cogenhoe, whilst 244 of the 401 inhabitants listed in Clayworth in 1676 had disappeared by 1688 and 254 newcomers had taken their place (61% and 62% respectively).

One of the values of the Salisbury Easter Books is that they allow us to chart the turnover of an urban population, a far less stable entity than that in a rural community, over not merely periods of ten years or more, but also on an annual basis. Furthermore, they enable us to study something of the movement within a town. As with the study of household structure there are, inevitably, a number of drawbacks. The gaps between the various books make it difficult to be precise about the length of time a person had dwelt in the parish; the study of intra-parochial mobility is hindered by the problems of comparing like-surnames and, above all, the sheer size of the population precludes a complete analysis.

In a later chapter the movement of servants will be considered in some depth. For this study however, it is necessary to restrict the analysis

to male householders. This in itself will obviously introduce an element of bias. The period before a man set up a home and workshop was often the period of greatest mobility and some of the stablest householders may have moved a number of times before they actually appeared in the lists. Nevertheless, it is possible that, by concentrating on this group, any changes occasioned by demographic or economic factors may stand out more clearly than if we had studied a group which, whatever the circumstances, was likely to move after only a year or two.

The study of the number of newcomers entering the parish each year is important for it provides yet another gauge of the impact of plague and dearth. In numerical terms the adult population apparently recovered rapidly after periods of exceptional mortality. Yet the actual personnel involved, particularly into the poorer streets, may have altered substantially. The Easter Books for 1593 to 1596, 1602 and 1603 alone, provide indisputable evidence of the number of people setting up a home in the parish for the first time. The results from these six books suggest that, on average, about 60 newcomers, or roughly 13% of the total number of male householders, entered the parish each year. To allow for gaps between the remaining books it is necessary to make interpolations by subtracting the number of people expected to leave the parish over a given period from the estimated intake of newcomers. As Table 2:11A illustrates, the discrepancies between the observed results and those which have been interpolated are not great. Obviously the longer the interval between two books the greater

45. The mobility of female householders will be discussed in Chapter 5. They have been omitted here, not merely because they are notoriously difficult to trace, but also because the factors affecting their movements were somewhat different.

46. See Table 2:12 for the estimated turnover for certain given periods.
the error factor. Thus, although it would initially appear that between 1603 and 1607 the proportion of new householders had risen above the expected level, when allowance is made for a margin of just over 40 individuals, one is forced to conclude again that, whatever the disruption between 1603 and 1607, in the long term the character of the population changed very little. No doubt, were it possible to examine the movements of the entire adult population, slightly more positive results might be expected. However, at the level of the household it appears that, despite brief periods of crisis, the annual immigration rate did not vary significantly.

Possibly high mortality would only have had more lasting repercussions in the backstreets. In examining the trends in individual streets it is necessary to consider not merely, as in the preceding analysis, the number of 'outsiders' who entered the parish for the first time, but also how many householders moved into the street from elsewhere in the parish.

47. Taking simply the figures for New Street, Catherine Street and the Chequers and using this wider definition, it is interesting to note that in 1607, and to a lesser extent in 1599, the ratio between the observed and the expected intake was higher than it had been in the complete sample. Even allowing for error, an unusually high turnover of householders and, by inference, a decidedly higher turnover of inmates, does seem quite feasible in those streets which were particularly prone to infection in 1604. However, in years of normal mortality it is significant that the average number of householders entering and leaving the backstreets each year was only marginally higher

47. In Table 2:12B, intraparochial mobility has been taken into account when calculating how many people set up a new home in St. Thomas's each year. This gives an annual average of 66, or 17% of the total number of male householders. The results can be directly compared with those for the backstreets given in Table 2:12C. There 18% of the householders in any one year were likely to be newcomers.
TABLE 2:11 MIGRATION INTO ST. THOMAS'S: THE NUMBER OF MALE HOUSEHOLDERS SETTING UP HOME IN THE PARISH EACH YEAR

A: NEWCOMERS TO THE PARISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Observed Results</th>
<th>Interpolated Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total A</td>
<td>% of All Male Householders B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* Due to the incomplete nature of this book only a % can be given. The gaps between 1574 & 1582 and 1585 & 1590 are too long to make meaningful estimates. *)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B to D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D to A</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>49.3 (103)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>139.3 (29.8)</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>66.2 (7.5)</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>106.8 (15.6)</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>139.5 (29.8)</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2: 11: B: NEVADANS TO INDIVIDUAL HOUSES
### TABLE 2:11 C: MIGRATION INTO THE BACK STREETS: NEWCOMERS TO INDIVIDUAL PROPERTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed Results</th>
<th></th>
<th>Interpolated Results</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of All Male Householders A</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of All Male Householders C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B to D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>57.0 (± 25.8)</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>57.0 (± 25.8)</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>45.7 (± 12.6)</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>28.3 (± 4.3)</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>57.0 (± 25.8)</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2:12 AVERAGE PERIODS OF RESIDENCE IN ST. THOMAS'S

#### A: MOVEMENT INTO AND OUT OF THE PARISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Years</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean % Of Newcomers</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Mean % All Male Householders</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average No. Newcomers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593 - 1596, 1602</td>
<td>49.83</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Year</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Staying:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593 - 1595, 1602</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593, 1594</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574 - 1596</td>
<td>38.56</td>
<td>38.80</td>
<td>27.06</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574, 1582, 1585</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>33.69</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 9 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574, 1582, 1585</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>33.69</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Years</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean % Of Newcomers</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean % All Male Householders</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average No. Newcomers</td>
<td>1593 - 1596, 1602</td>
<td>66.17</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Year</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Staying:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Only</td>
<td>1593 - 1595, 1602</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>40.92</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>1593, 1594</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 +</td>
<td>1574 - 1596</td>
<td>31.78</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 +</td>
<td>1574, 1582, 1585</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 9</td>
<td>Inferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2:12 C: MIGRATION INTO THE BACK STREETS: MOVEMENT INTO AND OUT OF INDIVIDUAL PROPERTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Years</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean % Of Newcomers</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Mean % All Male Householders</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average No. Newcomers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593 - 1596, 1602</td>
<td>28.33</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.92</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. Staying:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593 - 1595, 1602</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593, 1594</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574 - 1596</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574, 1582, 1585</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 9 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Inferred</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
than in the parish as a whole. Moreover, with the possible exception of an unusual influx into the poorer streets between 1603 and 1607, abnormalities in the annual intake do not appear to have been restricted to particular areas.48. If the assumption that large parts of St. Martin's and St. Edmund's were similar in character to the poorer areas of St. Thomas's is correct, then it seems logical to infer that the numbers of people entering the latter each year and the fluctuations in its population may, after all, have been fairly typical.

The second and, perhaps ultimately the most important, point to be gleaned from this study is the fact that at least an eighth and possibly as many as a sixth of the householders in any one year were new to the parish. No doubt they were not all new-comers to the town for there was a certain degree of inter-parochial mobility. Some, moreover, would have been sons inheriting their father's property, others newly married men who had previously dwelt in the parish as servants. Nevertheless, this does not diminish the fact that immigration into St. Thomas's was notably higher than immigration into a rural parish. In Cogenhoe between 1618 and 1620, for example, five households disappeared and two new ones were set up. The latter gives a proportion of 6.7%, far lower than the proportion estimated for a three year interval in Salisbury (21.2%). In Clayworth too, the appearance of 41 new householders, (45.1% of the total), between 1676 and 1688 is proportionately lower than the number of newcomers noted between 1574 and 1585 in St. Thomas's. (59.1%). 49.

48. The Ratio between B & D In Table 2:11C matches that in Table 2:IIB fairly closely.

Not only was there a significant influx of newcomers each year, but a large number of the immigrants only stayed in the parish for short periods. Obviously one cannot use all the Easter Books to study length of residence. The gaps between the earlier books serve to overestimate the numbers of temporary inhabitants, whilst after 1596 it is impossible to test for residence of ten years or more. However, by combining the evidence for stability, revealed by the earlier books, and for short-term residence from the consecutive books a fair impression of the transitory and of the more permanent elements in the population can be established.

Concentrating first on residence within one particular house the fluidity of the tenurial system becomes immediately apparent. On average over half the newcomers in any one year had moved within the space of three years, (roughly, 41% disappearing after only a year, and 12% after two years). On the other hand nearly a fifth of the male householders were still present in the same house ten years after they were first noted and just over a tenth as many as twenty years later.

Who the short-term residents were and where they went to is generally obscure. No doubt a few belonged to the group of the less "respectable" poor whom the urban authorities were so anxious to expel. Certainly they were of the stature to keep servants. Yet it would be wrong to assume that they were all from the bottom rung of the urban hierarchy. Whilst many must have left the town completely, a few can be traced at a later date in another parish or another part of St. Thomas's. For these men the first property sometimes represented a temporary home before they could acquire

---

50. Of 60 men appearing only once in 1593, 1594 and 1595, only 14 included more than 2 adults in their household (23.3%).
somewhere large enough to begin extending their household.

At the other extreme was a small, but by no means insignificant
group, who remained in the parish for most of the period under
discussion. Many came from the 'elite'. Yet men of humble background
also formed part of this stable group - Ellis Cocky, a baker, for
instance, who lived alone with his wife in the Churchyard between
1590 and 1601, or Richard Collins, another man whose home was included
amongst the 'simple' households, in each of the surviving Easter Books.
Although the poor are normally associated with high mobility, one
has only to look at a number of documents specifically dealing with
the poor to appreciate that the "vagrant element" represents only
one side of the coin. There were for instance, a number of common
names in the 1625 and 1635 censuses of the poor, and in the Norwich
poor census of 1570 over half of the people, whom length of residence
is indicated had been born in the city, whilst under a quarter
had settled within the last ten years. Similarly, of the 81 householders
in St. Thomas's who received relief during the 1604 plague, nearly
half had been noted in the Easter Books ten years earlier.

The figures presented so far have been based on the assumption
that the men recorded in different properties were inevitably different
individuals. However, when intra-parochial movement is taken into account
the balance between long and short term residents shifts somewhat.

51. Of 287 individuals residing in the parish for over ten years 43
were officers. (15%).
52. The Norwich Census of the Poor, 1570, Norfolk Record Society,
53. 27.5% (22) of the sample stayed for between one and three years,
47.5% (38) for over ten.
The small size of some of the samples prevents a detailed analysis,
but a limited survey shows that variations in the average length
of tenure between different streets also bore little relation to
the variations in the level of wealth. Whereas, for instance,
over half the men who established a home on the south side of
New Street during the test years 1593, 1594, 1595 and 1602 had
disappeared by the following year, the number of temporary
inhabitants dwelling on the north of the street was well below
average.
Thus, whereas 34 of the householders who set up a home in any one year stayed in that property for under three years and 32 for a decade or more, the corresponding figures for those residing in the parish, but not necessarily in the same house, are 23 and 39. To be certain that one is dealing with intra-parochial movement rather than the appearance of two men of like-surname is difficult and the number of such cases may be slightly overestimated. 280 possible moves have been established for which external evidence verifies that in at least a fifth, the man in question had not actually left the town. But for the rest one must rely simply on the contiguity of dates, and, on the negative side, the fact that there was no record of an intervening death.

From the Easter Book material, it would appear that intra-parochial mobility was comparatively unusual. Only 209 (12.2%) of the men who headed a house in the parish between 1574 and 1607 made a significant move and no more than 54 (3.16%) can be found heading more than two properties. Inter-parochial mobility is virtually impossible to trace, but what little evidence there is suggests that this was also rare. However, too much weight should not be placed upon these impressions, for the Easter Books rarely enable us to see more than a portion of a man's career. Gaps between the Books must undoubtedly obscure some

54. If these means are expressed as a percentage of the total number of newcomers each year it becomes clear that the most significant variation concerns the stabler inhabitants. Whereas 52.8% of the newcomers disappeared in under three years using the first method and 49.8% the second, the proportion staying for over ten years rises from a fifth to just over a quarter.

55. To allow for error a man must have moved more than three houses on either side of his first tenement in order for it to be counted as a significant move.

56. To confirm the impression that movement within the town was comparatively unusual it is interesting to compare the names listed in the Lay Subsidies of 1594, 1598, 1601 and 1611. Although the tax lists do not indicate what street or parish a man dwelt in it is significant that only 5 of the 47 who appeared in each list changed ward during the 18 year period. (10.6%).

movement and it is quite possible that men who apparently stayed in one spot for twenty years or so had moved before 1574 or would do so after 1607.

At this point the evidence concerning the movements of two particular groups, the Tailors and the City Councillors who dwelt in St. Thomas's, is worth taking into consideration. Again we cannot always pinpoint their complete careers, but from external evidence it is possible to determine a minimal period when they must have been resident in the town, and thus to verify possible movements in the parish and to identify periods when, although they do not occur in the Easter Books, they may have dwelt elsewhere in the town.

Of the 61 Tailors who resided in St. Thomas's at some point during the period as many as 30 apparently made a significant move, either within the parish, or by inference to St. Edmund's and St. Martin's, and eight moved more than once. Between them they made 42 moves, 32 were definitely within the parish, of which ten were within the same street. The officers seem to have been slightly less inclined to move although this may be simply due to the fact that longer career profiles can be established for the tailors. 22 of the 88 councillors in the sample made a significant move between 1574 and 1607, eight moving more than once. 22 of the 34 moves they made between them were intra-parochial and four, slightly less than the tailors, occurred within the same street. These two groups may be far from typical. They suggest, nonetheless that, whilst a householder was still more likely to move

57. The tailors can be traced from the point when they were admitted into the guild until the point when they either died or left the town, the officers from the date when they first joined the council, normally, sometime after setting up as Masters.
out of Salisbury altogether, movement within the town may have been slightly more common than initially suggested.

Apart from studying the frequency of movement about the town we also need to consider whether it was more common to change residence at certain stages of the life-cycle or whether it can be linked in anyway with social mobility. Even though individual motivation remains obscure in all but a limited number of cases, there appears to have been no obvious link between mobility and the householder’s position in the civic hierarchy. Nor did it coincide with a sudden increase or decrease in the size of the man’s household. On the other hand there may have been a positive correlation between mobility and marriage or inheritance. There were, for instance, a number of cases when movement within the parish coincided with a change of marital status. John Alderson of Fisherton Street was single when he first appeared in the lists. His marriage was recorded in April 1593 and by 1594 he was found living in Castle Street. John Slatter appeared alone in the High Street in 1590, but by 1592 had acquired a wife and had moved to Crane Street. Nothing further is known of these two men but it is possible that such moves were initiated by the transfer of property from the wife or her family. Thus, when Henry Marketman remarried a widow in February 1595 he moved from his own house on one side of New Street to his wife’s house on the other side. He obviously retained the tenure of his first property though, for by 1607 he had moved back again. Another man, Roger Lovell, moved from Castle Street to a property once held by John Talbott.

58. Several other examples emphasise that ties with the first house were not necessarily severed when a man moved. Richard Gauntlet left Bower’s Chequer for the High Street between 1574 and 1585, but significantly a son appeared in the former property in 1601. Augustine Abbot transferred his dwelling house to the High Street at some point between 1585 and 1593, but still referred to his old house in Butcher Row in his will. (PRO, PROV. II/10/12/176)
in Fish Row at some point between 1574 and 1585. In January 1582 his marriage to one Edith Talbot, perhaps the widow or the daughter of John, is recorded.

In a number of other examples movement can be linked with the death of a kinsman. Henry Lane, a tailor, went to live in his father-in-law's house, Under the Churchyard after the latter's death in 1598. For at least six years prior to this he had dwelt further along the street, although he actually started off his marital career in his father's old house in Bower's Chequer. Ellis Cocky, the baker mentioned earlier, dwelt in the Churchyard until 1602 and then moved to a house in New Street where three years earlier Thomas Soppe, a kinsman or possibly the father of his wife, had resided. In a third case a joiner and his family moved down the street to share, if not take over the running of, his father-in-law's house a couple of years before the latter died.

Given the integration of rich and poor it is difficult to assess objectively whether a move was in an 'upward' or a 'downward' direction. Besides, if movement about the town was more a facet of changing family fortunes than of changing economic status - and with more evidence of kinship links it does seem likely that the number of moves associated with marriage and inheritance would increase substantially - then we should not expect to find any obvious patterns. If anything movement seems to have been highly localised, with over half the moves which have been traced actually occurring within the same street. Whether this tells us anything about the extent of men's horizons, about their sense of belonging to a particular neighbourhood, is a question to which we shall return. There is certainly little to suggest that residence by the Market
or in the High Street was a distinction to be "achieved" as a man's status increased or that adverse circumstances forced men to move away from the centre, although this must have occurred occasionally. Nor does movement appear to have been the preserve of any particular social groups. The men in question ranged from humble craftsmen to country gentry whilst the wardens and ex-mayors in the two samples were neither more or less inclined to move than their junior colleagues. However, as emphasised before, more evidence of movement throughout the life-cycle is needed before it will be possible to reach any firm conclusion about the links between residential and social mobility.

In ensuing chapters the relationship between the life-cycle and the structure and stability of the household will be dealt with in more detail. At this point it is perhaps appropriate to reconsider the typicality of the material discussed so far. One of the disappointing although, in view of the small period covered, not totally unexpected, features of the evidence, is that the size and distribution of the adult population did not vary significantly from one book to the next. A high population turnover was characteristic even in normal years and with a constant influx of immigrants the town could recover rapidly from excessive mortality. We can only speculate whether, if the study could be extended to cover a longer period, the annual variations might be slightly more marked.

The contrasts which can be drawn between some of the central market streets and the backstreets in St. Thomas's make it clear that household structure was socially variable. Thus, whilst the parish contained a
variety of streets and household types, the results from the Easter Books concerning household size may be slightly weighted in favour of the larger domestic group. On the other hand, as there seems to have been far less correlation between length of residence and wealth, the results for mobility are likely to be more typical of the town as a whole.

The one caveat which might be raised is that, having a much greater surplus of baptisms over burials during this period than the other two parishes, St. Thomas's may have been more reliant on natural growth than on immigration. It cannot be mere coincidence that a quarter of the deponents from St. Thomas's during the period from 1560 to 1650 had lived in Salisbury since birth or infancy, compared with a sixth of those from St. Martin's and a seventh from St. Edmund's, whilst the proportions of deponents who had immigrated within the last ten years were 22.1%, 37.5% and 34.3% respectively. But even though this suggests that St. Thomas's was the stablest of the three parishes, its population was still remarkably fluid. Indeed the fact that both the household and the neighbourhood were constantly changing in composition is one of the most significant features to be revealed by the Easter Books and one which has important implications when we turn to consider how closely the individual members of the community were bound together.
CHAPTER III

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HOUSEHOLD:

COURTSHIP AND THE MARRIED COUPLE
Having established that each year over fifty new households were set up in St. Thomas's it is appropriate to consider next some of the formalities and customs which accompanied the establishment of a home and family. No doubt many of the couples appearing for the first time in the Easter Books were immigrants for whom this was their second or even third marital home. Yet cross checking with the Salisbury marriage registers reveals that at least a fifth of the new householders had only recently married. Although it was not unknown for a newly-wedded couple to lodge temporarily with kin, first marriage was generally synonymous with the establishment of a new domestic unit. At the craftsman level at least, it was also closely linked with setting up shop. Evidence concerning the Tailor's Guild suggests that it was common for a man to take his oath as a freeman, to marry and to enroll his first apprentice, within the space of two years. Moreover, the Joiners Guild actually forbade a man to take an apprentice "excepte he be a householder and a freeman or a maryed man or a widdower and free", whilst the Smiths ordered that no one was to "keepe open shop before 30 vnless he be married*. Given the close ties between marriage and acquiring a house and workshop, the marriage ceremony itself was symbolic of rather more than the union of two

1. As the parishes of marriage and of settlement were not necessarily the same the proportion should possibly be closer to a third.

2. During the 1590s, 179 marriages recorded in St. Thomas's, 78 of the men never appeared in the Easter Books. Of the remainder a quarter were householders before the marriage, 22 having clearly been married before, and eight men were listed living with kin. The rest set up as independent householders once they were married. Sometimes there was an inexplicable gap between the date of marriage and the first entry in the records. Yet just under a third (31) first appeared at the head of a household within a year of marriage and just over a half within two years.

families or of the beginning of the redistribution of resources between the generations. To marry and set up independently was a visible sign that the man had proved his skill as a workman and had sufficient resources to be able to participate as a full member of the society. It also marked the progression of the man and his wife from a position of dependency in another household to one of authority in which they themselves could hire and train servants and apprentices.  

COURTSHIP AND THE CHOICE OF A SPOUSE  

Before examining the financial implications of establishing a household we need to be aware of the mechanics of choosing a partner and of the various stages of courtship. Much of the available evidence comes from court records and concentrates on the "public" aspects of courtship rather than the preliminary stages of the relationship. Through the eyes of witnesses we learn of the occasions when the couple met in company and of giftgiving, using friends to carry tokens such as rings, clothing or even, on one occasion, a cabbage and some apples. Their accounts provided a wealth of detail concerning the conduct of spousals and the arrangement of the marriage settlement. Yet from the outsiders viewpoint it is difficult to obtain any impression of the meetings the couple may have had in private or indeed, of how they initially met. Even this material should be treated with a certain amount of caution, for court cases generally describe matches which, for one reason or another, had been frustrated and may not, therefore, be typical. Nevertheless, although there are disadvantages, it is possible to acquire a lot of information

4. For the wage-earner marriage probably did not represent such a socially significant step. The unions of the poor consequently involved far less ceremony than those of their superiors.

about contemporary attitudes to marriage by using ecclesiastical court records.

At the marriage of the wealthier citizen the attendance of, not only kin and friends, but also fellow guildsmen emphasised the transition from a position of dependency to one of social responsibility. Apart from a number of casual bystanders, both the bride and the groom would be attended by their own particular friends, references to a man's "brides boys" and to "the company that came along with the bride woman" occurring in a couple of depositions. The principal guests might be given a pair of gloves as a gift or in token of a formal invitation. Other special garments, such as the "wedding hats" or "wedding girdles" mentioned in a number of wills, added to the symbolism of the occasion, whilst occasionally the church of the major participants were decorated with flowers. The occasion would undoubtedly have been marked by gift-giving and, for those who could afford it, by some form of wedding feast.

There is little evidence concerning the nuptials, yet to judge from a letter referring to a couple who sought to marry in another parish "for none other purpose but to avoyd company wch wold look for entertainment if publickly they shold be married in church". (9). A certain amount of expense was inevitably involved.

6. Ibid., No. 54, fol. 49. & B.C.O.B., No. 5, fol. 5v.

7. One curious churchwarden's presentment told how at the wedding of Christian Bowmd "one William Cornys did wear a wythy garland in the church." S.D.R., Subdean of Sarum, Churchwardens Presentments, 1612-1639, St. Thomas, 1633.

8. When buying meat for his son's wedding in 1594 John Bricket was reputed to have said that he had rather it were burial meat rather than wedding meat. S.D.R., B.C.D.B., No. 12, fol. 70.

Although the solemnisation of the match in the church marked the visual climax of the courtship, it was not indispensable and a binding union could be established simply by the exchange of vows. There were two recognised forms of espousal. In "spousals de futuro" the couple merely indicated that they would marry at a later date. But an irrevocable contract was formed when they announced, in words of the present tense, that they took each other as man and wife.10. Vows of both types are mentioned in a number of disputes concerning marriage contracts. Sometimes the couple acted without witnesses. John Cooke, for instance, went to obtain Elizabeth Pearce's goodwill for his marriage to her daughter. But he was already betrothed and, asked whether witnesses should be called, replied that this was unnecessary for, "We are contracted together and she is my wyfe before god." Other couples however, were evidently concerned that, like the church ceremony itself, betrothal should be a public event and should be accompanied by certain ritual gestures, such as a kiss or a handclasp, and the exchange of small sums of money or rings as tokens. In 1585 for example, Ann Godfrey and Simon Lawes went to a friend's house confirming,

"that they had solemnly contracted themselves together and were now come before witnesses to p(ro)fite the same in publique manner". (12).

From the demographer's viewpoint it is obviously important to determine how often people based their marriage on betrothal rather than on a church ceremony. For a small section of the population the formalities of the church were of little significance. In the poorer parts of the town many couples were recognised as such simply by virtue of cohabitation. Moreover, it is evident from the notes in numerous

10. Henry Swinburne, A Treatise of Spousals or Matrimonial Contracts, 1686.
12. Ibid., No. 9 fol. 161/C.
vagrancy passports that, although some of the temporary inhabitants might claim to be married they had never been in church and possibly moved from one temporary liaison to another. Even so, there were practical reasons for publicising a marriage in church. The wife was not entitled to a dower without a formal blessing, nor would any offspring be considered as legitimate. Some people were possibly also affected by a superstitious belief that the union would only prosper if it were blessed, or by the belief that, only thus, could they preserve their credit. It is significant that most of the parties involved in disputes concerning frustrated matches had evidently intended to proceed to a church ceremony. Moreover, to judge from the lengths to which some people went to be married in church, even if it meant acting in secret and ignoring the legal requirements to obtain a licence or have the banns read first, it would be fair to assume that, for the majority of the population, the solemnisation of the match was a crucial part of courtship.

Not unexpectedly the motives behind the timing of a marriage and the choice of a partner, when revealed were diverse in character. Sometimes practical considerations, and in particular the need to find a wife who could assist in setting up a home and business, weighed heavily. In such cases it may have been logical to approach the nearest suitable female, albeit a fellow servant or a neighbour's daughter. She had, however, to be adequately endowed and engagements were occasionally broken if the girl's kin were unable to provide an acceptable marriage portion.


14. One man, Thomas Belcher, was married clandestinely at 10 o'clock at night "without licence or bans asking". Another couple who paid to obtain a licence were married very early one morning in St. Martin's. They were obviously anxious to avoid whatever shame was attached to conceiving outside marriage, the girl confessing that she "feared least she was with child by said Adlam". S.D.R., B.C.D.B., No. 2, fol. 36 and No. 5, fol. 51.
At the other extreme were the men who married for companionship like Henry Munday's servant who could "ly no longer alone but these cold nyghts would faine have a bed fellow". (15). Although many men may have been unable to set up shop without the prospect of acquiring additional resources through marriage, affection clearly outweighed financial considerations in a number of cases. John Cooke, the baker mentioned earlier, said that, although he might have a wife worth £30 he liked Agnes Pearce "better than any woman". Similarly Henry Barrow declared to his chosen spouse that,

"he had a great affection to her because she was very well like his first wife and therefore he could marry whither she had anything or nothing". (16).

Those about to enter a second marriage would possibly have been in a better financial position to indulge in personal sentiment. In another case, a widow announced that,

"she minded not to marry for riches and that she liked no man sithen the death of her husband so well as she liked Pinhome". (17).

But there were also many widows who, forced to marry out of necessity, would have had little choice in the matter. 18

Although undoubtedly in a minority, incidental information suggests that a number of matches were deliberately arranged. In the parish register it is interesting to discover several entries in which individuals of the same surname married on the same day or very soon after each other. On September 23rd 1599, for instance, the marriages of Thomas Goddyn to Clement Danyell and of Matthew Goddyn to Jane Danyell were recorded. 19

17. Ibid., No. 6, fol 39.
18. Infra, p. 244.
If the two men and the two women were indeed siblings was it simply a case of one link between the families initiating another? Or had the parents deliberately arranged for both their offspring to marry at the same time? In another example, Henry Gilbert married one Elizabeth Everley a week after a wedding of John Everley and Sara Gauntlet. Although some of the known examples may be coincidental, these two were obviously linked for the two men acted as each other's bondsmen when obtaining marriage licences.

Deliberate matchmaking seems to have been the policy in certain individual families and particularly, one would suspect, amongst the élite. The family of Augustine Abbot, a victualler from Butcher Row, is a case in point. Not only did Richard Belly and Elizabeth Shafflyn, Abbot's step-daughter, get married on the same day as William Shafflyn and Joane Hooper in 1588, but in October 14th 1594 the marriages of Abbot's own daughter to John Minterne and of Robert Tite to another step-daughter are recorded. Such arranged marriages, and two instances of pairing in one family are too much of a coincidence, to suggest anything else, were possibly designed to strengthen pre-existing ties. The father of Joane Hooper had, for instance, previously nominated Abbot as the guardian of another of his offspring, whilst a close neighbour of the latter Walter Belly, was possibly the father of the man who married his step-daughter. Moreover, these men were all fairly prominent citizens for whom it may have been diplomatic to bind their families by intermarriage.

21. Ibid., The same year two other members of the Belly family were united within a day of each other.
Although one tends to associate the "arranged" marriage with the elite there were signs that even amongst the lower ranks of society friends could and did interfere. One woman confessed that "through the importunity of divers of her friends and against her own full allowance and approbation" she had married Alexander Strugnell. Others were less easily persuaded. John Cooke for instance, complained that his sister "would have him marry where she listed but he would marry where please himselfe", whilst in accepting Simon Everett, Anne Godfrey apparently displeased Goodwife Cooke and Goodwife Lambe who had been anxious that she should marry one Lloyd the hatter. Yet although friends did intervene, there is little to suggest that it was on anything but a casual basis or that certain individuals assumed the unofficial role of "matchmaker" amongst their neighbours.

In most cases the initial stages of courtship were probably a matter for the couple alone. Yet there often came a point when outside intervention was either sought or offered. Several betrothals were actually initiated when a friend, who perhaps felt that the couples behaviour might offend against social mores if not channelled in the proper direction, demanded whether or not they intended to marry. Thus a fishmonger related how,

"he having been abroad about his affairs found in his house when he returned John Butler and Alice Rhodes without any other company and misliking this asked them what they were doing and whether John Butler intended to marry Alice Rhodes". (25).

24. Ibid., No. 26, fol. 72v. & No. 9, fol. 168c.
25. Ibid., No. 6, fol. 39.
Other couples initiated a public betrothal themselves by seeking the goodwill of the girl's parents or master. Consent was certainly not indispensable. There must have been many like Peter Bricket, who despite parental disapproval, boasted that he would "marry her though he went a begging w(i)th her". But; whether it were out of duty or in fear that they would be disinherited, there were other individuals like Elionora Cozens who only accepted Elizus Shuter on condition that "she might have her fathers consent and goodliKing ... and not otherwise". (27).

The will of Stephen Turner made in 1605, illustrates that disinheritance could be a threat if consent were not sought. He stated that,

"because childish marriages are often recompensed with many and greater evils all their liffe tyme after as Alsoe for that God hathe geven a prerogative unto parents over their children in this kynde, my mynde and will is that if either sonne or daughter shall marry without the consent of their mother or if... that the daughter soe offending shall forfeite the one halfe of their sayde hundred poundes and the son for offending shall forfeit half of the rent of lands or leases to them beforehand bequeathed for the space of four years after such offence". (28.)

Turner's attitude is very reminiscent of the views expressed in a number of popular conduct books. William Gouge, for instance, in his treatise on "Domestical Duties", said that "God hath further laid a charge upon parents to provide marriages for their children", and in another work by Dod and Cleaver it was pointed out that although they should not be forced into a match, children lacked the wisdom to make a good choice unaided. However, Turner may have been unusual in the measures he

26. Ibid., No. 12, fol. 70
27. Ibid., No. 28, fol. 56v.
took, for only 17 men out of a total of 187 testators leaving minors between 1500 and 1639, made similar stipulations to ensure that their children's marriages were supervised.

Even from a fairly small selection of court cases it can be appreciated that the degree of freedom each individual had in choosing a spouse could vary considerably. Probably a minority had little say in the matter. Some prompted by the hope of financial assistance, may have found it expedient to obtain a parental blessing, even if their initial choice had been made independently. For those lower down the social scale, who could expect to inherit little, courtship would obviously have been much freer. It must also be remembered that the chances of having no kin living nearby who could be approached to bless the match were quite high and, even though it was sometimes necessary to obtain the consent of a master or mistress, many young men and women would probably have met with little to constrain them in their choice.

30. It is significant that all the testators in question belonged to the elite and also that only three men made a son's portion conditional in this way. Did men have greater freedom in choosing a spouse than women? Certainly in the cases when approval was sought it was always the girl's kin who were approached and never the other way around.

31. Sometimes it was also prudent to seek the approval of friends if the couple had only known each other briefly. Widow Cox thus replied to John Pinhorse's suit that "it was no bargaine to be made for a day or two therefore it behoved him to enquire of her and she likewise of him and also referred the matter to the consente and goodwill of her friends". (S.D.R., B.C.D.B., No. 6, fol. 39v.).
THE FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF MARRIAGE

Marriage not only gave the individual a new position in society, it marked a new phase in the relationship between the generations. Recent work on the family has emphasised that the establishment of a new domestic unit was often linked with the transmission of property between father and son. In a rural community, where the small-holder could seriously weaken his estate if he apportioned it when his sons married, the latter often had to be delayed until the individual was in a position to take over the entire family holding or to acquire his own land. Having resources other than land, the head of an urban family was, by contrast, in a better position to help establish the younger generation during his life time. Continuity between father and son was, in any case, comparatively unusual in a town, and many young men would have been established in a profession long before their father began to divide his estate.

Although the timing of inheritance was perhaps not so crucial, this does not imply that there were no constraints to delay marriage in an urban environment. The young man would have had to complete his training, marriage during apprenticeship being prohibited, and then to build up enough capital to set up on his own. To judge from the evidence obtained from marriage licences roughly four-fifths of all Salisbury men entering a first marriage in the early seventeenth century were under 30. By this stage few would have been able to acquire much capital. A number may already have lost their father and inherited a portion. Yet if the

32. Although the acquisition of capital and land, whether by inheritance, pre-mortem transmission or individual endeavour, was an important prerequisite for marriage, it is unlikely that such an inflexible system existed in rural England as that described by Berkner in Austria. L. K. Berkner, 'The Stem Family and the Developmental Cycle of the Peasant Household', American History Review, 1972 p.77.

33. In St. Mary's Manchester, almost half of the grooms and over half the brides recorded between 1653 and 1660 had lost their father. L. Stone, op. cit., p.48.
To establish with any certainty how many men would have been able to take over an established household is difficult. As a rough guide the careers of 106 men who married in Salisbury during the 1590s and who can be found as householders or occupants in St. Thomas's within a few years of that date were examined. The sample is not entirely representative, for not only is it impossible to trace a date of marriage for the majority of householders, but some of the poorer inhabitants may have lodged with others and thus, never appeared in the lists of householders. Moreover, as it is difficult to trace kinship links, a number of couples who inherited an established household must inevitably go unnoticed.

Despite these problems, the analysis does, nevertheless, reveal several important results. 17 of the 106 men (16%) succeeded to a property by marrying the widow or the daughter of the previous occupant, and another six (5.7%) by inheriting directly from mother or father. Seven men (6.6%) were already householders, although they do not appear to have been married before. Ten more (9.4%) did not set up their own home straight away but went to live with kin. This leaves 66 individuals, just under two-thirds, who would have been obliged to find their own home and furnishings immediately after marriage.

34. Only those who appeared in the next Easter Book compiled after their marriage or, to allow for error, the one subsequent to that were included in the sample. Even then it is inevitable that a number of couples who lodged with kin for only a brief period after marriage will be hidden.

35. This is not, of course, an accurate guide to the frequency with which properties passed from one generation to another, for inheritance could occur long before or after marriage.
Setting up home was inevitably a costly business and it seems likely that many couples would have been unable to manage without a certain amount of financial assistance from their kin.\(^{36}\) The marriage was therefore often preceded by detailed discussion concerning the portion each family would settle on the couple. In 1612, for instance, John Scragg related how he had promised to donate his house in Milford when his stepson married, whilst the bride's father promised £20 and her uncle £10. However, there was some disagreement over the exact arrangements and, in particular, over Scragg's demand for 40 shillings a year rent for the house.\(^{37}\) This case, and a number of others, demonstrates how debates concerning the financial settlement could take months and could involve both neighbours and members of the wider family. They also make it clear that, although formal marriage settlements are more commonly associated with the landed gentry, future gifts from kin or friends were also an important consideration amongst the humbler ranks of society.

---

36. We can do little more than speculate about the financial needs of the newly married couple. Entry fines varied considerably. In Castle Street those charged on Corporation tenements in the early seventeenth century ranged from 10s to £12, with an average of just under £4. In one of the poorer areas around St. Edmund's church, the average was just over £3. Besides obtaining a lease the new householder had to find basic items of furniture, tools and stock. To judge from the many references in wills to items which the legatee "already had in his possession", the former were often borrowed from kin. A few tools were sometimes presented to a man when he completed his apprenticeship, although obviously his requirements in this respect would vary greatly according to the nature of the trade. To add to his financial burdens, the man about to embark upon his career would also have had to find money to pay for his entry into a craft and for the enrollment of apprentices. (S.C.A., 0/171, Survey of Corporation Lands).

From legal evidence it appears that the greatest interest lay in the portion which the girl could bring to the marriage. Indeed, on occasions the whole future of the match hinged on whether the man was offered enough or whether the girl's family fulfilled their promises. One man said that he would have taken Alice Rhodes to wife there and then if her brother "would have geeven half twenty nobles towards their beginning", whilst Robert Craiford admitted that he had intended to marry Jane Wraighton but,

"because her friends did offer nothing wt her but delayed and tryfled him he proceeded no further and abstained from making any contract". (38).

One reason why so much attention was focused on the girl's portion was that this frequently formed the bulk of her inheritance. Many testators who mentioned a married daughter had obviously given her a portion already. A number of married women may also have been ignored completely in their father's will. Others were left only a token or at least considerably less than their unmarried sisters. Thus whilst John Gould gave his younger daughter £20 and various household goods, his married daughter was left only a brass pot "for she hath her porc on already since her marriage". (39).

Likewise in as many as two-thirds of the wills which mentioned both a married and an unmarried daughter, the former was given a much smaller legacy.

The single girl was normally allowed to receive her inheritance at a particular age or at marriage, it being specified in a number of cases that the gift was to be used for her "preferment in marriage". In one of the rare examples of a will made by a spinster it is interesting that she should refer to certain goods at her mother's house as "my marriage goods"

38. Ibid., No. 6, fol. 36 & No. 1, fol. 20v.
Even girls from the poorest ranks of society could sometimes expect a marriage portion. During the early sixteenth century in particular, money was often given "towards the marriage" of certain poor maidens and bequests to female servants were also left specifically for this purpose. The girl's attractiveness as a bride often rested heavily on the endowment she could expect and it is notable that several female witnesses referred to the portions they hoped to receive when testifying to their credit in court.

Whilst the bride's portion aroused particular interest, the prospective son-in-law often taking the initiative and demanding what her parents would contribute, the process was not entirely one sided. In several cases the debts and expected income of the suitor were taken into account before consent was granted. One Salisbury deponent declared that George Churchouse, "hath coming into maintain himself and his family £30 a year and he had in portion with said Joan £200", but he believed that the girl's uncle, "would never have given him so much or married her to him for when he came as a suitor he said his debts were but £3 at most wherein he cheated Dr. Seward, for within a year after the marriage his debts all broke out and were discovered which came to a thousand and od pounds". (42).

In another case the girl's mistress asked her suitor what he had to bring her and was told that "he had a living of £15 or £16 a year". (43). In wealthier families it was certainly expected that the contribution from the girl's kin would be matched by a donation from the groom's family or

41. R.T. Vann points out that in Early Modern Banbury even the wills of the poor referred to goods wives had brought with them and he suggests that dowering must have gone on in all social ranks. This result also shows that there was no obvious correlation between the death of the father and age at first marriage. (R.T.Vann, "Wills and the Family in an English Town", Journal of Family History, Vol. 4, No. 4, 1979, p.361.)

42. S.D.R., B.C.D.B., No. 48, fol. 80v.

43. Ibid., No. 52, fol. 198v.
with assurances of an adequate living for the woman if she survived her spouse. In his will made in the 1620s John Puxton desired his executor,

"to have a special care that my daughter Frances may have assurance from her father-in-law Ambrose Smith of £40 a year during her life now to be in hand and £40 more a year after the decease of the said Ambrose Smith and his wife according to articles of agreement between him and me upon the marriage of his son to my daughter". (44).

In another will the testator mentioned that,

"upon the entermarrige betweene me and Mary my wife I did enter into coven(a)nt to leave to my sayd wife eighteen pounds yearly during her life after my decease". (45).

It was often only because the testator wished to make certain alternative proposals that such arrangements were mentioned at all. Thus, although the number of wills referring to written marriage settlements are in a minority, the latter may, amongst the wealthiest citizens at least, have been more common than the evidence suggests. Lower down the social scale, however, much must have depended on simple verbal agreements and instead of being promised a specific jointure if she survived her husband, the woman would have had to rely on the Common Law dower of a third. Obviously with so little available evidence it is difficult to ascertain how important financial endogamy was as a criteria for choosing a partner.

But it does seem fair to conclude that, whilst the groom's attractiveness depended as much on his credit and his future prospects, the prospective bride was far more dependent on what her family could actually provide to take with her into the marriage. 46. In consequence, the man may have been far less constrained by the interference of kin, in his choice of a partner.

44. P.R.O., Prob, 11/151/54/447.

45. W.R.O., Consistory Court Wills, Hugh James, 1610.

46. It was far more likely that a son would inherit the bulk of his estate when his parents died rather than being given a substantial portion on marriage and although tokenary bequests, which might indicate pre-mortem inheritance, were occasionally given to married sons, they were certainly not so frequent as in the case of married daughters.
THE AGE OF MARRIAGE

Although it is not intended to consider the demographic implications of the establishment of the household in any depth, the issue cannot be ignored entirely. As recent work has shown the dictates of inheritance meant that throughout much of Western Europe the age of first marriage was generally late. This in turn affected the rate of fertility and of population growth for, by marrying in her late twenties, the woman effectively missed several of the peak years of fertility. It also meant that the generations tended to be formed consecutively rather than concurrently and that the typical household was very unlikely to contain the representatives of more than two generations.

In seventeenth century England the evidence from reconstitution studies suggests that the mean age of first marriage for men was between 27 and 28 and for women between 25 and 26. Given the fact that in an urban environment the establishment of the junior generation was less dependent on the stage which the senior generation had reached in the life-cycle, it might be expected that the average age of marriage in Salisbury would be slightly lower than in a rural community. The size of the population in Salisbury prohibits a detailed reconstitution to test this theory, yet a limited survey can be conducted using the evidence from marriage licences. Inevitably the couples who adopted this slightly more costly procedure, rather than marrying by banns, would have been biased towards the wealthier section of the community. Yet to judge from the occupations

mentioned in the licences issued between 1615 and 1639 the sample was fairly widely based and certainly provides an idea of the age of marriage at the level of the craftsman if not at that of the wage earner.

During the twenty-five year period studied 249 of the Salisbury women mentioned in the licences were marrying for the first time. The mean age of marriage for the group was 24.3, the median 23. For men on the other hand, the mean was 26.3 and the median 25. Although these results are only slightly lower than those obtained in reconstitution studies, the proportion of Salisbury men and women who were over 30 at first marriage is surprisingly low. For the women it was 5.6%, for the men 14.4%, with only a handful over 40. By contrast, in early seventeenth century Shepshed, a Leicestershire village, more than a quarter of all brides and a third of all grooms were over 30, whilst in Terling in Essex, where as a result of the commercialisation of agriculture and the development of wage labour, the age of first marriage was lower than normal, the respective proportions were about a quarter and a sixth.

When the age of both partners is known it appears that almost one in ten were roughly the same age, whilst in nearly a quarter of the cases the bride was the elder. Generally, however, the groom was her senior by almost two and a half years. Although unions between people of very different ages were not unknown; the impression from this source is that most men did choose a partner from their own age group. A different picture emerges however, when documents giving the ages of man and wife at later stages in the life-cycle are used. For example, the average gap between a group of 25 men and women who appeared in the

49. Whereas most licences indicated if a woman was a spinster or a widow, for the grooms one has to assume that those not specifically labelled as widowers were marrying for the first time.

church courts between 1560 and 1640 was four years greater than that obtained from the first sample, whilst the interval between couples mentioned in the poor censuses of 1625 and 1635 was about six years greater. Although these samples are themselves biased towards particular groups and although the ages given are often suspiciously rounded, the contrasting results raise two points. Firstly that the "licence" group was perhaps not so typical of the whole of society as had been hoped, the contrast with the poorer couples in the censuses being particularly marked; and secondly that remarriage, which as we shall see was very common, may have served to widen the gap between the partners. Unfortunately the ages of those people entering a second marriage was rarely given in the marriage licences so it is difficult to test whether there was a substantial increase in the number of unions between people of divergent ages when this is taken into account. It was certainly not unusual to find a widow or widower marrying a much younger partner. But presumably this did not occur often enough to be considered a threat to the balance of marriageable young men and women, for there is no evidence that the uneven marriage aroused any of the antipathy which is occasionally found in rural communities. 51.

MARRIAGE HORIZONS

If the majority of first marriages were between men and women of comparable age did they also involve people from similar backgrounds? According to Lawrence Stone endogamous marriages were particularly important for members of the propertied classes. Nevertheless people of all social

51. Martine Segalen, "Mentalité populaire et Remariage en Europe Occidentale", in J. Dupâquier, op. cit., pp. 73, 74.
strata generally married within a very limited social and geographical range. Such evidence that exists for Salisbury confirms this impression, although the inhabitants possibly drew their partners from a slightly wider geographical area that they would have done in rural community. Between 1615 and 1639, for instance, 409 marriage licences were issued which involved Salisbury people. Just over half the prospective partners came from elsewhere, the groom being the 'outsider' in 130 cases, the bride in 79. 43% of these outsiders came from an area within ten miles of Salisbury and 70% from within 20 miles. Of the more distant ties it is interesting that the majority involved people from West Wiltshire, Dorset and Somerset rather than from the area to the North and the East. A number of those coming from over fifty miles away were from the West Country, although there were also links with London, Nottingham and Suffolk. Possibly in some of the more distant unions there had been a pre-existing link between the two families. Certainly several men applying for licences had originally dwelt in the bride's parish before they came to Salisbury.

Of the men and women who both came from Salisbury roughly two-thirds also belonged to the same parish. Whilst it is generally impossible to make any finer distinction than this the evidence from St. Thomas's suggests that marriages between people living ... within the same street or indeed between close neighbours was fairly common. No doubt some of the links may be coincidental, or at best only between distant kin. Nevertheless, it is significant that just over a quarter (27.0%) of the householders whose marriage can be traced, 421 in all, chose a woman bearing the surname of another householder in the street, or at

52. L. Stone, op. cit., pp. 50-1, 72.

53. It should be emphasised that the place of marriage was not always that of settlement, it being slightly more common to hold the wedding in the girl's parish. Possibly the marriage horizons of those who could not afford to marry by licence may have been rather more restricted.
least in the adjacent area, whilst another 22% chose someone who may have had kin elsewhere in St. Thomas's.\footnote{Infra p. 295. This excludes 54 men who took over or joined an established household. When one of the partners had been married before the likelihood that they had both come from Salisbury was slightly greater. Roughly two-thirds of the Salisbury widows and widowers married a fellow citizen, compared with just under half in the complete sample, and of those a similar proportion came from the same parish.}

Not only should one expect to find many marriages between close neighbours, but the Easter Books also reveal a number of unions between members of the same household. In 1601 for instance, Maurice Greene, the servant of John Baily since 1596, married the latter’s cousin who also resided in the household as a servant. In 1588 Thomas Minterne of the Ditch married his master’s daughter, whilst Henry Pounce’s second wife had been his maid servant for over 9 years. Although a number of examples of marriage to the widow or daughter of a fellow tradesman can be found using both the Easter Book and the Marriage Licences, it is impossible to ascertain the frequency of occupational endogamy. Stone suggests that, amongst the commoner trades, as many as a fifth of all clothiers, tailors, butchers, shoemakers, and sailors married daughters of members of their own occupation. However, such links may have been more common between wealthier tradesmen for, as suggested earlier, inter-marriage was one of the devices which helped to bind together the élite.

Whether one can infer from the large number of unions between fellow occupants or between close neighbours that many men simply opted for the nearest suitable partner or whether it would be truer to say that frequent contact fostered ties of affection is debatable. No doubt examples of both could have been found. It is also worth speculating how far the physical

\footnote{Stone, \textit{op. cit.}, p.50.}
proximity of the couple affected the progress of courtship. The couple who were neighbours may, for instance, have been free to indulge in a relatively unsupervised courtship. On the other hand, those who dwelt some distance apart may only have enjoyed rather formalised meetings in the company of others.

PRE-MARITAL RELATIONS

The relationship between the betrothed couple and, in particular the question of pre-marital sexual activity, is an issue of some importance. Contemporary attitudes towards sex as a part of courtship were decidedly ambivalent. Illegitimacy was understandably frowned upon for, like fornication, it was a challenge to the values of marriage. Moreover, it posed a financial threat as many bastard-bearers could only afford to maintain the child with parish support. If a couple could be considered as man and wife without a church ceremony pre-marital sex could not be condemned outright. Yet neither could society condone an unstable union which, as the number of bastard-bearers who had intended to marry testifies, could easily be terminated leaving an additional charge on the poor rate. Conception outside wedlock also ran counter to contemporary views on the virtues of married life and, in particular, to the idea that the individual should only establish a home and family when he had sufficient resources and credit to do so.

Even though the pregnant bride was unlikely to be a financial burden she might, therefore, meet with a certain amount of hostility, albeit implicit or explicit. Incontinency before marriage could serve to diminish the individual’s reputation and was one of the charges levelled at court witnesses to discredit them. Neighbours obviously took note when a child was born suspiciously early and might raise the issue later when the offender was involved in some other dispute. There
is also evidence of a more overt criticism in the increasing number of presentments for the offence during the early seventeenth century. In St. Edmund's for instance, Ambrose Smith was presented in 1632, "for having a child within four weeks that they were married," whilst a year later George Savage and John Ostler were punished having been "suspected to live incontinently before their marriage." (56.)

Although reprehensible to the more puritanically minded, the number of pre-nuptial conceptions which did occur suggests that sex must have been an acceptable part of courtship for a large section of the community. In St. Thomas's the date of marriage is known for 234 of the couples baptising children between 1570 and 1599. 27 of these (11.5%) may have conceived before marriage, for they baptised an infant within eight months. In St. Edmund's during the same period 36 births out of a total of 220 occurred within eight months (16.4%). In those cases when the protogenesic interval was only a few months it is possible that the marriage was a direct result of the girl becoming pregnant. One girl from St. Martin's who was "greete with child" on her wedding day, had reputedly caused the father to be arrested and thus "forced him to marry her." 56b. But judging from the experience of other women in a similar situation, such expedients were rare. A number of other "premature" births may have been the result of some form of betrothal licence, it having been suggested that conceptions occurring within three months of marriage could reflect a period of toleration after the formal betrothal. 56c.


56a. In some studies 8½ months is taken as a dividing time. This would encompass roughly 15.5% of the first births in St. Thomas's and 20% in St. Edmund's.

56b S.D.R., B.C.D.B., No. 11, fol. 34v.

56c P. Laslett, The World we Have Lost, 1965, p.141.
Some of the best evidence for sex as a part of courtship comes from bastardy cases. Although some women conceived after only one casual encounter, many illegitimations entered in the Bishop's court records were the result of fairly long-standing unions. A minority of the population clearly cared little for convention or for the consequences of their actions - women like Agnes Downe, for instance, who having had one illegitimate child, confessed to incontinency with one Davy, who promised her 12d, and with a Londoner, who gave her 2 shillings. But at least a third of the women presented for illegitimacy claimed to have been promised marriage. Such a woman was Joanna Kirby, with child by her master's son who,

"the sooner to wyn and allure her thereunto (did) p(ro)mysse her marriage and that he would accept and take her to wief so as he might have his pleasure of her". (58).

In similar fashion a widow claimed that Peter Clarke was suitor to her,

"protesting by great oaths that if she would consent unto him and suffer him to have his pleasure of her that he would make her his wife". (59).

Many cases depict the gullible women swayed by false protestations of love. But are they really credible? It is unfortunate that we rarely hear the man's story for their counter claims can be instructive. In the last example, for instance, the reputed father turned the blame towards the woman, claiming that it was by,

"her own seeking and calling him up to her house as he went by her house of purpose to entrapp him".

57. S.D.R., B.C.D.B. No. 6, fol. 64.
58. Ibid., No. 7, fol. 1.
Some offenders possibly used the fiction of a broken promise to incite the pity of the judges. But whether this were the case; whether the woman had been deliberately misled or whether both parties had sincerely intended to marry, is unimportant. The crucial point is that so many people, and the numbers presented for illegitimacy or pre-nuptial pregnancy can only represent a small portion of the total, were prepared to indulge in sexual relations once they had the security of a promise of marriage. Whether there was a point during courtship when relations which may have previously been criticised were suddenly tolerated is however, debatable. It is interesting that 27.8% of the pre-nuptial conceptions noted in St. Edmund's and 25.9% in St. Thomas's fell within the three month interval which Laslett has suggested may be indicative of a period of betrothal licence. Yet it seems unlikely that married people should be presented for "incontinency before marriage" if sex was condoned after betrothal. Certainly few of the bastard-bearers who used the excuse of a broken promise seem to have been "formally" betrothed. Alice Webb said that she and her partner had plighted "eche one to the other their faith and trothe", and Agnes Pannet maintained that she and Thomas Gorman were "contracted between themselves". But it is not clear whether they were ever publically espoused and none of the other cases suggest anything more than vague verbal agreements.

One of the most interesting discussions about attitudes to extra-marital sex is found in Wrightson's and Levine's study of Terling. They have shown that, although bastard-bearers were always more likely to be prosecuted than those who married after conception, 73% of all known cases of pre-nuptial pregnancy were presented between 1620 and 1639 compared with 35% between 1580 and 1599, and 28% between 1600 and 1619. Whilst pre-marital sex may once have been tolerated, they suggest

60. Ibid., No. 2, fol. 34 and B.C.O.B., No. 7, fol. 7v.
that the surge of prosecutions after 1620 is indicative of a rejection of any form of betrothal licence. In response to this growing hostility and to economic changes which helped to stabilise the opportunities for marriage the proportion of pregnant brides fell from a third in the late sixteenth century to 20% during the first half of the seventeenth century and 11% during the second.

Is it possible to determine any changes in the attitude towards pre-marital sex in Salisbury? Possibly it was not such a serious problem there for the proportion of pre-nuptial pregnancies which can be traced in the parish registers is decidedly lower than in Terling. The Salisbury Churchwarden's presentments cover only a short period. However, in the light of the changes noted in Terling, it is perhaps not mere coincidence that, whereas between 1611 and 1630 only three presentments were made for pre-nuptial pregnancy or incontinency before marriage, 28 occurred during the following decade. Official attitudes may not, of course, have always represented those of the community as a whole. The sudden surge in presentments may be indicative of the growing puritan element amongst the city officials, but it reveals little of the reactions an offending couple might expect in their own neighbourhood. It is also worth considering whether the threat of presentment would have been any more effective in curbing pre-marital sex than the informal sanctions operating within society itself.

It has already been mentioned that friends might intervene and demand a couple's intentions if their relations became "unacceptably" close and that neighbours could use the knowledge of a premature birth to attack a woman's good name. It is also clear that signs of excessive familiarity in public or of frequent meetings in suspicious circumstances would rapidly invite comment. Thus one man related how he had observed a man in
the Angel Tavern "making much" of a woman and "drinking often to her and holding her in his lap." Seeing such intimate and familiar passages between them" he asked the cause and was told that the couple were betrothed. Another man, accused of begetting a woman with child, had been noted for "keeping her company late and at unreasonable times in the night." 63.

Some parents and masters obviously tried to minimise the opportunities young people had for being alone together. However, their attempts may not have been very successful. One maid, presented for incontinency in 1616, remarked that her Master had "forbade one Giles Taylor, fish's man, to come to her in suspicious manner". Even so, we learn that "he had sundry times kept her company by reason that they were contracted together as man and wife before god" 64. In another case, in 1632, an apprentice was forbidden to meet a maid, yet he had often visited her and on one occasion was entertained in her mistresse's house" all a night being a suitor. 65. The effects of public opinion and of sanctions imposed by kin and neighbours undoubtedly varied. For many people it was shameful to conceive outside of wedlock. But others, and particularly those from poorer families, cared neither for the opinion of their neighbours nor for the possibility that they might be fined or ordered to do public penance.

64. Ibid., No. 8, fol. 6.
65. Ibid., No. 48, fol. 112v.
THE MARRIED COUPLE

The behaviour of the courting couple undoubtedly merits further investigation, not least because the freedom to choose a partner and the opportunity for intimacy before marriage would have had considerable bearing on the subsequent development of ties between man and wife. By the end of the sixteenth century two ideas prevailed concerning the relationships within the conjugal unit. The first was that marriage should be a companionate union, the second that, within this union, the wife should be the subordinate partner. These views were closely linked with current political and religious ideology. In particular the growth of Protestantism helped foster the idea that marriage was intended for companionship and not, as the Medieval church had emphasised, simply for the purposes of reproduction or to save the individual from the temptations of the flesh. One of the earliest official statements on this theme occurs in the 1549 Prayer Book which referred to "mutual society, help and comfort, that the one ought to have of the other both in prosperity and adversity." By the seventeenth century the idea received increasing publicisation in Domestic Conduct Books in which it was emphasised, that, although it was folly to marry for love alone, affection was something which, in a prudent match, would develop in time.

The Conduct Books also stressed the patriarchal nature of the family, a concept which reflected current ideology about the role of the state.

66. It is not necessary to dwell on the theoretical aspects of marital relations for contemporary ideas on married life have been adequately dealt with in a number of recent works. Apart from the work by Lawrence Stone already cited see also:-
Chilton Latham Powell, English Domestic Relations: 1487-1653, 1917,
Chapters 4 and 6.

The family was frequently spoken of as a "little commonwealth" or a "little church" in which, although the wife had some authority, both she and the children should offer deference and respect to the head. The concluding words of Kate in "The Taming of the Shrew" epitomise this philosophy. As she advised her companions, 

"Thy husband is thy lord, thy life, thy keeper, thy head, thy sovereign, one that cares for thee ..... such duty as the subject oweth to the prince even such a woman oweth to her husband". (68).

Whilst contemporary literature illustrates how the educated public viewed the ideal household and its corollary, the "misshapen house", where "the husband hath made himselfe an underling to his wife", it is difficult to penetrate to the beliefs and expectations of the ordinary man and woman, or to judge how far their relationship was based upon sentiment and subordination. Although the Conduct Books were intended for a wide audience it is debatable how many people ever read them. Even so, it is likely that a number of the ideas they expressed would have filtered down to the mass of the society, albeit through the medium of songs and plays or, in accordance with the order of 1562 that Homilies on marriage be read out regularly in church, via the pulpit.

Besides questioning how familiar the average citizen was with contemporary views on marriage, we need to consider how relevant these ideas would have been. Even a brief survey of court records makes it clear that from the outset many unions were based on affection and common interest. But once married a number of factors mitigated against the development of close ties between man and wife. One of the salient

features of the Early Modern Family was its instability. High mortality meant that for many couples the duration of the marriage was only brief. The hours of work were long and particularly in families where the man worked away from home, the time which the couple could devote to common recreative purposes would have been minimal. They may, in any case, have spent what little spare time they had in very different circles.

THE LEGAL AND ECONOMIC POSITION OF THE MARRIED WOMAN

Before turning to some of the court cases which provide evidence about the personal side of marriage, it is important to understand something of the economic position of the married woman. As one contemporary observed, "the wife is dignified by the husband and not anywaies he by the wife". On marriage she immediately assumed the status of her spouse. She lost her ability to act on her own behalf in court and all the goods which she acquired or bought into the marriage become the property of her husband. Such was the latter's control over his wife's goods that in one dispute it was felt that, although the couple were separated, the chattels in the woman's custody were still vested,

"in her sayd husband who did from tyme to tyme during the lyfe of ye said Margery and his wife dispose of them as he thought good". (73).

In the humbler household graced with few possessions the question of ownership would have mattered little. However, for the wealthier bride

70. Infra, p. 231.

71. Phythian-Adams points out that patriarchy would have been strongest in those families where the latter worked at home. In the wage-earning family the organisation of the household and the raising of children must have been largely the woman's concern.

C.V. Phythian-Adams, op. cit., p.96.


73. P.R.O., C/3/204/77.
there were disadvantages in relinquishing complete control of her  
inheritance. Her spouse could, for instance, alienate her estate and  
leave her ill-provided for if he died. The total incapacity of the  
"femme couvert" to own personal property and to manage an estate met  
with increasing criticism during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries  
and led to a demand that some of the rigid rules concerning her status  
should be modified. 74. Although the Common Law remain unaltered, the  
foundations were gradually laid for married women's property rights in  
the sphere of Equity. The spread of such devices as the contract  
entered into before marriage or the trust, whereby land could be put  
out to trustees for the use of the woman, helped to establish the principle  
that she could hold a separate estate. However, although progress was  
made, it is doubtful whether it benefited any but the members of the  
landed élite.

From testamentary evidence one can gain some impression of the  
attitudes of the urban élite to the married woman and her rights. In  
the treatment of their daughters many testators clearly adhered to  
the principle that her goods should automatically become the property  
of her spouse. A number left land to a son-in-law without mentioning  
his wife, and, although a couple might occasionally share the  
executorship, it was evidently preferable to nominate the husband. 75.
Sometimes it is clear that the portion given to an unmarried girl would  
ever actually fall into her possession. One man left his daughter

74. Maria L.Cioni, "Woman and Law in Elizabethan England with particular  

75. Even when the wife had the administration, her husband was still  
liable for any debts which the estate did not satisfy.
500 marks adding that,

"If Edward Courteys my servant do marry my daughter Annys he is to have at the day of marriage 200 marks, part of the said 500 marks and the residue to be paid him in the next two years".

Moreover, if Annys died or refused to marry him "contrary to my will and consent granted there to and also P(ro)mises made between them bothe", Edward was still to have his 200 marks "so that no refusal of marriage towards her to be made by the said Edward". 76.

However, besides the more conventional wills, there are a few examples dating from the seventeenth or late sixteenth centuries of attempts to circumvent the man's control over his wife's goods. Sibil Fryer, for example, left her two step-daughters £10 each, "desiring it to remain to them and their husbands not to have the disposing of the benefit thereof". 77. Similarly Thomas Barbe gave each of his sisters a cash portion and desired their husbands,

"that they will suffer my said sisters to take it to their own uses and at their owne disposing as tokens of my goodwill between us". (78).

Did these examples represent purely individual arrangements or did they reflect the growing body of opinion in support of women's proprietary rights?

Despite their inability to hold property, seven of the 154 female wills dating from 1500 to 1640 were made by married women. Significantly all seven were written after 1610. However, they did not mark any radical departure from tradition. Three of the women had been nominated as executor by a former husband, a fourth by her parents. Their wills were evidently designed to ensure that the administration of these estates was completed. Thus Mary Sherfield made her second spouse executor


77. P.R.O., Prob. 11/170/19/160.

78. P.R.O., Prob. 11/36/26/195.
in order that he might "have sufficient authority to administer the goods ...... of her late husband and her debts and credits." 79.

Another woman nominated her brother, but specified that the education and disposing of her children should be the responsibility of her second husband. In the other examples the husband was both executor and residuary legatee, whilst any additional bequests were of only a minor nature. Rather than attempting to divert their goods away from him, these women seem to have confirmed the husband's position and two actually specified that they were "acting with his assent."

Although these wills did not question the husband's right to control his wife's chattels they indicate that there were circumstances in which the latter could be considered as a separate entity. This could apply both to an inheritance and the marriage portion. In 1629, for example, Thomas Paul specified that the goods which his wife, "brought w(i)th her vnto me in marriage" were to go "to her owne proper behalfe vse and benefit to be disposed of at her owne will and pleasure and not to be reckon(ed), accompt(e)d, prised and valewe(d) as any parte or parcell of my goods or credits". (81)

Although it was unusual for a woman to be specifically granted free disposal of part of the estate, it was not unknown for a widow to receive intact the goods which she had before she married. In 1616, for example, a schedule was presented in court of the goods of John Barne's widow which were,

81. W.R.O., Subdean Wills, 1620s.
"by her brought unto the deceased at such tyme when as she was married unto him.... the property whereof was never at all altered but allways remayned as the goods of this deponent, and which "after the decease of such John Barnes she took and receaved as her owne proper goods". (82).

Another woman, Florence Davys, took the goods which she had inherited from her first spouse into the house of her second husband,

"and the property of the same goods was not by him the said William in his lief time altered but left by him to her the said Florence again." (83).

Presumably the goods then passed into the hands of her third husband.

What implications did the woman's lack of property rights have? It is significant that at each stage of the life-cycle she was judged according to certain financial criteria. As a spinster her credit depended upon whatever her kin would provide as a marriage portion. During and after couverture it depended on her husband's wealth and ability to provide for her. For the landed classes especially the wife's legal position and the customs governing the transmission of property between man and wife were issues of considerable importance. Yet to consider marriage simply as a property transaction in which, in return for keeping house and bearing children, the woman was given economic protection and accorded social status, is to oversimplify the position and to ignore the fact that, of necessity, many marriages were based on a working partnership.

On the rare occasions when a testator mentioned his wife's qualities it is significant that her role as a partner was obviously important. Thomas Reade left the bulk of his goods to his wife in recognition of the fact that she had, "by her joint care, travell and industry....... supported and augmented mine estate". (84). Another man made a similar bequest saying that his wife "hath ben marryed unto me theise three and twentie yeres and worked when I have played". (85). In looking for a wife the man sought not just

83. Ibid., No. 45, fol. 102.
a companion, but someone capable of helping in the shop, of overseeing the servants and, in poorer households, of taking on independent work to supplement the family budget. During the peak years of childbirth the woman would have had little time to play any role other than that of housewife and mother, a role which should not be underestimated, for domestic tasks such as laundering, preparing food and gathering fuel were often very time consuming and physically taxing. But evidence from Salisbury suggests that at some stage during couverture a large number of women must have engaged in some additional form of employment, whether it meant working independently or helping in the shop.

The degree to which a woman could physically assist her husband would obviously have depended on the nature of his business, and to some extent, on the prosperity of his trade. In the wealthier household she might play a part on the retailing side of the business, but possibly not in heavier activities. Poorer men engaged in petty retail may also have involved their wives. In 1585, for instance, a poor householder named Henry Stocker testified that he "chiefly liveth by selling and vending ale wherein he imploeth his wife". The partnership of husband and wife would have been particularly important in the home of the humbler craftsman who could afford little extra labour. Many of the weavers, shoemakers and tailors noted in St. Thomas's had no residential servants and it is in trades such as these, involving little equipment and demanding skill rather than strength, that female participation is likely to have been most common.

Some evidence of the role of married women in trade can be obtained from guild records. However, in using such records note should be taken of the context in which the various ordinances and minutes were made. Wives may

86. S.D.R., B.C.D.B., No. 9, fol. 189c v.
have been encouraged to work when trade was good and discouraged when conditions were bad. In Bristol, in 1461, for instance, complaints were made of a decline in trade and unemployment amongst the city's weavers. As a result men were ordered not to set their wives, daughters or maids to work either for themselves or any other men. Two years later, however, conditions had obviously improved for women were specifically advised to "help and labour with hir housband for thair boote sustynaunce and thair childryn thair encrease." It is also important, when using guild records, not to confuse social and economic roles. Although some crafts included both brothers and sisters, the latter may only have belonged as social members. The Salisbury Tailor's Guild is a case in point. It originated as a socio-religious guild, rather than simply as a craft fraternity, and in its earliest ordinances women were clearly expected to attend such functions as the annual feast and the funerals of departed brethren. Indeed, periodic references to the Midsummer Feast make it clear that this was something of a family occasion to be attended by each brother with his wife, children and servants. However, in neither these, nor in later ordinances, were women ever mentioned in any economic capacity. Lack of evidence does not of course, imply a complete lack of involvement and several memoranda in the Tailors' Minute Books suggest that women probably did assist in an informal capacity. In 1567, for example, it was agreed that,

"neither Anthony Lambert, his wife, nor any servants shall exercise the craft of furring of any garment other than for their provision". (90),

87. F. B. Bickley, (ed.) The Little Red Book of Bristol, 1, 1900, p. 129.
whilst in 1613 a man who had not served a full apprenticeship was admitted to the guild on charitable grounds, but was ordered to keep "neither servant nor apprentice except his wife." 91. It is unfortunate that similar records do not exist for any other Salisbury crafts and the ledgers of the town corporation make no general statements about married women and trade. There is, in fact, more evidence of the married woman's involvement in casual forms of employment, than of husbands and wives working together or indeed, of married women acting as "femme soles" in the city's more formal crafts.

For the woman from the poorer household, a variety of occupations were available ranging from domestic service and nursing to spinning and huckstering. Domestic service is commonly associated with the period spent living in another household between leaving home and marriage. However, apart from the resident servants about whom most is known, there must have been a substantial number of casual domestics who escape record because they did not actually reside with their employers. Although the group included young, unmarried girls, casual service seems to have been the particular preserve of married women, who wished to supplement the family income, or of widows, who were otherwise unable to support themselves.

Evidence for work of this kind occurs in the Norwich census of the poor dating from 1570. As many as 36 of the wives and 15 of the widows listed in the census (roughly 7% in both cases), were noted for "washing and skouring"; "helping women to wash"; or simply "helping others." 92. These activities were often performed in conjunction with another occupation such as spinning. Laundering may have entailed going "abrode" to work in another household or have necessitated taking in work, as did Agnes Jervis, the wife of a Salisbury tailor.

91. S.C.A., Assembly Book III, 1597-1613, I/246/3; fol. 80 v.
Occasionally a woman was appointed to work in a particular institution. Thus, when William Waterman was made keeper of the workhouse in 1623, his wife was nominated as "laundress and nurse of the house and to be at the stewards command for the cleanly keeping and usage of those in the house".  

Apart from laundresses, casual servants also included daily helps or "charmaids" as they were known. In his "Declaration" about poverty in 1661 John Ivie mentioned women known as "chewers" whose tasks included lighting fires in the morning and washing the children. Although there is no official reference to the subject in Salisbury (possibly because so few Court records survive), evidence from several other towns suggests that these casual servants were frowned upon by the authorities. Ivie pointed out that the Salisbury "chewers" were partly dependent upon parish relief, and it is understandable that there should have been a certain amount of anxiety about the existence of a large body of individuals who existed outside the normal framework of covenanted service and who could easily find themselves without employment or any income other than parish relief.

In Southampton at the end of the sixteenth century presentments ordering women to find themselves permanent employ or to leave the town occurred with regularity. Complaint was actually made in 1579 that,

"theare arr in this towne dyvers young women and maidens w(hi)ch kepe themselves out of s(er)vice and worcke for themselves in dyv(ers) mens houses contrary to the statute w(hi)ch we dess(ire) may be considered of and reformacon thereof to be had". (95).

93. P. Slack, Poverty in Early Stuart Salisbury, p.87.  
94. Ibid., p. 114.  
Elsewhere the attitude may have been more lenient. In Portsmouth for example, a list of wage rates dating from 1612 distinguished between servants paid by the year and those paid by the day. 

Nursing was in many ways even less organised than domestic service, and often entailed no more than one neighbour helping another during a period of illness. Thus when Mrs Boston lay sick "for ix weakes space", her next-door neighbour, the wife of a bottlemaker, attended her daily and was given in return an old cloth gown. In similar fashion one finds examples of willmakers leaving small gifts to "the woman who kept me during my sickness" and of women being temporarily employed by the overseers of the poor to care for the sick. For the younger woman there was always the possibility of earning a little extra money by acting as a wet-nurse. Joan Hewland, a poor woman from St. Martin's, apparently lived "by nursing of children." Another woman was "norse to Henry Parry the naturall son of Henry Parry chancillor when she had had her first child."

Women who normally cared for the sick probably also dealt with the preparation of the corpse. In the inventory and account of Simon Worley, who died in 1627, 6d was set aside for the corpse-bearers and for "the woman that did take paynes about him"; whilst a woman who died in 1610 stipulated that Goodwife Mytten should "wrap my body after my decease in a shrowde made of one of my sheets." In times of plague and other epidemics women were particularly in demand, both as nurses and as searchers of the dead. We know, for instance that the

---

98 Ibid., No. 29, fol. 19 v.
99 Ibid., No. 18, fol. 129.
wives of Francis Burnet and John Guphill were searchers during the outbreaks of plague in 1604 and 1627, the former still employed despite allegations that she had caused a child to be buried alive during the earlier epidemic.

In addition to the women who could be called in an emergency, there were some for whom nursing may have been a more permanent activity. This would include the small group of midwives who appeared in every town, besides those women who became reputed for their skills and would have been turned to whenever particular cures were required. The skilfull nurse derived a certain social standing from her abilities. Something of the respect with which midwives in particular were held can be gauged from an incident in Southampton in 1601 when a man was admitted to the freedom because his wife,

"is of verie good opinion amongst the whole inhabitants and hath manie yeres past bene and yet is comon and chiefe middwife of this Towne and hath taken great paines and honest care in her function as perteyneth". 

Although midwives were supposedly licenced and had generally obtained some elementary training, nursing was still largely dependent on folk remedies rather than on scientific skills and, as the Salisbury Barber-surgeons complained in 1614,

"there are divers women and others within this cittie altogether unskilfull in the Arte of chirurgerie (which) due often tymes take cures on them to the greate danger of the patient!"

Another area of female employment which would have been important for the poorer married woman, and even more so for the widow, was that

of petty retail. Fish-wives, ale-wives and hucksters of bread and a variety of small wares appear in the records of many sixteenth century towns, although it is generally impossible to estimate the numbers involved at any one time. One Salisbury goodwife claimed to be the servant of Goody Penny and her daughter "and doth sell cowheeles for them when she is at home". Other by-products of the butchers' trade were dealt with by the aptly named "pudding wives".

In the early seventeenth century a number of local women were presented for buying faggots in the Market and selling them again"by the penny", whilst in 1638 an ordinance specifically licenced four men and five women to act as coalbearers. Occasionally references occur to women who travelled further afield to sell goods. A spinster named Elisabeth Skeate testified that for eight years she was the servant of Alice Temple of St. Edmund's "who, being a petichapman and selling small wares, she this examine... by her appointment did carry the same pack over the country to sell". Another woman this time the widow of a carrier, sought the approval of the Corporation in 1633 to carry wares from Salisbury to London.

Huckstering was an activity which would have fluctuated according to season and to demand and which may have taken the woman away from home for long periods. The other traditional area of female employment, in the

104. S.D.R., B.C.D.B., No. 11, fol. 49.
105. An ordinance of 1616 mentioned the fact that butchers sold offal to poor women and "pudding wives" who created a nuisance by emptying "those bellies in the rivers (and) in the streets". S.C.A., Corporation Ledger C, fol. 251 v.
textile industry, may have been easier to combine with running a home and family, and thus have been more attractive to the married woman.

There are no references to female weavers in Salisbury, but during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when the town was at its height as a cloth producing centre, spinning had been particularly important. By the sixteenth century, although the slump in the cloth trade must have considerably reduced the amount of work available, a large part of the wool distributed for carding and spinning was still given to women who worked at home for piece rates. In a report to the Wiltshire Quarter Sessions in 1633 reference was made to "ye poorer sort of people who spinne theyr wooll in theyr owne houses", and another report that year mentioned fine yarns "spun by farmers wifes and othe of the better sort" for between 17d and 2s4d the pound, and lower sorts of yarn spun at between 9d and 17d the pound.

Apart from spinning, the occupations traditionally associated with the poor included lacemaking, buttonmaking and knitting. The 1625 poor census gives the names of a number of women who actually taught these crafts to poor children, along with the names of other poor women employed by local clothiers. Of thirty such mistresses, sixteen of whom are known to have been married and five widowed, twenty-two taught lacemaking, four spinning and three knitting. The majority employed only one child, but a few had comparatively large workshops. The wife of Lancelot Russell, for example, taught six children to make lace, whilst Alice Swift had three servants and six apprentices.

---

109. The evidence from Norwich suggests that this was in fact, the most important area of female employment. As many as two-thirds of the married women and widows listed in the Norwich poor census were noted for spinning. By contrast only about 1 in 25 were engaged in retail and 1 in 14 in domestic service.

109a. P.R.O., SP/243/23 & SP/16/267/17. The second report, drawn up with the aim of discrediting the market spinners, may not be totally reliable. Tables of wage rates issued at the Quarter Sessions between 1602 and 1605 suggest that these rates may be rather high, the official rates ranging from 1d to 4d a pound according to the quality of the wool.

The predominance of bonelace-makers amongst the mistresses suggests that this may have been an industry centred principally around the home and run entirely by women. Spinning, on the other hand, was engaged in by both men and women and was normally linked with the activities of large scale clothiers and market spinners. Of the women in the census who were set on work, ten were engaged in spinning, five carding and four knitting. Normally they seem to have been older women like widow Baldwyn who, at 70, span for Thomas Ray, or the wife of John Kengington, a woman of 56. Significantly it was specified that the youngest woman recorded, aged 32, was to be allowed to attend her children. Was it in fact rare for women with very young children to take up such occupations? In several cases, when the children were older, the whole family was engaged in the enterprise. Audrey, the wife of Hugh Eliot, was to spin ten pounds a week with her ten year old daughter. Katherine Crocher and her two daughters span and carded eighteen pounds a week for Bartholomew Tooky and, whilst John Kengington and his wife span, their son trained in the art of quilling.

Even a brief survey reveals how wide a sphere of economic activity was open to the married woman. Although there is little to indicate exactly how many women would have been obliged to work, it is logical to assume that amongst the wage-earning sector at least, it would have been of vital importance for the wife to find employment whenever she could. In Norwich only about 6% of the married women listed in the poor census had no apparent occupation and many of these were either sick or lying in childbed. Moreover, whilst the wealthier woman may not have been obliged to "get her fingers dirty", there is enough incidental evidence to make it clear that she too could play an important part by overseeing the

111. Amongst the poor in Norwich extra employment seems to have been important both for those with young children and for those without.
servants and dealing with customers.

It has been suggested that with industrialisation the opportunities for women to work diminished considerably and their role became increasingly restricted to the home. Deprived of an economic raison d'être the wife's position within the household was reduced to one of complete subordination. This brings us back to the question of the relevance of the advice given in Conduct Books concerning the dutiful and submissive wife. Legal custom meant that, in many ways, the relationship between man and wife was an unequal one. Yet with diverse opportunities to work, either outside the home or in partnership with her spouse, it seems unlikely that the woman would have accepted a completely subordinate role. Many examples reveal the wife acting in anything but a dutiful position and it is apparent that the characters of the individuals involved generally dictated the pattern of relationships within the household rather than anything else. There were, nonetheless, certain accepted social norms and if a couple's behaviour was thought to be too irregular, the informal sanctions which operated within the community helped to ensure that they were kept in check.

THE PERSONAL RELATIONSHIP OF MAN AND WIFE

If the belief that the family should be run on patriarchal lines was of limited relevance in practice, what of the other criteria for the ideal marriage, namely that it should be a companionate union? Apart from letters and diaries, sources restricted to the wealthy and the educated, the evidence concerning the personal side of married life is limited. Wills are one of the few documents to give any insight into individual feelings, but even they only touch the surface of personal sentiment. We can never be sure, for instance, that an expression of concern for the

wife's future welfare was not simply a manifestation of duty, or that the use of endearments was not a matter of rhetoric rather than of genuine affection. Nor is it possible to judge how far practical considerations, such as the testator's wealth, the age of his wife, or the presence of children, may have coloured the individual's decisions.

In a subsequent chapter the testamentary provisions for widows will be discussed in some detail. To conclude the study of the married couple, I intend to concentrate instead on legal evidence and especially on those cases which illustrate some of the tensions which could develop between man and wife. Undoubtedly only the most extreme cases would ever have reached court. Nevertheless, they do indicate the levels of behaviour which were considered acceptable within the context of marriage.

There are enough casual references to brawling and petty violence to indicate that minor quarrels must have been very common. For a man to beat his wife occasionally would not have been questioned. Indeed, according to a number of Conduct Books, chastisement may even have been for the woman's good. However, repeated outbreaks of violence or other forms of cruelty would soon arouse comment and encourage the intervention of friends and neighbours. Thus one man, hearing William Elvar beating his wife in the next room, "arose and did help to parte them". Another stepped in front of his mistress when his master threatened to kick her. Sometimes the intervention was of a more diplomatic nature. In 1596, for

113. In his autobiography, Simon Forman relates how his Master and Mistress were often "at square" together and how on two occasions the former had thrown a pair of tailor's shears at his wife. A. L. Rowse; Simon Forman; Sex & Society in Elizabethan England. 1974, pp. 267-79.
115. Ibid., No. 24, fol. 113.
example, William Wallen's mother tried to "pacify certeyne wiefes and braules" which had occurred between John Raye and his wife, telling the latter "that yf you goo into him I will do what I may to make you and your husband friends". Another man had apparently "much disliked his wife and would have taken away her wedding ring and turned her out of doors had it no been by persuasion of frendes". (117).

In describing domestic quarrels a number of witnesses echoed the ideas of contemporary authors. One of the most graphic cases of cruelty appearing in the Salisbury Courts concerned George Churchouse and his wife. The descriptions of the latter accorded well with the Conduct Book's picture of the ideal wife. As one witness remarked, "she carried herself dutifully and respectfully towards her husband as became an honest wife". He, on the other hand, was a "sottish kind of base spiritted man" who "behaved inhumanely and churlishly... not like a husband to his wife". Besides periodic outbursts of violence - beating Joan when she was with child for instance, or dragging her forcibly out of bed - George suspected every man that came to the house and "abused his wife exceedingly laying diverse asp(erator) tions on her of dishonesty". It was considered unnatural that he should refuse her money, that he should forbid people to visit her and that even "when she was in labour he never came to know therof and never came twenty four hours after she was delivered". One witness obviously shared the contemporary views on the companionate marriage and observed that Joan,

116. Ibid., No. 13, fol. 6.
117. Ibid., No. 29, fol. 14v.
118. Ibid., No. 48, fols. 7, 21-22, 44, 55 v, 58 v, 76-84, 92v.
"has just cause to decline his company and to live from him if she may, for that there is no felicity for any woman to cohabitate w(i)th a man of his disposition."

It is unfortunate that those cases which did reach the courts rarely give any indication of the underlying causes behind the dispute. One can only speculate how poverty, overcrowding, drunkenness, perhaps simply, as in this example, instability of character, would all have helped to exacerbate the tensions which existed between man and wife.

It is significant that public opinion apparently took more note of marital disputes involving infidelity than of those involving cruelty, and that, when the latter was dealt with in court, other factors often initiated the prosecution. Specific cases of adultery were in fact, few in comparison with those for illegitimacy or incontinence. Even so one of the surest ways of diminishing the individual's credit was to suggest that he or she had been unfaithful. True to the double standard or morals, female adultery was regarded more seriously than male. The adulterous wife offended not only by abusing her subordinate position. Her actions also implied that she was deficient as a housewife and mother. Thus we are told that, if Joan Davies were such a woman "she would not take such paynes as she doth for the maintenance of her husband and children." (120).

Whilst infidelity was hinted at in a majority of the defamation cases involving women, the most effective way of slandering a man seems to have been to suggest that he was a cuckold. Being an implicit comment on their authority within the household, many men were clearly sensitive about their

119. In his study of sexual offences in Wiltshire, Martin Ingram suggests that the matter would only have been taken to court in the most blatant cases or in those linked with some other dispute. M. J. Ingram, Thesis, op. cit., p.220 .

wives' reputations. George Churchouse may have been extreme, but he was not alone in having suspicions about his spouse's conduct. Alice Spencer's husband accused her of being "naught together" with a tailor who visited her on business. Another man, alarmed at the rumours concerning his brother and his wife, ordered the couple not to meet and forbade his brother "his house unless he lay in the chamber appointed to him." Whilst some husbands tried to hide their wives' offences others actually revealed them. Thus Alice Silvester recorded how,

"her husband had some mislikinge between her and Richard Reade for evel lyving together and by his meanes and by reason thereof she was (convicted) after Mr. Ticheborne (who) did cause here and said Reade to be punished". Possibly this was one way in which the injured husband could restore his credibility at the head of the household.

THE IRREGULAR MARRIAGE

Although adultery and cruelty were both grounds for legal separation, only rarely did they lead to the breakdown of the marriage. Cases specifically mentioning couples who lived apart are unusual. Yet there are sufficient incidental references to suggest that marriage may not, after all, have been quite so stable. Amongst the poor in particular, there must always have been a small number of women who, for one reason or another, had been deserted. In the Norwich census of the poor this applied to roughly 7% of the wives listed, many being left to cope

121. S.D.R., B.C.O.B., No. 6, fol. 117.

122. The man's mother also intervened because she "misliked" the fact that her second son had initially shared a chamber with the couple and she "caused two beddes to be furnished in a backe chamber of said house and Thomas and his servant to lie there". Such attempts by kinsmen to preserve the credit of their family may have been fairly common. S.D.R., B.C.D.B., No. 6. fol. 18.

123. Ibid., No. 6, fol. 84.
with young children. In Salisbury as many as 5 of the 31 wives in the 1635 Poor Census resided alone, although they may not all have been permanently deserted. Again a feature of the poorer household, it was not unknown for a man to work away from Salisbury or to go elsewhere to serve as a soldier. John Huff, a shereman, related how,

"he hath still conversed and kept company with his wife and children ... ever since his marriage ... except for three months when work was scant he bestowed himself in carrying of acquavite sometimes taking it to Marlborough, Welles, and once to Shrewsbury". (125).

Often such cases only came to note when the woman aroused suspicion by becoming pregnant. One poor woman presented for being with child, claimed that it was her husband's who,

"being ingaged for his father's debts is forced to live from her but doth now and then come home to her in secret and by stealth." (126).

Another confessed that her spouse had been absent for nearly five years,

"saving that he hath kept her company and hath had use of her body on Sunday after Shrovesday last and on Trinity Sunday last and at other times since".

Sunday presumably being the only day when these separated couples could visit each other.

Cases of separation, whether permanent or temporary, were matters of some concern for the authorities. They feared in particular that the deserted woman would be unable to support her family without parish relief. In this context it is significant that Huff added that "during his absence he left his wife and children at Fisherton Anger at his own charge only".

There was also the fear that, if left alone, the woman might be tempted

---

127. Ibid., No. 10, fol. 16.
to commit adultery. Such practical considerations apart, separation was also deemed an offence against the meaning of marriage. Even though relatively few cases ever reached the courts, it is significant that presentments for "living asunder unlawfully" began to appear amongst the Churchwarden's records for the first time in the 1630s. As one entry emphasised, it was "God's law and man's" that a couple should cohabit. Along with those punished for incontinency before marriage, the offenders seem to have been the victims of an increasingly stringent campaign to defend the more puritanical values of marriage.

No doubt one reason for the sparsity of cases dealing with marital breakdown was the fact that marriage was least stable amongst the poorer mobile section of the community. One has only to scan the lists of vagrancy passports to find a number of individuals whose spouses apparently lived elsewhere. However, least we give the impression that marital disputes were confined to the poor, a couple of examples of separation referred to in wills should be mentioned. In 1636 John Saunders, a linen-draper, left his daughter £12 a year, "as long as she shall continue to be the wife of Frances Champion and as long as she shall live assunder and aparte from him", He also intimated that if she was widowed and remarried she should be given a second marriage portion. Parental responsibility did not necessarily cease once the daughter was safely married. In another will Dorothy Wotton referred to the quarrel between her son-in-law and his wife who, to judge from the Easter Books, had been living apart for sometime. She requested that her executor, "take some compassion on my said daughter Ann and not to suffer her to perishe after my decease".

128. S.D.R., Churchwardens Presentments 1612-1639, St. Thomas 1638.

129. Slack, Poverty in Early Stuart Salisbury, pp. 22, 25, 27.

She also emphasised that her son-in-law should not
"reape to himself any manner of benefit or commodities
by my death" for he "hath delt soe unkindly with her
having alreadie had soe great a portion with her and
nothing at all regarding her as he ought to due". (131)

Kinsmen might also intervene to ensure that a separated wife had
adequate maintenance. In the 1570s for example, "there was an
v.n due or vnkindelie mislikinge by sep(ar)acion or living asunder not
vnlik to vnkinde divorce", between Thomas Davys and his wife. Whilst
the former dwelt in Salisbury, the latter stayed in London and, after
the intercession of friends, was allowed £30 a year from her spouse
towards her maintenance. 132. Unfortunately, although the wealthier couple
were more likely to obtain an official settlement than their poorer
counterparts, there is no indication whether, in these particular cases,
the separation had any legal basis.

Some people left home with the specific intention of forming another
union. Others joined up with another partner whilst travelling. Thus
it was noted in a vagrancy passport that, although Richard Barrett was
allegedly travelling in search of his wife, he had apparently persuaded
a Salisbury woman that he would marry her. 133. Whilst specific cases
of bigamy are rare, it is likely that many offenders would have escaped
prosecution. The issue was confused by the uncertain legal position of
those who remarried on the assumption that a missing partner was dead.
The Church opposed remarriage without concrete proof of death. But
according to the Civil Law a woman could remarry if her spouse had been
gone for five years or more, whilst the Common Law stipulated an interval
of seven years.

131. Ibid., 11/119/50/398.
132. P.R.O., C/3/204/77.
133. Paul Slack, Poverty in Early Stuart Salisbury, p.35.
Occasionally a marriage was questioned when a man was suddenly heard of again. In one case Robert White told how,

"after Luke Norton had been absent from this town some two years and upwards it being credibly reported that he was dead, (he) did marry Ursula Norton". (134).

However, some of the witnesses believed that Luke was still living.

Other cases of bigamy were more blatant. In 1581, for instance, Phillip Evans married Elizabeth Symonds,

"to the great offence of all their neighbours abowtes and have eu(er) since lyved together incontinently and adulterouslye contrary to the lawes of god and man". (135.)

Elizabeth's first husband, meanwhile, was reputedly living at Romsey.

Although this union was viewed as a social offence, neighbours could and did turn a blind eye to a number of irregular marriages. Thus it was only when Alice Rhodes was herself a witness in court that the details of her so-called marriages were related. She had apparently been "married" to one Morrell, by whom she had had two children, but had been ordered to leave him "by reason that Baker was first lawfully wedded to her". Notwithstanding, she "hath since again bestowed herself in marriage to one Rhodes", and then ironically, on his death four years later, "receaved again into the company and mutual cohabitation the forenamed Baker and lives with him as her husband". (136).

Alice had lived in St. Martin's for many years and her affairs must have been well known. One can only assume that she was able to live apart from her first husband for so long because she belonged to a poorer neighbourhood in which such irregular unions may have been fairly common.

135. Ibid., No. 8, fol. 128v.
136. Ibid., No. 11, fol. 33v.
The confusions of the law must also explain why so many irregular marriages failed to reach court. The uncertainties concerning spousals meant that some marriages were of dubious validity anyway and might easily be challenged with claims of an earlier contract. Moreover, the ambivalent position of the deserted wife and the problems in establishing the fate of her spouse meant that it was often simpler to ignore a suspicious union.

Whilst a small group cared neither for the fact that they might be prosecuted nor for the condemnation of their neighbours, some people were clearly alarmed by the prospect of an irregular marriage. Such was true in the case of William Fashion. He had married one woman, but left her on discovering that her husband was still living and eventually wedded Ursula Morgan instead. Although the first union was legally invalid, William was anxious that it may still have been spiritually binding. According to his wife he often said that,

"he could not prosper because he had married her whilst his other wife was living and repented him that he left her saying that he and this examine lived wickedly together wishing his own throat cut that ever he left his lawful wife Margaret Saunders". (138).

It is impossible to judge how typical Fashion's views were, but it does seem possible that a superstitious fear of being married "unlawfully" may have acted as an incentive to encourage marriage in church.

In discussing the personal relationship between husband and wife emphasis has been laid on some of the more bizarre and exceptional cases.

137. Ibid., No. 25, fol. 60v.
No doubt quarrels of a far less dramatic nature would have arisen in numerous households. The impoverished and overcrowded conditions in which many people lived could hardly fail to strain the ties within the domestic unit. However, lest the cases described distort the picture, it should be stressed that, for the majority of the population, marriage would have been based, if not on love and close companionship, at least on a tacit affection and a working partnership. Indeed, although "love-matches" were certainly not unknown, the need to find a wife who could bring a reasonable marriage portion and who would be able to help in the shop were clearly crucial considerations for the man who contemplated setting up a household.
CHAPTER IV

THE EXPANSION OF THE HOUSEHOLD
Amongst anthropologists the development of the family has been considered in terms of three distinct stages. The first stage spans the years between marriage and the birth of the last child; the second the years of dispersion as the children themselves married and the third, the period of generational replacement, stretches from the marriage of the last child to the death of the parents. Such a model cannot, however, be adopted without modification when considering the development of the family in the past. It was unusual, for instance, for siblings in the pre-industrial household to progress simultaneously through the period of primary socialisation and to leave home at more or less the same time as they would do in the modern family. Moreover, whilst the latter is generally of limited duration, the household in the past did not necessarily dissolve after the death of the surviving marriage partner but could be perpetuated by the transfer of authority from one generation to the next or from the widow to a second spouse.

Bearing in mind what has been described as the "perennial character" of the historical family, it is simplest to consider the phase between marriage and the death of one of the partners as a whole. For convenience this phase may be described as one of the 'expansion', for after its formation the domestic unit was gradually extended by the appearance of three additional elements, children, servants and, less frequently, kin. Yet in some ways this is a misnomer for, with the possible exception of children and apprentices, these groups rarely stayed in the household for long.

In this chapter I propose to consider the three additional elements in turn. Their fluidity inevitably creates certain problems when considering household structure at fixed points in time. At the date of enumeration it is conceivable that a household which normally contained servants may, for some reason, have appeared with none whilst another, which could normally be described as nuclear, would be listed with a resident kinsman. Throughout most of its development it can be assumed that the structure of the normal household would reflect that of the majority of households at a fixed point in time. However, certain common but short-lived stages in the family-cycle may show up in only a minority of the units in a population listing. Thus, whilst it is unlikely that a static listing will reveal many families extended in an upward direction, a far greater proportion of couples may in fact have given lodging to parents at some point during their careers.

As suggested earlier, in order to avoid the problems of using cross-sectional data we need to adopt a developmental approach by examining household composition in terms of age groups and career profiles. Such an approach enables one to consider whether the non-nuclear components of the household, servants and kin, were more likely to be found at certain stages than others. It also has implications when attempting to explain variations in mean household size. Thus, whilst some historians have stressed the importance of the number of offspring, others suggest that servants were the most significant variable in determining household size.

In some European communities the size of the household was evidently fairly constant and there was a strict balance between its various components. For instance, kin and servants often replaced children rather

than appearing at the same time. With a developmental approach it is possible to see whether there was indeed a correlation between the three elements and also whether mean household size increased with age or whether it responded primarily to socio-economic factors.

CHILDREN AND CHILDHOOD

Besides examining the effect children, servants and kin had on the composition of the household I propose to look at these groups in terms of the individual life-cycle and to consider the relationship between the head of the household and his various dependents. Of all the members of the household children are least well-documented and it is often only a casual reference in a court case which serves to remind us that the Early Modern Town was not, after all, an entirely childless place. Ariès study of childhood has done much to illuminate contemporary attitudes to the young. Yet much remains to be discovered about the physical upbringing of the child; about the care of infants whilst their parents worked and about the involvement of older children in the home and workshop. We also need to establish how far the child's upbringing was maternally dominated and what contact he would have had with kin or with his peers.

Within the household children were a particularly transient element. The nuclear core was certainly not the static unit of modern times, in which father, mother and a fixed number of offspring share a common domestic experience for a period of some 15 to 20 years. Nor was it a particularly close-knit unit for the fluidity of the younger generation

4. L. Berkner, 'The Stem Family', loc. cit.,
helped minimise the development of affective ties. Despite the fact that there was little deliberate family limitation, high mortality and the tendency for children to leave home early helped to ensure the relative numerical stability of the conjugal unit. As Tranter's work on Cardington demonstrates, the household certainly did not expand in direct relation to the wife's fertility for although on average over five children were born to every labouring couple in the village, at a fixed point in time no more than two children would be found residing in each parental household.

Similar comparisons between fertility rates and the size of the average sibling groups are prevented in Salisbury by the incomplete enumeration of the population in the Easter Books. Nevertheless, it is possible to make a number of suggestions based on research elsewhere. So far the most comprehensive estimates of the number of children in the pre-industrial household are those obtained by Peter Laslett. He found that just under three-quarters of all households in his sample of 100 communities contained resident offspring, the mean density for sibling groups being 2.8. Goose's results for early seventeenth century Cambridge are not dissimilar and confirm that, although Laslett's results are based primarily on rural communities, it is unlikely that the situation in an urban environment would have differed markedly. 42.6% of the population in Laslett's communities were categorised as "children". But this definition is made irrespective of age and the actual proportion below communicable age omitted from the Easter Books was probably closer

8. Goose found that 40.19% of the total population was composed of children and that 74.16% of all households contained offspring with an average of 2.3 children in each. The lower mean may reflect the fact that his four parishes were drawn from the poorer part of the town.
to a third.9

The results from a number of studies suggest that there was some
correlation between wealth and the number of children in a household.
In Cambridge, for instance, there was an average of 4.67 children in
the homes of the gentry and 2.57 in the homes of merchants and retailers.
By contrast, the labouring household contained only 1.95 children. In
Coventry a century earlier, a merchant was likely to have 2.5 children,
a labourer no more than $1.7^{10}$. Although individual factors must
have played a part, it seems likely that the uneven distribution of
children would have been caused primarily by variations in infant
mortality rates and in the age at which children were sent out to work,
the likelihood that the child would survive infancy and the age of leaving
home both decreasing as one descends the social hierarchy. On this
assumption it seems logical to focus our attention on the two poles
of childhood, namely birth and the less ritualistic, but equally critical,
phase of leaving home.

**CHILDBIRTH: THE DEMOGRAPHIC ASPECTS**

Demographic studies emphasise that there was generally little
delay before a couple started to produce a family. It has already
been pointed out that perhaps as many as one in five couples conceived
their first child out of wedlock and Dr. Eversley suggests that in the
Early Modern period, the interval between marriage and the birth of
the first child was normally between 15 and 18 months, with intervals


10. The Coventry results are notably lower than the English standard
for demographic crisis had had a severe impact on the ability of society
Given the differences between social groups we should possibly expect
some variation in the density of sibling groups between the market
area and the back streets in St. Thomas's.
of 23 to 26 months thereafter.¹¹ In St. Thomas's where the date of marriage is known for 234 of the families baptising children between 1570 and 1599, there was a mean interval of 21 months and a median of 15 between marriage and the baptism of the first child. In St. Edmund's during the same period the mean was almost 22 months, whilst in the 1620s it was nearly 23 months with a median in both periods of 16.5. These results are comparatively high and the means in particular, may be inflated by under-registration. In St. Thomas's an attempt was made to establish a more complete sample by taking into account those children who apparently escaped baptism but can nonetheless be traced using the burial register or a register of churchings known as the Chrysom Book.¹² Even so the intervals are still greater than in Colyton between 1550 and 1640 where the mean protogenetic interval was only 11.3 months, or in Terling between 1570 and 1724 where it was 14.9 months.¹³ In another urban study, that of Petersfield in Hampshire, the results are also higher than those obtained for various rural communities, although slightly lower than those for Salisbury. Between 1570 and 1639, for example, the mean protogenetic interval was 17.0 months. However, the interval fluctuated from one decade to the next and during the 30 years after 1570, the period covered for Salisbury, was at its highest at 19.7.¹⁴

It is not our purpose to discuss in any detail the demographic significances of these birth intervals or the possible reasons why...


The fact that couples baptising a child in another parish have not been traced will also inflate the mean.

they might vary from place to place or from time to time. For such a discussion we should obviously need to cover a wider time-span and to consider the situation in comparable towns. The Salisbury results may be unreliable. Even so, they still serve to emphasise how rapidly the financial burdens of the newly-wedded couple would be increased by the addition of an extra member to the household, for at least a third of all couples in the town apparently produced a child within the space of a year. Although the evidence is limited it is possible that the poorer the couple the sooner the appearance of children. In the 1620s when occupations were given in the St. Edmund's register, it is interesting to note that the lowest birth intervals were often linked with some of the humbler groups such as weavers, tailors and labourers. Although it has not been possible to establish whether the age of marriage or the number of pre-nuptial pregnancies were similarly correlated, this has certain implications when considering the variations in the size of sibling groups according to social category.

Whilst our prime concern is to consider the number of children likely to reside in each household at any one time, brief mention should be made of the average number of offspring actually produced per couple. The typical seventeenth century woman, to judge from the results in a reconstitution study in Shepshed, Leicestershire, had 3.66 births (0.04 before marriage and 3.62 afterwards). Fertility depended to some extent on the age of marriage. Thus, whereas the average woman from Colyton who married before the age of 24, bore 7.3 children before she was

15. In St. Thomas's 37.2% of the women gave birth within 12 months and 68.8% within 2 years. In St. Edmund's the respective proportions were 35.5% and 64.1%. In Terling, by contrast 80% of all first births occurred within 2 years of marriage. It is interesting to note that in 39 cases where the husband or wife had been married before the protogenetic interval was marginally lower than that for the complete sample, the mean being 20.5 months, the median 12.0.

her fellows marrying between 25 and 29 or between 30 and 39, bore 5.7 and 2.7 children respectively.\textsuperscript{17}

Turning back to Salisbury we have to depend on the results from a less sophisticated analysis. If, for instance, the crude aggregates for births and marriages are used, it appears that for every union solemnised between 1570 and 1639, 2.77 children were baptised in St. Thomas's, whilst in St. Edmund's and St. Martin's the rate was slightly lower.\textsuperscript{18} However, allowance should be made for the under-registration of perhaps a tenth of births and for the fact that the samples include all couples irrespective of whether they were childless or, because of death, did not 'complete' their family.\textsuperscript{19} An average of between 3.5 and 4 children may therefore, be more realistic.

Possibly only two-thirds or, during periods of particularly adverse conditions, only half, of the children born in an Early Modern community would actually survive to replace their parents.\textsuperscript{20} It has been estimated that, between 1566 and 1621, the normal expectation of life at birth was about 38 years, the child being particularly vulnerable during the first year of life.\textsuperscript{21} Reconstitution studies have revealed that infant mortality rates of over 120 per 1000 were common. In Terling, for example, the rate between 1538 and 1725 was 131 per 1000; in Colyton

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{17} E.A. Wrigley, 'Family Limitation', \textit{loc. cit.}, p.97.
\bibitem{18} In St. Edmund's, where the registers are only complete for seven of the decades between 1500 and 1639, the rate was 2.35. In St. Martin's where only 50 years can be analysed, it was 2.49. Allowance should possibly be made for a time-lag between marriage and conception. However, if besides dividing the number of marriages into the number of baptisms for the same decades, the baptisms for the following decade are used the results are not substantially different.
\bibitem{19} See Appendix Three.
\bibitem{20} In late sixteenth century Petersfield well over half the children born never reached child-bearing age. J.R. Taylor, \textit{op. cit.}, p.528.
\bibitem{21} Wrigley and Schofield, \textit{op. cit.} pp.230, 234. This was actually a period of relatively high life-expectancy compared with the remainder of the seventeenth century.
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between 1538 and 1599 it was 145 per 1000.\(^{22}\). In a town, where sanitary conditions were decidedly more hazardous than in the countryside, the chances of death during the first year of life were even higher although, as Finlay has demonstrated, there could be considerable variation between one urban parish and another. In some of the poorer riverside parishes in London, for instance, the infant mortality rates actually exceeded 200 per 1000.\(^{23}\).

In St. Thomas's the burial statistics should be treated with as much caution as those concerning baptisms.\(^{24}\). However, by using the combined evidence from the two registers and the names of the newly-delivered mothers' recorded in the Chrysom Book it appears that during the 1580s, a decade of fairly unexceptional adult mortality, the infant mortality rate may have been as high as 160 per 1000, with at least 84 per 1000 dying within a month of birth. Given the wealth bias in St. Thomas's it is conceivable that conditions for young children would have been even less favourable in the other two parishes.

Without a detailed reconstitution of society we can do little more than touch on some of the more important demographic aspects of childbirth. For some ten to fifteen years many women would have been regularly incapacitated by pregnancies.\(^{25}\). William Clarke's wife for

---

\(^{22}\) Wrighton & Levine, \textit{op. cit.}, p.57; Wrigley, 'Family Limitation'; \textit{loc.cit.}, p.99.

The combined results from twelve reconstitution studies give rates of 143 per 1000 males and 127 per 1000 females between 1550 and 1599, and 142 and 123 per 1000 during the next 50 years. Wrigley & Schofield, \textit{op.cit.}, p.249.


\(^{24}\) See Appendix Three.

\(^{25}\) For 322 Petersfield families between 1570 and 1639 the average childbearing period was 9.4 years. J.R. Taylor, \textit{op.cit.}, p.513.
instance, had eight children between her marriage in January 1577 and June 1586, and Robert Bames' wife seven between 1586 and 1599, that is roughly one birth every 17 to 20 months respectively. Obviously not all pregnancies resulted in live births and whilst over one in ten children died during infancy, a similar proportion would probably have died between the ages of one and fifteen. Thus, it is not surprising to find that four of Clarke's children and three of Bames' died before the childbearing period was ended.

Despite fairly frequent conceptions the high level of child mortality meant that after the first few births the household would no longer increase progressively in size, but would expand and contract in response to the fluidity of the younger generation. Houses containing large sibling groups were not unknown in Salisbury. Between 1584 and 1599 for instance, Renold Beckham baptised as many as thirteen children of whom ten were still alive by his death in 1613. But overall the average sibling group would probably not have been much larger than the English Standard of 2.8. For most of the first decade of married life the majority of households would have contained at least one suckling child. Thereafter, until the last child left home - possibly over 20 years after the family first began to expand - it is likely that there would always have been one or two older children present who could contribute in some way towards the running of the home.

THE RITUAL OF CHILDBIRTH

Before turning to the age of leaving home, another important factor in determining the size of the household, brief consideration should be given

26. In Terling 741 in every 1000 babies survived to the age of 15. In Bottesford, another Midland village, the rate was 715 per 1000 and in Colyton 700 per 1000. Wrightson and Levine, op.cit., p.57.
to the two major rituals accompanying childbirth, baptism and churching.

During the sixteenth century baptism was usually celebrated fairly soon after birth, although in later centuries delays of several weeks might ensue. The Edwardian Prayer Books stipulated that parents

"defer not the Baptisme of Infants any longer than the Sunday or other Holy Day next after the child be borne". 27.

Those who delayed could be punished in the ecclesiastical courts, although it was not until the 1630s that presentments for deferring baptism until the wife's churching began to appear in any number in Salisbury. 28. Even though few offenders would ever have been punished, it seems likely that most parents did adhere to the principle of early baptism. Quite apart from any legal requirements this was felt to be in the child's best interests. Before the Reformation it was accepted that the unbaptised infant would be doomed to purgatory and in some places the ceremony was deemed necessary if the baby was to survive at all. 29. The superstitions surrounding baptism must have been enhanced by the ritualistic aspects of the ceremony. To commemorate its entry into the spiritual community the child, bound with a chrisom cloth, was signed with the cross and, before the Reformation, exorcised. Its entry into the physical community was sponsored by the attendance of gift-bearing god-parents, after whom the baby was often named. Kinsmen, and grandparents in particular were often appointed. So too were wealthy neighbours or fellow craftsmen who might be able to aid the child's progress in the later life. 30.


28. Although the number of known offenders is too small to make generalisations, the merging of the two rites may betoken a decline in their individual significance.


30. Evidence gained from the study of 152 wills mentioning godchildren, 1500 to 1639.
Although the child's mother may have been unable to attend the baptism, roughly a month after giving birth she went to church for a thanksgiving. To judge from the dates given in the two St. Thomas registers this could fall anywhere between 9 and 38 days after baptism, although normally it was three to four weeks later, (the mean interval from a random sample of 136 cases being 24.2 days). The regularity of this interval suggests that between birth and baptism was also fairly constant and that if churching was normally delayed until "a month of days had passed", then in most cases the latter would have been no more than a few days after birth.

Whilst baptism was the rite of passage introducing the new-born child, churching was the ceremony which recognised the woman's new role as a mother. Numerous superstitions surrounded the ceremony. At its most extreme it represented the end of a period of ritual seclusion during which time sexual relations were forbidden, and the woman was not supposed to leave home or to look at the earth or the sky. Some even believed that a woman dying before churching should be refused Christian burial. Puritanical opinion opposed the mystical elements of the ceremony and, in particular, the notion that it formed a rite of purification. The established church also emphasised that it was simply a service of thanksgiving. Nevertheless, it is significant that a number of entries in the Chrysom Book still referred to women who had been "purified" rather than churched. It is also notable that items such as the white kerchief which the woman wore to church and childbed sheets, 

31. Every fifth entry was used.
32. K. Thomas, op.cit., p.42.
both attacked by the puritans as unnecessarily stylised adjuncts of childbirth, were held in esteem by many people and, to judge from occasional references to them in wills, obviously had a special place amongst the household linen.

The superstitious elements of the ceremony had an undoubted appeal. Yet for many women churching represented little more than an opportunity to meet and celebrate with their peers. The sick could be churched at home, but it was generally a public occasion for the newly-delivered mother, her friends and the local midwives. After giving thanks she made an offering to the church and paid for the chrisom cloth. The former varied from ½d to one shilling in Salisbury, whilst the latter was normally about 6d. Elsewhere fixed rates were levied. In the registers of St. Michael-le-Belfry in York, for instance, it was noted that,

"ther is due at the churcning of every woman a crysome and a peny yf the childe be then lyvinge and if the childe be deade, then but a peny". 34.

In Leicester an act for the relief of the poor in 1568 stipulated that certain contributions towards the poor were due at weddings and churchings. Every member of the 'Twenty-Four' was to pay 2s 4d when his wife was churched, whilst members of the "Forty-eight" were to give 16d, "commoners of the best sort" 8d, and of the "second sort" 4d. It also stipulated that,

"for the eschuynge of the superfluous charge and excesse of the inhabitantes ...... that there shal be no feastes maide at any churchings within the said towne savinge only one comptent messe of meate provided for gossips and mydwyves" 35.

33. See for instance the will of Margaret Bower, P.R.O., Prob, 11/115/48/357, 1609 and the inventory of Thomas Holmes, Sub-Dean Wills, 1614 which included "one bearing sheet" and "one churching kercher of lawne".

34. D.M. Palliser, Tudor York, 1979, p.120.

Although there is no mention in the Salisbury records of feasting it seems likely that, in common with other rites of passage, churching would have been an occasion for some form of commensality, albeit restricted to women.

Although marriage in church was far from universal, in view of the superstitions associated with them, and especially the idea that an unbaptised child would not prosper or that the unchurched woman was unclean, it is possible that baptism and churching would have been more rigorously upheld. Nevertheless, both inspired a certain amount of opposition. From 1600 onwards there was always a small group who refused to have their children baptised. In St. Thomas's for instance, Abraham Cade and his wife, noted as Anabaptists, were presented at regular intervals for deferring the baptism of their offspring. One of the most heterodoxical outbursts against baptism was actually made by the curate of St. Martin's who claimed that,

"there was noe place of scripture in expresse words for the baptising of children but for the circumcision of them only".37.

Amongst those reported for disobeying "the order of the book of common prayer p(re)siped for thanksgiving of women after childbirth" were Thomas Baslyn who claimed in 1584 "that yt was superstition" and, four year later, that, "puryfieing of women is a Juyish cerymonie".38. Apart from those who condemned the ceremony outright there were also occasional outbursts against some of its more superstitious elements such as wearing a kerchief.39.

37. S.D.R., B.C.O.B., No. II, fol, 128. This appears to be the only reference to the rite of circumcision in the Salisbury records.
38. Ibid., No. I, fol,12v and H.M.C. Var. Coll. VI, 1901, p.69.
39. A witness in one state trial referred to the wife of a Salisbury councillor who "would not weare a kerchief when she was churched", P.R.O., S.P./16/183/58.
The number of people presented was never large and, like Baslyn and Cade, they presumably represented only the more persistent offenders. Certainly comparison between the Baptism and the Churching registers reveals few people who failed to conform more than once. Error or death rather than outright hostility to the rites of the established church probably accounted for the majority of omissions. It is unfortunate that the Chrysom Book stops in 1592 for there are signs of a relative decline in the number of churchings. Between 1575 and 1579, for instance, 88.6% of all births can be linked with an entry in the Chrysom Book, between 1580 and 1584, 92.5%. During the next five years however, the level dropped to 74.5%. Was this mere chance or is it possible, that, as the puritans became more influential, the numbers failing to give thanks would have increased? It is important to remember that this was in many ways an era of transition. By the mid-seventeenth century birth was no less hazardous for mother and child than it had been a century earlier. Yet whilst some of the superstitions of pre-Reformation days lingered on into the seventeenth century, the ritualism associated with childbirth gradually diminished in importance. The mother-to-be would have had to turn to more individualistic superstitions to find the psychological props she needed to cope with the traumas of birth.

FROM CHILDHOOD TO LEAVING HOME

The dearth of evidence for the years between infancy and adolescence forces us to turn somewhat peremptorily from the birth of the child to the time when he or she left home. We can do little but speculate about the child's development during the intervening years. No doubt the wealthiest citizen would ensure that his children, or at least his sons, had some form of rudimentary education. The children of the civic élite
may have been sent away to school, or very exceptionally, have been taught by a private tutor. Lower down the social-scale there were limited facilities to attend the Free School in the Close, supposedly open to any "fit boy" or the Town Free School held in the George. 40. In 1632 it was stipulated that free-citizens were to pay 2s 6d whilst the poor could send their sons to the latter free of charge. 41. However, it is debatable whether many would have made use of this facility. Besides the grammar schools there were a number of petty schools run by women. Some were licenced, like Dorothy Langford "to teache children to reade the englishe tongue and to instrucce them in the skill of needle worke". 42. Others were run unofficially by non-conformists, such as Abraham Cade's wife, who were periodically presented in court.

The number of children, and especially of girls, who received any education must have been minimal. Not only were facilities limited, but many children would have been obliged to work from an early age. Positive evidence concerning child labour is devoted mainly to the poor. In 1626, as part of the Corporation's attempt to alleviate poverty, it was ordered that,

"no child be suffered to beg but that all the children of the poor that are not able to relieve them be set to sewing, knitting, bonelace making, spinning of woollen or linen yarn, pinmaking, cardmaking, spooling, buttonmaking or some other handiwork". 44. The age at which it was thought suitable to start training children seems to have been about six or seven. An ordinance made a year earlier stated that clothiers and spinners were to declare how many children of seven and over they could set on work, whilst in the two

40. The school in the Close was of medieval origins, but had been refounded in 1540. The Town school originated when the mayor and Commonalty were given the supervision of an establishment founded out of chantry revenues in 1569. D.H. Robertson, Sarum Close, 1969 edn., p.123, V.C.H., Wilts., V, 1957, pp.349,357 & VI, 1962, pp.77, 100.
42. D.H. Robertson, op. cit., p.164.
43. S.D.R., Churchwarden's Presentments, 1612 - 1639, St. Thomas, 1630.
44. P. Slack, Poverty in Early Stuart Salisbury, p. 89.
poor censuses there are several examples of children of six or even
younger being given work. Whilst training may, in some cases,
have entailed leaving home, most of the younger children probably still
dwelt at home. Certainly one of the ordinances initiating the scheme
stated that 6d was to be allowed for the maintenance of each child
and they were to board and lodge with their parents.

Although child labour was only organised when the pressure of
poverty forced urban authorities to find masters for the poor, most
children from poorer families would probably have undertaken some form
of work long before leaving home. At the craftsman level, where
home and workshop were closely linked, it also seems likely that
children would have run errands for their parents, although we can only
speculate how soon it would be before they could make a positive
contribution to the workshop.

To establish how long children worked at home or indeed at what
age they were considered fit to leave home is difficult. The oft-cited
comment of an Italian visitor that, between the ages of seven and nine
children were put out "to hard service in the houses of other people",
was certainly applicable in some families. However, population listings
show that a number of youths of 20 and upwards continued to dwell in the
parental home. The situation varied from one family to the next, as it
did in the eyes of the authorities. According to the workhouse
ordinances of 1640 children were to be placed with masters "as they
growe able and of fittynge years", but significantly boys were not to

46. Ibid., fol. 313v.
47. Sometimes they may even have formed the principal wage-earner in the
family. In Norwich one of the householders listed in the poor census
had a child of "14 years that knytt gret hose by whome come theyr cheyfe
lyveinge". (J.F. Pound, op.cit., p.55) In the Salisbury census of 1635
in 8 of the 38 homes containing children in St. Edmunds and St. Thomas's
a child was apparently the main, if not the only wage earner.
remain in the house beyond the age of 16, nor girls after 15. In
the 1625 poor census a number of children were designated as suitable
to be put out to service. John Morgan's eldest son of twelve was
thus deemed "fit to be apprentice", whilst the fourteen year old
son of William Thringe was "fit for an apprentice and the maid
of eleven, to be placed". Testamentary evidence suggests that there
was also considerable variation in the age of leaving home at the
upper end of society. William Creed's wife was to keep her two sons
until the younger had reached fourteen; John Sampson's wife to bring
up her daughters "untill they shall accomplish thaire ages of
16 yeares", whilst William Goodridge's sons were to be educated at
home until 21.

Several other studies emphasise the problems of trying to
establish an age by which most children would normally have left home.
Using data from six communities, Laslett estimated that whereas
5% of all boys and 4% of all girls aged between 10 and 14 were in
service, the respective proportions for those aged 15 to 19 were
35% and 27%, and for those aged 20 and 24, 15% and 40%. Although
the tendency for boys to leave home first is reflected elsewhere,
the situation varied considerably from one community to another.
In late sixteenth century Ealing roughly three-quarters of the boys
and half of the girls between 15 and 24 were in service. Almost
a century later over half the children aged 15 and over in Swindon
still resided with their parents, whilst in Cardington in 1782 the
proportion was no more than a third.

51. P. Laslett, Family Life, p.34.
52. Ibid; p.44.
53. R. Wall, "The Age at Leaving Home", Jnl. Family History, Vol. 3,
To explain these variations we need to look at the economic structure of the settlements in question. Customary inheritance procedures and the opportunities available for the child to work at home or in a stranger's household, would have helped determine the age at which a child left home. In Cardington, for instance, many girls who might otherwise have gone out to service, were occupied in the flourishing domestic lacemaking industry. The number of dependents and the survival of the parents would also have been important determinants. Children may have been more inclined to stay with a widowed mother than with a couple. On the other hand parental deprivation may have precipitated entry into service.

It was suggested earlier that variations in the size of sibling groups may have been exacerbated by a tendency for poorer children to leave home earlier than normal. However, as Richard Wall points out, older children were not necessarily more numerous in the homes of the gentry. Thus, whilst in late seventeenth century Swindon the proportion of those aged 15 and over who still dwelt at home was 71% amongst the local tradesmen and craftsmen, and 42% amongst the labourers, the respective proportion for the gentry was only 18%. There is little to reveal when the children of the Salisbury élite normally left home, although occasional references to children residing with grandparents suggests one reason why the third figure should be so low. However, it is possible to affirm that the children of the poor began their working career somewhat earlier than normal by examining the poor census of 1635.

Besides naming each householder on relief, the census lists children and in some cases, their respective ages and the details of any work they did. The St. Edmund's list names each individual child. In St.
Thomas's names are not normally given, although there is some indication of age. In St. Martin's the clerk simply indicated how many children there were in each family. Bearing in mind the mean size of sibling groups in the labouring household in Cambridge and Coventry, it is surprising to find that in the homes of those on relief in St. Edmund's and St. Thomas's the mean sibling density was as high as 3.03, whilst in St. Martin's it was 2.64. The census also includes those householders in St. Martin's who were considered to be poor but were not actually in receipt of alms. The sibling density for this group was 2.26.

Although these results are unusually high the proportion of householders with offspring was actually far lower than one would expect in society as a whole. Just over half the men (57.5%) and a quarter of the women (25.6%) on relief were recorded with children. The proportions for the second group, those just above the poverty line, meanwhile, were more akin to the English Standard, namely 71.1% and 40.4%. As many of those on relief were elderly the large number of childless homes is not surprising. But how can the large sibling groups in the remaining households be accounted for? Were these families forced below the poverty line because they had so many mouths to feed? Or, contrary to what was said earlier, was it sometimes more expedient for children to remain at home and supplement the family income than to go into service?

An examination of the distribution of children over the age of 14 makes it clear that the second suggestion should be discounted. 89.5%

54. Supra, p. 146.
55. Slack estimates that those on relief would have formed about 5% of the total population, whilst perhaps as many as a third could be described as poor. P. Slack, Poverty and Politics, p.176.
56. In a period of high unemployment to remain at home may, of course, have been the only alternative for many children.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households Containing Children:</th>
<th>Ealing 1599</th>
<th>Households on Relief in St. Edmund's and St. Thomas's in 1635 Headed by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 14 years old</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households With Children</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% All Households</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the two-generational households in St. Edmund's and St. Thomas's contained offspring below 14, a proportion higher than that obtained for Ealing in 1599, namely 81%. But as Table 4:1 illustrates, the proportions of households in the two communities containing children over the ages of 14, 16 and 20 become progressively divergent. The two communities were dissimilar in character and perhaps not entirely meet for comparison. Yet there is little sign that children in Ealing remained at home longer than normal. Indeed the proportion of youngsters over 14 who were in service was considerably higher than in a number of other communities. It does, therefore seem reasonable to assert that there was a positive correlation between poverty and child-mobility.

CHILDREN IN ST. THOMAS'S

The process of leaving home was a gradual one, some children going into service several years before they reached communicable age, others remaining at home until they married. In any community we should, nevertheless, expect only a minority of households to contain houseing children, although whether the proportion should be as low as that obtained in St. Thomas's is questionable. The annual figures may not be reliable, for offspring were not always specifically labelled and in some years were possibly omitted altogether if their parents paid for them. However, some of the omissions can be picked up by considering the number of individual householders with single children. Of the 1289 individual men who appeared between 1582 and 1607, no more than 72 (5.6%) were

57. Being predominantly rural in character, the servants in Ealing were often engaged in husbandry.

58. Supra, p.151.

59. Supra, p.11. The annual results fluctuated from under 1% to 9%. Even allowing for the fact that people with the same surname as the head may be offspring, the maximum annual total is only 11%.
recorded with unmarried, houseling children. At 14.5% the proportion of widows in this category was slightly higher, but even this brings the total to little more than one in every 14 householders. 60.

The relative scarcity of resident, adult off-spring in St. Thomas's is highlighted by the results for Ealing where 21.4% of all households contained children of 16 and over, the age by which most children would presumably have reached spiritual maturity, and 32.1% children over 14. The registration of children in St. Thomas's may be inadequate, but it does raise the question whether adolescents left home earlier in a town than they did in a rural community.

Having established that wealth probably had some effect on the age of leaving home, it seems inevitable to ask whether fewer houses in the backstreets contained offspring of communicable age than those in the market streets. However, as Table 4:2 illustrates, it was neither the former nor the latter which predominated in this respect but streets such as Crane Street, Fisherton Street and the Close Gate. 61. Moreover, the proportion of male householders with children who were officeholders or subsidy men is only marginally higher than was true for the community as a whole. 62.

The material it has been possible to amass concerning children raises far more questions that it answers. In particular it emphasises the need

60. Inclusion of those with the same surname brings the total to just under one in ten. However, as many of these were labelled as servants it is quite likely that some were not children, but more distant kin.

61. The evidence is insufficient to determine whether there was any occupational bias. Possibly amongst a group such as the Butchers it may have been common for sons to return and assist in what was particularly heavy work rather than becoming apprenticed elsewhere.

62. 8.3% held office, for example, compared to 6.3% overall. At least a third of the families in question, and possibly, over half if we discount the householders appearing in only one book, had several children who remained at home beyond communicable age. Were these families wealthier than average or did particular circumstances encourage them to stay at home longer than normal?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>MALE HOUSEHOLDERS</th>
<th>FEMALE HOUSEHOLDERS</th>
<th>ALL HOUSEHOLDERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>With Offspring</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ditch</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bower's Chequer</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatmeal Row</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher Row</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Row</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricket's Corner</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Street</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. High Street</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. High Street</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Gate</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Street</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Catherine St.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Catherine St.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Chequer</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lion Chequer</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. New Street</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. New Street</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Churchyard</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under The Churchyard</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to study, not merely the general distribution of children in society but, where possible, to examine the distribution of specific age groups and to consider how the numbers in each household fluctuated according to the different phases of its development. We also need to question the assertion that children were not, in fact, the most crucial determinant of household size. This assertion rests on the belief that during the Early Modern period servants were taken on to replace children as they left home. Thus, the more servants in the household the fewer children. One of the best examples of the reciprocal link between the two is that described by Berkner. In the Austrian stem-family the balance between the need for a constant labour force and the availability of a fixed space for lodging meant that the size of the household changed little over time. Although the number of servants increased in relation to wealth, they were more likely to be found in households with few or no children or in those where the latter were not yet old enough to work.

In an urban community, where there was less need for a fixed labour force, we should not expect to find such a rigid pattern. With an incomplete census it is difficult to test whether the size of the household remained constant over time. However, on the assumption that the presence of older children would diminish the need for additional labour, it is possible to examine whether those households with children contained fewer servants than normal. The results for the three years when both categories were best enumerated, 1585, 1593 and 1594, were used for this exercise. As Table 4:3 illustrates, in all three years the male householders in question had slightly fewer servants than normal. However, the reverse was true in the case of female

63. L. Berkner, 'The Stem Family', loc. cit., p.413.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1585</th>
<th>1593</th>
<th>1594</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householders</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Householders with Single Offspring</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householders</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Householders with Single Offspring</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A = The % of the total number of households in each sample with servants.
B = The average number of servants per household.)
householders. The reciprocal relationship seems to have been strongest between male servants and sons. As, the latter were sometimes labelled as servants, it seems likely that those who remained at home beyond communicable age were actually being trained by their fathers. In female-headed households, however, the women lodging sons were more likely to have an additional male labour force than normal. In such cases an older son may have deliberately returned home in order to help his mother run the workshop.

Whilst the results give weight to the idea that there was some form of reciprocal link between children and servants they should not be over-stressed. There is certainly a logic in the suggestion that the departure of a child left room for additional labour. Yet, as we shall discuss later, it is possible that servants were particularly important at the beginning of the life-cycle and that the need for extra labour may actually have diminished by the time the children were ready to leave home. Moreover the distribution of servants was probably affected by wealth more than any else. This is made clear by the lack of any obvious correlation between those streets with comparatively few children and those where servant-keeping households were in the majority. Streets such as Crane Street and Fisherton Street, noted for the highest child densities, did not contain the least servants, yet neither were they amongst the most prominent in this respect. The Ditch and Oatmeal Row had most servant-keeping households, but relatively few with adult offspring. However, in Castle Street and West High Street, again containing a large number of servants, the reverse applied.
SERVANTS AND THEIR ROLE WITHIN THE HOUSEHOLD

THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE SERVANT POPULATION

Having suggested that there was a reciprocal link between children and servants I propose to continue the theme of the expansion of the household by examining the distribution of the latter in St. Thomas's and by trying to ascertain how far that distribution can be linked to the domestic-cycle and to factors such as wealth and occupational status. Although better documented than children servants are a particularly elusive groups to analyse. This is partly due to the fact that they form such a disparate group, encompassing both skilled and unskilled; residential and non-residential; young people at the beginning of their careers and older, widowed or unmarried men and women; and partly because, whatever sources are available, it is impossible to estimate the exact proportion of the population which worked in a hired capacity.

The Easter Books can be used simply to determine the number of residential servants in St. Thomas's, although even the picture obtained by this analysis is unlikely to be complete. Cross-checking reveals a number of servants who were unspecified as such in individual books and the temporary omission of some of the less mobile servants confirms the need to treat any estimates of the size of the servant population with caution. One of the most serious problems is to estimate how many servants would have been too young to be enumerated. If most children took communion from the age of 14 onwards then it is likely that the majority would be included in the lists. If, however, there was a delay until 16 or 17, then we would be missing a substantial part of the servant population.
The question of age is particularly relevant when considering the number of apprentices in the community, for boys could be enrolled from as young as ten upwards. As mentioned earlier, apprentices were only consistently recorded in 1585, 1593 and 1594. In later books the word "prentise" is occasionally appended besides both male and female servants. However, as the formal apprenticeship of girls in Salisbury was exceptional it seems unlikely that the picture will be seriously distorted by assuming all unnamed apprentices to be male. Possibly even more apprentices are hidden under the label of servant. Yet this is also unlikely to be a serious problem, for, they were almost invariably paid for by their masters, there was strictly speaking, no need to enlist apprentices.

Given the inconsistent enumeration of the latter only the material from 1585, 1593 and 1594 can be used for the statistical analysis of the complete servant population. The number of servants present in 1585 seems particularly high and this may weight the results. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to use the results from these three years, for the mean proportion of households containing "covenanted servants", the maids and men-servants who were hired on an annual basis, was very similar for the twelve year period from 1582 to 1603. During this period the annual

64. This may have been fairly unusual however, for terms of apprenticeship were not meant to terminate before the age of 24, and were generally of seven to ten years duration.

65. Supra, p.11.

66. The sex ratio for apprentices in Cambridge in the 1620s was 89:47. N. Goose 'Household Structure', loc. cit., p.374.

67. See Tables 4:4:A, B, &C.
### TABLE 4:4 A  HOUSEHOLDS CONTAINING SERVANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households With:</th>
<th>1585, 1593 &amp; 1594</th>
<th>1582 - 1603</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any Servant</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Servants</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Servants</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentices</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenanted Servants (Male &amp; Female)</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Households</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>5175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4:4 B  MEAN SIZES OF SERVANT GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1585, 1593 &amp; 1594</th>
<th>1582 - 1603</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any Servant</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Servants</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Servants</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentices</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covenanted Servants</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4:4 C  HOUSEHOLDS CONTAINING SERVANTS BY MARITAL STATUS: 1585, 1593 And 1594

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households With:</th>
<th>Married Men %</th>
<th>Widows %</th>
<th>Bachelors %</th>
<th>Widowers %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any Servant</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Servants</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Servants</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentices</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4:5A HOUSEHOLDS CONTAINING SERVANTS BY YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female Servants</th>
<th>Male Servants</th>
<th>Male or Female Servants</th>
<th>Apprentices</th>
<th>Male, Female or Apprentice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4:5B MEAN SERVANT DENSITIES BY YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female Servants</th>
<th>Male Servants</th>
<th>Male or Female Servants</th>
<th>Apprentices</th>
<th>Male, Female or Apprentices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
proportions of servant-keeping households ranged from 23.7% to 36.9%. The high totals for 1585 suggest that either the clerks were particularly thorough that year or that the servant population was actually greater in the 1580s. On the other hand, it is difficult to attribute the low results in 1602 and 1603 to anything but under-registration for there is no obvious reason why fewer households should have contained servants then than in 1601 or 1599. Given the discrepancies between the various books it seems safer to consider cumulative results drawn from a number of books than to rely on any one year as a guide.

Restricting the discussion therefore, to the years 1585, 1593 and 1594 it appears that roughly two-fifths of the households in St. Thomas's contained servants or apprentices (42%), the average number of servants in each being 2.20. Direct comparison with other towns is difficult because of the varying character of the sources which have been used elsewhere. However, it is interesting to note that in 1523, after the depopulation of many small households, 39.4% of the households in Coventry contained servants, whilst in early seventeenth century Cambridge the proportion was 35.2%. In all three towns the results are higher than the English Standard (28.5%), or than those obtained for the village of Clayworth, namely 31% in 1676 and 29% in 1688. On average the servants and apprentices in St. Thomas's formed nearly a third of the communicable population and, if one assumes that roughly a third of the inhabitants...

68. For annual variations see Tables 4:5A & B.

69. In 1582 there were slightly fewer servants than normal. Moreover, there was also an unusually large number of "unspecified" inhabitants. If even half were servants, and it is likely that many were, the 1582 results would be more akin to those of 1585. It is unfortunate that in the other early Easter Book the clerk often gave a combined total for children and servants so it is not possible to test whether the 1574 servant levels were also high.


would have been children, about a fifth of the total population, slightly higher than the English Standard of 13.4%. 72.

One or two householders in St. Thomas's had over ten resident servants. Giles Estcourt of New Street, for instance, housed eleven servants in 1585 and Edward Penruddock had ten in 1593. However, they were exceptional for nearly half the householders with servants had one only. Looked at from the servant's point of view it appears that at least three-quarters of the recorded servants lived in groups of two or more. 73.

Most of these groups were mixed in character, no more than 10.1% of all householders keeping male servants only; 19.7% apprentices only and 28.7% maids only. The typical household was more likely to contain female servants than a representative of the other two sub-groups, although the former were not actually the most numerous of the three. Thus, whereas 26.8% of all households contained maids compared with 20.2% apprentices and 15.2% male servants, the average sizes of these individual groups were 1.15, 1.82 and 1.54 respectively.

Having established that, although most streets contained a range of occupations, there were marked differences between the peripheries of the parish and the main commercial streets, it seems logical to expect certain topographical variations in the distribution of servants. To some extent the results are evened out by the occasional large household, such as Giles Estcourt's, in one of the backstreets. In consequence, the relative order of the streets varies slightly according to whether one examines the proportion of servant-keeping households or the average size of servant groups in each street. 75. Thus, whereas, a similar

72. This contrasts with a result of 24.8% for Coventry and 13.6% for Cambridge. See Table 4:6.

73. See Table 4:7. The proportion should probably be even higher if we allow for the fact that some servants would have been too young to be enumerated.

74. See Tables 4:4B and 4:8.

75. See Tables 4:9 and 4:10.
### TABLE 4:6 THE NUMBER OF SERVANTS AS PROPORTIONS OF THE TOTAL COMMUNICABLE POPULATION (a.) AND OF THE TOTAL ADULT MALE AND FEMALE POPULATIONS (b.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Servants</th>
<th>Female Servants</th>
<th>Male Servants</th>
<th>Apprentices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4:7 COMPOSITION AND SIZE OF SERVANT GROUPS: 1585, 1593 & 1594

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households With:</th>
<th>1585</th>
<th>1593</th>
<th>1594</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Servant Only</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more Servants</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Servants</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Servants</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentices</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4:8 THE COMPARATIVE SIZE OF INDIVIDUAL SERVANT GROUPS: 1585, 1593 & 1594

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households With:</th>
<th>Mean Total</th>
<th>1 Representative Only Mean</th>
<th>4 or More Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Servants</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>101 88.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Servants</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46 70.8</td>
<td>3 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentices</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>39 42.4</td>
<td>5 5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4:9 MEAN PROPORTIONS OF HOUSEHOLDS CONTAINING SERVANTS

1585, 1593 AND 1594

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Area</th>
<th>All Servants %</th>
<th>Female Servants %</th>
<th>Male Servants %</th>
<th>Apprentices %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ditch</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bower's Chequer</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher Row</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Row</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatmeal Row</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricket's Corner</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Street</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. High Street</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. High Street</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Gate</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Street</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Churchyard</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the Churchyard</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Catherine St.</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Catherine St.</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Chequer</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lion Chequer</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. New Street</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. New Street</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4:10 MEAN SIZES OF SERVANT GROUPS BY STREET: 1585, 1593 & 1594

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean of Means</th>
<th>All Servants</th>
<th>Female Servants</th>
<th>Male Servants</th>
<th>Apprentices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bower's Chequer</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher Row</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Row</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatmeal Row</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricket's Corner</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Street</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. High Street</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. High Street</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Gate</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Street</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Churchyard</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the Churchyard</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Catherine St.</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Catherine St.</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehart Chequer</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lion Chequer</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. New Street</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. New Street</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 2.20 1.15 1.54 1.82
proportion of households contained servants in Blue Lion Chequer and North New Street, the presence of a couple of larger premises meant that the latter contained over twice as many servants per household.

Such idiosyncracies apart, the results do help define further the variations between different parts of the parish. Under a quarter of the properties in New Street, the Chequers and the area around the Churchyard contained servants. Although wage-earners were dispersed throughout the parish this was clearly the area in which they were most likely to be found. By contrast, over three-quarters of the householders in the Ditch, Butcher Row, Oatmeal Row and West High Street, kept servants although, as Table 4:9, emphasises we cannot think of the Market Streets as one homogeneous group for both Fish Row and Bricket's Corner were below the 50% line. It is notable that, Fisherton Street, East Catherine Street and the area known as 'Under the Churchyard' were also above average in this respect.

Further distinctions can be made by considering the distribution of the three sub-groups. For the parish as a whole between 1585 and 1603 the ratio of male to female servants was 68.4.76. A higher ratio than average was obtained in West High Street, Castle Street, The Ditch and Bower's Chequer. The other Market streets had noticeably fewer adult male servants. Even in Butcher Row, where a large male labour force would have been required to cope with the heavy nature of the work, the ratio was only 37.5. Adult males actually outnumbered female servants in Fisherton Street and Catherine Street, the latter of significance if the assumption that the economic activity in the east of the parish was biased towards

76. This can be compared with a ratio of 85 men to every 100 women in the population as a whole. (Excluding apprentices). See Table 4:11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ditch</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>170.1</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bower's Chequer</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>303.5</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher Row</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>116.9</td>
<td>106.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Row</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>129.9</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatmeal Row</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>175.5</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricket's Corner</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Street</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>145.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. High Street</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>193.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. High Street</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>126.4</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Gate</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>151.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Street</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>123.9</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>281.8</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>113.3</td>
<td>418.5</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Churchyard</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the Churchyard</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>358.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Catherine St.</td>
<td>121.2</td>
<td>301.1</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Catherine St.</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>316.2</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White'Hart Chequer</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>163.4</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lion Chequer</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. New Street</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>164.2</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. New Street</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>150.9</td>
<td>247.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>195.2</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: Male Servants per 100 Female Servants using mean totals, 1585 - 1603
B: Male Servants and Apprentices per 100 Females using mean totals, 1585, 1593 and 1594.
C: Male Servants per 100 Apprentices using mean totals, 1585, 1593 and 1594.

(* No Male or Female Servants present in these three years.)
the wood and metal crafts is correct. The other area noted for its high
servant population, Under the Churchyard, also had a strong sex ratio,
although female servants were slightly in the majority.

The situation alters when one adds apprentices to the analysis.
Then in every street but Blue Lion Chequer, where the sample is very
small, males heavily outnumbered females by nearly two to one. Again
Catherine Street, Fisherton Street and Under the Churchyard stand out
having three or more males to every maid-servant. A third ratio,
which refines the analysis still further, is that of male servants to
apprentices. For the parish as a whole there were roughly two covenanted
male servants to every three apprentices. In three streets, Butcher
Row, West High Street and New North Street, the former exceeded or
equalled the latter. In Fisherton Street, East Catherine Street and
White Lion Chequer the two groups were very similar in size. The lowest
ratio is found for under the Churchyard, where the predominance of
apprentices may have been related to the large number of tailors residing
near the church.

OCCUPATIONAL VARIATIONS

The topographical variations noted above were determined by a number of
factors, not the least of which being the social and occupational status
of the household head. The wealthiest citizens generally had more servants
than normal and were also more likely to have representatives from all three

77. As younger apprentices may not be recorded it is possible that
in reality the ratio was slightly higher. It is also likely that a
tendency for boys to be taken on earlier in some trades than others
may distort the results.

78. After Bower's Chequer this street had the highest proportion of
apprentice-keeping households, with roughly two-thirds of the latter
containing two or more apprentices,
sub-groups. In 1593 for instance, 31 of the 34 city councillors present that year had a resident servant, the average per household being 2.6. 28 had female servants (82.4%); 11 male servants (32.4%) and 14 apprentices (41.2%), the proportion in each case being notably higher than the norm.

Besides reflecting individual levels of wealth, the distribution of servants may also reveal differences between those trades which were prospering and those in decline. In discussing the ability of the skilled-labour force to replace itself in early sixteenth century Coventry, Mr. Phythian-Adams made the point that, the number of living in servants reflected to some extent, the 'health' of a trade and that a particularly low ratio, of male to female servants or of male servants to householders could be indicative, of serious decline. Apprentices and maids were cheaper to employ than journeymen and it is quite possible that the less prosperous crafts may have tried to deliberately reduce the numbers of the latter. However, the number and type of servants in each property would also have depended on the nature of the householder's occupation. Female servants, for instance, would have been more profitably employed in the homes of victuallers, where they could play an active part in the shop, than by men engaged in some of the heavier crafts. Men such as tailors, shoemakers, and cappers may have been able to manage with the assistance of apprentices and female labour, whilst the metal and wood crafts would require a larger adult male labour force.

The main problem in any attempt to link the distribution of servants with occupational structure is that there are no guidelines to establish

---


80. In a number of towns the reliance on partly-trained labour was prevented by legislation limiting the number of apprentices taken on at once or stipulating that one journeyman should be employed for every two or three apprentices.
the proportion of skilled and unskilled labourers in each trade, nor to estimate how many non-resident servants each occupier would have had. Some men may have relied entirely on 'outside' labour. Others, like James Gally, a glover, may have housed large numbers of servants yet still have employed men who lived in other parts of the town. To complicate the issue still further, there is also the possibility that some servants only lived with their masters on a temporary basis. One brewers "dayly household servant" had "a house, wief and children in New Street". However, it is significant that he abided,

"for the most part in house with Mrs Boston her and her husband, a brewer, of whom he hath his meate and drinke and wageis and is greatly relieved and maynteyned by them". 81.

An occupational analysis is also hindered by the fact that the minority of householders whose occupation can be established often belonged to the more prosperous trades. Thus the proportion of householders of known occupation with servants is notably higher than that for the parish as a whole in 1585, 1593 and 1594. Nevertheless, the results still reveal a number of distinctions between individual trades. 82.

Not surprisingly the groups with the highest proportions of servant-keeping households included the merchants and the victuallers, the two most prominent groups in civic affairs by the early seventeenth century. Less expected, and perhaps in some measure the result of the small nature of the samples, are the high results for clothmakers and woodworkers. The lowest results pertained to the building and leather workers. Although the labour of strong men was essential in the building industry the work was not domestically based and people were often hired on a casual basis.

82. See Table 4:12.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Groups</th>
<th>Mean No. Households Per Annum</th>
<th>Mean Proportions of Households Containing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any Servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERCHANTS</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTUALLERS</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butchers</td>
<td>(10.0)</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTHING</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors</td>
<td>(27.3)</td>
<td>(58.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXTILES</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEATHER</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemakers</td>
<td>(9.7)</td>
<td>(41.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METAL</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOD</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Master would therefore, have been less inclined to accommodate his servants. The leatherworkers, who in this sample at least, are represented principally by shoemakers, probably included a large number of poorer craftsmen who worked entirely alone. Although the servant density for the leather-workers does not seem particularly low, the result is distorted by the presence of one or two substantial men like Nicholas Dublell, a shoemaker from New Street who had four apprentices, and two covenanted servants in 1585, and the glover James Gally who housed eleven servants that year.

The distribution of the three sub-groups emphasises some of the points already made. A greater proportion of merchants, victuallers and, to a lesser extent, metalworkers and men involved in clothing, had female servants than male servants or apprentices. On the other hand, adult males outnumbered females in the homes of builders and textile, leather and metal workers; whilst apprentices predominated in the homes of tailors and woodworkers. Within these broad occupational groups individual crafts may have had their own particular characteristics. Amongst the victuallers, for instance, innholders would have been particularly likely to employ residential servants, and they seem to have been more reliant on adult male labour than the bakers or, surprisingly, the butchers.

The samples from St. Thomas's are too small to enable us to draw anything but very tentative conclusions. More evidence is needed in particular of the terms under which men were hired, before it will be possible to build up a more constructive argument concerning the

83. Judging from court depositions innholders, and brewers too also had large numbers of living-out servants who acted as alebearers, ostlers and tapsters.
relationship between the size and composition of servant-groups and the nature of individual occupations. Nevertheless, it is encouraging to find that in Cambridge there was also a tendency for some trades to favour servants, whilst in other's apprentices predominated although, as Goose pointed out, there may not always have been a rigorous distinction between the proportions of householders with apprentices from the victualling, service and transport sectors for instance was particularly low. Amongst the town's crafts however, apprentices were apparently far more common than covenanted servants.

SERVANT KEEPING AND THE LIFE-CYCLE

It has already been suggested that servant-keeping may have been more important at certain stages in the domestic-cycle than others and it is possible that the nature of each servant group was influenced more by the age of the household head than by his occupation. In the male-headed household there certainly appears to have been some relationship between the presence of adult offspring and the number of resident servants. Yet, although it has been suggested that in the Early Modern Period servants were taken on to replace children as they left home, it is also possible that the former were particularly important at the beginning of a man's career and may actually have declined in number during his later life.

Ideally a more continuous profile of each individual's career than the Easter Books allow would be needed to test for the significances of age. The fact that the lists cover only 14 out of a period of 34 years, that servants were not consistently enumerated and that we know the age of so few of the householders prevents a thorough analysis. Yet a limited

survey of the more stable households can still be conducted.

Concentrating first on the homes of men who had only recently married, a sample was taken of all men known to marry after 1588 who set up a house in St. Thomas's within a year or two of marriage, and who remained in that house for at least five years. The second qualification introduces a bias towards the more substantial householders, the proportion of the 53 men in question recorded with servants being above average, (69.8% as opposed to 42%). However, a wide range of occupations are represented and the householders in the sample came from all parts of the parish.

The immediate impression, when studying the employment of servants in terms of the domestic-cycle, is how flexible the household could be. Even the wealthiest residents were apparently without servants in some of the lists and those that were recorded varied considerably in number, sex and status from one year to the next. Nearly half the men in the sample had servants by the first, or at least the second book subsequent to their marriage. The proportion should probably be higher though, for some of the men who only appeared to extend their household some three of four years after marriage, and a number of the 16 listed without servants, may have employed younger servants who were not included in the lists. Moreover, even with imperfect data, the results do emphasise how closely linked were the processes of setting up shop and marriage. Obviously a number of self-employed craftsmen would never have been able to afford the cost of extra labour. There were also a few men who became householders and acquired servants before

---

85. Although the 53 men in the sample were, on average, enumerated in six Easter Books each, they were recorded with servants in only two. Some of the inconsistencies must undoubtedly reflect the omission of servants below communicable age.

86. In the majority of cases this implies an interval of 3 years at most.
they married, or who were able to take over an established household like William Warde who gained three male servants and a maid when he inherited a house in Fisherton Street. But, for the more substantial citizens at least, the norm seems to have been to set up home and begin developing a labour force within a year of taking a wife.

It is important to stress that we are talking not merely about taking on employees to help in the shop, but about domestic labour too. Although from a modern viewpoint one might expect a man to employ maid servants somewhat later in his career when he had the chance to amass some capital, domestic help was no luxury, in an age when childbirth frequently and fairly rapidly, incapacitated the wife. It is therefore worth noting that as many as ten of the fifteen men recorded with servants in the first list after their marriage, had a maid.

Although the evidence concerning apprentices is incomplete, comparisons based on material from the Tailor's guild suggests that it was common for a man to take his oath as a freeman, get married and enroll his first apprentice within the space of two years. One of the tailors in the present sample, Peter Johnson, married in June 1591; took his first apprentice a year later and is mentioned in the Easter Book of 1593 with one apprentice. Another, Jessey Paige, married in January 1596, took on a boy in May 1597, yet is not listed with any servants until 1601. Such examples illustrate how the Easter Books may give the impression of a greater delay before employing servants than was true in practice, although it is possible that, given the

---

87. The average interval between admission and enrollment of the first apprentice was just under two years for a sample of 30 tailors admitted to the guild between 1570 and 1640.
tendency for tailors to rely more heavily on apprentices than on covenanted labour, they may have been more speedy in this respect than other craftsmen.

Information from the tailors' records helps to fill in certain gaps. It also emphasises some of the problems of examining servant-keeping from static points, albeit from a number of points rather than one listing only. Of all the master tailors who appeared in Salisbury between 1570 and 1629, two-thirds enrolled at least one apprentice between these dates. This contrasts with the much lower proportion of just over a third for the tailors listed in the Easter Books of 1585, 1593 and 1594. The two results are not directly comparable. Nevertheless, they demonstrate how, in using listings we may miss out many men who, if not at that particular point, would still have had servants at some stage during their career. In the case of the tailors, the chances of catching a man with an apprentice at a fixed date are minimised by the fact that only a minority trained more than two boys during their career. Of 195 masters present between 1570 and 1629 for instance, 43 enrolled only one boy during this period, 30 only two, whilst 71 do not appear to have taken on an apprentice. 88.

Whilst a large proportion of householders began to employ servants soon after setting up home, an exercise similar to the one described above, 88. This exercise inevitably catches and loses a number of men in mid-career and is therefore not a complete guide to the number of boys taken on by each individual. Two-thirds of the men in question are known to have taken on an apprentice. However, as some only appeared for a couple of years the proportion may in reality be closer to three-quarters. (Of 164 men who were present for five years or more 109 - 66.5% - enrolled an apprentice). The results also demonstrate how within any one craft the distribution of apprentices could be very imbalanced. Thus, of the 124 men who did train an apprentice a quarter took two-thirds of the boys enrolled during the period.
revealed that a majority of the men who could be traced within a year or two of death also had servants. At this stage however, female servants seem to have been the norm and it was unusual to have servants in any number. Turning to the tailors again, a study of 71 men who disappeared from the records before 1630, reveals that on average there was an interval of 10.2 years between enrolling an apprentice and a man's final appearance at a guild assembly. Even allowing for the fact that training would have taken at least seven years, this still leaves a large number with no apprentice when they died or left the town. 29 of the men (40.8%), had enrolled a boy within seven years of disappearance and had presumably not completed his training. Another 13, (18.3%), had probably not had a boy in the house for over ten years. Disappearance from the records does not, of course, necessarily indicate the end of a man's career. But the results suggest that, for the tailors at least, training apprentices was far more important at the beginning of a man's career than later on in life.

SERVICE AND THE INDIVIDUAL LIFE-CYCLE

Having concentrated so far on the characteristics of the masters rather than the servants themselves, I propose to look next at service as a stage within the individual life-cycle and to consider the relationship between master and man. In discussing the stem-family system Berkner remarked that servants should not be viewed as a distinct social class, but as young people engaged in certain economic functions for a limited period. Laslett also spoke of service as a phase in the

89. Some of the men in the sample would of course, have only been in mid-career when they died.

90. L. Berkner, op.cit., p.411.
life-cycle, saying that perhaps 40% of all children underwent a period of "secondary socialisation" before setting up their own home. However, although for many people service marked no more than a transitory period of economic and social training, it also represented a source of permanent employment for many poorer inhabitants and, as pointed out earlier, of casual work for an unknown number of married women and widows. Although we shall be concentrating on, what Laslett terms "life-cycle servants", the importance of these older servants should not be forgotten.

The period between leaving home and marriage, which could last for as many as ten to fifteen years, was often one of considerable mobility. Indeed, to judge from the evidence from Kent, where depositions have been used to trace movement since birth, servants were likely to move more frequently and over greater distances than most other occupational groups. To serve in one place for more than a couple of years was unusual. In early seventeenth century Cogenhoe of roughly 100 servants names in a series of seven listings, 71 appeared only once, and only ten more than twice. In order to compare the degree of servant mobility in Salisbury two samples were used. The first comprised all the named servants in the Easter Books, 718 men and 1075 women in all; the second all those who appeared during the years 1593 to 1596 or 1602. Only the smaller sample gives definite evidence of those servants who were present for no more than one year.

For the larger sample the proportion of both sexes who were found in more than one book was 18.2%, whilst in the other the respective proportions

91. P. Laslett, Family Life, p.34
94. Some servants, of course, would go with their masters when they left the parish.
were 44.3% for male and 45.6% for female servants. Mobility clearly did not vary according to sex. It is also significant that almost half the servants remained in one household for more than one year, the normal covenanted period, but that only 34 men and 34 women stayed with one master for terms of five years or more. Although small the latter confirms the existence of a more permanent sub-group. It may even have been larger than this for a number of servants moved from one household to another in the parish. Out of 103 female servants listed in Castle Street, for instance, 13 were subsequently found with different masters, three in Castle Street itself. One of these women, Temperance Taylor, lived with John Eyre in 1593, with his neighbour Giles Tucker for the next two years and with William Becke in Oatmeal Row in 1596. The "permanent" servants must have included poorer people who could never afford to marry and widows like Emme Burell, who served John Odell for 22 years.

Depositions provided a little more evidence of servant mobility, although this method catches people in mid-career and thus may underestimate the time that they spent in the city. Of a group of 50 female servants who appeared in the Bishop's Court between 1560 and 1650 five had been in Salisbury for under a year; twelve for under five years; and three for between five and ten; three for over ten and six since birth. The length of time they had actually served in a particular house is mentioned less frequently. However, six had obviously been hired within the last few months; two had been in service for under two years and three for under three. Another three had served for over three, five and ten years respectively. Small though the sample is it confirms that, whilst terms of five years were comparatively rare, periods of two or three years with one master were fairly normal. Nor were terms of less than a year unknown. One native of Salisbury had apparently
spent half a year at Stert, a year at All Cannings and six months with Mr. Lowe in the Close, before she married and settled down in Castle Street.

Alice may have been unusual in moving away and then returning to the town of her birth, but in general maid servants do not appear to have travelled long distances. In 21 cases where the place of birth is known, six came from Salisbury, the rest from Wiltshire and Dorset. The furthest point mentioned was Kilmer Down near the Somerset border. Likewise, movement since birth seems to have been restricted to the neighbouring counties. Evidence for the male deponents is too sparse to draw many conclusions. Probably, as Clark suggests, they would have travelled slightly further than their female counterparts.

The ages given by the deponents suggest that the majority of the female servant population were indeed below marriageable age. For instance, the average age of a group of 26 maids was 24, the range being from 16 to 50. Only three were over 30, including Mary Saunders, a woman of 50 who had served her mistress for well over a decade and had had a child by the latter's former husband. Although the sample is small, it does not contradict the assumption that a majority of all female servants would have been in their late teens and early twenties with only a small proportion who never married or went into service on bereavement. The average age given above may, nevertheless, be too high, for court witnesses were generally drawn from the older age-groups in society and, as evidence from the poor census reveals, girls from ten to eleven upwards were considered as "fit to be placed". If one excludes apprentices, the male deponents meanwhile formed a slightly older group than the female. Of a group of ten men, for instance, the average age was 32 with a range from 16 to 58.

Possibly slightly more men than women spent their lives permanently in service.

**APPRENTICESHIP**

Of all three servant groups apprentices seem to have come from the widest catchment area, although by the seventeenth century the field had shrunk considerably. The proportion of boys joining the Tailors' Guild, the only craft with surviving records, who came from the town itself rose from 22% in the 1570s and 19% in the 1580s to 46% and 49% in the 1630s and 1640s. In the 1570s the immigrants included seven boys from Cumberland; a couple from the Channel Islands and one each from Wales, Northamptonshire and Lancashire. By the 1630s, but for three lads from Guernsey, Oxfordshire and Somerset, the field was restricted to Wiltshire, Dorset and Hampshire. The pattern in other trades was probably very similar. 40% of the 133 boys enrolled between 1603 and 1614, the only period for which a list of indentures for the whole town exists, were from Salisbury. Most of the remainder came from Wiltshire and Dorset with small groups from Hampshire and Somerset and solitary instances from Devon, Huntingdonshire, Worcestershire and Guernsey.

One tends to think of apprentices as semi-permanent members of the household, for they were supposed to serve out terms of at least seven years. Yet there is evidence to suggest that a number changed masters in mid-term. The Tailors' Assembly Books often record transfers occasioned by the demise of the former master or sometimes with his assent.

96. S.C.A., Additamenta Box 1-16, No.7/1, Add. 3.
In 1640 for instance, it stated that,

"Adam Draper, late apprentice of Adam Fisher deceased until 24 is by his own consent and at his request assigned and appointed to Edmund Watson". 97.

The guilds were well aware of the likelihood of movement and in 1612 forbade men to take on lads simply for the purpose of selling them or assigning them to someone else. They also stipulated, as did the Merchants, that on losing one master a boy was to,

"serve out the residew of his apprenticeship with some free brother or sister of this company as the said apprentice shall get or procure to take him and in default thereof w(i)th some brother or sister of this company to be p(ro)uided and appointed by the wardens". 98.

The terminology of both this ordinance and the note concerning Adam Draper raises the question how free boys were to choose their own master, or indeed their career. Older boys who had already served part of their term obviously had some measure of freedom, although several will-makers stipulated with whom their apprentice was to serve out his term. Earlier when it was initially decided what career the boy should follow, he may have been bound by his father's wishes. Some willmakers, like William Williams who entrusted his son to the custody of Thomas Symbarbe "to see him well kept until he be bound apprentice and then to bind him to himself", made it clear with whom they wished their son to be indentured. 99. But often they left the matter to fate or stipulated no more than that the son should be bound to "some honest man".

In considering how free the individual was to choose his own master we should also ask whether he was constrained to follow in his father's footsteps. Several willmakers clearly hoped that their son would continue

97. I/245, fol. 52.
98. I/244/a.
their trade, yet there seems to have been little compulsion. Henry Reynolds left stock to his son "in hope he will bee a good workman in my trade of a smith", whilst Thomas Wylie left various tools to his son but realistically stated that,

"if he have no minde to the same occupation then my wife to see such molds and tools to be sold for the most profit to the use and behalf of said son". 100.

Between 1570 and 1639 40 boys entering the Tailors guild were bound to their fathers, whilst another 18 of the 124 who came from Salisbury were the sons of tailors (46.8%). However, continuity was possibly more common in certain trades than others, for by contrast, 13 of the 56 boys enrolled by the Corporation in the early seventeenth century were bound to their father, with only three others following his trade (28.6%). It may be significant that in 1612, separate rates for the initial enrolment, or the admission to the freedom, of sons of free brothers were only specified in the ordinances of the smiths, butchers, glovers and shoemakers. To judge from the fact that the number of sons taking over their father's houses in Butcher Row was higher than average, continuity may have been particularly common amongst the butchers. 102.

The reasons why a boy should have elected, or been compelled, to follow his father's profession remain obscure. Probably it depended 

100. W.R.O. Subdean Wills 1630s, P.R.O., Prob. 11/37/9/57.

101. As the boys from Salisbury formed only a minority of those enrolled during this period it is clear that it was in fact fairly unusual for a man to take on his own son. Possibly the butchers were less conscientious about enrolling the boy. But the guild was fairly strict in enforcing enrollment and several of the offenders they fined were actually fathers.

102. However, see infra p. 297, n.31. Whether within a given trade the wealthier brethren were more likely to train their own offspring is difficult to say. Certainly some of the 31 tailors who did so belonged to the guild élite, 15 rising to the level of "warden". Seven of the men actually took on more than one son, but there were no hard and fast rules. A man might train one boy and send another to a fellow guildsman
entirely on individual circumstances. One son might follow his father, another branch out into a different trade. John Snooke, for example, had four sons of whom three joined him as tailors, whilst the fourth became a shoemaker. Sometimes it was the eldest son who carried on the family business, sometimes a younger sibling. Not, it should be emphasised, that the boys who did learn their father's trade necessarily stayed in the city to take over the shop. No more than 20 out of 58 tailor's sons indentured between 1570 and 1640 were admitted to the freedom of the guild and of these few probably took over directly from their father.

FROM APPRENTICE TO MASTER

The ages at which a young man embarked upon the various stages of his career varied greatly from one individual to the next. By 1612 a minimum of seven years training, which did not cease before the age of 24, was the norm. But many boys were bound for longer periods. One in five indentured between 1603 and 1614 for instance, faced terms of ten or more years. The age of enrollment also varied. Some willmakers stipulated 14. Amongst the poor, boys of between 12 and 15 were considered "fit to be an apprentice". Nor were older boys hindered from finding a master. One deponent claimed to have been apprenticed to a shereman at the age of 22. Before then he had worked in the trade on a casual basis.

Once his term was over guild regulations required that the young man be made free of the city and admitted as a free brother, sometimes demonstrating his skill first by making a "proof piece". Although admission

103. S.D.R., B.C.D.B., No. 11, fol. 56.v.
and marriage were often closely linked, freedom did not always imply the immediate establishment of a shop. For some a covenant period of a year was required before they left their master. Others, lacking the capital to set up independently, spent a period as a journeyman.

The journeyman stage is one about which least is known. We can only speculate how many journeymen had trained in the town or would ultimately set up shop there, or about the length of time spent as a journeyman or working with one particular master. The Tailors' Act and Memoranda Book gives a list of journeymen who paid "free sowing" money from 1562 onwards. The list is not comprehensive for additional "free sowers" are mentioned in the guild Assembly Books. The former possibly represented "foreigners", the latter men who had actually been apprenticed in the town. The sums they paid, 12d and 6d respectively, were certainly in accord with an ordinance of 1598 ruling that foreigners should pay 12d for freesowing, aliens 2s and every person trained with a free brother, 6d. The only problem is whether, since journeymen are only named in the Assembly Books from 1614 onwards, the system had changed and whether prior to that date all journeymen had been included in the Memoranda Book. However, as only four of the 397 men listed in the latter between 1570 and 1650 had previously been enrolled in the apprenticeship register and as only six can be linked in any way with the lists of Masters, it does seem likely that "outsiders" were separately recorded.

The "foreign" journeyman were a particularly mobile element and rarely settled as householders in the town. Only one occurs as a tenant in the Easter lists and although a couple rose to the rank of Master this

was clearly unusual. In 1578 for instance, it was agreed that William Neighbours, a foreigner,
"for that he hath bin a workinge journeyman of longe contynance in this citie and hath byn stewerd of the journeymen ... and is otherwise a veraye honest man and married and of good years being approved workeman...... shalbe admitted as a Freebrother". 105.

Of the 73 additional journeymen noted in the Assembly Book between 1614 and 1650, however, 49 can be traced in the apprentice lists, whilst 40 were admitted as masters. Proportionately this means that some 55% of the men assumed to be natives, or 17% of the total number of journeymen noted during the period, rose to higher rank. Considered from the apprentice's viewpoint, 27.4% of the boys enrolled between 1610 and 1619 and 29.7% of those in the following decade, became wage-earners in the town, proportions only slightly higher than those actually admitted as freemen (20.5% and 28.4% respectively). 106.

For some men the period spent as a journeyman was so brief as to have been little more than a formality. Eleven of the 36 boys apprenticed between 1610 and 1630 apparently never entered this stage before becoming Masters. Another ten transferred to the Mastership within six months. 107. Two years seems to have been the average interval between becoming a journeyman and admission to the ranks of the Masters. But a few spent much longer periods as wage-earners. Thomas Strowde, for instance, paid his freesowing money in 1618 but was not listed amongst

106. It is possible that any one of three lists may be incomplete. However, with no comparable material for other guilds it is difficult to ascertain how typical the results are.
107. That this stage could be a formality is confirmed by an entry made in 1632 stating that "Alexander King late apprentice of Adam Fisher desires to be free of the company which is granted on condition he performe orders, in the mean time having taken an oath may work as a journeyman for the wche he hathe paid 6d". S.C.A, I/246/4., fol. 5.
the Masters until 1632, whilst Henry Gilbert had to wait for a period of twelve years. No doubt some journeymen spent only a short time in Salisbury before setting up in another town. Others probably remained as wage-earners for the rest of their careers. A number may have worked on a fairly permanent basis for one man, others for short periods, perhaps even taking on work from several brothers. In 1605 a shoemaker's journeyman claimed that he worked for Walter Ashley and "is with him today and gone tomorrow as they can agree and not otherwise". But in practice arrangements were probably not quite so casual for in 1612 a number of companies ruled that journeymen should not leave their Masters without a month's warning.

Strictly speaking journeymen were not allowed to take apprentices themselves, although the Joiner's ordinance of 1612 stating that, "no freeman shall during the time that he shalbe a journeyman take any apprentice without the goodwill of the warden and brethren excepte to be a householder and a freeman or a married man or a widdower and free", suggests that there could be exceptions. As with the ordinances forbidding a man to set up shop before the age of thirty, it was felt that a certain level of wealth and experience was necessary before a man could assume the responsibilities of husband and master. This raises the question how many journeymen were actually householders. Although few of the 'foreign' journeymen can be traced, one would expect a number of the natives to set up home soon after they had completed their apprenticeships. The lists of the latter are, unfortunately, too late to compare with the Easter Books, but as a small group are known to have married fairly soon after payment of free-sowing money it seems likely that many were householders.

SERVICE OUTSIDE THE GUILD HIERARCHY

To reach any conclusions about the servants who existed outside the "framework" of apprentices, journeymen and masters is difficult. The fact that several tailor's journeymen can be traced as living-in servants in St. Thomas's emphasises that we cannot simply assume the residential servant to be an unskilled labourer. In all probability they encompassed a wide variety of categories. Certainly quite a few of the servants noted in the Easter Books are later found living and working on their own. Roughly a fifth of the male servants listed in 1590, for instance, subsequently established a home in the parish, not to mention an unknown number who set up in other parts of the town like Gawin Chubb, who served John Bayly of the Ditch between 1585 and 1596 and by 1599 had married and was living in St. Edmund's.\textsuperscript{110}

A small proportion of the servants recorded in the Easter Books or the local Court records would, however, have belonged to the group of more permanent servants who resided in the town. One of the latter described himself as "a pewterer and household servant" and claimed to have worked for Robert Shingleton for eight years, whilst his fellow, who at 58 was two years his senior, had served Shingleton for "many years."\textsuperscript{111} These "long-term" servants must have included semi-skilled men who worked in the shop and also men who did odd jobs and ran errands for both the Master and the mistress. Not, it should be emphasised that there was a rigid division between domestics and labourers. Thomas Chicke, Shingleton's man, was not alone in describing himself both as a "craftsman" and a "household servant", and quite a number of the youths

\textsuperscript{110} Several servants actually took over their former master's home by marrying his widow or a daughter. Infra, p. 238.

\textsuperscript{111} S.D.R., B.C.D.B., No. 9, fols. 54\textsuperscript{v} and 56.
appearing in Court were listed as apprentices and "Famula Domestica". Whatever their sex or status, servants were traditionally thought of as members of the family and as such, were expected to assist in a range of domestic tasks.  

At the opposite extreme many girls would have helped in their Master's shop besides in the house. Female assistance would have been particularly important in the victualling trades. Drawing beer, serving food and selling bread are all mentioned in depositions. But men other than victuallers may also have employed maids in the retailing side of their business. In the account of his apprenticeship with a Salisbury merchant, Simon Forman related how, on one occasion when his master and mistress were absent, the kitchen maid was willed "to looke into the shope and helpe yf occasion served". A small number of girls were formally apprenticed, their indentures mentioning that they were to be taught a trade besides the domestic arts. In January 1612, for instance, Elizabeth Deacon was bound to a Salisbury tailor and his wife in the "mistery and sciencs of huswyfrye and flexdressing". Two months later Mary Gunter was apprenticed in the art of "le huswyfrye and knittinge". The number of girls who were apprenticed was always low. In Salisbury only five of the 138 agreements made between 1603 and 1614 concerned girls, whilst in Bristol just under 3% of the apprentices listed between 1542 and 1552 were female. The enrollment of girls

---

112. It is interesting how, in 1603 the Wiltshire Weavers and spinners complained that the clothiers had cut their wages and some of them 'make such their workfolkes to doe their household businesses, to trudge in theyr errands, spoole theire chains, twist their list, doe every command without giving them bread, drinke or money for many days labour}'. H.M.C. Var. Col. V.I., 1901, p.94.

113. A.L. Rowse, op. cit, pp.267-278.

114. S.C.A., Additamenta Box 1-16, No. 7/1 Add. 3.

was possibly laxer than for boys and the number of agreements may, in reality have been slightly higher. Whether or not they were formally bound, however, it is important to remember that many girls would have obtained some knowledge of a trade or craft long before they married.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MASTER AND SERVANT

In a sense the non-residential servant, albeit a charwoman or a journeyman, would have belonged to two households, it being likely that he or she would have spent a large part of the day and also have eaten meals in the master's house. But it was the residential servant in particular, who would have been treated as a member of the householder's own family. Early seventeenth century Conduct Books stressed that servants were to be given sufficient food and clothing, to be kept from idleness and to be trained, both in a craft and to lead upright lives. In short they were to be treated very much as the children whom they sometimes replaced. In return the authors of the Conduct Books recommended that servants should revere and obey their master. They should not grumble or speak evil of him, nor marry without consent or carry out their own business affairs. At all times they should dress and behave modestly.

Whether these precepts were adhered to is, of course, another matter. The cases which come to notice often paint the blackest pictures - maids gossiping and spying on their mistresses; masters siring children on gullible wenches; cases of theft; of runaway apprentices and of servants who became involved in marital disputes. Society made some attempt to regulate the relations between master and man. Most guilds,
for instance, ordered that quarrels be brought before the assembly to be settled by the brethren. But many minor frictions must have occurred which never merited record. One account of "domestic harmony", written from the servant's point of view, is contained in the autobiography of Simon Forman who, before his illustrious career in London, served an apprenticeship in Salisbury. His pessimistic view of his youth no doubt colours the description, but the quarrels he mentions would not have been unusual. He complained amongst other things that "beinge the youngest apprentice of four" he "was put to all the worse"; that "ther fell out many controversyses between his mistress and him and she would often beate him", and that he was particularly harshly treated by the maid. Ultimately he left the household having fallen out with both his master and his mistress. Yet despite this he was still mentioned in the former's will.

The traditional bequest of gifts to servants reveals the other side of the coin. Roughly a third of all willmakers made gifts to their servants between 1500 and 1640. The custom seems to have been more widespread in the early sixteenth century than it was later. 42% of all male testators and 52% of all female mentioned servants during the first 70 years of the period, compared with 31% and 26% in the next 70 years. The gifts themselves ranged from small sums of money, tools or articles of clothing, to the occasional bequest of land or of the residue of the estate. Sometimes they were conditional on future service, but a number like Mathew Comyn, endowed their late servants. Despite the high mobility of servants, contact with their former employers was not always lost. Occasionally we glimpse signs of a paternalistic attitude


towards servants. William Lobbe for instance, gave his servant an annuity

"and some money in his purse at sundry times and now and then to drink withall and when he die to be honestly brought to the grave". (118).

Other testators showed concern by leaving their employees marriage portions or goods to enable them to set up shop.

Female testators were more inclined to endow maids than men servants and one wonders whether, within the household, there was some identification of interests between members of the same sex. In his treatise on "Domestical Duties", William Gouge remarked that women lost authority when they gossiped with their servants or suffered them to be their companions. Yet he was not alone in asserting that,

"if there be a master or a mistresse ioynt gouernors over on house it is fittest for the master to correct men servants, the mistress maids". (119).

Whether there was any demarcation of authority in the average household is debatable. Yet it is interesting to note how, in his description of charmaids Ivie said that they "commonly are their good dames"; whilst a Southampton case records how, on being asked to go into service, a maid was taken to a man's house

"wher the sayd Nicholas his wiff did bargayne with her for one yere ....... and too have for her wages xxs and payre of hosen and a payre of shoes". (120).

In practice, given the close link between home and workshop, it is likely that servants were controlled by both man and wife, a fact which could lead to disputes between the couple. Avis Greene's description of how her mistress often rebuked her

118. P.R.O., Prob. 11/24/20/147.
"for some faultes comitted in her service at which William Pashion many times brawled with his wife about it and he somewhat favoured said Avis and took her parte against his wife".  

was possibly far from unusual.

The degree to which a servant was integrated into the household was obviously limited by the fact that many moved away after only a year or two. However, some employees, may already have had close ties with the householder by virtue of kinship. In discussing domestic service Laslett suggested that young men and women probably relied heavily on kinship networks in order to find employment. Although unlikely to be related to their own master, at least through the male line, many servants probably had ties with other members of the community. This, he suggests, was because, although unwilling to submit their relatives to economic servitude, people were quite prepared to see them and their own children working for neighbours. Whilst sufficient Willmakers mentioned poorer relatives in their employ to challenge this explanation, the evidence from Salisbury confirms the relative scarcity of kinship links between a man and his servants.

Only 37 of the servants specifically named in the twelve Easter Books between 1585 and 1607 bore the same surname as the head of the household, (2.1%). Even though a certain proportion would have been related through the female line and though some inmates classified as kin may have acted as servants, it is unlikely that more than 5% of all servants dwelt with kin. Possibly kinship links were more common between apprentices and their masters than in the case of covenanted

122. P. Laslett, Household and Family, p.58.
123. Cousins and Siblings are included amongst the "hired" kin. Infra, p. 215.
servants. Taking simply those boys who came from Salisbury itself and excluding the 40 who were bound to their father, roughly 10% of the tailor's apprentices enrolled between 1570 and 1640 had masters bearing the same surname. However, only one of the 133 boys indentured in Salisbury between 1603 and 1614 appears to have been similarly linked through the male line.

Was it any more common for youths to be sent to work for neighbours than to kinsmen? In his will dating from 1617 Henry Lane made the somewhat unusual arrangement that, although his son should be bound to his friend John Snooke,

"he shall not withstanding serve under Thomas Barnes and be brought up at my trade and that he shall have his dyet in the howse with his brother Dytton". (124).

John Snooke lived next door to Lane, Barnes had just completed an apprenticeship with him and Humphrey Ditton, his-son-in-law, had been given charge of his house until the son came of age. Another tailor, Roger Willis, entrusted his son to John Longman who lived next door but one to him in the High Street. However, apart from these two examples, there seems to have been no deliberate attempt by the tailors to send their sons to men who lived close by.

The same was apparently true of covenanted servants for no more than one in every 25 had the same surname as another householder in the street, a proportion only slightly higher than those linked in similar fashion to the master of the house. Nevertheless, one or two householders, like Thomas Dyer of Bower's Chequer who seems to have hired someone from a neighbouring family in 1592, 1593, 1594 and 1599, evidently preferred

124. P.R.O., Prob. 11/131/64/483.
to taken on the offspring or kinsmen of their neighbours. It may be no more than coincidence but slightly more examples can be found in the wealthier market streets. Like guardianship, sending children into service with neighbours may have been one way of tightening the bonds between members of the city élite. Amongst the butchers in particular the linking of households in this manner seems to have been fairly common. One local butcher, Henry Pounce employed the daughters of three of his neighbours, whilst Edith Pounce, perhaps his own daughter, worked for John Cookney, a few doors further along Butcher Row, meanwhile, a lad named Roger Cookney was hired by a third butcher, Richard Belly.

Inevitably the number of people working for kin or for neighbours must have been far greater in practice than the number it has been possible to trace. Moreover, even if not actually hired by them, it is quite possible as Laslett suggests, that many servants only found work with the assistance of kin and friends. In a subsequent chapter the links which existed between one household and the next and the ways in which people turned to the wider family for help will be considered in more detail. Now, however it is appropriate to conclude the discussion of the expansion of the household by considering just one of the ways in which distant kin were linked together, namely by co-residence.

---

KIN AND THE EXTENDED FAMILY

It has been established that in England, as in many other parts of Europe, the extended family household - that is the household containing relatives other than offspring - was rare. The evidence from static listings certainly suggests that the nuclear family was the predominant household type by the early sixteenth century. However, it is conceivable that a longitudinal study would reveal that many households did in fact pass through an extended phase at some point during the developmental cycle. For an ideal study we should obviously need an unbroken series of listings covering a far longer span than the St. Thomas Easter Books. Nevertheless, the latter do illustrate how kin could reside with the family for brief periods only.

As with servants and children, kin were sometimes specifically labelled by the compilers of the Easter Books, whilst others have been identified using external evidence. Nevertheless, many more links, particularly through the female line, must remain undiscovered. Bearing in mind that the results are therefore, only minimal, let us consider how common resident kin were in late sixteenth century Salisbury. From the annual totals presented in Table 4:13 it appears that only about one in every 33 households contained parents or siblings and about one in 25 kin of any category other than offspring. The largest numbers of kin to be identified were in 1582, 1599 and 1601 when just over one in every 20 households were extended. This proportion is slightly higher than that obtained for early seventeenth century Cambridge, where 3.1%


127. The second total includes those identified using external evidence or presumed to be related because they bore the same surname as the head. It is, of course, impossible to judge how often servants who were simply listed by their christian name or inmates with different surnames may have been related.
## TABLE 4:13 HOUSEHOLDS CONTAINING KIN: ANNUAL TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total No. Households</th>
<th>A No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>B No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>C No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5830</strong></td>
<td><strong>172</strong></td>
<td><strong>242</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>246</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>372</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>416</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: Parents and Siblings  
B: A + More Distant Kin  
C: A + Married Offspring  
D: B + Married Offspring + Other Ambiguous Couples
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Total Householders</th>
<th>A  No.</th>
<th>A  %</th>
<th>B  No.</th>
<th>B  %</th>
<th>C  No.</th>
<th>C  %</th>
<th>D  No.</th>
<th>D  %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ditch</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowers Chequer</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher Row</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Row</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatmeal Row</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricket's Corner</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Street</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. High Street</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. High Street</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Gate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Street</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Catherine St.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Catherine St.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Chequer</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lion Chequer</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. New Street</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. New Street</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Churchyard</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under The Churchyard</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2089</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: Parents and Siblings  
B: A + More Distant Kin  
C: A + Married Offspring  
D: B + Married Offspring + Other Ambiguous Couples
of all households contained resident kin, but lower than the proportions
of 12% and 9% obtained for Clayworth in 1676 and 1688 or than Laslett's
English standard of 10.1%.\textsuperscript{128}

On the assumption that kin were a particularly fluid element of the
household, it is perhaps fairer to consider how many individual
householders lodged kin, rather than the annual totals. This method gives
\[\text{\textsuperscript{a minima}}\text{ of 3.8% and \textsuperscript{a maxima} of 6.0\%.}\textsuperscript{129}\] However, even these results
may not be a true representation of the number who would have given
houseroom to kin at some stage during the life-cycle. It is surely
significant that 12.2% of those male householders whose marital career
was actually spanned by the Easter Books, and 16.7% of those householders
who remained in the parish for ten or more years. (15.9% in the case
of the male, 26.7% the female householders), can be traced sharing with
kin. Although both samples are slightly biased towards the wealthier
citizens, they do emphasise the dangers in using static listings.

Certain groups may have been more likely to have extended households
than others. Although female householders predominated in the second
sample mentioned above, overall proportionately fewer women lodged kin than
men, the respective proportions for the individuals appearing between
1574 and 1607 being 4.2% and 6.5%. Court records reveal many examples
of poorer families taking in relatives when they were in trouble. However
an examination of the distribution of households containing kin by streets
suggests that it was generally the wealthiest families, and logically
those with most space, who were most likely to have an extended household.
As table 4:14 shows the Market Streets predominated in this respect, although

\textsuperscript{128} High mobility would reduce the likelihood of co-residence with kin in
an urban environment, although there are also technical reasons why the
Salisbury results are low. A full reconstitution would undoubtedly reveal
many more links. A certain number of households must also have contained
kin below communicable age who were not recorded.

\textsuperscript{129} See Table 4:14.
even in Butcher Row, no more than one in six individual households contained kin. Of the backstreets South New Street stands out in having slightly more extended households than normal, although if one includes households containing members of the immediate family only it was below average. The positive correlation between wealth and the extended household is confirmed by the fact that whereas 6.3% of all the male householders listed between 1574 and 1607 belonged to the office-holding élite, this was true of 18% of the men who gave houseroom to kin.

MOTIVES FOR LODGING KIN

Given the fact that kin were a comparatively rare element in the household, it is important to ascertain what motivated people to reside with distant members of the family. The practicalities of taking in extra inmates should not be overlooked when considering why some households were more likely to be extended than others. For many men the cost of feeding an extra mouth or the problems of finding adequate space would have been prohibitive. The bias towards the élite should certainly not be interpreted merely as a sign that kinship links were strongest at this social level, although the mobility of the poor may have served to minimise the number of connections the latter had in the town.

Individual case histories emphasise how varied the motives for taking in kin could be. It was not uncommon to offer houseroom to the elderly and infirm who could no longer care for themselves, at least a quarter of the households in question being extended in an upward direction. There was nothing mandatory about giving lodging to the aged. The 1601 Poor Law confined responsibility for the relief of the elderly to their

130. As it is impossible to categorise all the kinship links revealed in St. Thomas's, the proportion may be closer to a third.
children and, although bound to offer assistance, the act did not specify that the latter should actually provide a dwelling place. Nevertheless, as the phraseology in a number of wills makes clear, it would have been considered "unnatural" to turn away a needy relative if the householder could afford to accommodate them. In 1617 for instance, Roger Luxmore required that his daughter "shewe herselfe a naturall and loving daughter" towards her elderly mother, and "honesty and carefully relieve her and maintaine her in all necessaries according to her estate for her natural life." 131. Although mothers occur most frequently amongst the known co-resident kin, distantly related dependents are found in some of the wealthier Salisbury households. In 1554 Thomas Wylie significantly willed his wife to "see to and order my Aunt Johanne Gyles during her natural life" and to "keep her both in meat, drinke, and rayment like an honest woman", treating her "as she would do her own mother". (132).

Another testator left goods to his wife,

"for the better maintenance conforte and releasse of my sister in lawe Margaret Quarley nowe living, being and remayning in house with me, being stricken in years and aged and of weake and simple capacity and understanding not able to guyde or order herselffe". (133).

At the other end of the spectrum people often took in kinsfolk who were too young to fend for themselves. In any pre-industrial community between a quarter and a third of all children would probably have lost one or both parents. 134. No doubt most of these "orphans" would have remained with the surviving parent but some, deprived of both parents, would possibly have gone to reside with kin. Perhaps surprisingly this

131. P.R.O., Prob. 11/130/71/64.
133. W.R.O. Subdean Wills, Thomas Paul, 1620s.
134. Infra, p. 278.
also applied to a number of fatherless children from wealthier families, for, as testamentary evidence illustrates, the widow was not necessarily the obvious choice as the child's guardian. Between 1570 and 1600, a period when particular concern was shown in wills for the care of young children, 14 of the 28 testators who appointed a guardian chose a kinsman or friend in preference to their wife. After 1600 the number of references to custodianship declined and, if mentioned at all, the charge was more likely to be assigned to the widow, although she might have had to hand over the children or give additional sureties if she remarried.

Sometimes the death of the father split the family completely, each child going to a different guardian. On other occasions the wife retained the younger children, whilst the rest left home. Thus in 1579 William Chambers stipulated that his son was to be put into the care of a kinsman from five until of full age, whilst his daughters were to remain with the widow until the age of twelve. Another man sent the offspring of his first marriage to their grandfather and an uncle, but stipulated that those of his second union should be maintained by their mother.


It would be tempting to assume that children were only sent to guardians when their natural mother was dead. However, this was not always the case. Nicholas Huttofte, for instance, appointed custodians for all his children despite the fact that his second wife was still living. (P.R.O., Prob.11/68/3/22) Another reason, this time more hypothetical, is that the practice of sending children to other homes may have been seen as one way to strengthen the ties which existed between members of the urban elite. It was generally only the wealthiest testators who made such provisions and not only were they and the men they appointed often linked by blood or marriage, but many also had economic ties. Thus Anthony Maynard, a member of the "Forty-Eight", appointed three other assistants, Peter Hayward, Simon Neale and Richard Gauntlet, a future mayor whilst another mayor, Edward Rodes was chosen by John James, one of the "Twenty-Four" and by Thomas Tovye a junior councillor and a fellow merchant. Individual circumstances obviously varied, but it is interesting to speculate why some men deliberately encouraged the break up of their household and why the practice of putting children out to guardians apparently declined after 1600. (P.R.O., Prob. 11/58/39/282; 11/58/39/288 and 11/76/60/112).
### TABLE 4:15 THE GUARDIANSHIP OF CHILDREN

**TESTAMENTARY EVIDENCE 1500 - 1639**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1500 - 1569</th>
<th>1570 - 1599</th>
<th>1600 - 1639</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Guardians Appointed in Preference to the Widow**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1500 - 1569</th>
<th>1570 - 1599</th>
<th>1600 - 1639</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother-in-law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-in-law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son-in-law</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Kinsmen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinswomen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: Testators referring to guardianship  
B: % Total male testators with children  
C: Men giving custody to someone other than the widow  
D: % A
Half the men nominated as guardians between 1500 and 1639 can in fact be identified as kinsmen, uncles being a common choice, whilst many of the others were fellow tradesmen or office-holders.

Another arrangement, which, like guardianship may have been exclusive to the élite, was for a child to reside with kinsfolk even though both parents were still alive. In 1619 Oliver Powell left his grand-daughter £10 on condition that she continued to dwell with his wife. If her parents' removed her without the latter's consent the legacy was to be void. Another man gave the education of his grandson "which is nowe with me" to his son, and gave his grand-daughter £300 desiring that "she shall remain and have her education of my wife her grandmother". In these wealthier families the emphasis seems to have been on the education of the child and also on companionship for the grandparents. Lower down the social scale if a young kinsman was taken on whilst his parents were still alive it would generally have been as an apprentice or a domestic servant.

The Easter Books do not allow any assessment of the frequency with which children dwelt with kin, their incomplete nature presumably being one reason why the proportion of extended households in St. Thomas's is lower than that established by Laslett. However, the lists do reveal cases of younger siblings, and occasionally of poorer distant kin, who resided in the household as servants. Moreover, although from lack of evidence we are forced to conclude that most servants would not have been related to their employers, it is conceivable that many other resident kinsmen would have formed an additional labour force even if they were not officially covenanted.

139. Ibid., 11/133/66/525.
140. Generally when kinsmen were hired as servants the household would be extended in a downward direction, although poorer members of the senior generation were occasionally hired as were members of the householder's own generation.
Apart from taking on kin at the two points in the life-cycle when they were least able to fend for themselves, during childhood and old age, court cases reveal how relatives were sometimes given houseroom for brief periods when they were particularly in need of assistance. A newly-married couple might, for instance, spend a short time with their parents before establishing their own home. Thus we hear how,

"as soon as (Peter Bricket and his wife) were married, the old man, his father, receaued them both into his house and household and with him they dwelt in unis et eisdem". (141)

Other couples were given temporary accommodation by relatives when they first arrived in the town, an arrangement which, if they were poor and had no assured livelihood, was frowned upon by the authorities. In 1635 the overseers from St. Edmund's complained that,

"Giles Silvester has entertained one Barnes who married his daughter and lately come from Laverstock and lives with Silvester".

whilst in St. Thomas's, it was noted that,

"the widow Pannell has taken a house upon the ditch and entertains her son in law Robert Screach, now come from London". (142).

In the first case the couple were ordered to leave the city, in the second to give sureties that they would not become chargeable to the authorities.

The records also gave evidence of relatives who were lodged during periods of financial difficulty or illness. When George Churchouse fell into debt he was, "kindly receaved by Dr. Seward (his wife's uncle) with his family into his house both at bed and board". (143.)

In another case a deserted wife was assisted by her mother who,

"is so tender over her and her poor grandchildren that ..... she is content to take them home here to her, although she be so in age that she needs a comforter herself" (144.)

142. P. Slack, Poverty in Early Stuart Salisbury, pp.98 and 101.
143. S.D.R., B.C.D.B., No. 48, fol. 44.
There are also instances of women returning to their parents after bereavement or having quarrelled with their spouses; of bastard-bearers seeking shelter with siblings and of the sick being cared for in the homes of kin. Often these arrangements only lasted for a matter of months, a fact which emphasises the dangers of relying on listings compiled at fixed points in time. The number of householders who offered a temporary shelter to kin must have been considerably larger than the number who actually appear in the records. We can give some impression of the changing composition of the household over a period of years, but not of its fluidity from one month to the next.

HOUSEHOLDS CONTAINING ELDERLY PARENTS

Having considered some of the motives for co-residence let us turn to look at certain individual groups. Given the high mortality of the population in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it is clear that many people would have been orphaned by the time that they married. Moreover, even if their parents were still alive, it is quite likely that they did not dwell in the immediate neighbourhood. To say then that only about one in twenty households were three generational (in Laslett's 100 communities the proportion was 5.8%), is misleading. Most couples would never have been required to find accommodation for elderly parents.

The proportion of widows and widowers in the population was comparatively small and of those only a minority can actually be found dwelling with kin. In a sample of 61 pre-industrial communities, for

---

example, 7% of all widowers and 13% of all widows resided with adult offspring, whilst 4% in both cases shared with more distant kin, and 9% and 8% respectively with non-kin. 146. To establish how many widowed persons in Salisbury dwelt with the second and third groups is not possible. However, the evidence from St. Thomas's confirms that it was unusual for widows to live with married offspring and demonstrates how, in an urban community at least it was exceptional to find a widower in this position.

Concentrating initially on the widow, it is significant that only 13 out of a group of 249 women bereaved between 1574 and 1607 can subsequently be traced in the home of a son or daughter (5.2%). 147. Three had a brief period of independence first. The rest had moved in with their offspring or had handed over the control of their old home by the next listing after bereavement. The annual figures in Table 4:16 confirm that very few households were extended in an upward direction. In any one year an average of no more than 1.8% of the households in St. Thomas's included an elderly mother, whilst no more than 0.1% included a father. As these widowed people rarely stayed in the household for long it is possible that rather more households would have been extended at some point during the life-cycle. But in fact of the individual householders who appeared between 1574 and 1607, no

147. Some would presumably have gone to dwell with children who lived outside St. Thomas's.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households Containing:</th>
<th>Mean Households Per Annum</th>
<th>Individual Householders 1574 - 1607</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother-in-law</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father-in-law</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother-in-law</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister-in-law</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Kinsman</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinswoman</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4:17 Individual Householders with Specific Groups of Kin: 1574 - 1607

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Siblings</th>
<th>Distant Kin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ditch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowers Chequer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher Row</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Row</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatmeal Row</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricket's Corner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. High Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. High Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Gate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Catherine St.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Catherine St.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Chequer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lion Chequer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. New Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. New Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Churchyard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under The Churchyard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.73% 1.53% 2.35%
more than one in forty ever accommodated a mother or mother-in-law, 148 whilst only four can be traced lodging an elderly father.

In discussing the treatment of the aged Laslett suggested that widowed persons from wealthy families were less likely to be found living with kin than those of lower social status, the implication being that, if a family could afford an alternative arrangement, they would opt against co-residence. 149. It is unfortunate that the present sample is too small to test whether, in accord with this hypothesis, elderly mothers appeared more frequently amongst the inmates in the backstreets. 150. Yet it may be significant that only four of the fifty men who offered a home to their mother or their wife's mother belonged to the office- holding élite, a slightly lower proportion than the householders who lodged kin of any category. Lest it be assumed, however, that poverty alone

148. Margaret Spufford suggests that, although population listings reveal few three-generational households, wills often give the impression that it was common for a widow to be given houseroom with her offspring. The situation obviously varied according to the demographic and tenurial patterns in each community. In Orwell, one of the three villages in her study, testators frequently provided for the widow to live with the inheriting son. But this was a community in which it was uncommon for women to inherit land themselves and in which many men died leaving underage children. As the burden for maintaining them fell on the widow, she in her turn was carefully provided for after she had fulfilled her obligations.

The fact that houseroom was far less common in Spufford's other two Cambridgeshire villages emphasises the danger in extrapolating from one community to another. In Salisbury the infrequency with which testators stipulated that their widow should be given lodging with offspring serves to confirm the impression obtained from the Easter Books. Margaret Spufford, Contrasting Communities: English Villages in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth centuries, 1974, pp.112-116.

149. P. Laslett, Family Life, p.213.

150. It is significant that in Butcher Row nearly one in ten households were vertically extended, nearly four times as many as in the parish as a whole, whilst between 1574 and 1607 no examples can be found in Fish Row, Oatmeal Row or Bricket's Corner. See Table 4:17.
motivated an elderly woman to move in with her family we should look at the information which can be obtained from wills.

Testamentary records give little indication of the frequency of such arrangements. No more than a third of the testators who left a widow between 1500 and 1640 mentioned their dwelling house and some of these failed to make it clear where the widow was to live. However, the evidence does illustrate that even in the wealthiest families the widow might have to accept board and lodging. As many as 21 of the 39 men who left their home to someone other than the widow between 1540 and 1640 specified, for instance, that a room or some other share of the house should be set aside for her benefit. Not that the widow was necessarily constrained by her husband's will for several testators emphasised that the woman had the option to refuse these arrangements. Roger Tanner, stipulated that his wife was to have meat, drink and lodging at the charge of his executor, a son-in-law, plus £10 a year and "if she refuse or mislike such diet and lodging she shall have instead twenty pound a year" (151). Another man, John George, gave his wife the parlour in his son's house, adding that "if they agree not in one yeare after my decease that they parte the goods equally". 152.

Individual cases confirm that to dwell with a child could be a matter of free choice rather than an arrangement forced upon the woman out of necessity. In 1603, for example, Agnes Weekes is found living by the Close Gate with her son-in-law John Coppinger. She had nonetheless been adequately provided for, inheriting amongst other things a farm and real estate outside Salisbury. Moreover her will and inventory, valued at £164, affirm that she was still a wealthy woman by her death in 1613.

Yet rather than living independently she chose to lease the farm to Coppinger and to reside with him, forgiving him the rent in return for his "soiourning me and mine." Another woman, Alice Huttoft, a merchant's wife, could presumably have settled in one of several tenements which she had inherited from her father. Indeed her spouse obviously assumed that she would do so for, beyond stating that Alice was to have "her dyet and stay in the house" for three months after his death, he made no provision for her accommodation. Yet the Easter Books reveal that until her death seven years later, she continued to dwell in her old home on the Ditch with David Eaton, her son-in-law.

Alice Huttoft was comparatively unusual in residing with her kinsman for so long. The majority of widows in this position appear in one listing only, whilst no more than three shared for longer than ten years. It is difficult to trace the fate of a widow once she disappeared from the lists but, excluding those examples where the whole household vanished, it seems that at least half actually ended their days lodging with kin. Some of the women who only appeared once as an inmate possibly set up their own household later. Periods of "quarantine" whereby the wife was allowed to remain in her old home until she had received her portion were not unknown. In the 1580s William Moggeridge stipulated that his widow was to have an annuity of twenty marks and until the first payment his executor was to find her meat, drink and lodging. Twenty years later Henry Dove ordered that his wife should be given "houseroom and lodging in the best chamber in my house in Salisbury until she may lawfully have possession of the dwelling house and coppihold tenement in Alderbury wherein she is to have her widow's estate." (156).

153. W.R.O. Subdean Wills, 1613. By her death Agnes had obviously handed over most of her household effects to the family for her inventory consisted primarily of jewellery and clothing.


155. P.R.O., Prob, 11/73/12/93.

156. P.R.O., Prob. 11/129/49/391.
Other women may have opted for co-residence as a temporary expedient before remarriage. Several willmakers, actually specified that the woman was only to have houseroom "during her widow's estate". Yet none of the widows found dwelling with offspring in St. Thomas's can be traced in the marriage registers and it seems logical to assume that the majority in this position would have been older women who would have been unlikely to find a second spouse.

Bearing in mind the fact that co-residence did mark the final stage in the life-cycle for many of the widows in question it is not surprising that the majority lived with a married couple rather than a single child. Perhaps less expected is the fact that whilst 40 shared with a son, only 13 appeared with a daughter or a son-in-law. The results are inevitably incomplete, mothers-in-law being particularly difficult to identify. Nevertheless, when the question of co-residence is linked with that of inheritance, it does seem feasible that there should have been such a bias. It appears to have been customary in Salisbury to leave the dwelling-house to the widow rather than to a child, only 34 of the 140 married men who mentioned the property between 1500 and 1639, bequeathing it to a child in preference to their wife. However, when a child was nominated it would generally be a son rather than a daughter. Only three of the testators in question left the house to a daughter. In one case she held it jointly with a brother, in the other example, there was no apparent male heir.

157. See for instance, W.R.O., Subdean's Wills, Oliver Pewd, 1615.
158. 42 of the women noted between 1574 and 1607 were found living with a couple, one each with a widowed daughter, a widowed son-in-law or an unmarried daughter, and eight with unmarried sons.
159. The question of continuity between man and wife will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5. It should be emphasised that wills provide an incomplete picture of inheritance customs for many men made pre-mortem arrangements for the descent of their real estate.
160. Even if we consider all the wills mentioning children between these dates rather than those made by married men, no more than 12 men left the house directly to a daughter compared with 56 to a son.
Although the will making population may be unrepresentative of the community as a whole the bias towards the male heir can be confirmed by considering the living arrangements in 117 households in St. Thomas's which, at some stage between 1574 and 1607, were shared by a mother and her children. As Table 4:18 illustrates, the former was more likely to head the household if the children were unmarried, over four-fifths of the women who shared with a single child heading the list in contrast to just over a quarter of those with married offspring. The woman was also far more likely to head a household containing a adult daughter than one with an adult son, it being particularly unusual for a single girl to run a household which she shared with her mother. There are only two examples of single women (one being widowed) caring for their mothers and even when the daughter was married, in over half the known cases the widow was apparently still in charge.

Our conclusions must be tentative. Not only is it difficult to determine in each case whether the widow or a member of the junior generation actually headed the household, but it is debatable whether, for contemporaries, there would always have been a rigid distinction between the head and the other members of the household.\(^{162}\) The exact arrangements presumably varied from one family to another, depending sometimes on the extent to which the widow had organised affairs whilst her spouse was alive and sometimes on the age and character of the individuals involved. Although wills provide some impression of the most common arrangements, they only reveal what the testator hoped for and tell nothing of the problems.

---

161. These results echo the unpublished findings of Charles Phythian-Adams regarding St. Michael's parish in Coventry in the 1590s. In a household containing a married couple the mother was more likely to be an inmate, otherwise the majority of widows preferred to remain householders in their own right.

162. Assumptions concerning the "headship" were based on the order of the names in each household and on the amounts contributed towards the Easter collection.
TABLE 4:18  THE STATUS OF THE WIDOW IN 117 HOUSEHOLDS
CONTAINING A WOMAN AND HER ADULT OFFSPRING: 1574 - 1607

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Widows With:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Proportion Heading The Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married Offspring</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Married Daughter</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Married Son</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Children</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Single Daughter</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Single Son</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
co-residence could bring, nor how the arrangements might be modified in
time as the widow grew older or the son married and had his own family.
In some households there may actually have been a gradual shift in
authority from one generation to the next. In 1590, for instance, Alice
Pounce took over her spouse's home in Butcher Row. She appeared alone
in the Easter Book of 1592, but for the next four years had two sons
living with her - George, who in 1594 was listed as a servant, and
Nicholas, who had been married since 1591. Between 1593 and 1599 one
assumes that Alice had nominal control of the household for her name
always headed the list. From 1601 however, Nicholas and his wife were
at the head, followed by "widow Pounce his mother." Comparisons based on
the layout of the lists should be made with caution for the methods of
compilation may have varied from year to year. But to confirm that there
had been some transfer of authority within the household it is
significant that after 1599 the son began to pay the larger sum towards
the church tithe. In 1596 Alice paid 16d for herself and George, and the
couple paid 8d. By 1601, meanwhile, Nicholas was still paying the same,
but the widow's contribution had dropped to 4d.

Several similar examples occur. In one household by the church,
Widow Morren headed the list in 1595 and 1596, yet by 1599 her son was
at the head and paid the larger tithe. Possibly James's marriage in 1596
determined the timing of the transfer. As an agreement made in 1587 between
Alice Lansdale and John Moggeridge, her future son-in-law, illustrates,
it was not unknown for a woman to 'retire' when her children married.163.
However the sample of known instances of succession during the mother's
lifetime is too small to establish how frequently there was a correlation
with the marital status of the junior generation. It certainly did not
apply in the case of the Pounce household and it is possible that the age
of the widow or the son's position in the urban hierarchy may have been
equally important.

163. Infra, p. 222.
Although cession from mother to son during the woman's lifetime may have been slightly more common than the evidence suggests, the norm was for a son to enter a property immediately after his father's death or after the death or remarriage of his mother. The other possibility, for a man to retire and hand control to his son "inter vivós", was exceptional. In the 34 year period covered by the Easter Books there are only three known examples of a man living with a son and one with a son-in-law. Two of the men appeared only once and nothing further is known of them. In the third case it is possible to trace the transition between father and son. In 1596 William Goodridge and his sister lived with their widowed father, a householder since 1574. By 1599 William had married and, although he did not actually head the list, he paid the higher tithe. By the following book he headed the list and amongst the members of his household until his death in 1604 was William Goodridge his father" or, as he was termed in 1602, "Old Goodridge". In this case the father's retirement coincided with the "establishment" of the junior generation. In the fourth example the son-in-law had already been a householder for some time before he moved to take over John Burges's household in 1599. The latter, who died in July 1600, and his wife, who continued to live with her daughter for several years, were presumably elderly and no longer able to cope on their own. Whether the son-in-law also took over the workshop we cannot tell, but it is possible that to cede control of the business during old age may have been slightly less unusual than handing over the household itself.164.

164. In a letter dating from 1624 John Hancocke referred to the fact that "I am nowe noe Brewer..... I have passed my brewhouse unto my sons and meynteyne not of what they have done thearein". H.R.O., J.L. Jervoise, Herriard Coll. Sherfield Mss. 44M69/56, XXXVII, No. 5.
THE HORIZONTALLY EXTENDED HOUSEHOLD

Whilst 56 of the 219 individual households containing kin between 1574 and 1607 were extended in an upward direction, only 32 are known to have included collaterals. This is certainly an underestimate given the difficulties of tracing kin and the fact that a number of households must have included siblings who had not yet reached communicable age. Few collaterals from beyond the householders family of origin have been identified but it seems likely that they would have been even more unusual than siblings. In any one year an average of no more than 1.3% of all households contained adult siblings, whilst only 1.5% of the individual householders appearing between 1574 and 1607 lodged a brother or sister. 165.

There seems to have been a definite correlation between the laterally extended household and the economic status of the householder. The Ditch, Bower's Chequer, Oatmeal Row and Castle Street head the list of individual streets in this respect, whilst as many as ten of the 25 men who lodged siblings belonged to the office-holding élite. During the period studied, 15 individual households contained a brother and 17 a sister. In both cases the majority were living with a brother (11 and 13 respectively), although it is possible that some who resided with a married sister remain undiscovered. The multi-couple household will be discussed later, but it is interesting to note that in five cases it was not simply a sister but also her spouse who was given houseroom. Only one of these couples, John Coriat and his wife appeared more than once. Significantly, not one example has been found of two brothers and their wives living together.

165. Whilst it is difficult to draw comparisons it is interesting that 4 of the 85 households in Ealing included a sister (4.7%) whilst none included a brother.
In common with those couples who dwelt with their parents, it seems to have been preferable to go to the wife's kin rather than to the husband's.

The women who have been identified seem to have stayed with their kin for briefer periods than the men. Fifteen of the sisters appeared in one list only, with no more than one staying for over ten years. By contrast eight of the 15 men appeared more than once and three can be traced for periods of ten or more years. One, Robert Penruddock, belonged to a gentry family. Another, Thomas Dyer, appears to have dwelt with his brother as a semi-permanent servant. No more than three of the brothers and two of the sisters were specifically labelled as servants, although it is possible that others would also have fallen into this category. In some cases a sibling may have been taken in whilst he or she was still under age. Several Willmakers specifically entrusted the care of their youngest offspring to a brother or sister who was already married, amongst them being Reynald Beckham, a joiner, who ordered his son to find "meat, drink and apparell" for his youngest son and his three daughters until they came of age. Beckham has already been noted for sharing with his father and mother-in-law. His brother also dwelt with him as a servant in 1582 and 1585, before marrying and setting up his own house and, besides, expecting his son to lodge his siblings, Beckham also requested that he give houseroom to his mother. The example suggests that certain families may have had a tradition of co-residence.

166. Supra, p. 213.
If it was unusual for a household to contain siblings or parents, it was even rarer to find more distant kin as inmates. Although a small sample of people known or presumed to be kin was used when establishing the maximum number of households containing kin, this is an inadequate guide to the frequency with which distant kin were found in the household. Not only is it conceivable that many individuals who have been classified as servants or simply as "others" were actually related to the householder or his wife, but it is also possible that some of those who have been presumed to be related by virtue of sharing the same name as the householder, were children or siblings rather than more distant kin. We cannot therefore give any precise statistical details, yet there are enough incidental references in other records to suggest that resident kin from beyond the immediate family were possibly more common than might be imagined and to indicate that the reasons why people lodged with offspring or siblings applied equally to those residing with other relatives.

THE MULTIPLE-FAMILY HOUSEHOLD

So far we have considered simply the frequency of the extended-family household, the household containing parents, siblings or more distant relatives. A few of these units can also be described as "multiple-family households" for they included another married couple in addition to the couple or widowed person heading the household. Apart from the occasional example of a couple sharing with married offspring, such as John Burges and his wife, or with a sibling, such as John Coriat and his wife, the multiple-family household was generally composed of a couple or a widowed person plus their married offspring.

Whilst roughly one in every 25 households each year contained resident kin, the number containing either kin or a married couple lay between one in
Throughout the 34 year period a maximum of 89 individual householders lodged another couple (4.3%), slightly higher than the mean annual proportion of 3.2%. The sample is small but there does appear to be a bias towards the wealthier streets, 12 multi-family households being found in Castle Street, nine in the Ditch and eight in West High Street. Amongst the backstreets only South New Street was above average in this respect with nine examples. Although it was noted earlier that women were less likely to house single kinsmen than men, 5.8% of the individual female householders lodged a married couple in contrast to 3.9% of the latter. 59 of the 67 men in question were married. This means that, at some point during the period, roughly one in every 35 households contained more than one couple.

In 21 cases it was impossible to ascertain whether the "guest" and "host" couple were actually related, although it seems reasonable to assume that a few must have been linked through the female line. Not that it was unknown for a couple to lodge with complete strangers. For the poorer householder, and the widow in particular such lodgers would have helped to supplement the family budget. Apart from the 21 uncertainties, five couples were linked laterally, two belonged to the senior generation and 58 (65.2%) to the junior generation. In three more cases the exact degree of kinship is uncertain.

To determine why a married couple should have opted to reside with kin

---

167. Included in the second total are a number of ambiguous cases where it is uncertain whether there was a definite kinship link between the "guest" couple and the "host", or it is not clear whether the second couple were actually living next door rather than in the same house.

168. If all the ambiguous cases were excluded this would give a minima of 47 or 2.2%. See Tables 4:13 and 4:14.

168a. In the poorer household the two conjugal units may not have been integrated but simply have doubled up in one "houseful" because of a lack of space.
I propose to concentrate on those couples who moved in with their parents, a group which accounts for the majority of those belonging to the junior generation. Earlier it was pointed out that, although most couples set up a home soon after marriage, just under a tenth of a sample from St. Thomas's apparently dwelt with their in-laws for a brief period first. In all 61 couples have been traced living with parents of whom the majority, 43, shared with the bride's family. In 40 cases two couples co-resided, in 18 the couple shared with a widow and in three with a widower. For a moment four of the couples may be discounted as they only moved in with the senior generation after a period as independent householders. Of the remainder at least 39 had only recently married before they appeared in the lists. In six cases there was a slight gap between the two dates, whilst in eleven more the date of marriage cannot be traced. Lacking evidence to the contrary, the latter are assumed to have been newly-weds.

If the main reason for the doubling-up of domestic units was that the junior couple could not immediately afford to establish their own home, one might expect that the families in question would be drawn primarily from the poorer parts of the parish. Yet only 14 came from New Street and the Chequers area, whilst almost half dwelt near the Market. Moreover, just over a third of the 40 men who lodged a younger couple belonged to the office-holding élite and nearly a quarter to the mercantile community. Although poorer families were involved, co-residence was not necessarily a sign of poverty.

---

169. Children are obviously more readily identifiable than other kin, but it is unlikely that a complete family reconstitution would reveal many more instances of multiple-family households which were extended horizontally or in an upwards direction.

170. The total differs from that given above being based on the "guest" couples rather than on the "hosts".
Sometimes, as one early seventeenth century court case illustrates, the financial state of the host, rather than that of the younger couple, was crucial. In the debate proceeding the marriage of Widow Turner's daughter it was agreed that, being unable to pay the portion of £200 demanded by the groom's family, "she should give them two years board or it should be noe match". According to one witness this meant, "meate, drinke, washing and all other necessaries befitting a married couple not keeping house", and would cost the widow about £16 a year. Although this is the only example of its kind, the existence of similar arrangements might explain why living with the bride's parents was more common than virilocal residence.

Whilst it is impossible to establish exactly how long each couple resided with their in-laws, the majority were present for an average of three to four years, with at least five sharing for over ten. Most of the couples had also started to produce their own families before moving on. Although the gaps between the various books must inevitably conceal a number of couples who only co-resided for brief periods, we are clearly dealing with more than a temporary phenomenon. It is unfortunate that the future whereabouts of the younger family is generally unknown. At least seven men subsequently set up their own home in the parish; eleven took over their host's household and four died soon after marriage. Of the remainder, exactly half if we exclude the eleven couples who appeared in the final Easter Book, ten disappeared from the records with their hosts, and twelve presumably left him to establish a home outside the town. For some couples co-residence marked an interim period before

setting up independently, although this was often some time after marriage. However, for at least a quarter of the couples it can be seen as a prelude before they were able to inherit the family property. It is significant, that although most couples resided with the girl's kin, only five of these ultimately took over the house in contrast to eight from the group living with the groom's parents (11.9% as opposed to 42.1%). Whilst uxorilocal residence may have been arranged as part of the marriage settlement, virilocal residence can be more readily understood as an aspect of inheritance.

In five cases the heir actually succeeded whilst a member of the senior generation was still living. The gradual transition in the Pounce and Morren households has already been mentioned. In the other examples the transfer was occasioned by the movement of the original householder. One man, John Simons, dwelt with his stepfather after his marriage and then remained in the household whilst the latter moved away. Alexander Alford meanwhile, left his earlier home to join his father-in-law in 1603 and then continued as the head when he moved to St. Edmund's.

It is particularly difficult to explain why a couple should have opted for co-residence at a later point in their marital career. No doubt it was sometimes with a view to taking over the property, perhaps occurring when the senior couple become too old to cope on their own. Couples may also have moved in with kin during periods of domestic crisis, the example of George Churchouse being a case in point. **172**. Whatever the timing of these arrangements the reason for living in a multi-family household were clearly complex. We cannot underestimate the importance of individual circumstances, but nor should we ignore

**172. Supra, p. 204.**
the fact that the tenurial balance between the two generations may have been far more important that it would initially appear.

**LIVING ARRANGEMENTS IN THE EXTENDED HOUSEHOLD**

The motives for living with kin were so varied that we should perhaps reconsider what sharing a household meant for the individuals involved. The Easter Books provide no more than an outline of the structure of the household and it is rare to find evidence concerning the actual running of each domestic unit. One example, which emphasises the problems of relying on listings, concerns a house in Castle Street. In 1607 the property was nominally headed by Widow Cabell, who paid 6d in the Easter collection, whilst her son, who contributed 6d for himself and his wife, appears to have been an inmate. From Henry Cabell's will however, we learn that the widow and her son were left in joint control of the home and dyehouse with instructions that neither was to do anything therein without the other's consent and that, if the woman remarried, she was to yield up her share of the property. 173.

In most cases the resident kinsman probably adopted a subordinate position within the household, albeit as a servant or a dependent. Some couples, like widow Turner's daughter and son-in-law, were provided for entirely by the head of the household. The elderly would have been particularly dependent on the householder for their maintenance and most of the will-makers who specified that the widow should be allocated houseroom required that she be given food and apparell as well. However, as suggested earlier, several widows could have lived elsewhere had they wished and it is possible that, whilst sharing in some aspects of domestic life, they may have retained an element of independence. Renald

173. P.R.O., Prob. 11/104/52/33.
Beckham's wife for example, was to be provided with "sufficient, necessarie, wholesome meate and drinke". But possibly she fended for herself for she was also to have two rooms "solely to herself", plus a large number of household implements.

For both generations to share the costs and responsibilities of running a household, as they did in the Cabell family, may have been fairly common. Earlier we mentioned the marriage agreement made between Alice Lansdale and her son-in-law. Although the latter was to find the widow meat and drink, she obviously continued to contribute towards running the home, agreeing that if John gave "a peck of wheat and one peck of malt weekly towards the finding of the said house", she would provide the residue.

In another case we learn how Agnes Comyn and a kinsman, who dwelt with her between 1592 and 1596 had,

"in comyn and general opinion and reputation of the neighbors employed their stocks together to the comon benefit of one and another". (176.)

In some of the wealthiest multiple-households it is possible that, rather than sharing a common table, the two families had their own clearly defined areas within the house and ran their affairs independently. In the larger courtyard houses in Salisbury it would certainly have been feasible to allocate a separate wing to the younger couple. It is significant that in at least seven of the 61 multi-couple households both units apparently had their own servants. Interesting too, is

175. S.D.R., Bishops Court Miscellaneous Papers 29/47.
178. In such cases there is a danger that the two generations may have been neighbours rather than co-residents.
the fact that several of the complex families had links with the gentry or the mercantile community. In both groups the men were often absent on business for long periods and may have had second homes in London, or in the country. Under such circumstances the Salisbury house could have been run entirely by the women-folk for a large part of the year, or have been used simply as a temporary base when the family had business in the town. Two families, will serve as examples. Katherine Webbe, the woman who headed the largest household in St. Thomas's, gave accommodation to her sister and brother-in-law; to her three daughters and their spouses, and to a number of nephews, nieces and godchildren.

The Webbes were prominent Wiltshire landowners and it seems likely that the house in Castle Street was used as a town base by the different branches of the family and their relatives. This would explain why Katherine and the various couples were not consistently enumerated, although the house was certainly in the hands of the family from 1592 onwards. The second sample concerns Robert Bower, a merchant and mayor in 1585. He dwelt in the parish between 1574 and 1606, although inexplicable gaps suggest that he may have spent time elsewhere. Although his household was decidedly smaller than Mistress Webbe's, he managed to accommodate two daughters and their husbands, both of whom were again inconsistently recorded. Whether the two younger men worked with Bower is uncertain, but a common business interest may have been one reason why some of the wealthier families shared their homes.

If listings reveal nothing about the practicalities of running an extended household they also tell nothing of the personal relationships between the householder and his kinsmen. As several court cases make clear, these were often far from harmonious. Widow Turner, for instance, was supposed to give her daughter and son-in-law two years board, but the arrangement broke down when the couple quarrelled with her son. John Bricket, who
accommodated his son after his marriage, had never approved of the match and after his son's death declared that the widow "shall not long roost in my house" (179). In another family Alex Cater gave his brother a bed, but tension soon arose when he began to suspect him of unfaithfulness with his wife, whilst Agnes Comyn, who shared with her kinsman John Samways and his wife, quarrelled with the former over some bonds and eventually took him to court on a charge of fraud. These cases are probably far from typical, yet they do emphasise that, in attempting to establish why a kinsman eventually disappeared from the household we often need look no further than the personalities of the people involved.

KIN AND THE DOMESTIC-CYCLE

Having discussed the periods in the individual life-cycle when people were most likely to move in with kin it remains to consider whether there were certain stages in the development of the household itself when residential kin or additional couples were particularly common. Table 4:19, detailing the frequency with which the household was extended in a vertical or a horizontal direction, reveals a significant difference between the household headed by the couple and that headed by a single person. Logically those who were nearer the beginning of the domestic-cycle, namely single or married men were more likely to house parents or siblings; widowed people to house members of the junior generation. Unfortunately it is impossible to go beyond this without a detailed analysis based on the age of each individual householder.

179. Supra, p. 219 & p. 204.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households Headed By:</th>
<th>Same Generation</th>
<th>Older Generation</th>
<th>Younger generation</th>
<th>Unknown generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Man</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widower</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the light of the results obtained elsewhere it is certainly tempting to view the extension of the household as a function of the developmental cycle and to assume that the man in mid-career, whose parents had died, whose siblings were already established and whose children had not yet left home, would have been least likely to head an extended household. In both Ealing in 1599 and Ardleigh in the eighteenth century it is significant that kin occurred most frequently amongst those households which were headed by a young couple or by an individual who was reaching the end of the life-cycle.\textsuperscript{181} Similarly Berkner found that, whereas only 25\% of all the peasant households in Waldviertel in 1763 included kin, 60\% of those headed by men aged between 18 and 27 and 45\% of those aged between 28 and 37 fell into this category.\textsuperscript{182}

The Salisbury evidence reveals a tentative link between resident kin and age. It also suggests that far more households may have been extended for brief periods than the annual totals would suggest. However, it would be unwise to infer from this that most households did pass through phases of extension at particular stages in their development. The model of a unit which oscillated from an extended phase to a nuclear phase and back again seems far less applicable in an urban situation than in a rural environment such as Waldviertel, where the system was heavily dependent on a maximum utilisation of both living space and labour. In the agricultural household, such as Berkner describes, the presence of a newly married couple at one point and of aged parents at another was closely linked with the transmission of land from one generation to another.

\textsuperscript{181} P. Laslett, \textit{Household and Family}, p. 150.
The former needed houseroom until they could inherit an estate, the latter gave up their role as householders when they retired from the land. In the Early Modern town by contrast, a number of factors inhibited the extension of the household - heavy mobility, high mortality, lack of continuity between father and son, poverty and lack of space to name but a few. It is certainly logical that the householders who did accommodate kin would belong to certain key age groups. But given the fact that only a tiny minority of the newly married, the group most likely to have elderly parents, or of the older households with marriageable offspring ever did house kin, it is clear that in this instance, we can only assign a minimal role to the developmental cycle.
INMATES, LODGERS AND UNIDENTIFIED INHABITANTS

There remains one element of the household which has not yet been mentioned, namely lodgers and inmates. In only 15 of the 100 communities studied by Laslett were inmates specifically recorded. On aggregate they formed nearly a tenth of the population (9.7%), and were found in nearly a fifth of all domestic groups (18.1%). Lodgers were possibly more common in the town than in the rural household. In London almost a fifth of the population in the 1590s were lodgers. In the village of Clayworth, by contrast, no more than two or three of the houses listed in 1676 and 1688 contained anyone who might conceivably fall into this category.  

To take in outsiders, albeit for short periods only, must have been an important source of income for the poorer urban householder and, in particular, for the widow. The Salisbury records reveal many cases of strangers dwelling with poor women. In 1635 for instance, Widow Easton from New Street, was presented having "entertained William Symes, a stranger", and Elizabeth Vaughan for lodging one Widnall, "who lately came from the Devizes to inhabit in this city." The Salisbury Corporation was not alone in its attempts to forbid the sub-letting of tenements or to check the type of person entering the town by demanding that either they or their "host" should give sureties that they would not become chargeable to the town. Corporation leases commonly stipulated that under-tenants were not to be admitted without consent and in the late sixteenth century several views were taken of

185. P. Slack, Poverty in Early Stuart Salisbury, p.98.
186. Supra, p. 57.
properties containing more inhabitants than "thought convenient".

It was ordained in 1611 that "no tenant shall keep any undertenants or more tenants in one house than one", and one year later that,

"no dweller in any house to receive any inmate to dwell in same house, either foreigner or citizen, unless with the consent of the mayor and justices of the peace". (187.).

The position of inmates who were unrelated to the head and who had no functional role in either the home or the workshop is obscure. A Salisbury butcher commented that before setting up home,

"he and his wife did sojourn at the house of Mrs Shingleton for space of a quarter of a year and upward but not altogether at the chargeis of sayd Mrs. Shingleton". (188).

In this case the couple may have shared a common table with the family. Other lodgers, and this could include kin, probably rented a room in which they ate and slept quite separately from the rest of the household.

Strictly speaking, the fact that the link between lodgers and other members of the domestic unit was tenuous means that they should be counted as members of the same "houseful", but not as members of the same "household". In other words, although sharing the same premises it should not be assumed that they shared any of the activities of the household.

In the present analysis it is impossible to observe this "nicety". The number of inhabitants who can be positively identified as lodgers is minimal, and although the official attacks on sub-letting imply that many premises were shared by unconnected groups or individuals, the Easter Books are not sufficiently detailed to enable us to identify such units. Only in 1593 does the bracketing together of several groups of four or five couples, who were unconnected in other years, raise the possibility

188. S.D.R., B.C.D.B., No. 9, fol, 89C.
189. Laslett point out that even parents were occasionally described as lodgers. Family Life, p.178
that some individual households may in fact have been crowded into one tenement.

Once servants, offspring and kin have been taken into account we are left with a group of additional men and women which formed 2 or 3% of the recorded population in St. Thomas's. Even if they were all lodgers, and it seems inconceivable that some were not servants or kin, this gives a proportion far lower than in Laslett's 15 communities. A few can definitely be categorised as lodgers. In 1590, for instance, George Goldring lodged "Mrs Jane Garet a border", whilst in 1582 one of the men grouped with Rankin Smith was noted as "his tenant". Yet such examples were exceptional. It is interesting that unidentified inhabitants appeared most frequently in the homes of single men and widows, those most likely to have the space and the incentive to sub-let. Even so, this still applied to less than one in ten widows whilst overall, no more than one in twenty households, included an unidentified inmate.

In view of Laslett's suggestion that lodgers may have been fairly common in the early modern town and the fact that overcrowding was considered a problem in Salisbury why is it that so few of the communicants in St. Thomas's could have fallen into this category? Even if allowance is made for the fact that a number of individual householders may actually have been inmates in another unit, it is unlikely that the results would differ markedly. It is possible, of course, the lodgers were more common in St. Martin's and the poorer parts of St. Edmund's. Yet perhaps the most logical reason why all but a tiny

---

190. This result is an average for the years 1585 to 1607. In 1582 the unidentified group amounted to nearly a tenth of the recorded population, but many of these were probably servants, for the latter were far fewer than in the other lists.
minority of the inhabitants can be classified as householders or as kin and servants, is that most lodgers probably only stayed for short periods and would consequently escape enumeration. Indeed, even if they were present when the Easter Collection was taken, it is conceivable that, as they were only temporarily attached to the parish, lodgers may have been deliberately overlooked. The evidence is unsatisfactory, yet on the basis of incidental references in other records, it is possible to conclude that, whilst most of the people appearing in the Easter Books seem to have had a functional role in the household, by virtue either of kinship or of service, many households may have been briefly extended by the presence of a stranger.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE DISSOLUTION OF THE HOUSEHOLD

AND ITS EFFECT UPON THE WIDOW

"Of fyve husbandes scoleiyng am I
Welcome the sixte, whan that evere he shal
For sothe, I wol nat kepe me chaast in al
Whan myn housbonde is fro the world ygon"

Chaucer: The Wife of Baths' Tale.
THE IMPORTANCE OF REMARRIAGE IN THE PAST

One of the distinguishing features of the pre-modern family is that it was, in the words of Lawrence Stone, a "transient and temporary association". A number of factors which contributed to the fluidity of the household, namely the mobility of servants; the tendency to give houseroom to kinsmen for short periods only and the high mortality of children, have already been mentioned. In this chapter I propose to complete the discussion of the family - cycle by considering how the household could be disrupted by the premature death of the householder himself or of his wife.

The evidence from Colyton in Devon suggests that for the majority of couples the duration of first marriage in the seventeenth century would have been between 17 and 20 years. Many people may have lived to see their children start their own families. In Petersfield, for instance, where the average marriage contracted between 1570 and 1639 apparently lasted just over 19 years, one of the 37 unions traced from the 1570s lasted for 50 years; four for over 40 and seven for over 30 years. Yet there were also many couples who only lived together for a brief period before death, particularly in childbirth, intervened.

Earlier it was stressed that it was rare for adults to live alone and that the household headed by a married couple was the norm. However, given the low expectancy of life, it is fair to assume that a significant number of households were the product of second or even third marriages. Indeed, it has been estimated that whereas only 10% of those marrying in

1. L. Stone, op. cit., p. 46.
2. Ibid., p.47.
4. Supra, p. 73.
the nineteenth century were contracting a remarriage, the proportion in
the sixteenth century may have been between 25 and 30%⁵. With only
occasional references to marital status in the Salisbury parish registers
it is difficult to assess the proportion of marriages in which one or
both partners had been married before. In St. Martin's, where widows are
occasionally indicated, at least a quarter of the women marrying between
1578 and 1607 had been married before. As the status of nearly half the
women is unknown, the proportion in reality may have been closer to a
third. However, the evidence from a sample of 428 marriage licences
ratified between 1615 and 1635 suggests that this estimate could be too
high. Only 68 of the brides recorded were widows (15.9%), whilst 297
(69.4%) are known to have been spinsters.
The evidence from this source should be treated with some caution for the
poor would have been unable to afford marriage licences. However, the
fact that slightly more of the grooms had been married before, 89 (20.8%)
being specifically noted as widowers, suggests that remarriages may have
been more common for men than for women.

Whilst the evidence concerning the remarriage ratio is limited, it is
possible to consider the rate of remarriage, that is the likelihood that
a widowed person would marry again, in rather more detail. Concentrating
on widowers first, it is notable that at least two in every five men
bereaved between 1570 and 1599 can be traced entering a second marriage.⁶
There was little difference between the three parishes in this respect
nor, despite heavy mortality in the 1590s, did the rate vary much during

⁵. R. Schofield & E.A. Wrigley, "Remarriage Intervals and the effect of
Marriage Order in Fertility", in J. Dupâquier, op. cit., p. 212.

⁶. This rate is slightly lower than that obtained by Barbara Todd for
the parish of Stanford in the Vale in Berkshire where between 1567 and 1617
48% of all widowers and 25.3% of all widows can be traced remarrying.
1981.
Inevitably an analysis of this sort rests on the assumption that like
surnames relate to the same individuals. The greater the interval between
bereavement and remarriage the less reliable the evidence although as
comparatively few can be traced remarrying after five years, the results
should be reasonably accurate. See Table 5:1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Thomas's</th>
<th>St. Edmund's</th>
<th>St. Martin's</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>St. Martin's All Widows</th>
<th>St. Thomas's Householders Widows</th>
<th>Testators Widows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. Bereaved</strong></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Remarrying</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. Remarrying Within</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 +</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interval Between Bereavement And Remarriage In Months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Excluding Those Remarrying After 60 Months</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the three decades covered. With larger samples one might expect to find
significant annual variations. It is particularly unfortunate that after
the severe epidemic of 1604 the registers became very brief and are
inadequate for this type of analysis.\footnote{7}

One of the main problems in trying to estimate the rate of remarriage
is to determine the size of the group "at risk". The proportion of
two-fifths is clearly inadequate for not all the men bereaved during
this period would have been able to remarry. Some would have died shortly
after their spouse. Others left the town altogether. There must also have
been a small group who married elsewhere. In order to obtain a more
acceptable result the fate of 153 men from St. Thomas's was examined in
more detail.\footnote{8} As only a minority of the known second marriages were
contracted after 60 months particular attention was given to the men's
movements within five years of bereavement.\footnote{9} It was found that roughly

\footnote{7} Other studies suggest that the remarriage rate may have been higher
in the late 16th century than in subsequent periods. In Abingdon, for
instance, as many as two-fifths of the sixteenth century widows examined
may have remarried, yet by the seventeenth century the rate had fallen
to about a fifth. Todd suggests that this was related to the increasing
longevity of first marriages and possibly to a shift in public opinion.
There was, for instance, a tendency for more testators to impose
penalties should their wife remarry. She also makes the point that the
widow's chances of remarrying increased during periods of economic
uncertainty as the opportunities for female employment diminished. \textit{Ibid.},
pp. 97-125.

\textit{Wrigley & Schofield} suggest that the decline in both the male and the
female remarriage rates after the pre-industrial period should not simply
be explained in terms of a fall in adult mortality. It also reflects
changes in the age of first marriage and in the proportion ever marrying.
R. Schofield & E. Wrigley, "Remarriage Intervals", \textit{loc.cit.}, p.212.

\footnote{8} See Table 5:2.

\footnote{9} Schofields analysis of eight parishes between 1600 and 1799 indicates
that 89% of the men and 80% of the women who remarried did so within the
TABLE 5:2 THE REMARRIAGE RATE IN ST. THOMAS'S:
AN EXAMINATION OF THE CAREERS OF 153 MEN BEREAVED BETWEEN 1574 & 1607

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBERS:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Of Sample</th>
<th>% Of Group Effectively At Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remarrying in Salisbury</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presumed to Marry Elsewhere</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dying Within 5 Years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known to Move From The Parish</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known to Remain Single For 5 + Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Recorded in The Easter Books</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Effectively At Risk (Including Allowance For Some Who Never Dwelt In The Parish)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
one in ten died during this interval. Another 20 (13%) apparently moved away from the town, or at least the parish, for they disappeared from the Easter Books. One can only speculate upon the possible relationship between bereavement and mobility. Some of the widowers in question dwelt alone in the parish for several years before disappearing. Yet at least six vanished almost immediately. One case of particular interest concerns Robert Banes, a prominent Salisbury merchant. Between 1590 and 1596 he lived next to, or possibly even in the same house as, his father-in-law on the Ditch. His wife died in July 1597 and by 1599, the date of the next record, Robert had moved to Catherine Street and had evidently remarried.10.

Inevitably some of the men who vanished from the records would have remained in the parish for only a year or two anyway. This may also have been true of another 31 members of the group who never appeared in the Easter lists. If we assume that half the untraced widowers never lived in St. Thomas's and subtract them from the total, along with the 20 emigrants and the 15 who died, this reduces the group effectively at risk, namely those who apparently still dwelt in St. Thomas's, to just over 100. Positive evidence confirms that 64 of these men remarried in Salisbury. Another 20 presumably married elsewhere for, after a short interval they reappeared in the lists with a spouse. Clearly, unless death intervened or the widower moved away from Salisbury, it was unusual for men not to enter a second match, and for those at risk a remarriage rate of over 75% seems quite feasible.

10. Even then Banes maintained a close link with his first wife's father, for an oblique reference in his will, where Robert was significantly named as executor, suggests that the latter actually owned the property in Catherine Street. (P.R.O., Prob. 11/120/72/97.)
To confirm that the male remarriage rate was high it is notable how few households in St. Thomas's were actually headed by widowers. Certain problems hinder the identification of widowers, yet even if all single male householders were included the proportion would still be low. For instance, on average between 1585 and 1603 only 2.5% of all households were headed by known widowers and 3% by other single men. As might be expected, widowers rarely lived alone for long periods. 60% of all those appearing in the test years 1593, 1594, 1595 and 1602 had disappeared or remarried by the following year, the "normal" rate of disappearance within a year being 40%. Similarly, whilst roughly a quarter of all male householders stayed in one house for ten years or more, only two out of a group of 32 widowers (6.25%) were found living alone ten years after bereavement.

As pointed out earlier it was rare for a man to "retire" from his home and workshop, no more than two of the widowers from St. Thomas's ever handing over to a married son. It was slightly less unusual for women to cede their homes to their offspring or to live with others, and widows who headed households were also more common than men. Between 1582 and 1603 roughly one in every eight households was headed by a woman. Moreover, the proportion of widows appearing for one year only was slightly less than that for the widowers, with nearly twice as many remaining as occupiers for periods of ten years or more.

The evidence from the St. Martin's burial register, which provides the names of surviving widows, confirms that the predominance of widows amongst the single householders was related to the lower incidence of female remarriage.

11. Unless a man was previously recorded with a wife or external evidence confirms that he had been married the single male householder is normally considered as a batchelor.

12. Infra, p. 266.
For instance, of 258 women widowed between 1570 and 1599, only about one in three can subsequently be traced in the Salisbury marriage registers. Moreover, as Table 5:1 illustrates, whilst the widower was likely to remarry within a year, for widows an interlude of 18 months was more common, although even the latter remarried with extraordinary haste on occasions. In one court case it was related how, a week after the death of her husband, Simon Everett visited Anne Godfrey and declared that,

"he woulde tarry no longer w(i)th her for that she was a sole and alone woman except she could find in her hart to love him above all other" ,

whereupon the couple became betrothed. Other less fortunate women, such as Sibille Carpenter of Fisherton Anger, who "went into service and continued widow for eight or nine years", faced long periods of living alone.

Given the problems of tracing the careers of women it is difficult to determine the female remarriage rate with as much precision as was possible in the case of the widowers from St. Thomas's. However, the results from two further samples confirm that this rate must have been at least a third. Despite the fact that the second sample, composed of women whose husbands died leaving a will between 1570 and 1599, is biased in terms of wealth, neither the remarriage rate nor the interval between bereavement and remarriage varied significantly from the St. Martin's results. A rate of just over a third was also obtained using a sample of 114 women whose spouses were listed in the Easter Books and whose date of death was known. The median remarriage interval for the group was 14.5 months, the mean 25.6. Roughly a tenth of these widows, whose careers can be reconstructed in slightly


14. Ibid., No. 11, fol. 59v.
more detail, died within five years of their spouse. The number who
moved away or who remarried elsewhere remains obscure. But we know
that at least 18 (15.8% - a proportion higher than that obtained for the
St. Thomas widowers) continued living alone in the parish, either as
householders or with kin, for periods of more than five years and possibly
a number more went to work as servants in other households.

Even with minimal figures the Salisbury evidence confirms the impression
gained from other studies that remarriage in the past was predominantly
a male affair.\textsuperscript{15}. As Schofield and Wrigley's analysis of 14 pre-industrial
parishes suggests, it was also more likely to involve the union of a
widower and a spinster than a widow and a bachelor, or than two
bereaved individuals, the proportions for the three categories being 71.9%,
18.9% and 9.2% respectively.\textsuperscript{16} Although the source has its limitations,
it is interesting to note that half the widows and over a third of the
widowers listed in the Salisbury marriage licences, married another
bereaved person. Ages are not always given but the widower does seem
to have been slightly more inclined to marry a younger spouse than the
widow. The age gap between man and wife was logically greater in higher
order marriages than in first marriages.\textsuperscript{17} It is also possible that the
fortunes of the two partners may have been more divergent in the former
and that, as Segalen suggests, there were less concern to find a spouse
of corresponding status and greater freedom to satisfy personal sentiment.\textsuperscript{18}

The Salisbury evidence is insufficient to assess the importance of
economic endogamy, and we can do little but suggest that the geographical

\textsuperscript{15} The fact that, at all ages, men were more likely to remarry than women
may have helped to compensate for the uneven sex-ratios common to
pre-industrial communities.

\textsuperscript{16} R. Schofield & E.A. Wrigley, "Remarriage Intervals", \textit{loc.cit.}, p.223.

\textsuperscript{17} Supra, p. 106.

\textsuperscript{18} M. Segalen, "Mentalité Populaire", \textit{loc. cit.}, p.72.
area from which a spouse was chosen may have been even more restricted in the case of the second partner than in the first. 19. An examination of some of the couples in the Easter Books illustrates that there may often have been a pre-existing link between the man and the woman. Of a group of 64 widows known to remarry during the period covered by the books, it is fairly certain that 16 married a widower. In five cases the second husband was a close neighbour. Collet Paynton, for instance, married John Water who dwelt next door to her and her former spouse in 1574. When John died in 1583 she married the servant of another neighbour, one John Clent. At least four other women married servants. One, Alice Jacob, married a neighbour's former apprentice. The other three, perhaps motivated by the need for assistance to carry on the family business, chose men who had previously served them or their late spouse.

One of the most interesting facts to be revealed by this particular sample is how common it was for the second spouse to take over the woman's dwelling house. Exactly half the households in question were found listed under the man's name shortly after the marriage. 20 The former servants were included in this group and a number of other men may have been "new beginners" who, like Jesse Paige who married Katherine Whitemarsh, the widow of a tailor, shortly after being admitted to that craft, had taken the opportunity to acquire both home and workshop by marrying a widow. On the other hand several in the group, such as John Diaper and Henry Marketman, were already householders and clearly had no such motive in moving in with their second wife. The women who handed over their homes are equally difficult to categorise. A number had young children.


20. Although the second husband had "possession" of the tenement he did not necessarily hold the lease. In the 1649 survey of Ecclesiastical Property for instance, a house in Tanner Street was recorded in the "tenure" of Robert Smith, whilst the remainder of the lease was in the hands of "Joane Smith als Ganniet" relict and executor of Richard Ganniet. In other cases the lease passed to the second spouse as well. Thus the remainder of a lease made out to Sara Clerke was found "in Lawrence Tattershall by marriage of the lessee". (S.D. R., Parliamentary Survey 1649, No. 12, f. 11, No. 11, f. 2.).
and had only been married for a short time before the first husband died. However, they also include women like Joan Hanora who had no children and who married a former servant when she was in her fifties.

The woman's ability to pass on a tenement to a second spouse undoubtedly affected her chances of remarriage. Before turning to the question of the widow's property rights, it is important to consider some of the other factors which may have affected the rate of remarriage namely age, the presence of children and wealth. One of the most obvious explanations for the predominance of widows in sixteenth century society is that they were numerically at a disadvantage.\(^{21}\) If the sex-ratio for St. Thomas's, estimated at 85 men (excluding apprentices), to every 100 women was, reflected in the rest of the town, then it seems logical that, unless they looked further afield, women would have found it harder to attract a second spouse than men. In some towns the freeman's widow at least, had certain attractions which offset her numerical disadvantage. In Bristol and Worcester, for instance, marriage to a widow was a recognised means of entry to a craft or into the freedom of the city.\(^{22}\) However, this was not the case in Salisbury. The 1612 craft ordinances were unanimous in setting heavy fines for women who continued to trade after remarriage and there were no facilities for the unskilled "foreigner" to ignore the normal entrance procedures, by simply marrying a widow and taking over her shop. Indeed only if the woman married two men from the same trade, a practice which although not unknown was far from universal, would her previous spouses' stock have been of much benefit other than as an asset to

---

21. In the Standard English Community the sex-ratio was 91 males to 100 females and 8.7% of the population were widows compared with 3.5% for widowers.

be sold.

Given the imbalanced sex-ratio it seems logical to assume that the wealthier the widow and also the younger she was, the greater her chances of remarriage. Without a full-scale reconstitution, it is impossible to assess the importance of the second of the two factors with any certainty. Yet a rough indication of the effect of age can be obtained by considering how long the individuals previous marriage had lasted. Even though the age at first marriage is unknown, it seems reasonable to assume that a majority of those who had only been married for a few years were younger people with dependent children.

As Table 5:3 indicates, the male remarriage rate does not appear to have varied significantly with age. The date of the previous marriage can be traced in 218 cases. Perhaps surprisingly, for they would have been particularly in need of the support of a wife to care for young children and to help in their trade, the men who were widowed after less than five years of married life were the least likely to remarry. One can only assume that this group was particularly mobile and that many of the widowers moved away from Salisbury soon after bereavement. At the opposite end of the scale, the men whose previous marriage had lasted for over twenty years remarried, whilst those known to have been married twice before actually had the highest remarriage rate. Although the median remarriage interval extends slightly as the duration of the first marriage increases, the older widowers were also more likely to marry within the space of a year than the norm.

23. In 18th Century Tuscany the chances of remarriage appear to have decreased with the increasing duration of the previous marriage, although this was more marked in the case of women than of men. Nearly a quarter of the widows who had been married for less than four years remarried, compared with only 5.1% of those married for ten years or more. For the widowers the corresponding proportions were 52.1% and 20.5%.

(C.A. Corsini, "Why is Remarriage a Male Affair? Some Evidence from Tuscan Villages during the 18th Century", in J. Dupâquier, op. cit., p. 390.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration Of Previous Marriage</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number Remarrying</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. Remarrying Within:</th>
<th>Remarriage Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Twice Before</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration Of Previous Marriage</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number Remarrying</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. Remarrying Within:</th>
<th>Remarriage Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Twice Before</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: Men from all three parishes known to have been bereaved between 1570 and 1599.  
B: Women from St. Martin's known to have been bereaved during the same period.
For widows age may have been a more significant factor. The duration of the previous marriage is known in 79 cases. Significantly none of the women who had married over twenty years before bereavement, and who were presumably in their late 40's or 50's, took a second spouse, whilst just over a quarter of those known to have had two previous husbands took a third. The highest rate pertained to the group who had been married for between five and ten years, although curiously it was those married for between ten and twenty years or widowed once before who seem to have remarried fastest. Were the few older women who did remarry particularly wealthy widows who financial status enabled them to rapidly attract a suitor?  

The man left with young children would have been anxious to find a surrogate mother, the woman to obtain additional support for her family. Yet whilst creating an obvious motive for remarriage, children may also have been considered a liability and actually have restricted the chances of remarriage. Taking first the group of testator's widows one can gain a rough impression from the wills themselves how many women would have been left in charge of minors, although it should be emphasised that testators did not necessarily name all their offspring, nor did many indicate their exact ages. The presence of children did not greatly affect the rate of remarriage, 35.3% of the apparently childless widows remarrying in contrast to 40.3% of those with children. Yet significantly, not one of the

24. Schofield and Wrigleys analysis of 423 men and 295 women who remarried between 1600 and 1799 suggests that the age of the widower at bereavement had little effect on the speed with which he remarried but that there was a tendency for a woman over 40 to marry sooner than younger women. They commented that as the probability of ever remarrying normally declines after this point, the shorter intervals at older ages may simply reflect an increasingly severe selection of eligible women. Schofield & Wrigley, op. cit., p. 218.

25. Although theoretically a disincentive, children may not always have been an obstacle in practice. In the wealthier family they were often put out to guardians. In the poorer household the loss of a parent may have marked the point when some of the older children left home to find work.
women whose children were all of age remarried, whilst 34.3% of those with mixed families did so and 36.8% of those left entirely with minors. Once again it appears that the older the widow the less her chances of remarriage, although whether this was due to diminished opportunities or to reduced necessity remains open to conjecture.

The number of children involved does not appear to have affected the woman's chances, indeed proportionately more of the women with over three children can be traced remarrying. Even a woman such as Dorothy Castle with as many as six or seven dependents can be found entering a second marriage, although there were other women in similar circumstances who were less fortunate. Elizabeth Williamson for example, was left with seven young children when her husband died in April 1589 and was still single by February 1595 when her death is recorded. Likewise Joan Bricket, who was left with nine minors in 1587, continued to dwell alone in Bricket's Corner until 1604. It would be interesting to know the exact ages of the orphaned children for those of ten and over who could be put to work would presumably have been less of a burden than those under five. To test for the effect of the presence of young children a group of 47 widowers from St. Thomas's and of 69 widows from St. Martin's were examined using the age at bereavement of the last surviving child to be baptised as a guide. The samples are small due to the problems in tracing baptisms and the results are therefore only tentative. Slightly more of the men with children under five remarried than did the widows, (61.1% as opposed to 47.4%), yet at the same time far more of the men who apparently remained single had young children than did those who remarried.

26. A similar exercise in Abingdon reveals that the testator's widow who remarried was more likely to have dependent children than normal. B. Todd, op. cit., p.118. See Table 5:4A.

27. In 18th Century Tuscany the likelihood of remarriage decreased with the number of surviving children. Whereas for instance, 17.7% of all childless widows and 41.2% of the comparable widowers remarried, the corresponding proportions for those with three or more offspring were only 3.3% and 22.2%. Corsini "Why is remarriage a male affair?" loc. cit., p.390. 28. See Table 5:4B.
### TABLE 5:4 REMARRIAGE RATES BY NUMBER AND AGE OF SURVIVING CHILDREN

**A: SALISBURY TESTATORS' WIDOWS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIDOWS WITH:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number Remarrying</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Children</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Children</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 +</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Adult Offspring</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Minors</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Family</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B: ST. THOMAS'S WIDowers AND ST. MARTIN'S WIDOWS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total No. With</th>
<th>% No. With</th>
<th>% No. With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children *</td>
<td>Children Under 5 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowers Who Remarry</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Remain Single</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widows Who Remarry</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Remain Single</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: Widows whose husbands died testate between 1570 and 1599.
B: Men from St. Thomas's and women from St. Martin's bereaved between 1570 and 1599.
* At bereavement rather than at remarriage.
TABLE 5.5 Remarriage Rates by Age of Children: 1570 - 1599

A: ST. THOMAS’S WIDOWERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervals in Months</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Children</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Children</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Children Under</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 At Remarriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Children Under</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 At Remarriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B: ST. MARTIN’S WIDOWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervals in Months</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Children</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Children</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Children Under</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 At Remarriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Children Under</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 At Remarriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The same was true of the widows although less marked. It was certainly far from inevitable that the man or woman with young children would remarry, although it is quite possible that those not traced to a second marriage moved away and married elsewhere. On the other hand as Table 5:5 illustrates, there does seem to have been a slight tendency for those with children under five to remarry faster than normal. 29.

In many ways the impact of wealth upon remarriage is even harder to gauge than the effect of children. It has already been pointed out that although possibly wealthier than normal, the testator's widow was apparently neither more nor less likely to remarry than women in the two other samples. Yet a more detailed examination suggests that wealth and remarriage may, in fact, have been inversely related. For instance, of the 78 testator's widows who failed to remarry at least 41 (52.6%) had been married to subsidy men, at least 19 (24.4%) to civic office holders and, where occupation is known, over half to merchants or to men described as gentlemen or yeomen. By contrast the husbands of only 16 of the 40 women who remarried were subsidy men (40%); 6 were officers (15%); under a fifth were merchants and none were described as gentry. Even with incomplete evidence it appears that the widow who was logically the most attractive potential partner may have preferred to remain single. 30. In the case of the widower, on the other hand, the inverse relationship between wealth and remarriage does not seem to have applied. 17.5% of the men from St. Thomas's who remarried were known to be members of the office holding elite and 27.5% to be subsidy men. By contrast only 5.9% of those

29. In Schofield and Wrigley's English Sample the more children alive the the longer the duration of widowhood. This factor was particularly strong in the case of the women, the childless widow remarrying on average within 1.92 years, her fellow with three or more children in 4.01 years. For widowers, on the other hand the means differed by less than a year. Schofield & Wrigley, "Remarriage Intervals", loc. cit., p.218.

30. The lower remarriage ratio for the Salisbury brides who married by licence may not have been a chance factor after all.
who remained single were officers and 11.8% taxpayers.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF BEREAVEMENT.

Individual case histories illustrate the dangers of over-emphasising these results, yet it does appear that factors such as age, the presence of children and wealth may have been less crucial for the widower, than they were for the widow. It was unusual for the former to remain single for long, whatever his circumstances. On the other hand it was far more common for the woman to marry only once, particularly if she had an adult family or if she had been adequately provided for. In considering the frequency of remarriage we need to be aware of the balance between opportunity and necessity. The woman who, like the widow described in the "Lawes Resolutions of Women's Rights", was "faire, young, rich (and) gracious in her carriage", may have been beset with suitors and troubled all day "with answering petitions" (31). Yet as Segalen argues, her position may have been so much more favourable than that of the married woman that she would actually have preferred to remain a "femme sole" (32). It was her less fortunate counterpart, unable to maintain her family single-handed, who was most likely to remarry even though she may have found it far harder to attract a second spouse.

Not only do the results suggest that the widower was more likely to remarry than the widow, but it is possible that he found bereavement less disrupting. Looked at in practical terms, and there is very little evidence of the emotional distress caused by bereavement, remarriage simply entailed replacing one member of a man's household with another. Perhaps the second wife would bring additional children with her. Occasionally


bereavement might also cause the man to move away from his old home, particularly if the property had been attached to his former spouse's family. Yet it seems unlikely that many male households would have been drastically restructured as a result of bereavement.

The widow, by contrast, would be more likely to face physical and social upheaval. Many women had to leave their marital home, either on remarriage or because the inheritance of the property passed elsewhere, and even those who were able to stay might witness the disintegration of the home as the dead man's effects were divided. At the same time apprentices were often transferred to new masters, younger children were sometimes put out to service or to the care of guardians and occasionally a married son and his family moved in and assumed effective control of the household.

In order to obtain some impression of the problems the widow faced I propose to devote the remainder of this chapter to an examination of some of the provisions made for the widow and to look in particular at her ability to keep a roof over her head and to maintain herself and her family. The contrast between the wealthy woman who deliberately chose not to remarry and the poor woman forced to seek a second spouse out of necessity can be extended further by considering how widowhood transformed the woman's position in society. In some senses the widow was actually better off than the married woman. As a "femme sole" she had at last a legal identity. She could trade independently, make contracts, devise property and could sue and be sued. Although conditions in Salisbury were possibly less favourable for the widow than elsewhere, even there the widow could theoretically surmount her loss by taking over her husband's workshop and by becoming involved in guild and civic life.
In the past the matriarchal figure who ran a thriving workshop and competed on equal terms with men has been given disproportionate attention by historians. Such "quasi-men" did exist, but they were exceptional. Although widowhood may have brought new opportunities for a small minority, for many others it can be described, in the words of Charles Phythian-Adams as a "social version of old age". As a "femme couvert", the woman's status depended entirely on her spouse's role in urban society. With his death she lost far more than a mere companion and provider. She was deprived of the basic link which bound the family to the intricate network of guild and civic affairs. Although many women did assume a new role in society, either by remarrying or by becoming involved in trade, there were numerous others for whom these options were not open and who could claim, like Agnes Comyn, to be "a poor widow left desolate to the world". Unless they could rely on casual work to sustain them or on the support of their families, these were the women who were left to the care of public charity and who appeared regularly as "paupers" in the burial registers or in the lists of inhabitants receiving relief.

TESTAMENTARY PROVISIONS FOR THE WIDOW

Contemporary attitudes towards the widow are illustrated in legal measures concerning women. It is also possible to gain some impression how individuals imagined the widow would cope by examining the provisions laid down for women in wills. Inevitably there are a number of problems in using this source, not the least of which being the recognised bias of the willmaking population towards the élite. As the sixteenth century progressed there was a tendency for the practice to become more widespread,

33. C. V. Phythian-Adams, op. cit., p.91.
34. P.R.O., C2 Eliz. C. 17/40.
35. Respectable poverty, as Paul Slack points out, "was the prerogative of women, children and the old." Widows and spinsters formed over half the impotent poor listed in the 1625 Poor Census and an eighth of those set on work. P. Slack, "Poverty & Politics", loc. cit., p.166.
although even in the 1590s under one in every ten men dying in St. Edmund's are known to have made a will. How typical the attitudes were of the men who did make some provision for their wives is debatable. No doubt many men who died intestate were possessed of so little that it was though unnecessary to make a will. Their meagre estate would pass automatically to the widow. Yet even amongst the élite will-making was far from universal. Was intestacy a sign that the man was unconcerned about the fate of his family or was it simply a case of death catching him unawares? Moreover, if some men were prepared to leave the division of their estate to the workings of the law, why did others feel it necessary to make a will?

In the earlier sixteenth century the predominant motive seems to have been to make some provision for the after-life. By the end of the century however, concern for the family had assumed far greater prominence. For some, duty and a desire to conform were uppermost. Indeed, as one man put it, "who soe provideth not for his denyth his faith and is worse than an infidel". At a more practical level others, like Robert South, drew up a will in order "to avoid the variance, trouble and contention that may growe betwixt my wife and children". However, chance references in a couple of wills indicate that some men did feel a genuine concern for the widow's future welfare. Roger Luxmore, for instance, left all his goods to his daughter but stressed that,

"for as much as Agnes my loving wife and ancient yoakefellow is verie much stricken in years and is feeble and weake in body and mynd by reason of her age; it is not my intent nor meaning by giving my whole estate to my said daughter to leave her without comfort and reliefe". (38).

36. P.R.O., Prob. 11/90/70/100.
37. Ibid., 11/28/5/4.
38. Ibid., 11/130/71/64.
Another problem in using testamentary evidence is that the testator often left much unsaid. He may, for example, have provided for his offspring and arranged for the division of his real estate long before the will was drawn up and hence, have had no reason to mention either. Likewise his bequests were often of such a general nature that it is impossible to gauge the future prosperity of the widow. This was particularly true when, as in the majority of cases, the widow was given the residue of the estate. Between 1540 and 1639 roughly two-thirds of the testator's widows were granted the residue, nearly a tenth a share of it and almost a twentieth the entire estate. In making such a bequest the testator presumably thought that his wife would be able to live independently and possibly that she would continue his business. Yet if he was of humble status or had previously given shares to his children the residue may simply have included the few chattels which remained in the house. Moreover, the widow may have been forced to sell a large part of the estate in order to settle his debts and legacies.

Generally it is only when the testator made specific provisions for his wife, rather than granting her the remainder of his goods, that one finds most evidence of concern for her welfare. Sometimes the portion was composed entirely of household goods, listed in meticulous detail or perhaps left to the discretion of the executor. Other men left their wives an annuity or a lump sum, the former ranging from £2 to £200, the latter from £2 to £1000. In bequeathing a substantial sum the testator generally envisaged that his wife would continue to live independently, perhaps using the money to lease a house, if she was not given the reversion.

---

39. Between 1540 and 1637 roughly a fifth of the 389 testators widows were left a specific bequest rather than the residue or the entire estate.
of his dwelling house. Smaller amounts were often left to the elderly widow with stipulations that a son or daughter should see that she was adequately maintained. Implicit in many of the bequests was the belief that the widow’s portion should be sufficient to maintain her status. One man ordered that household goods be given to his wife "as are mete and convenient to her degree". (40). Another desired that his wife should take,

"such bedding, linnen, furniture and utensils of plate and household stuff as shall conveniently serve her and two servants for as long as she is unmarried." (41).

Like many others John Lowe clearly believed that his responsibility to provide for his wife only lasted whilst she remained single. Yet there is little evidence to suggest that men tried either to enhance or to undermine their widows’ future marital prospects. There were testator’s who made certain gifts of land or chattels conditional upon the widow remaining single. Yet, affecting only a small minority, it is unlikely that such terms ever posed a serious threat. Moreover, it was rare to forfeit the entire bequest and the widow was often compensated in some way, particularly if, as was often the case, the stipulation applied to the dwelling house. Such terms generally implied a desire to keep certain property within the family, rather than to inhibit the woman’s chances of remarriage.

Having suggested earlier that wealth may have been one of the factors affecting the rate of remarriage it is possible that the provisions laid down for the widow may also have had some bearing on the question. Because the precise value of her share is often obscure it is only possible to

40. P.R.O., Prob. 11/55/14/112, Anthony Weakes.
41. Ibid., 11/161/55/439.
42. Of 389 women bereaved between 1540 and 1639, only 45 faced a reduction of their portion on remarriage, whilst a mere seven held property for the duration of the children’s minority and 132 were endowed for their "natural life".
make a few generalisations. Women who were granted a modest provision rather than the bulk of the estate and who had no share in the administration of the will seem to have remarried with less frequency than normal. As they were often women with adult offspring, age was presumably the prevailing factor. Where land was concerned, the tenure of the dwelling house made little apparent difference, the proportion of women specifically endowed with their marital home who remarried being similar to that in the main sample. Yet only a seventh of the women given housetoom, again mainly older women, and only a quarter of those granted agricultural land or extra tenements in the town, generally the more substantial widows, are known to have remarried. It seems reasonable to conclude that the type of provision was less significant than the age of the widow or the relative wealth of the family.

Not only do the provisions laid down for the widow indicate that most men assumed that she would be able to maintain herself and her offspring, but in charging her with certain responsibilities, and in particular with the executorship, the testator expressed his faith in her ability to deal with his affairs and, perhaps in some cases, acknowledged the strength of an earlier working partnership. In 362 Salisbury Wills made between 1540 and 1639 full executorship was given to the widow in 262 cases (72.4%); she shared the responsibility in 31 cases (8.6%); whilst in 69 wills someone else was nominated (19.1%). Generally the older the widow the less likely that she would be burdened with responsibilities. It is interesting to note that whereas 21% of the women made full executor had

43. See Table 5:6.

44. It is not merely the individual who believed it natural for the woman to act as the dead man's legal representative. In cases of intestacy it was normal to appoint the widow as administrator. There were of course alternatives and Todd has shown how in Abingdon the tendency to nominate a kinsman or friend in preference to the widow increased as the seventeenth century progressed. B. Todd, op. cit., p.137.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIDOWS GRANTED:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number Remarrying</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Estate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residue of Estate</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Residue</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modest Provision</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIDOWS APPOINTED:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Executor</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Executor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIDOWS GIVEN:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling House</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houseroom</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Real Estate</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
adult offspring and 43.1% dependent children, the corresponding proportions for those who were not involved in the administration were 46.4% and 34.8%. Not that age was always a decisive factor. Sometimes a minor was appointed in his mother's stead, with the administration vested in a friend until he was legally old enough to accept the charge. This might be the case when the man had remarried and wished to give preference to the children of his first union. One second wife was actually ordered "to have nothing to doo or to meddle with anything concerning my last will and testament". (45.) But equally there were examples when the second wife was nominated rather than her step-children. Ultimately the decision probably depended heavily on the strength of the relationship between man and wife.

Besides being expected to collect the deceased's debts and to pay his creditors and legattees, the executor was often given explicit instructions concerning the upbringing of the children or the care of an elderly relative and, especially before the Reformation, about how the testator wished his obsequies to be conducted. No doubt many women proved able administrators, particularly, if they had assisted in their husband's business during his lifetime. But in some cases the possibility of being able to relinquish their responsibilities may have been a positive incentive to remarry especially if, as was often the case, the testator died heavily indebted. Women such as Ann Johnson, who in 1625 handed over the administration because her husbands debts "did and doeth exceede the valewe of his goods and credits", or like the pewterer's wife who, despite inheriting stock worth £48 would have had to dispose of this in order to settle debts and legacies amounting to £68, may have been far from unusual. 46. In one court

45. P.R.O., Prob.11/91/33/257, Maurice Gauntlet.
46. W.R.O., Subdeans Wills, 1625, Gabriel Johnson & Consistory Court Wills 1595, Richard Horner.
case we hear of a man who lamented that,

"I have given away soe much that I shall leave my wief
but a poore woman and my cloth is not sold yet nor my
children are not yet bred". (47.)

In order to maintain the children the widow was forced to sell up the stock
at a loss and perhaps significantly, remarried shortly afterwards. Another
woman, whose second husband had been an innkeeper, claimed that she had
been unaware how indebted the latter was when she took over his affairs.

Provost had clearly been a substantial man, his property in New Street being
estimated at £20 a year and his personal estate at just over £1300. Yet
even when Margery had settled debts of over £1000 his creditors were still
not satisfied. The answer was to marry for a third time, "the better to
enable herself to give satisfaction for those debts which she soe had
undertaken to paie". Yet Margery's problems were not over then for,
ironically, the third husband died "greatly indebted for the same debts." (48)

These may be extreme cases. Nevertheless, they add to the impression gained
from local court records, where widows were repeatedly cited in cases of
debt, that the administration of a dead man's estate could encumber the widow
for many years after his death.

THE WIDOW'S ROLE AS A PROPERTY OWNER

Even though economic necessity might encourage her to remarry, the
testator's widow was probably better off than most. The executrix in
particular may have inherited at least enough capital to live on, even
if she was unable to carry on the trade, and she would probably have been
able to stay in her husband's dwelling house. Whether the widow did succeed
to the tenure of a dwelling house or was simply allocated houseroom is an
issue of some importance. The need to find accommodation or conversely,

47. W.R.O., B.C.D.B, No. 11, fol. 102.
48. P.R.O., C/3/372/18, 1624.
the ability to offer it, would have had considerable bearing on the woman's chances of remarriage and would also have had implications for the stability of the rest of the household. In discussing old age, Peter Laslett concluded from the evidence of population listings that the majority of widows and widowers lived where they had been before bereavement. "The loss of a spouse", Laslett claims, "did not always or even usually lead to the breakup of the household", although he adds that it might of course "lead to the movement of the bereaved family away from the community". (49).

This optimistic picture is possibly more appropriate to the widower than the widow, for the evidence from Salisbury suggests that continuity between man and wife was far less common than might be expected. Between 1574 and 1607, for instance, the deaths of 264 of the householders listed in the Easter Books, are recorded in the Salisbury burial registers. Of their widows only 62 (23.5%) can subsequently be found heading their former home, whilst another ten lived there under a son or son-in-law and ten more with a second spouse. Clearly these figures are inadequate for the gaps between the various lists must conceal a number of women who only took over the marital home for a short period. A more acceptable test is to simply consider those women whose spouse died during the year preceeding an existing book. From a sample of 45 such women just over half did in fact remain in the dwelling house, 22 as the householder and two who remarried during the interval. But for at least a third of these women their tenure was only brief. Some disappeared in a couple of years, others continued in occupation, but handed effective control to a second spouse or kinsman. Of the 21 widows who disappeared almost immediately, two died shortly after their spouse, two went to live with kin and three can be traced as householders in another street. The fate of the remaining 14 is uncertain. Having established

49. P. Laslett, Family Life, p.199.
that at the end of the sixteenth century at least a third of all widows remarried, it would seem logical to assume that the women in question had rapidly attracted a second spouse. But apart from the women who continued in the dwelling house with a second husband only one woman can be traced in the marriage registers within a year of bereavement and only a couple more at a later date.

The evidence cited above suggests that there may have been continuity, albeit for short periods only, between man and wife in roughly half the households disrupted by death. But how typical were the women whose husband's deaths can be traced? It is interesting to note that of the 310 women who headed a household in St. Thomas's from 1582 onwards, only 110 (35.5%) had definitely succeeded their spouse. Even when the analysis is restricted to the years with consecutive records the result is still only about a third. Where had the remaining two-thirds come from? It was not simply a case of widows moving from their old home to another part of the parish, for only a small number can be traced at an earlier date. No doubt a few came from St. Edmunds or St. Martin's, but probably many belonged to the group of immigrants who regularly flooded into the town.

How can one account for the evident lack of continuity between man and wife? Remarriage was obviously a contributory factor, although how often this was forced upon the widow in order to avoid the threat of homelessness is debatable. Moreover, as the average second marriage took place a year after bereavement, we might expect to find far more widows listed in at least one of the records. Individual factors such as the economic status of the family or the age of the widow and her children must have had some affect on the

---

50. Although these women probably included a few deserted wives and spinsters it is assumed that the vast majority were widows.
The widow's chances of remaining in her old home. The influence of age will be discussed later. Wealth could have diverse effects. On the one hand it may have been easier for the man who actually owned his dwelling house, to leave it to his wife. But the wealthier citizen would also have been more likely to possess several tenements and hence, able to settle his wife in alternative accommodation. Unfortunately, the samples are too small to compare continuity on a street basis. However, it is interesting to note that the longer the widow remained in the parish, the greater the chance that her husband had preceded her.

Speculation on the possible causes of movement is, of course, of limited value without some awareness how far local inheritance and tenurial customs may have overridden the more individual factors. We may be simply faced with a situation in which a large number of properties were only held for one man's lifetime or in which it was customary for property to descend to a child rather than to his wife. One custom peculiar to boroughs was that the widow should be entitled to a "freebench". The exact interpretation of the freebench varied from town to town but originally, in its simplest form it implied the enjoyment of the husband's chief dwelling house until remarriage. In Salisbury reference to the practice is found in a fourteenth century document which clearly states that,

"when a man and his wiff doth purchase anie tenement in the citie aforesaid and the man dieth his wiff survivinge she so relicte shall have freebench therein soe long as she liveth". (51).

If the woman remarried and then died, her second spouse had to yield up the tenement to the true heirs, whilst if she predeceased her husband and he took a second wife, the latter was bound to demise the tenement unless it had been specifically bequeathed to her.

51. S.C.A., Box, 4, No. 45. 1306 Articles of Agreement between Bishop and Citizens.
By the sixteenth century, as Borough Custom gave way to the Common Law, the Freebench often came to entail merely a right to some share of the man's property rather than a right to the chief messuage. In Salisbury there is little to indicate how long the custom endured. The only reference in the sixteenth century, occurring in a series of articles relating to the dispute between the Bishop and the Commonalty, is tantalisingly brief. Amongst the Bishop's counter claims to the Citizens' demand for Incorporation was included the point that, "by the 27th article the husbanede shall not be tenant by the curtesie neyther the wyfe ten(an)te in dower." (52). Whether or not this indicates that the fourteenth century ruling still applied, the evidence from several other sources confirms the impression given by the Easter Books that the dwelling-house was by no means the inevitable prerogative of the widow.

Much of the property in Salisbury was leasehold. In the few surviving deeds and the records of the leases made by the town's two largest landowners, the Corporation and the Dean and Chapter, there is nothing to indicate that the widow was prohibited from renewing her husband's lease. Even so, it is significant that less than a third of the female lease-holders named in the 1649 Parliamentary Survey of Ecclesiastical Property and just under half the women in a Corporation Terrier detailing leases made during the first half of the seventeenth century, had been preceded by their spouse. Possession of the lease did not of course, always imply tenure, a point which adds another dimension to the question of continuity. The Parliamentary Survey listed the person who actually had the tenure of a property in 1649; the person who held the remainder of the lease, and the person to whom it was originally granted. The three could be synonymous. Yet no more than 40%

52. S.C.A., Box 4, No.2, 9/2

of the male and 56.5% of the female leaseholders were also occupiers.
Thus one finds women like Margaret Teate, who inherited the reversion
of her husband's lease but chose not to dwell in the house in Milford
Street or, conversely, women like Margaret Chiffinch, who continued in her
husband's old house whilst the lease passed to someone else. The distinction between occupier and, leaseholder should be borne
in mind when turning to the testamentary evidence. Not only do wills
reveal very little about the goods the widow would have inherited but they
are equally, if not more, ambiguous about her chances of inheriting real
estate. Between 1500 and 1640 only 140 of the 438 wills made by married
men mentioned the testators dwelling house (32%), and 154 other tenements
or agricultural land (35%). Moreover even when land was referred to it
was often in very general terms. Many men simply bequeathed "all my lands
in Salisbury" and it is rare to discover how much a particular house or
plot of land actually meant in financial terms. There are two possible
reasons why real estate was so infrequently mentioned. Either the testator
was content to leave the division of his estate to the workings of the law,
or he made arrangements during his lifetime, perhaps by allocating portions
to his children when they came of age or by stipulating who was to have the
reversion of leasehold property when the original lease was drawn up.

54. There are a number of other problems which hinder the use of the records
of property transactions as a guide to continuity. In listing the householders
at a fixed point in time the Parliamentary Survey inevitably hides any women
who had taken over a lease and subsequently died. The Terrier on the other hand,
lists successive leaseholders over a period of 60 or 70 years, but not the
people who held the remainder of each lease. Thus, we will only find evidence
of continuity if the widow actually took out a new lease. Some women did so
even when the old lease had some time to run, but there is evidence to suggest
that the widow could have the reversion without renewing the lease.

55. Most of the wills mentioning real estate date from the first three quarters
of the sixteenth century. An interesting peak occurred during the thirty years
after the 1540 Statute of Wills, which permitted the devise of all types of land
rather than simply lands of purchase. It was possibly in response to this
innovation that the numbers temporarily increased. See Table 5:7A.
### A: Variations in Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1500 - 1639</th>
<th>1500 - 1569</th>
<th>1570 - 1639</th>
<th>1540 - 1569</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling House</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Land</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B: Variations According to the Ages of Named Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Some Children Known To Be Underage</th>
<th>Some Children Known To Be Adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling House</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Land</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5.8 BENEFICIARIES OF THE DWELLING HOUSE: 1500 – 1639

A: IN ALL WILLS REFERRING TO THE DWELLING HOUSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFICIARIES</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife And Child</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B: IN WILLS WHERE SOME OR ALL NAMED CHILDREN ARE KNOWN TO BE UNDERAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife And Child</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C: IN WILLS WHERE ALL NAMED CHILDREN ARE KNOWN TO BE ADULT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife And Child</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External evidence affirms that both these eventualities did occur. It also makes it clear that, instead of demanding why so few testators mentioned land we need to consider why it was referred to at all. In an urban environment the descent of real estate was a less crucial issue than in the countryside where land formed the basis of the individual's wealth. As Spufford has shown, in a village the inheritance of land was closely bound up with the local tenurial system and the prevailing demographic structure. The need to balance the requirements of his dependents with the desire to preserve a workable farming unit dictated how the individual would settle his estate. By contrast, the urban testator had greater flexibility to indulge his whims. It is interesting that in Salisbury references to land occurred most frequently in the wills of the wealthiest testators and also, to the dwellinghouse at least, in wills where all the named offspring were adult. The former would, one assumes, have been men who were able to endow all their dependents with land and were disinclined to leave the division of their estates to the arbitrary workings of the law. The latter, faced with two or more effective claimants to the property may have hoped, by making specific provisions, to avoid future disputes. The testators who referred to the dwelling-house formed at most about 2 or 3% of the total number of men dying at the end of the sixteenth century, a group who would have been more likely to own the property and thus freer to determine its descent. Although the Willmaker may not be typical it is notable that even amongst the élite the widow could be ousted from her former home. Of the 140 men mentioning the dwelling house 88 named the widow as immediate beneficiary (62.9%); 9 stipulated that she should share the house (6.4%) and 34 left it to a child (24.3%). Not unexpectedly the woman


57. See Table 5:7B.
with young children stood the greatest chance of remaining in her home, under half the women with adult offspring retaining the property. Nevertheless, age was not always a deciding factor. Occasionally the house was left to a minor and, provided that she was given custody, the mother would presumably live there until he came of age. But it is uncertain what happened to the widow when a friend or kinsman was appointed as guardian. On the other hand, although the mother gave way to the eldest son in some families, one must not forget that, by the time their father died, the children had often established their own home and sometimes left the town altogether.

The men who did leave the dwelling house to their spouse had varying motives. For some a concern for her welfare was uppermost. Others made it clear that the children were to benefit. George Castell, who died in 1592, gave his wife the lease of his house and all its contents with the proviso that if she refused to bring up her children, the house was to be divided amongst them. Later in 1633, William Strayne left his wife his messuage and Inne in Salisbury where I dwell...... to hold for twelve years if she so live .... to the ende that she may with the profittes thereof educate and bringe upp my children and pay my dettes". (60).

Very few men, stipulated that the widow was only to live there during the children's minority, although it was not unknown for a son to take over at a later date and for his mother to continue as an inmate. Generally the widow's tenure of the dwelling-house was intended to endure for her lifetime or at least whilst she remained single. Occasionally the testator

58. See Table 5:8. 59. P.R.O., Prob. 11/82/93/364. 60. P.R.O., Prob. 11/165/42/336. 61. Supra, p. 212. 62. Of the 50 widows with children who were left the dwelling-house between 1500 and 1639, 54% held it for their "natural life"; 24% for widowhood and 6% for the duration of the child's minority. 4% had free disposal and in 12% the situation remains uncertain.
indicated his willingness for the woman to remain in the home even if she did remarry. John Evaunce, who died in the 1540s, said that on remarriage his wife could have a year rent free after which she was to pay £4 a year to her son. Possibly, one of the main reasons for mentioning the dwelling-house was to indicate who was to have the reversion after the widow. It was certainly unusual for no remaindermen to be named and for the woman to be given, implicitly or explicitly, the right to dispose of the tenement after her death. Consequently it is rare to find references to land in the wills of widows themselves.

As an alternative to the dwelling-house the widow might be given houseroom, a practice which was discussed earlier, or additional land elsewhere. Although one can rarely ascertain the value of the lands the widow might inherit, it is possible to obtain some idea of the principles which guided the testator when dividing his estate. According to the Common Law the widow was entitled to a third of the lands with which her husband was seized at anytime during the marriage. During the middle ages Borough Custom rather than the Common Law prevailed in many towns. The exact proportion the widow could claim varied from one town to the next. So too did the treatment of second wives or of the woman who remarried. Whilst it is not clear what the practice was in Salisbury, it seems likely that by the sixteenth century

63. P.R.O., Prob. 11/31/16/125.

64. Only about one in ten widowed, female testators referred to the dwelling house and one in seven to any other real estate. The comparable figures for all male testators, married or single, were 28% and 33.4%. Occasionally a woman claimed that she had been given free disposal. This was one of the issues in the chancery case involving Margery Provost, and also the cause of a dispute between Alice Wilton and a kinsman who claimed that, "perceiving that she hadd only an estate for her lief and could in no sorte dispose of the premises", Alice had obtained false deeds purporting that the lands had been granted to her and her spouse jointly. In consequence "the said Alice ou(er) lyying the said George should have and enjoiye all and singular the said messuages to her and her heirs for ever".

P.R.O., C13/253/16.
Borough Custom had, as elsewhere given way to the Common Law. The latter was referred to in a number of wills. Thomas St Barbe, for example, left his land "to descend and goe to my next heir and according to the course of the common lawes of this realme". Another man left the entire estate to his wife, adding that if she married she was to have the third part only "according to the custom of the realm". Thirds were also mentioned by John Sampson, who devised all his lands to his daughters apart from a third which went to his widow for as long as she lived, and by John Griffith, who gave his wife a third of his lands and tenements "for her dower".

Rare though these examples are, they suggest that, in the main, the Common Law was adhered to in Salisbury. If the testator did refer to the dower it was not to radically amend current practice, but simply to add certain individual qualifications. Thus, he might prefer to transmute the third into a cash sum or to leave the widow a larger portion that the law required. One of the objections to the Common Law dower, apart from the fact that it hindered alienation "inter vivos", was that it could easily encumber the estate which the testator wished to bestow upon his children. This fear is illustrated in a will made in 1605 which stipulated that,

"because I know not what thirde the lawe will allowe out of my lands to my wief and that the landes maye the better be left oute for the rayssinge of porcons for my daughters without any incumbrances, I due therefore in lieue of her thirdes give and bequeath to Anne my wife twenty pounds a year for her natural lief". (68).

It has been suggested that in the late sixteenth century the widow's position deteriorated as more testators barred her dower right by putting out land to feoffees for particular use. In Salisbury, however, when

---

65. P.R.O., Prob. 11/77/1/1.
68. P.R.O., Prob. 11/124/84/146.
exceptions were made to the dower, the widow was normally granted some form of compensation, albeit in the form of an annuity or of specifically named lands. Thomas Hooper, for instance, gave his wife £4 a year "in recompense of such dower as she shall, can or may demande" and John Webbe left his mansion house and other lands in Salisbury to his widow, provided that she renounced her title of dower and cancelled a recognisance promising her 100 marks for a jointure. In some cases the testator stipulated that unless his wife signed a deed of release her portion was to be void. But even without some form of sanction, as Veale in his work on Bristol suggests, the gifts given to the widow were generally sufficient to ensure that it was not worth her while to attempt to enforce her claims.

The limitations of the various sources prevents a detailed analysis of the value and type of land the wealthier widow was likely to receive and it is impossible to estimate exactly how many women succeeded to a tenement and how many were left homeless or dependent on the assistance of kin. Succession to the chief messuage was certainly not the inevitable prerogative of the widow by the late sixteenth century, although legally there was nothing to prevent her continued tenure even if she remarried. Moreover, even if she did inherit the reversion, the study of St. Thomas's Widows emphasises that the woman did not necessarily remain in the property for long. To consider the widow's position by simply examining the intentions of the Willmaker is therefore clearly misleading. To account for the high mobility of women after bereavement is difficult. Economic status and the stage the family had reached in the domestic cycle were probably more significant in determining where the widow should dwell than the limited evidence suggests. Yet ultimately much depended on individual family

70. P.R.O., Prob.11/76/67/162A and 11/53/24/185. See also 11/55/14/112; 11/102/104/03; 11/133/12/93.

circumstances. The question is obviously linked with that of remarriage, but it is impossible to assess whether the widow moved in order to remarry or whether her search for a second husband was motivated by the need to find a home. Nor can it be ascertained how common it was for a man to marry a widow and take over her house. All we can do is point out that tenure of the dwelling-house did not apparently enhance the widow's chances of remarriage, and that of those women who did marry possibly no more than a quarter would automatically forfeit their home.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FEMALE HEADED HOUSEHOLD

Although much concerning the inheritance of property remains obscure our understanding of the widow's role as a property owner can be extended by considering the characteristics of the female householders in St. Thomas's. During the period covered by the Easter Books 378 different women headed a household in the parish. No doubt a few would have been spinsteris and deserted wives, but without any evidence to the contrary it seems fair to assume that they would have been in a tiny minority. In Laslett's 100 communities 12.9% of all households were headed by widows and 3.4% by single and unspecified females. In early sixteenth century Coventry the corresponding proportions were 12.1% and 7.6%. At 12.9% the mean proportion obtained from the 14 Easter Books is slightly lower than the English Standard. However, it is notable that as many as 18.1% of the total individual householders appearing between 1574 and 1607 were women, a reflection of the fact that the female householder was less stable than the male. As Table

72. P. Laslett, Household & Family, p.147.
74. If, as suggested in the Introduction, the recipients of poor relief were exonerated from the Easter levy, this may explain why the result for St. Thomas's is comparatively low for widows generally figured highly amongst the poor.
B. Todd, op. cit., p.231.
5:9 suggests the numbers of women declined slightly at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Whether or not this was related to demographic factors is uncertain. Probably it was only a temporary drop for analysis of the Aid and Supply of 1651 suggests that just under a sixth of the tenants in Salisbury were women, whilst the 1649 Parliamentary Survey gives a proportion of just over a sixth. It is impossible to estimate how many of the towns widow's were householders rather than lodgers, for the marital status of the latter is rarely specified. But for every 100 females in the parish only 9.4 had independent control of a property, a figure which compares with 77 in every 100 adult males.

As the wealthiest of the three Salisbury parishes St. Thomas's may have had a disproportionate share of the female householders. The only comparable figures for the town as a whole were made on a ward rather than on a parish basis. But as there was little significant difference between the four wards the same was probably true of the parishes. Between individual streets there were however, significant variations in the distribution of female house-holders. As Table 5:10 illustrates, the Market Streets, Butcher and Fish Row especially, housed fewer women than average. On the other hand New Street and the Chequers attracted large numbers. Crane Street was the most popular of all with 28 of the 87 different householders who appeared between 1574 and 1607 being women. Although the distinction between richer and poorer areas was by no means rigid and some prosperous families appeared in the more peripheral streets, it is surely significant that a majority of women congregated in the less important streets. One wonders whether this tendency was matched in the rest of the town, with large numbers of widows dwelling in St. Martin's and in the northernmost chequers of St. Edmunds.

75. 'S.C.A. Assessment of the City Towards Aid and Supply of £12,000, 1651, X/206.
76. The latter excluding apprentices. Laslett estimates that roughly 60% of all widows headed a household, but this may well underestimate the number of servants and inmates who were widows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Married Men</th>
<th>Married Bachelors</th>
<th>Widowers Men</th>
<th>Assumed Widowers Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>254 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>3.0 x</td>
<td>2.5 x</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* Supra, p. 254 fn. 50.

+ Part of the 1607 Book is missing, hence the smaller total. x 1585 - 1603 only.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Individual Householders</th>
<th>Female Householders No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ditch</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowers Chequer</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricket's Corner</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher Row</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Row</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatmeal Row</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Street</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West High Street</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East High Street</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Gate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Churchyard</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under The Churchyard</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Street</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Catherine St.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Catherine St.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Chequer</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lion Chequer</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. New Street</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. New Street</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2089</strong></td>
<td><strong>378</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assuming that some of the cheapest housing would have been found in areas like New Street, it is possible that reduced circumstances drew women to the peripheral streets. Unfortunately, it is rarely possible to determine what a woman's status was before her spouse died or whether she had originally enjoyed a better home. Comparison of surnames reveals a small group of husbands and wives who may have dwelt in different parts of the parish. Clement Freeman, for example, moved from her husband's house in Bowers Chequer to dwell in New Street, a move which was perhaps necessitated by hardship. Another woman, Joan Hanom, moved from Crane Street to West High Street, and soon attracted a second spouse. The other possible moves are rather more tentative, yet in their diversity they do show that "downward" mobility, if movement to the edge of the parish can be described as such, was by no means inevitable. Nor, apparently, were many widows forced by later developments to choose a cheaper dwelling for unless it was to get married, few women once established at the head of a household moved to another part of the parish.

The distribution of women may of course reflect the availability of empty housing rather than individual fortunes. Property near the Market Place would inevitably have been subject to far greater demand than housing in the backstreets. It also raises the question of feminine involvement, in trade. If there were successful businesswomen in the town one might expect that they too would live near the centre. Butcher Row, a street noted for its insularity, included no more than three independent widows between 1574 and 1607. Did the butchers discourage women from engaging in what was, after all, a particularly heavy trade, and if so, was the butcher's widow obliged to move from the Row or to remarry someone who could run the shop?
Not expectedly the female-headed household was less stable than the male. The results from 1593, 1594, 1595 and 1602, years when consecutive records make it possible to test for residence of one year only, suggest that of the women taking over a property in any one year just over half would disappear by the next year, (56.7%), whilst just under a tenth resided in the parish for ten years or more. The corresponding proportions for the male householder, meanwhile, were 40.9% and 19.1%. The discrepancy may in part be due to the fact that it is easy to lose track of the woman if she remarried. The number staying in one spot for over ten years, albeit under the name of a second spouse, may in reality have been considerably greater. As some of the individual street samples are so small it is difficult to tell whether there was a tendency for the temporary householders to congregate in the back streets. However, in common with the male householders, comparison on the basis of household size shows that wealth and stability were by no means synonymous. A few of the long term residents had unusually large households. Alice Smallam of the Ditch, shared with seven extra adults in both 1574 and 1585, and Katherine Webbe, who lived in Castle Street for 15 years, housed the unprecedented number of 32 in 1592. On the other hand a number of women like Widow Nutte of New Street or Agnes Eyre of White Horse Chequer, appeared for periods of over ten years but never had more than one or two additional adults living with them.

It was pointed out earlier that the average household in St. Thomas's contained just under three adults, whilst roughly 40% of all homes contained servants and under 5% distant kin. Only a small proportion of the former were headed by widows and despite the fact that the largest house in the town belonged to a woman, on average the female-headed household contained no more than 1.95 adults (inclusive of apprentices), a figure which is lower

77. See Tables 5:11 and 5:12.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% All Female Householders</th>
<th>Interpolated Results</th>
<th>Ratio of B to D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>24.2 (± 13.4)</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>21.2 (± 8.3)</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>15.2 (± 3.2)</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Years</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean % Of Newcomers</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average No. Newcomers Each Year</td>
<td>1593 - 1596, 1602, 1603</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Staying:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Year Only</td>
<td>1593 - 1595, 1602</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>56.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>1593, 1594</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 +</td>
<td>1574 - 1596</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 +</td>
<td>1574, 1582, 1585</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>Inferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
than the mean for widowers and slightly higher than that for bachelors.

In fact nearly half the widows lived alone, or at least without adult companions and only about 2% headed households of more than five adults. As Table 5:15 makes clear, the groups most likely to be found living with widows were adult offspring and servants. It was mentioned earlier that a higher proportion of the female householders recorded between 1582 and 1607 lodged single children than did their male counterparts. Whether we should also expect proportionately more to house children below communicable age is debatable. In early sixteenth century Coventry only about one in every five female householders were listed with children, a proportion well below average. But as a result of demographic crisis, the number of children in the community was unnaturally low anyway. Laslett, meanwhile, found that only 49% of all widows in a sample of 61 pre-industrial settlements lodged unmarried offspring, a result which is again low when compared with those for certain individual communities. In late sixteenth century Ealing, for instance, 78.6% of all widows housed children compared with 67.1% of all males. A century later the respective proportions at Clayworth were 83.3% and 79.7% and at Cardington 86.4% and 84.3%.

The demographic structure of a community, and in particular the remarriage rate, must have influenced the frequency with which the female headed households contained children. With a large number of young widows or deserted wives in the community, the number of such households may have been high. If, on the other hand, the younger widow remarried fairly rapidly and the majority of female householders were elderly or poor, the reverse

78. See Tables 5:13 and 7:2. 79. See Table 5:14. 80. Supra, p. 163.
81. C. V. Phythian-Adams, op.cit., Almost 60% of the households headed by a couple contained offspring, and 36% of those headed by single and unspecified males.
82. P. Laslett, Family Life, p.198.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Households</th>
<th>Couples</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Widowers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1574</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The higher totals for 1574, 1585, 1593 and 1594 are inflated by the inclusion of apprentices. Were they excluded the mean for all households between 1574 and 1607 would be 2.50. *)
### TABLE 5:14 THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS BY MARITAL STATUS AND NUMBER OF RESIDENT ADULTS: 1585, 1593 AND 1594

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households Headed By:</th>
<th>1 Adult Only</th>
<th>2 Only</th>
<th>3 - 5</th>
<th>6 - 10</th>
<th>10 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowers</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5:15 THE COMPOSITION OF THE FEMALE HEADED HOUSEHOLD

1585, 1593 AND 1594

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households Containing:</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offspring</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Kin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Servants</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Servants</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentices</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Females</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified Males</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number in Sample</strong></td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
may have been true. Not that we should automatically assume that the older or poorer the widow the less likely that she would have had resident offspring. The distribution of children in St. Thomas's was certainly not weighted in favour of the women in the wealthier Market Streets and it seems possible that financial considerations may actually have encouraged the poorer widow to keep her children at home. Some may have been unable to afford marriage portions for their daughters or to enroll their sons as apprentices. Others possibly found it cheaper to depend on their offspring than to hire servants. A number of children were certainly listed as servants in the Easter Books and one willmaker stipulated that if his eldest son was content to tarry with his wife "and do his dutie as a servant ought to do", she should pay him £5 a year plus meat and drink for his wages. It is uncertain how common such an arrangement would have been, but the use of children as servants may help to explain why the woman was less likely to have resident servants than the male householder, yet more likely to house resident offspring.

THE WIDOW'S ROLE IN TRADE

The evidence from St. Thomas's concerning servant keeping is of some importance when we turn to consider the role of the widow in trade. No doubt many widows would have been left with sufficient capital to be able to maintain their families without ever entertaining the prospect of remarriage or of finding work. But for the widow of the humbler craftsman and the wage-earner, some form of employment, however casual, may have been vital to prevent her slipping below the poverty line.

84. P.R.O., Prob.11/60/5/37, 1576.
The occupations mentioned when discussing the married woman and trade—casual service, petty retail, spinning, lacemaking and other crafts linked with the textile industry, were all important sources of income for the widow. Amongst, the Mistresses listed in the 1625 Poor Census were Alice Burch of New Street, who taught bonelace-making, and Alice Swift a button maker. A number of the market spinners were widows, some of whom gave work to their children in order to make ends meet. Goodwife Hales, for instance, desired to be lent 40s to keep her three children "working at spinning to the market", whilst Anne Panell required stock to employ her six children. 85. The women employed by the overseers of the poor to nurse the sick were often bereaved and, although infrequently labelled as such, it is possible that a number of the servants in St. Thomas's were homeless widows. However, of all the trades in the "informal sector", it was victualling with which the widow was most commonly associated.

The sale of beer and various foodstuffs was a recognised means of subsistence for the poor. In a letter to the Privy Council in 1608 it was commented that alehousekeepers were

"generally for the most part verie auged and poore people whose labours are past and have no other means of living". (86).

and during the late 1620s and 1630s a number of petitions from poor tradesmen and widows requested licences to victual. Alice Webster for instance, desired to sell bread, drink and similar provisions "beinge nowe aged, not being able to impoye her selfe to her bodie labour for her reliefe and conforte". (87).

85. P. Slack, Poverty in Early Stuart Salisbury, pp.68-70. Widow Panell provides one example of the poorer widow who had older children still living at home.
As a result of official attempts to regulate drinking, particularly from 1620 onwards, a number of lists of tipplers and alehousekeepers exist. It is apparent that whilst the numbers of women involved were never large, they were by no means insignificant, although in a town the size of Salisbury it is quite likely that many widows would have managed to sell victuals without becoming licensed. In the lists of victuallers recognisances made between 1627 and 1635 the number of women never rose above 14 a year. Nevertheless, they still always formed over a third of the total. Another list made in 1630 listed 43 alehousekeepers, of whom 15 were women, with a further four noted as cooks and three as innkeepers. The contrast between the numbers of female innkeepers, only 7.5% of the total, and the number keeping alehouses demonstrates that it was chiefly at the poorer end of the market that widows operated.

The widow who ran an alehouse or an inn was in a position to act as a pawn-broker and money lender to her poorer neighbours. Occasionally one finds references in widow's inventories to lists of goods held as sureties - Edith Bide for instance, was owed over 15 pounds "upon pawnes" when she died in 1625 - whilst poorer women, for whom broking may have been their chief means of gaining a livelihood, were presented in court from time to time for selling stolen goods. In 1631 for instance, Agnes Masters, a butcher's widow, was questioned for her part in selling a stolen apron and neckerchief. She was referred to in the case as, "a coman carrier of cloathes and other things about the towne to sell and to pawne".

89. S.C.A., N/101/56.
90. W.R.O., Subdean Wills, 1620s.
91. S.D.R., B.C.D.B., No. 11, fol.46.
The network of individuals mentioned in the case for buying or pawning goods consisted chiefly of poor women, for whom such an informal system was possibly the only means of obtaining "new" clothes or household goods.  

Theoretically, besides being involved in retail, in casual service and in the textile industry, the widow had the scope to work in a much wider range of crafts and, unlike the majority of married women, to venture into the more formal, hierarchial world of the guilds. However, there is little evidence for women working in this sphere, either during the sixteenth century or after 1612, when the Salisbury crafts were reorganised into companies. According to the new ordinances of 1612 widows were permitted to trade until they remarried. Whether this reflected an earlier system or whether the ordinances were modelled upon those of some other town is difficult to establish. Certainly in the earlier Tailor's Guild ordinances no particular provisions were made for women.

Doubtless a number of women who traded in the city would have escaped all record. But the general lack of evidence also raises two other possibilities, namely that the majority of widows became involved in the less formal areas of trade already discussed, or that considerably more remarried than has hitherto been suggested. That the poorer widow may have found it necessary to remarry if she was to maintain her family is clear. Yet even the woman who inherited a thriving workshop may have preferred to remarry rather than trading as a "femme sole". This can be appreciated when we consider some of the practicalities involved.

92. In Leicester complaint was made in 1573 of women known as "Brogers or pledge women" who "vsed the trade of selling apparell and household stuff" and who "have disorderlye used the same in hawkinge abrode from house to house".  
Leicester Borough Records III, ed. Mary Bateson, 1905, p.147.

The single woman who wished to trade needed tools and a place in which to work, a labour force and some previous experience of business. Of these the last would obviously have depended upon the degree to which the woman had assisted her spouse, a matter about which it is difficult to do more than speculate. The other two main requirements, if we can rely on testamentary evidence, may have been passed onto the widow with less frequency than might be expected.

Apart from occasional references to dyehouses and tanhouses, places of work are rarely mentioned in wills. Yet as most industry was still domestically orientated certain assumptions can be made about the inheritance of a workshop in the light of what has been established about the descent of the marital home. Given the fact that a large number of women moved within a year of bereavement and that, even when the wife did gain possession of the house a kinsman sometimes took over the business, it seems fair to assume that relatively few women would ever have taken charge of an established workshop for more than a short period.

It is also possible that few women would have inherited much stock or equipment. Again the evidence from probate records is scant. Several testators clearly intended that their tools should pass to the widow. In 1610 for instance, George Davis left his apprentice a pair of shears "within one month after my wife shall leave of the trade which I dowe nowe use", whilst Nicholas Atkinson left his embroiders tools to his son "which I will my wife shall keepe and use as long as she doth use my trade". But there are just as many examples of tools being given to a child or servant in preference to the widow. When stock was not referred to, and this was true in the majority of wills, it may have passed automatically to the executor. Yet comparison between the inventories of man and wife suggests that this was not always the case.

Indeed tools are only listed in four of the 116 widow's wills examined between 1590 and 1640 and eleven of the 55 inventories.

In some cases the lack of evidence may simply be due to the fact that the widow had been forced to sell the contents of the workshop in order to satisfy the dead man's debts and legacies. More information is obviously needed about the circumstances of individual families and the requirements of different crafts, for some would demand far more equipment than others. Dying and brewing were particularly capital intensive. On the other hand the tailor needed only a pair of shears and a pressing iron. Whilst tools and equipment were by no means the inevitable prerogative of the widow, it would be wrong to assume that if she appeared to be left without tools, the woman would have been unable to trade.

The other major requirement if the widow was to continue her spouse's business was to have a sufficient labour force. As with tools, needs varied according to different trades. Metal-workers and builders were particularly dependent on adult male servants; tailors and shoemakers could suffice with apprentice labour. With a woman heading the shop the support of skilled servants would have been more important. Yet, as the evidence from the Easter Books suggests, surprisingly few women had any servants, let alone male servants. Taking simply the totals for the years 1585, 1593 and 1594, 22.3% of all female-headed households contained servants in contrast to 45.3% of all male households. 12.5% of the women had maids, 6.5% male servants and 8.7% apprentices. Without knowing how many servants lived out, these figures are obviously an inadequate guide to the degree of feminine involvement in trade. Yet if a significant number of women did trade for more than a brief period after bereavement, then one might expect to find a slightly higher portion with residential male servants.

---

95. See Table 4:4C.
As further negative evidence it is notable that a number of the women who did have male servants also housed another adult male, such as a son or kinsman, who possibly took effective charge of the shop. Joan Bricket had a male servant in 1590, shortly after her husband's death, but none thereafter until 1601 when her son came to share the house. In 1574 another woman actually lodged "her son's man"; whilst in 1601 Walter Ashley and his man resided with widow Dyer and Edward Lye and his man with Widow Lobe, his future wife. In several other cases male servants were only noted shortly after the husband's death and it seems likely that they were serving their covenanted time rather than appointed by the widow in her own right.\textsuperscript{96}

The presence of apprentices in a few female households may be similarly accounted for. The Butchers are representative of the trades recognised in 1612 stating that,

"the apprentices of the husband of suche widdowe and such other apprentices as she shall take shall serve her as apprentices soe longe time as she shall keepe her husband's trade and remain a widdowe". (97).

But although theoretically permitted, it is exceptional to find a woman with an apprentice who had been bereaved for more than a couple of years and who may have taken on the boy herself instead of simply completing his training.\textsuperscript{98}

Moreover, of the 133 boys who were indentured between 1603 and 1614, 17 were bound to a man and his wife, but not one was formally apprenticed to a widow.\textsuperscript{99}

\textsuperscript{96} This appears to have been an accepted practice for several testators specifically required their servants to remain with the widow for a year after their death.

\textsuperscript{97} S.C.A. I/244.

\textsuperscript{98} It is significant that when the guild ordinances were re-issued in 1676 the clauses mentioning "such apprentices as she shall take" were either crossed out or omitted altogether.

\textsuperscript{99} S.C.A., Addimenta Box 1-16, No. 7/1, Add.3.

We can only speculate whether the 15 individual women mentioned in these indentures, who were married to a wide variety of tradesmen, actually helped to train the boys or whether their concern was solely with their welfare. It is interesting that the apprenticeship indentures in Bristol almost invariably mention the woman as well as her spouse.

E. Ralph & N.M.Hardwick, \textit{op. cit.}
As it was unnecessary to re-enroll boys we should not expect many references to women completing the training of their husband's apprentices. But there is evidence to suggest that even this was rare. If for instance, the tailors were typical in taking few apprentices during the latter part of their career, then it follows that only those women bereaved shortly after marriage would have been left with apprentices. Moreover, even then they did not necessarily complete the training of the boys for a number of memoranda in the Tailor's Minute Books refer to boys transferred to new masters whilst their former mistress was still alive. The explanation must rest partly on the fact that the younger the widow the more likely she would have been to remarry and possibly, the less competent to train an apprentice.

Whilst the evidence demonstrates that there were a number of practical problems in continuing a business, it should not be inferred that widows never became involved in the Salisbury craft guilds. In the list of Free Citizens compiled in 1612, solitary women were listed amongst the merchants, tanners, butchers, pewterers and innholders, whilst odd examples of female tailors, glovers and maltsters appear in other records. However, these women were numerically insignificant compared with the many married women and widows we hear of in the fields of victualling, casual retail and textiles. It is certainly difficult to point to any business women who stood out and rivalled their fellow tradesmen as they did in certain other towns.

Whilst the guilds theoretically permitted widows to trade it is possible that individual tradesmen may have discouraged female participation. One

100. S.C.A., I/252.

101. Such a woman was Judith Delamotte of neighbouring Southampton, who took over her husband's dyehouse in 1617, but had been operating in her own right as a clothier long before that date. A.L. Merson ed., A Calendar of Southampton Apprentice Registers, 1609-1740, Southampton Record Society, 1918, p.lxxv.
clothier, whilst commenting on a widow who had made a loss selling the cloth
she had inherited, remarked that he had suffered greatly as a result of
"the great dampe of deadnes" in the cloth trade, and that she must have fared
far worse "especially being a widow woman not knowing how to doe the best
for herself" (102). The man's reference to the slump is important. As
pointed out earlier, by the end of the sixteenth century the Salisbury cloth
industry was suffering serious problems. It was also a period when complaint
was made of decline in the town's other trades; when poverty proved a growing
problem and when the authorities became increasingly worried by the loss of
work to foreigners. With the danger of unemployment amongst the native male
craftsmen is it really to be expected that women would be tolerated in any but
the more menial, less organised trades?

In late sixteenth and early seventeenth century Salisbury the future may have
offered little but upheaval and a struggle to survive for many widows. The
options available to the widow were possibly less restricted at other periods
and in other towns. It is also clear that the effects of bereavement would
have varied from one social group to another. At one extreme the widows
of the town's élite would have been well provided for, enjoying perhaps
an annuity or being left with the facilities to engage in trade. Most
would have inherited some land, if not their old marital home, and they could
choose whether to live independently or to reside with a kinsman. They could,
moreover, opt either to stay single or to remarry. At the other extreme were
the widows of the poor who were least likely to remain in their old home,

who would have been left with no more than a few household goods and who, despite casual work, would probably have been unable to maintain their families without resorting to parish relief. Yet these women would have been accustomed to movement, to hard work and to a precarious existence near the poverty line. They may also have found it relatively easy, given the somewhat unstable nature of their marital arrangements, to establish another, albeit temporary liaison. It was the wives of the ordinary "commoners", the mass of small tradesmen and shopkeepers, who may have suffered most from bereavement. Such women would have inherited little in the way of stock or capital and they were neither immune from hardship like the rich, nor inured to its effects like the poor.

THE 'HYBRID' HOUSEHOLD

Although the main concern of this chapter has been to assess the impact of bereavement upon the widow, it must not be forgotten that the demise of the householder would also have had serious implications for the rest of the household. Not only would most children have had some experience of living with unrelated people of different generations and sexes, but an unknown number may also have spent some time in a broken or a "hybrid" household, that is one which, as a result of remarriage, contained offspring from two or more different unions.

Children who had lost one or both parents were common in the Early Modern Community. They would possibly have been more numerous in a town than in the countryside, although Peter Laslett's study of 19 pre-industrial settlements indicates that the proportion could vary considerably.103. In

Ealing in 1599 and in Cogenhoe in the early seventeenth century a quarter of all children were classified as "orphans". Almost a fifth had lost one parent in four Cambridge parishes in the 1620s, whilst in Clayworth at the end of the century the proportion was almost a third. How many children, once orphaned, would have been brought up by a step-parent and how many would have moved in with strangers is impossible to determine.

In the 19 communities studied by Laslett, 3.3% of all known orphans were found living with "strangers"; 20.5% with step-parents and as many as 76.2% with the surviving parent alone. Yet the problems of identifying orphans and of using static listings undoubtedly colour these results. It seems unlikely that so many of the parents would have remained single. Moreover, even if they were brought up in a one parent family, the children might still have experienced some physical disruption if, as was often the case, the whole household was forced to move as a result of bereavement.

Obviously the older the child the less vulnerable he or she would have been to the effects of the dissolution of the household. The loss of a parent may have encouraged the older child to leave home and enter service. His siblings below the age of ten would normally have remained with the surviving parent, although testamentary evidence suggests that amongst the élite at least, the widow was not automatically chosen as guardian and that even children of five could be sent into the custody of strangers.

---

104. N. Goose op. cit., p. 378.

105. Supra p. 202. Evidence from wills made between 1500 and 1639 suggests that by the 17th century fewer very young children may have been parentally deprived. There was a relative decline in the number of testators leaving entirely dependent families, (the proportion naming minors only dropped from 64% of those whose children can all be categorised according to age, in the first half of the period, to 45% in the second) and a corresponding increase in the number leaving completed families and referring to grandchildren. Between 1500 and 1569 13.1% of all the male testators and 53.3% of all the female made bequests to a grandchild. Between 1570 and 1639 the proportions were 27.9% and 65.4%.
Children who were already established in a trade may actually have returned home when their father died. In St. Thomas’s men in their early 20’s occasionally appeared when their mother was bereaved, perhaps coming back deliberately to help her run the shop; whilst married offspring sometimes moved in and eventually assumed the running of the household. However, such arrangements were uncommon. Furthermore, if surprisingly few widows succeeded their husband to a property, continuity between father and son was even rarer. No more than 42 houses can be traced descending from a man to his son and twelve to a son-in-law during the period covered by the Easter Books, whilst another twenty sons and five sons-in-law succeeded a widow. By the time both parents died it was presumably common for most children to have already established their own homes.

Not only is it impossible to estimate how many children would have been brought up by step-parents or guardians, but there is little to indicate how close-knit the "hybrid" household would have been nor whether "adopted" children were fully integrated into the family or treated as distant kin or servants. To judge from testamentary evidence second wives were treated no less favourably than first. True the children of the first marriage were sometimes given the dwelling house or the administration of the estate, but equally, there are many cases where the widow had preference. It was

106. Sometimes a son succeeded to his father's old house when the latter moved elsewhere. Other's did not enter their inheritance for some time after both parents died, even if they were old enough to do so. It is significant that only just over one in seven male households known to have been vacated by death, descended directly or indirectly to a child, although undoubtedly more instances of continuity would be revealed were it possible to study a longer period.
rare for step-children to be left more than the testator's own offspring, yet a number were given generous portions and were clearly viewed as integral members of his family. The timing of the second marriage must have been important in determining the relationships within the family. If it occurred whilst the children were still young the step-father or mother would obviously have played an important part in bringing them up. If the first marriage was long-lived, the links between the members of the two families may have been tenuous, if not in some instances, openly hostile. Contemporary writers were obviously aware of the problems remarriage could bring. In his "Instruction of Christian Women" Vives remarked that,

"As for step-mothers they have an yll name as malitious towarde theyr husbands childre of the whiche thyng there be many examples in memory",

whilst William Gouge said it was common for step-parents to act jealously and hinder the well being of their step-children, and he advised that,

"Widowers and widowes that have children seriously thinke of it beforehand and be the more circumspect in taking a second or third husband or wife." (107).

It is certainly in societies where remarriage was common that one might expect the "wicked stepmother/jealous step-sisters scenario" to be acted out. Yet in the Early Modern period the loss of a parent and the merger of one household with another was in many ways just one more aspect of the fluidity of the household. If people were used to living with comparative strangers and to a fairly regular turnover of co-residents, they probably adopted a pragmatic approach to the appearance of surrogate parents and siblings. The tensions which existed in the hybrid household may, in consequence, have been little different from those which sprang up in the "unbroken" home.

CHAPTER VI

THE HOUSEHOLD WITHIN THE COMMUNITY
In discussing the historical study of the family-cycle Hareven pointed out that, whilst, the household may be nuclear, the family itself is by no means an isolated unit. Although we have concentrated primarily on the residential group we should not forget that the members of each household were involved in a number of overlapping relationships which transcended the domestic unit. They could be linked to several other households by virtue of kinship and would have had various economic ties with other families, the wage-earner, for instance living in one house and working in another. Membership of certain physical units, such as the parish and the ward was common to all and carried with it certain responsibilities and expectations. In addition, the inmates of the household would have belonged to one or more occupational groups, possibly formalised by guild membership, and to several informal peer groups.

Given the instability of the household these external links may actually have been more important than those binding the members of the domestic group. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, especially, Stone believes that the family was a loosely structured entity which depended heavily on outside influences. But he suggests that between 1500 and 1700 its boundaries became more clearly defined, the affective bonds within the conjugal unit were strengthened and the influence of kin and neighbours upon domestic life began to decline. With this in mind I intend to conclude this study by assessing the importance of kinship and neighbourliness and by trying to ascertain whether people were more likely to spend time with their peers or whether, like work, recreational activities were structured by the framework of the household.


2. L. Stone, op. cit., p.93.
The dichotomy between household and peer-group membership is illustrated by the customs associated with church seating. As elsewhere, different status groups were allotted particular places in the three Salisbury churches. At the back, seats were set aside for the poor. At the front, in order of seniority, sat the town councillors with additional seats reserved for their wives. In St. Edmund's there is evidence of a weaver's pew and it seems likely that other crafts would also have sat together. People outside these groups hired individual pews which were often shared with members of their own sex or "pew-mates". The segregation of the sexes had never been complete and even before the Reformation husbands and wives could sit together. Yet by the seventeenth century people seem to have been more inclined to sit with their families, the establishment of special benches for children and servants being noted in several churchwarden's accounts. In 1637, for example, Maurice Aylerugge paid 2s for a "little portable seat in the North Isle against his own seate doore for his children," and in 1648 Ambrose Smith hired a pew for himself and his family and was allowed "to fix a new bench for his servants at his own charges." (4). Although perhaps fortuitous, it is tempting to see this as one aspect of a growing trend for social life to become focussed on the household.

In the early sixteenth century recreation was often communal. As in most Early Modern Towns the year at Salisbury was punctuated by religious processions, guild feasts, church ales and other parish gatherings. However, as the guilds declined in importance and as the ritual associated with the pre-Reformation church began to disappear, group festivities gave way to activities which were both more individualistic in character, and more

likely to be pursued indoors rather than in the streets. The church's importance as a social centre diminished. The household and the alehouse began to take its place. The former also assumed a more important spiritual role in the eyes of the reformed church, with emphasis being placed on family worship and on domestic virtues.

To assess whether or not religious and economic change really did increase the importance of the household as a social unit is difficult, particularly when so little is known about any but the more formalised recreational activities. In Salisbury it is possible to point to both peer-group and family activities before the Reformation. Many of the rituals for which we have evidence such as the St. Osmund's Night procession and the George Feast, were confined to the city freemen. Yet at certain points in the year there were opportunities for other members of society to meet with their peers. Women for instance, joined together at Hocktide for a brief period of misrule, entries for money collected for the "wifes gathering" or the "wemen and maydens gathering", appearing regularly in the Churchwarden's Accounts until the last quarter of the sixteenth century. There is little evidence of any festivities at Candlemas, a Holy day particularly associated with women, although this may have been one occasion when the "wife's light" was carried to church attended by minstrels. The light was certainly lit at Whitsun when women and youths gathered in each parish for dancing. In 1547 16s 6d was received in St. Thomas's "for the gatherynge of the wyffes, doughters and servauntes on the Fryday in Whitson weke" and references to the "childrens dawnce" or to money gathered at Whitsun appear until the early seventeenth century. Some light is thrown on the Whitsun revels in a lease of the rectory of St. Thomas's

5. Ibid., p. 274.
in which the Dean and Chapter agreed to contribute towards

"the wyves, doughters, mayden servants and scolers of
the said parish of St. Thomas towards the making of
such lights as they done seu(er)allye mayntayne", and
to give 20s "in recompense of such drinkinge as
they were wonte to make vnto the said wyves,
dughters, mayden servants and scolers yerlye at
and in the same Fridaye in the Whitson weke." (6).

The servants who gathered on "Frick Friday" were probably apprentices
and younger domestic servants. For the older, unmarried man there appear
to have been no specific parochial rituals, unless they joined in the
Maytime revelries, which, one assumes, would have occurred in the town. 7.

Once attaining journeyman status however, they may have been able to
participate in their craft festivities. The journeymen tailor's actually
had a fellowship headed by two stewards and on Midsummer's Day, after
accompanying the procession of the Masters, held their own gathering.

According to the guild's fifteenth century ordinances the whole company
processed to mass carrying the journeymen's light and then back to the hall,

"the jornemen afore the maisters and thanne the jornemen
there for to have a drynkyng yn the moste godely wyse
by ye avys of the wardeynes and stewards aboue reherssed." (8)

A memorandum of 1537 ordaining that,

"all man(ner) of occupations within this city and their
journeymen shall kepe their fests oon day for the master
and oon day forther journeymen only at the tymes
accustomed that is to say when they use to bring in
their lights",
suggests that similar arrangements were adopted by other crafts. 9. However,
there is no evidence of any other journeyman fellowships apart from two
notes in the 1630s pertaining to the hire of part of the Tailor's hall by
the journeyman weavers.

7. Although the latter are not specifically mentioned, isolated references
are made to cleaning the church and preparing timber "at ye Dawnse of Powles".  
Although young people may have been able to mix freely with their own kind on many informal occasions, it is significant that the activities of servants and journeymen for which we have evidence were all carried out in close conjunction with their elders. On Midsummer's Day the masters accompanied the journeymen's procession and the subsequent drinking in the Tailors' hall was apparently carried out with their blessing. The maids who gathered on "Fryck Friday" had their mistresses close by to supervise them. Like periods of misrule, such festivities gave the younger 'unruly' elements of society the opportunity to share in communal activity, but not to overstep its bounds.

Not only did the ritual year cater for controlled peer-group activities, but there were opportunities for the whole household to share in communal festivities. The Tailor's Midsummer feast, for instance, was attended not only by the Masters and their apprentices and journeymen, but also by their wives and children. In 1570 it was noted that,

"the bretheren of this company shall be allowed to bring every of them one of their children and no mor to the midsomer accustomed feast of this house of fre costs and that for every childe besides yff they bring more than one the shall paye for every childe a grot a meal",

whilst other ordinances mention the sums to be paid for the Masters and their wives.\(^{10}\) In the fifteenth century it was specified that the journeymen should serve their masters and then they in turn should sit down and be waited upon by the apprentices. When the mayor tried to forbid the morris dancing which traditionally accompanied the feast in 1611, reference was made to the danger of quarrels amongst "suche a company of youth and vnruuly apprentices".\(^{11}\).

\(^{10}\) S.C.A., I/246/2/ fol.75.

\(^{11}\) P.R.O., SP/14/66/64.
Although certain notions of order were clearly respected during the festivities this may have been one day in the year which was intended to be enjoyed, primarily by the young.

Having originated as a religious fraternity it is possible that the Tailor's guild may have permitted more family involvement than the other Salisbury crafts. The only other reference to women attending feasts occurs in a Corporation memorandum of 1609 which stipulated that, at "any meeting for eating of venison or such like", each of the Twenty-Four was to come "with their wyves and send 2s whether he come or not, and each of the Fourty-eight 12d". But this may have been a recent innovation. It was certainly not until the 1590s that wives were allowed to attend the guild feasts in Coventry. However, whether typical or not, the example of the Tailors is important for it demonstrates that, even before the Reformation, social activity could be performed within the framework of both peer-group and the household.

**THE SOCIAL CIRCLES OF MAN AND WIFE**

Outside the formal craft and parish festivities it is difficult to ascertain how far social activities were segregated. Deposition accounts make it clear that people often did frequent the company of their peers. There are many references to women gossiping together by the fireside or at their doors, whilst their husbands ventured further afield - perhaps to "recreat" themselves in the park; to "pass away the time" by playing skittles or bowls with their fellows or simply to sit "drinking and making merry together" in an alehouse. Yet husband and wife also

---

14. S.D.R., B.C.D.B., Nos. 18, fol. 60; 3, fol. 69v & 10, fol. 46.
shared many common activities and would visit neighbours together, perhaps to play cards, as did John Pyle and his wife, or to eat and drink in company. Their social networks would rarely have been identical, yet within a neighbourhood, a man and his wife generally had a number of common friends and enemies. One man remarked how,

"there hath been theis twelf months past great enmity and displeasure between said Morgan and this deponent and also between them and there wifes abowte evel wordes passing to and fro between their wifes" (16).

Another was reported to have "borne a deadlie hatred against John Blathat" because the latter had caused his wife's arrest some ten years earlier.17.

In order to compare the social networks of men and women the range of beneficiaries mentioned in wills between 1500 and 1639 was examined. Even with a complex form of record linkage only a portion of the links which bound together the community can be traced and any results based on one source alone must be treated with caution. In this case the testator's family obligations would have limited his concern for outsiders and generally only the wealthiest testators or those with no family could afford to endow many friends. Yet it was unusual for a willmaker to mention no outsiders, even if it was only as overseers or witnesses, and although representing only a portion of the testator's social network, such people were those with whom he probably had the closest and most frequent contact. As Table 6:1 illustrates, although the size of some of the samples conditions the results, from the 1580s onwards both male and female willmakers tended to name fewer and fewer beneficiaries. Whilst this could be indicative of a growing concern for the nuclear family at the

15. Ibid., No. 18, fol. 20.
16. Ibid., No. 9, fol. 58c v.
17. Ibid., No. 33, fol. 161v.
### TABLE 6:1 THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF LEGATEES MENTIONED IN WILLS PROVED BETWEEN 1500 AND 1639

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Male Testators</th>
<th>Widowers</th>
<th>Female Testators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Wills</td>
<td>Mean Legatees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 - 1509</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1510 - 1519</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520 - 1529</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530 - 1539</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540 - 1549</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550 - 1559</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560 - 1569</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570 - 1579</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580 - 1589</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590 - 1599</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 - 1609</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610 - 1619</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620 - 1629</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630 - 1639</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>633</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
expense of more distant kin, it may have been a matter of simple economics. As the number of willmakers increased, so their average wealth, and with it the potential for generosity, decreased.\textsuperscript{18}

Wealth was a major factor in determining the extent of each testator's bequests. So too was his marital status and the stage he had reached in the life-cycle. The man with a young family would normally distribute the bulk of his estate for their benefit. The testator with few domestic obligations, and this included the widow whose children had already been provided for, was able to endow a great number of legatees than normal. Thus, whereas the average male testator between 1500 and 1639 left 10.5 legatees, the female willmaker left 12.0 and the widower 13.3. The bereaved person was not only freer to nominate his or her friends, but by this stage in the life-cycle, the family itself would probably have extended. Hence, comparatively fewer widows and widowers concentrated exclusively on the immediate family, and they were likely to name more members of their children's families and fewer of the preceding generation than the married testator.\textsuperscript{19}

If gifts to non-kin increased as the testator's domestic obligations diminished, one might also expect a corresponding increase in the number of spiritual bequests. In all three groups a majority made some provision for the afterlife. Yet surprisingly, women seem to have been the least spiritually minded. Perhaps they were not so anxious to maintain their social prestige with elaborate philanthropic gestures, for it seems unlikely that they were any less superstitious than men. It was also curious that,

\textsuperscript{18} During the first decade of the seventeenth century it is notable that the number of wills proved fell, whilst the mean number of legatees rose slightly. Premature death in the 1604 plague must have prevented many people from making wills, although cases of men calling their last wishes through a window illustrate how even the sick could spare a thought for the future.

\textsuperscript{19} See Table 6:2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Legatees</th>
<th>Males %</th>
<th>Widowers %</th>
<th>Females %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Family Only +</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Of Origin *</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offspring's Family</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Kin</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Kin</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Kin</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church And Poor</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total In Sample</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Including wills in which overseers from outside immediate family were rewarded with small tokens.

* Including the family of siblings.
despite the fact that women probably had more social contact with members of their own sex, they were slightly less inclined to leave gifts to women than to men. Nevertheless, it is significant that almost half the female testators nominated a female friend in contrast to just over a quarter of the male testators. They were also more likely to have female witnesses. Between 1590 and 1629, for instance, nearly a quarter had at least one female witness, whilst amongst the male willmakers the corresponding proportion was only 2.4%.

Having briefly noted some of the differences between male and female wills, I propose to look more closely at a group of 86 wills in order to see how far the woman's social circle differed from that of her spouse. Not only was the woman freer to endow a wider range of legatees than her husband but, even if she had shared his contacts whilst he was alive, it is possible that after several years alone her circle of friends would have changed substantially.

One of the most extensive networks mentioned by a woman occurs in the will of Agnes Tyrell drawn up in 1563. In all Agnes named 58 individuals, none of whom are known to be kin. Several were godchildren, others the wives or daughters of her executors. The rest were probably friends or neighbours. Agnes's husband also named a wide group. But of his 22 legatees, seven were kinsmen. The two wills had only six legatees in common, although a further eight mentioned by Agnes were related to her spouse's beneficiaries. Moreover, Henry's four overseers also acted as executors or overseers for his wife. The fact that the couple were childless may explain the range of their legatees, yet the disparity between the two wills was clearly not due to the lapse of time,

for they were both drawn up within the space of five months. Two other cases involving childless couples suggest that the Tyrells may have been unusual in naming so many people. The first couple mentioned only seven beneficiaries between them, none of whom were common, whilst only four of the second woman's twenty legatees were totally unrelated to those of her spouse.

Individual examples emphasise how varied the circumstances of each couple could be. Yet overall the results suggest that apart from a core of close relatives and neighbours, husband and wife may have had very divergent social circles. On average the 43 men in the sample had three fewer legatees than the women. Yet little more than half the women left gifts to more individuals than their spouse, and between them they nominated proportionately fewer non-kin. In all 1173 different individuals were mentioned in the 86 wills, albeit as beneficiaries, overseers or witnesses. Of these just under a fifth were common to both man and wife (219), a proportion which is surprisingly low when we consider that, unless death intervened, children and certain other close relatives were likely to be mentioned by both partners. In fact, little more than one in four kinsmen were common to both wills, whilst the corresponding proportion for non-kin was only about one in ten (27.7% and 10.4% respectively).

The disparity between the wills of men and their wives may have increased with wealth, although this cannot be tested for here. It may also have been affected by the remarriage of one or both partners, which would give them obligations towards a second group of kin, or, as suggested

22. W.R.O., Subdean Wills, John Eyre (1622), Prudence Eyre (1637), Catherine Holmes (1623), P.R.O., Prob. 11/138/68/38, William Holmes.

23. The means were 12.7 and 15.7 respectively, both higher than those for the complete sample between 1500 and 1639, suggesting that those families in which both partners made a will were likely to be wealthier than normal. The sample does, however, include a number of modest craftsmen besides members of the civic élite.
earlier, by the passage of time. As Table 6:3 shows, there was only a slight tendency for those who had been married twice to mention fewer common names than normal. Sometimes they would concentrate exclusively on their first family, but gifts to step-children were not unknown. The example of the Tyrells has already indicated that the time lapse between two wills may not have been particularly significant. The proportion of non-kin named in both wills was certainly below average after an interval of ten or more years between the two. Yet it was only marginally higher when they dated from the same year. If the woman's circle changed significantly over time then one would expect a far greater divergence between the two sub-groups. As less than a fifth of all the woman's witnesses and legatees in the second group were mentioned by her spouse, it appears that even during the marriage, the social contacts of man and wife may have been very different.

The choice of executor was especially important for he or she was responsible for settling the estate and performing the dead man's wishes. Between 1500 and 1639 nearly three-quarters of all married male testators nominated their spouse, whilst only about one in 13 chose someone outside the immediate family. Occasionally a child was called upon to administer the affairs of both parents, but in general it was unlikely that husband and wife would share a common executor. Nevertheless, in view of the responsibility of the office, one might expect the woman to appoint someone who had been well known to her husband.

In this particular sample two couples shared an executor whilst in 28 cases the wife's executor had been a beneficiary, an overseer or a witness in her husband's will. Almost a third of the widows however, made an individual choice. Here the duration of widowhood may have been more important, for although three of the 13 women in question died within a
TABLE 6:3 THE INCIDENCE OF COMMON NAMES IN A SAMPLE OF 43 PAIRS OF WILLS MADE BY HUSBANDS AND WIVES: 1500 - 1639

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Common To Both Wills</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Named Individuals</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Non-Kin</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Beneficiaries</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: Total Sample.

B: Couples involved in a second marriage.

C: Couples making wills within a year of each other.

D: Couples whose wills were written over ten years apart.
year of bereavement, eight made their will over nine years later.

Overseers did not hold such a trusted position as the executor and were more likely to be friends than kinsmen. The likelihood that the woman would appoint someone outside her husband’s network was therefore greater. Only eight women nominated one of their spouse’s overseers and of the 65 overseers appearing in the widow’s wills only 24 were mentioned in any capacity by the spouse. Witnesses were even less likely to belong to both circles, no more than 40 of the 147 chosen by the widows falling into this category.

We should be wary about placing too much emphasis on these results. The testator could only have given gifts to a minority of his daily contacts and whilst some beneficiaries were evidently close friends, the distribution of small tokens may sometimes have been fairly arbitrary. It is conceivable that many people were named by only one partner, even though they were common visitors to the house and close friends of both. Although only 183 of the 674 individuals named as beneficiaries by the 43 women had previously received a gift from the spouse (27.2%) it is therefore significant that another 135 are known to have been related to the husband’s legatees (20%). Even if their wills were very dissimilar, a couple need not necessarily have moved in entirely different circles. Moreover, even if the wealthier couple belonged to very divergent social networks, this need not apply to society as a whole. It is possible, for instance, that the social contacts of the humbler craftsman and his wife may have been restricted to a much smaller neighbourhood.
THE FAMILY OF INTERACTION

Whilst they did not always mention the same members of the family, kin were prominent in the wills of both the men and the wives. A few nominated relatives who lived some distance from Salisbury, but generally the choice was restricted to kinsmen from the immediate locality, gift-giving and the allocation of certain responsibilities such as the executorship and the care of children, forming part of the many reciprocal services which were exchanged by neighbouring kinsmen.

So far little is known about kinship networks in the past, a deficiency caused partly by the problems of tracing kin. In one of the most detailed studies to date Wrightson and Levine have shown that in the Essex village of Terling the kinship network was very loosely structured. Between 40 and 50% of the households in the village were related to another domestic group but, although extensive networks were not unknown, the links generally only involved one other household and were restricted in the main, to close blood relatives or affines. As the diary of the rector of another Essex village demonstrates, distant kin such as cousins may have been recognised, but contact between them was very infrequent. Wrightson and Levine's study also reveals that although a person may have had more living relatives at certain points in the life-cycle than others, neither age nor wealth appear to have had a marked affect on the density of the kinship network.

The size of the population in Salisbury precludes any attempt to trace all possible kinship links in the town. However, a study of the incidence

---


of like-surnames suggests that, perhaps because of the high mobility
of an urban population, the kinship network may have been even more
loosely structured than in a village. In a typical year just over a
third of the householders listed in the Easter Books had the same name
as another householder in St. Thomas's (36.8%), an average of 32 sharing
a name with two others and 28 with more than three. Some of the larger
surname groups, such as Smith and Michell, probably included non-kin, but
even when they are excluded the number of linked households still amounts
to 32.9%. In Coventry a similar exercise revealed that 18.6% of the
1274 households listed in 1523 were headed by people with similar names
to at least one other head in the same Ward, the lower proportion
presumably being due in part to the fact that the wards were smaller
than St. Thomas's.\textsuperscript{27}

In both Coventry and Salisbury the surname groups normally only
comprised two or three households. Yet extended groups were not unknown.
The Brickets, a group associated with the wood and metal crafts, are a
case in point. Between 1574 and 1607 twelve men and two women of this
name appeared as householders in St. Thomas's, whilst several more adult
males resided with their parents. Three families were recorded in
Catherine Street; a tailor lived by the church and a cutler's family
resided in Bricket's Corner. Besides being linked together, the Brickets
had connections with several other households including the Beckhams, another
family of joiners in Catherine Street. Although two of the men made wills
they were not amongst the most prominent Salisbury families. Neither were

\textsuperscript{26} This exercise will only reveal links on the male side and we can
rarely be certain that men with like-surnames were always related.

\textsuperscript{27} C. V. Phythian-Adams, \textit{op.cit.}, p.155.
the Pounces, a group concentrated around Butcher Row, which included six male heads, one woman and again, several resident sons. Whether they were all related is uncertain, although they evidently had several affinal links with other local butchers.

The Pounces were one of several surname groups in Butcher Row, the most cohesive of the streets in the parish. On average roughly one in ten households were linked by name to another in the same street (or 8.2% if the more common names are excluded). Kinship ties may have been less important amongst the urban poor, yet it was not necessarily the wealthiest streets which had the greatest incidence of like-surnames. In 1593 as many as two-fifths of the households in Butcher Row were linked by name, but Blue Lion Chequer and Catherine Street were also above average in this respect, the latter perhaps related to the proliferation of wood and metal workers in this area. Occasionally people of the like-surname were close neighbours, although probably no more than a minority of the population ever dwelt in very close proximity to a kinsman. In 1593 for instance, only 16 householders lived next to, or within two or three doors of another of the same name.

To balance the fact that the last exercise only reveals agnatic connections an attempt was made to discover how many people dwelt near a possible affine. In 1593, a year when 12.9% of all householders resided in the same street as someone with a similar surname, only 3.5% dwelt near someone bearing their wife's surname. If the sample is restricted to those men whose wife's maiden name is actually known, namely those who married in Salisbury, the proportion rises to 10.7%. But this group may have lived in closer proximity

28. Possibly some couples which have been categorised as co-residents really dwelt next door to their parents or siblings. It is interesting that elderly widows do not seem to have chosen close residence in preference to co-residence with their offspring. In 1593 only seven women lived in the same street as someone of the same name and of these only two were immediate neighbours.
to their affines than those who married elsewhere. We can do no more than tentatively suggest then, that affinal links were probably only slightly less common than those between agnates. Like co-residence, residential propinquity may have been most common at the extremes of the domestic-cycle. Certainly slightly more newly-married couples had tentative affinal connections with their neighbours than those in the wider sample and it may have been fairly common for a couple to settle near their in-laws and then to move away at a later date.

Without more tangible evidence it is difficult to determine why certain streets were apparently more close-knit than others. Logically one would expect the streets which contained large numbers of temporary inhabitants to be far less cohesive than those where long-term residents predominated. In two of the latter, the Ditch and Bower's Chequer, testamentary evidence was used to supplement the surname evidence already discussed. The results show that almost a quarter of the householders who appeared between 1574 and 1607 had a definite, or at least an assumed connection, with another household in the street, whilst to exclude those who appeared in one list only, increases the proportion to over a third (23.5% and 38.3%). As certain crafts tended to congregate in particular areas it is possible that the structure of the kinship network may have been related to the occupational character of individual streets. As in many other towns; Butcher Row stands out as a particularly cohesive unit. Indeed, the combined evidence from wills and surname linkage suggests that nearly half the men recorded in the street may have been linked to another household.

29. Roughly one in seven of the couples whose marriage can be traced were linked by the wife's maiden name to someone in the street where they set up home and nearly half to another household in the parish. Once again Butcher Row stands out, a quarter of the men setting up home there marrying someone who may already have dwelt in the street. It should be noted that men who took over an established home have been excluded from this analysis.

30. The number of householders who lived near kin at some point during their career will obviously exceed that obtained from an individual listing.
at some point during the period. Whilst the nature of their profession demanded that the butchers dwelt in close proximity, other crafts do not appear to have formed such obvious residential groups. Yet this may in part reflect the fact that only a minority of the professions in St. Thomas's can be traced. The butchers were certainly not the only trade to be united by kinship and were presumably not alone in taking advantage of the mutual assistance which close residence could bring.

Kinship undoubtedly played an important part in binding together the community. Despite the rather tenuous nature of the evidence it is possible that at least a third of all householders had connections with other occupants in their parish and proportionately more in the city as a whole, not to mention the links which would have existed between the other members of the household. Yet the presence of kin in the locality does not necessarily imply that there were close relationships between them.

Some of the ways in which kinsmen assisted one another have been mentioned in earlier chapters. Even if it was rare to share a house with distant relatives, those who were sick or in trouble would often turn to a kinsman who lived nearby. Uncles and brothers became involved in marriage negotiations; close relatives would normally attend family weddings and funerals and were also common choices as godparents and guardians. Between 1500 and 1639, for instance, 63 of the 235 godchildren nominated in wills are known to have been kin (26.8%), whilst roughly half the men appointed as guardians were apparently related to the testator. Wealthier kinsmen, meanwhile were often looked upon as patrons who might take on a poorer relative as a servant or use their influence to find him work. In the 1620s for example, Alexander and Augustine Poore wrote asking Roger Sherfield

31 As many as 234 of the 776 men enrolled as freemen between 1612 and 1640 shared the name of a fellow craftsman (30.2%). The tanners had the greatest incidence of like-surnames (53.1%), whilst the joiners, coopers, brewers and shoemakers were also above average. Rather surprisingly the corresponding proportion for the butchers was only 30%. 
to put the case of their brother Roger, "who is late growne weake in his linnes" and needed a licence to sell beer, to his own brother, the Recorder of Salisbury.\(^{32}\) Although it is difficult to assess how often relatives were approached in preference to outsiders, positive aid to kinsmen frequently took the form of loans. In the wills from St. Thomas's dating from between 1570 and 1619, 55 debtors were named of whom 20 were kin (36.4%). However, these particular debts were forgiven by the testators, whilst those which remained outstanding were more likely to be held by non-kin. The kinsman who failed to pay what he owed, may have been treated leniently, for none of a group of 110 debt cases dealt with in the Bishop's Court in 1600 involved people of the same name.\(^{33}\) In addition to lending money and goods, kinsmen often stood surety for each other. Again it is impossible to determine how frequently this occurred but it is interesting that 11 of the 64 city bonds drawn up in the 1620s and 1630s included a guarantor who bore the same name as the debtor.\(^{34}\)

In affairs concerning family property, Wrightson and Levine remarked that "it was kin who were most deeply trusted", adding that relatives might be nominated to administer or supervise a will even if they lived some distance away. In Terling only 13% of the executors nominated between 1550 and 1699 were not kinsmen, although widows and children were obviously chosen in preference to more distant kin. 45% of the overseers in their sample were relatives, amongst whom brothers and brothers-in-law predominated. Witnesses

---

32. H.R.O., J.L. Jervoise, Herriard Coll, Sherfield Mss. 44 M69/56, XXXVIII, No. 17. Although it is uncommon to find large family groups within the city council itself, civic officers may have been in a position to appoint kin to certain posts. One interesting example of an officer making use of his family is mentioned in 1624. Apparently when he was Mayor Maurice Green's brothers attended him as "one of his livery and retinue there with him some three or four of the hollidayes" (B.C.D.B., No. 40, fol. 44).

33. The same applied to the prosecutions for trespass dealt with that year. Were kin able to apply their own sanctions without resorting to the law?

34. 26 of the 124 people noted as sureties were of the same trade as the debtor. Tanners, and to a lesser extent butchers and weavers, seem to have been particularly inclined to involve fellow tradesmen.
by contrast, were generally neighbours, only 5% actually known to have been kin. In Salisbury the situation was similar. Although distant relatives were still preferred to non-kin, there are signs that the tendency to rely on the nuclear family actually increased towards the end of the sixteenth century. Between 1500 and 1569 for instance, 6.5% of all married male testators nominated a distant kinsman as executor, and 4.3% a friend. During the next seventy years the respective proportions fell to 4% and 1.2%. Fewer overseers, but more witnesses, were kinsmen in Salisbury than in Terling; the respective proportions in the St. Thomas's wills made between 1570 and 1609, being 28% and 15%. The women in the sample did not differ markedly from the men, the corresponding proportions in this case being 30.4% and 8.8%.

A man's attitude towards his kindred can be gauged both from the nature of the responsibilities he entrusted them with and also from the gifts he gave them. As pointed out earlier, the testator's economic status and his domestic commitments may have prevented him from nominating more than a few of his relatives. Thus whereas 68.7% of all male testators between 1500 and 1639 left gifts to kin, the proportions for the widows and widowers were 81.8% and 84.1%. Even though the gifts were often no more than tokens, it is significant that so many people did remember their kin. As Figure 6:1 illustrates, by the latter part of the sixteenth century more testators were leaving their entire estate to the nuclear family. Yet this was mainly at the expense of non-kin, for the proportion leaving to kin of any category did not alter markedly.

Blood relatives were the most common beneficiaries after immediate dependents, yet affines do not seem to have been treated discriminatorily and brothers-in-law in particular were often entrusted with the executorship

FIGURE 6:1 THE PROPORTION OF TESTATORs MENTIONING SPECIFIC GROUPS BY DECADE: 1500-1639
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or the care of children. Gifts to the preceeding generation were understandably rare, those to siblings and their families very common with over a third of the male testators leaving to a sibling, a fifth to nephews and nieces and roughly a sixth to brothers and sisters-in-law.

Besides offering positive assistance in the form of loans, the care of the sick or the administration of a dead man's affairs, kin were a potential source of moral support and advice. Several cases reveal attempts to uphold the reputation of individual members of the family and, presumably, with it the credit of the family as a whole. In 1603, for example, when Alice Gilbert was accused of incontinency before marriage, her brother and sister both tried to clear her name in the neighbourhood. In another family the mother intervened when her younger son was suspected of infidelity with his brother's wife. To some extent the interest shown in the marriage arrangements of sisters and nieces must also betoken a concern for the standing of the family group as a whole.

Whether or not the support of the wider family was a sign of affective relations or simply of duty is difficult to determine. In the modern community Bott points out that contact with kin is affected as much by personal likes and dislikes as by such factors as physical accessibility and economic links. Although inaccessibility obviously restricted contacts in the Early modern period, it is clear that people did not feel obliged to frequent the company of their relatives, even if they dwelt in the same town. One Salisbury woman said, "she was much conversante with Mrs.

40. Distance was not always a problem. Gift giving and debt relationships could involve people from beyond the immediate locality and irregular social contacts were maintained between kinsmen living in different parts of the country. Richard Hibberd, for instance, visited his brother-in-law whenever he went to London and Katherine Blacker went to stay with an uncle in London. (S.D.R., B.C.D.B., No. 54, fols. 50, 35.)
### Table 6:4 The Range of Legatees Named in Wills: 1500 - 1639

#### % of Male Testators Leaving To:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Friends</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Friends</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephew/Niece</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godchild</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister/Brother-in-law</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchild</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son/Daughter-in-law</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masses &amp; Guilds</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepchild</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt/Uncle</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-laws</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Grandchild</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-parent</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### % of Female Testators Leaving To:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Friends</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Friends</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchild</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son/Daughter-in-law</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephew/Niece</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godchild</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister/Brother-in-law</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masses &amp; Guilds</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-child</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt/Uncle</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Grandchild</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6:4 CONTINUED

% OF WIDOWERS LEAVING TO:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Friends</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchild</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son/Daughter-in-law</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godchild</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephew/Niece</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister/Brother-in-law</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masses &amp; Guilds</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-child</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Grandchild</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-laws</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Singleton (her cousin) when she dwelt upon the ditches, but not after", proximity obviously determining the relationship rather than kinship. Her sister in Southampton, on the other hand, described Mrs. Singleton as "very near in kinred" and visited her from time to time. Another Court witness said that he and his wife went to his mother's now and then "and had their diet there as any friend might do one with another and not otherwise." If social contact could be maintained on a casual basis, so too, presumably, could the exchange of services between kin.

According to Lawrence Stone the period between 1500 and 1700 was characterised by weakening ties within the wider family. Certain welfare functions normally performed by relatives were taken over by public bodies; high mobility reduced the accessibility of kin and the ideal of kinship as the highest focus of loyalty was challenged by developing ideals of the state and the conjugal family. Whilst the Salisbury evidence is insufficient to quantify the extent of services and contacts between kin, it is clear that many families were extended, if not by co-residence, at least by interaction with other related domestic groups within the town. How often people deliberately opted to live near each other in order to share certain domestic and commercial services and how far their conceptions of kinship obligations differed from those which determined the relationship between friends and neighbours is debatable... Chance references emphasise that there were certain behavioural norms. A father was said to "bear a naturall and fatherly affection" towards his son; a daughter was required to "shewe herselfe a naturall and loving daughter to her mother" and a woman was willed to care for her spouse's aunt "as she would do her own mother".

---

41. Ibid., No. 9, fol. 57c. 42. Ibid., No. 25, fol. 103v.
Yet there are also many instances of tension between kindred which demonstrate that these norms were not always adhered to. Many families probably did form cohesive residential groups in which the reciprocal exchange of services and moral support were considered natural. But equally there were many other families which maintained casual, if not hostile, relationships with their kin. Moreover, the evidence makes it clear that the wider family was not indispensable and that, although people were often called upon to assist a kinsman who lived nearby, they do not appear to have provided any services which could not have been performed as easily by neighbours, friends or fellow tradesmen.

RELATIONSHIPS WITHIN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD

For the many people who had only remote contacts with their relatives the neighbourhood played an important supportive role. As with kin, neighbours were called upon to participate in the various rites of passage which punctuated the domestic cycle. They attended each others weddings and took an interest in marriage negotiations. They cared for the sick and would accompany the body of a neighbour to the grave. Women also assisted when a neighbour was in childbed and probably attended the churcheing service too. Although less likely to be nominated than kin, people acted as godparents to children in their street, perhaps helping to further the child's career in addition to assuming the role of spiritual patron. As most of the streets in Salisbury were heterogeneous in character, it was natural for the wealthier inhabitant to adopt a philanthropic attitude to his poorer neighbours. This may have entailed


46. The sample is small, yet it is interesting to note that of 27 godchildren given legacies by householders in St. Thomas's, eleven were kin and nine lived in the same street.
the provision of neighbourhood "drinkings" as was common in early sixteenth century Coventry, besides the establishment of charitable loans and the bequest of food or small sums of money.  

In 1533 for example, Thomas Birkhede left 4d "to every householder within the checker that I dwell to pray for me." (48). Fifty years later Mathew Comyn donated 2s to the poor "inhabiting on the way against my house under St. Thomas's Church." (49.)

Although neighbours were occasionally described as "gossips", a term which was apparently reserved for particularly intimate acquaintances, there were limits to neighbourly relations. Certain behaviour was deemed "unneighbourly", yet expectations did not necessarily run to close friendship and trust. One occasionally hears of individuals like John Pyle and Walter Powell of St. Martin's who "were and are great friends often resorting unto one the others company". (50.) But for others their social contacts rested on no more than the fact that they lived in close proximity. Andrew Mathew, for instance, said that "he doth account of Mistress Shingleton in respecte of friendshipp as of other his neighbors and not otherwise", whilst Richard Goughe remarked that, "he has been at William Daniels house diverse times and eaten and drunken there as a neighbour and not otherwise." (51.)

Although neighbours exchanged a wide range of domestic services, it is notable that in matters concerning property or the care of children people were more likely to turn to kin or to fellow tradesmen from other parts of the town. Between 1570 and 1609, 42 of the 150 overseers

---

47. C. V. Phythian-Adams, _op.cit._, pp. 141, 167.
51. Ibid., No. 9, fol. 89cv. & No. 28, fol. 28v.
appointed by willmakers from St. Thomas's were kin; (28%). Another 60
lived in the same parish (40%), but only 24 came from the same street
(16%) and only 8 were immediate neighbours of the testator (5.3%). As
Table 6:5 illustrates, witnesses were slightly more likely to be drawn
from the same street and twice as many were close neighbours. Even so,
it is curious that so few testators involved someone who lived nearby
and strange too that few involved servants or inmates. The female
willmakers, whose social contacts, one would expect, were more restricted,
seem to have been no more inclined to turn to neighbours as supervisors
or witnesses than were the men. Indeed, they appointed decidedly fewer
people from within the parish. Obviously the fact that we are dealing with
a restricted social group is important, for the civic élite would have
had far more divergent social and business contacts than the humbler
craftsmen and wage-earners. Even amongst this small group it is
noticeable that the poorer testators were more likely to involve their
immediate neighbours than normal.\(^{52}\).

In the same sample of wills 55 debtors were mentioned of whom 12
are known to have lived in the same parish and only 6 in the same street
as the testator (21.8% and 10.9% respectively). No more than three
debt links involved close neighbours. Similar results were obtained when
the debt cases dealt with in the Bishop's court in 1600 were examined. In
39 prosecutions involving at least one man from St. Thomas's, debtor and
creditor were fellow parishioners in 22 cases, coming from the same street
in five and from within two or three doors of each other in two. Nearly

\(^{52}\) In such a short period it is difficult to discern any trends particularly
as the number of willmakers declined between 1600 and 1609. Yet the results
for that decade and the 1590s suggest that by the 17th century an increasing
number of people may have looked beyond the parish for assistance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overseers Known To Be:</th>
<th>1570 - 1579</th>
<th>1580 - 1589</th>
<th>1590 - 1589</th>
<th>1600 - 1609</th>
<th>Total 1570 - 1609</th>
<th>Sub-Total Female Testators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsmen *</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From The Parish</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Same Street</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Neighbours</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(150)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Witnesses Known To Be: |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
|                       | %           | %           | %           | %           | %                 | %                         |
| Kinsmen *             | 12.5        | 14.3        | 16.1        | 14.9        | 15.0              | 8.8                       |
| From The Parish       | 56.3        | 56.0        | 47.0        | 38.4        | 49.2              | 23.5                      |
| From Same Street      | 31.3        | 28.6        | 24.0        | 17.0        | 24.8              | 20.6                      |
| Immediate Neighbours  | 31.3        | 14.3        | 9.1         | 6.4         | 12.0              | 11.8                      |
| Total Sample          | (16)        | (84)        | (87)        | (47)        | (234)             | (34)                      |

(* If both a kinsman and a neighbour the former only will be counted. )
a fifth of a wider sample of 110 debt cases involved complete outsiders. As the wills dealt with those people whose debts were forgiven and the court cases with those which remained unpaid the two samples may not be totally representative. Nevertheless, the apparent scarcity of credit links between close neighbours confirms the impression that people preferred to seek financial aid from trusted long-term acquaintances rather than from those with whom they came into daily contact. 53.

The fact that a man could choose his friends but not his neighbours is undoubtedly one reason why, although willing to exchange domestic services rarely neighbours, entrusted each other with more weighty matters. In any neighbourhood there would inevitably have been a small core of stable families who has known each other for years. But there would also have been many temporary residents upon whom it would have been impractical to depend. There were, furthermore, a number of other good reasons for not relying on neighbours.

The early modern household was not a private, self-contained unit and domestic activities were frequently carried out in public view. The householder and his servants sat and worked by an open door; the woman washed in the streets and baked bread in the communal bakehouse. In what little leisure time they had people would sit gossiping beside the front door or they might join in communal games in the street. Not only were neighbours constantly in and out of each others houses, but the walls dividing them were so thin that they could easily hear if anything untoward occurred next door. It is no wonder that little escaped the attention of

53. It was likewise rare to enroll a boy as an apprentice with another craftsman in the street and when appointing guardians, people were more inclined to name fellow officers or tradesmen than their neighbours.
neighbours and that the slightest hint of scandal could rapidly become common knowledge. Court cases demonstrate how a man and woman seen together in suspicious circumstances, or a newly-married couple who produced a premature baby would inevitably arouse comment. They also emphasise that memories were long and that a person's actions could be used in evidence against them years after the event. In short, the people dwelling within a closely knit neighbourhood would have known too much about their fellows to be willing to entrust them with their affairs.

Not only were rumours and suspicions rife in the small community but an uneasy balance existed between friendship and hostility. Although only a small proportion of the disputes which occurred in a neighbourhood would ever have reached the courts, defamation cases illustrate some of the tensions and expectations which existed between neighbours. It is no doubt significant that in the majority of defamation cases which were dealt with between 1550 and 1650 the parties involved usually came from a very confined area. Thus in 36 cases where the residence of both plaintiff and defendant is known, over three-quarters came from the same street and over a third were evidently close neighbours. Many disputes were sparked off by minor issues - an argument over a loaf for instance, or a lost bet - but sometimes there were signs of grievances which had been in existence for years, and which involved not only the acting parties, but also their witnesses. In 1618 for example, one of the witnesses in the case of Stonax v Blathat was reported to have "borne a deadly hatred ag(ains)t John Blathat", and to have said "that he would do any mischief he could to John Blathat to be revenged of him". His malice was apparently occasioned by the

54. Ingram made the same point in his study of sexual litigation in Wiltshire. M. J. Ingram, *op.cit.*, p.293.
fact that the latter had caused his wife to be arrested over ten years earlier.\footnote{55}

Occasionally a couple can be found at the centre of a number of interlocking disputes. In 1612 for instance, Sybil Rogers and Rebecca Daniel, both of Castle Street, were involved in a defamation action arising from a quarrel when Rogers beat Daniel's servant. At the same time Daniel prosecuted Joana Williams, a close neighbour, for calling her a "jade". Four of the witnesses appearing in the two cases had their own private quarrels with Daniel or her husband. Henry Cable had long borne a grudge against William Daniel for accusing him of picking a woman's purse. Another witness, Richard Young, who also came from Castle Street, said that two years before there had been "some variance between him and William Daniel", although they had made friends and "have continued so ever since". Richard Goughe, a tailor, had likewise quarrelled with Daniel two or three years earlier, although he had often visited him since, and Dorothy Shawe confessed that Rebecca and William had "often abused her" but she bore them no malice.\footnote{56}

Another series of interlocking disputes involved a group of households in Catherine Street.\footnote{57} In 1614 Alice Mustian persuaded some of the local children to perform a play depicting the scene in which Robin Humphries, a joiner, was reputedly caught in bed with Mary the wife of Henry Roberts. Although the two women were noted enemies, Mustian's motives were allegedly to ensure that the offence was adequately punished, an interesting example of the way in which informal sanctions could operate within the neighbourhood. As she is reported to have said,"if they had been carted, then this play need not have been played"\footnote{58}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item 55. S.D.R., B.C.D.B., No. 33, fol. 161v.
\item 56. Ibid., No. 27, fols.12, 218v-131v, No. 28, fols.6, 26-30, 39-41.
\item 57. Ibid., No. 29, fols.11-21v, 34-40.
\item 58. Ibid., fol. 14v.
\end{itemize}
Two of the witnesses in the case, Margaret Benbury and her daughter Anna Tomlyn, had been involved in earlier defamation suits against Mustian. But she was friends with Richard and Judith Riche, who lived next door to Mary Roberts, and with William Ames and his wife, the "next neighbours" of Margaret Benbury, and apparently visited and shared meals with both couples. The relationship between the Riches and the Roberts had been strained when Judith was accused of stealing some of Henry's timber. The Ames' meanwhile, were involved in two law-suits with the Benbury's, although they maintained friendly relations with Anna Tomlyn's estranged husband.

These two examples may be exceptional. Nevertheless, they do illustrate how, even within the confines of a single street, the network of friendships and hostilities could be very complex. For most of the time the relationship between neighbours would probably have been fairly equitable - as one woman said, although she had some "words of displeasure" with Emme Head, she "doth not forbear to speak to her, but giveth her the tyme of day." (59). However, quarrels could flare up over petty issues and a grievance which had supposedly been forgotten might be dragged up again if, for instance, someone wished to challenge the impartiality of a witness. Thus, Thomas Hanby, a shoemaker, related how he had accidentally broken a window in his neighbour's house, but that the latter had refused his offer of payment. When he was called to give evidence in a case involving the neighbour's wife, however, an action was entered against him for the glass. (60).

Given the fact that neighbours knew a great deal about each others' private lives; that friendships were easily made and just as easily broken and that, within a confined area the tensions engendered by overcrowding, poverty and disease could rapidly flare up if provoked, it can be appreciated why neighbours were not always willing to trust each other with their most

59. Ibid., No. 12, fol. 60v.

60. Ibid., No. 6, fol. 21v.
intimate affairs. The quarrels for which we have evidence frequently took place outside the parties' houses—whilst they were at work, engaged in domestic chores or perhaps simply sitting gossiping. The restricted circles involved suggest that men's social and working lives were confined to very small areas. Yet the frequency with which plaintiff and defendant were close neighbours contrasts markedly with debt and trespass cases which were far more likely to involve outsiders. Why should there have been such a contrast and why did certain disputes end up in court when it is clear that many others were settled informally?

One of the basic reasons for proceeding in a defamation action was so that the injured party could restore his or her reputation after being slandered openly in a quarrel, or, through gossip, behind his back. The majority of the Salisbury cases dealt with attacks on the plaintiff's sexual probity. Sometimes they concerned a specific allegation of immorality but more commonly they involved the use of generalised abuse such as "whore" "jade" or "cuckold". As Ingram points out in his study of sexual litigation in Wiltshire, defamation cases were traditionally fought between people of roughly equal status. Not only would the poor have been unable to afford the cost of litigation, but they had comparatively little to lose if they were slandered. The defamation action seems to have been primarily a mechanism whereby people of some standing in society challenged the assertions of men and women of sufficient credit to be believed. It is

---

61. Ingrams points out that cases of larceny also rarely involved neighbours. He suggests that various pressures, including the ideals of neighbourliness probably tended to limit prosecutions when local residents were involved, whereas the pursuit of outsiders was less inhibited. M.J. Ingram, "Communities and Courts: Law and Disorder in Early Seventeenth Century Wiltshire" in Crime in England: 1550 - 1800, ed. J.S. Cockburn 1977, p.130.

62. Witnesses frequently mentioned that the plaintiff's credit had been greatly diminished by the allegations.


64. Ibid., p.293.
significant that the defendants rarely included servants, although the latter
do seem to have been important in spreading rumours. Presumably there were
other measures for punishing the slanderous subordinate. There was moreover,
less danger that their allegations would be taken seriously. Indeed one
maid who had seen her mistress committing adultery was specifically warned

"to take heade what. she sayed because the p(ar)tyes
were vearye honest and of good credit and (she) might
chaunce to repent the speaking thereof" (65.).

The anxiety men felt to preserve their reputation reflected not only
a fear of losing business, but also a need to be socially accepted within
the neighbourhood. It is significant that many people who deviated from the
accepted norms were criticised because they had offended against their
neighbours. In 1581 for example, it was reported that Elizabeth Symonds
had contracted a bigamous marriage with Philip Evans "to the greate offence
of all thir neighbors abowte." (66). In such cases it was not only the
reputation of the individual which was at stake but that of the neighbourhood
as a whole, as Margaret Saunders was obviously aware when she lamented that,

"I am sorry that wee have two yong men in our streete
that shall have wifes and both broken to their handes." (67).

By spreading gossip about offenders, or in more extreme cases, by using the
rare expedient of "shame punishments", such as the play arranged by Alice
Mustian, people attempted to regulate the behaviour within their neighbourhood.
If these informal sanctions failed, and there is no way of determining the
influence of public opinion, then people could always turn to the law. In
1583, for instance, the constables searched a house in St. Martin's for a
couple suspected of incontinency "at the special instance, request and
intreate of some of... Edith Lyne's neighbours." (68).

66. Ibid., No. 8, fol. 129.
67. Ibid., No. 22b, fol. 14.
68. Ibid., No. 9, fol. 207c v.
The neighbourhood, albeit a street or a group of streets, was the smallest unit of social control apart from the household. It is difficult to judge how far people's loyalties were focussed on their immediate neighbourhood rather than on their parish, their craft or indeed on their family. The fact that so many issues were discussed in terms of neighbours and the neighbourhood may indicate that, in terms of daily issues at least, people's mental horizons were fairly narrowly defined. Yet individual attitudes obviously varied according to personal circumstances. The wealthiest citizen might live near some of his peers, but his trade and his office would bring many contacts beyond the parish and the town. The interests of the labourer or the humbler craftsmen however, would have been far more localised.

In an earlier chapter it was pointed out that intra-parochial mobility often entailed movement within the same street, a fact suggesting attachment to a particular area. However, many people changed "neighbourhoods" during the period studied, not to mention the hundreds who moved into or out of the town. When we consider that the majority of the inhabitants would only have been attached to a given locality for a short period and that many would have had links with more than one neighbourhood — perhaps living on one side of the parish and working on the other — it seems logical to conclude that loyalties to a particular street or neighbourhood could never have been very strong. Although the neighbourhood played an important supportive role it had the disadvantage of being both unstable and, at times, oppressively close-knit. Neighbours inevitably exchanged a variety of services, yet they formed only part of the tangible network of kin, friends and workmates upon which the sixteenth century householder and his family would have depended.
"If you know what is going to happen to people, and not what has happened to them, it makes it difficult to prevent it happening, if you don't want it to have happened, if you see what I mean?"

As the present investigation has shown, such are the inadequacies in the sources at our disposal that many aspects of daily life remain an enigma. Using records that were primarily fiscal or judicial in purpose we learn little about childhood, about the day to day running of the home or about the ordinary citizen's reactions to the world about him. It is easy, as Macfarlane warns,

"to find ourselves forgetting such basic things as night and day, hate and fear, a patterning of every movement of the day and every feature of the natural world and many other fundamental features of the past". (1).

Yet of all branches of historical enquiry, the study of the family probably comes closest to unearthing these "fundamental features" and enables us to obtain some impression of what life was like for ordinary men and women in the past.

During this particular study an attempt has been made to understand something of the framework in which people lived and worked, to discuss the development of the family and of the individual from birth to death; and to highlight some of the expectations and obligations which bound the community together. It remains to conclude with a brief picture of the "typical" household in late sixteenth century Salisbury and with an assessment of the factors which had most effect on its composition and size. It was established earlier that the standard domestic group in St. Thomas's contained just under three adults and, although this remains speculative, possibly two or three children. In Table 7:1 it can be seen how the different elements we have discussed were apportioned. It is unfortunate that a direct comparison cannot be made with Laslett's English Standard. However, it is


2. The results are confined to the three years when the enumeration of servants and offspring was most reliable.
### TABLE 7: THE COMPOSITION OF THE STANDARD HOUSEHOLD

#### 7:1 COMPARATIVE RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>St. Thomas's 1585, 1593 &amp; 1594</th>
<th>English Standard 1574 - 1851</th>
<th>Ealing a. 1599</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0.14 +</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.97 * 4.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7:2 HOUSEHOLDS HEADED BY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Couples</th>
<th>Widows</th>
<th>Widowers</th>
<th>Single Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Offspring</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.22  1.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.81</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7:3 MALE HOUSEHOLDERS APPEARING WITHIN FIVE YEARS OF:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Marriage</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Entering Junior Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.39</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.43</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a. P. Laslett, Household and Family, p.82.  
+ Adult Offspring only.  
* Excluding the household of Catherine Webbe which distorts the result because of its exceptional size.)
notable that, the proportion allotted to kin was lower in Salisbury, whilst, despite the fact that a small group would have been too young to be enumerated, the number of servants per household was marginally higher. As servants were also more numerous in a number of other early modern towns, it seems reasonable to suggest that the latter was a particular feature of the urban household.

It has not been possible to reach any firm conclusions about the periods, if any, during the domestic-cycle when kin and servants were most likely to be found in the household. Nor was it feasible in the present study to carry out an analysis based on the age of the householder. Nevertheless, several limited comparisons can be made by considering the structure of the household at fixed points during its development and according to the marital status of its head. As Table 7:2 illustrates, certain elements inevitably come to the fore when the latter is controlled for. Adult offspring were more prominent in the home of the widow and the widower. So too, were lodgers, if it can be assumed that unidentified inhabitants did generally fall into this category. Servants meanwhile, were more numerous in the homes of widowers and married men.

The stage the householder had reached in his or her career obviously had some effect on the type of kin to be found in the household and perhaps, to a limited degree on its size. Yet it was by no means inevitable that the composition of the household would respond to changes in the domestic-cycle or that it would increase progressively in size as the head advanced through the craft and civic hierarchies. In some households the number of inhabitants fluctuated erratically from one year to the next. In others it

3. Marital status is in some senses an inadequate guide to the effect of the life-cycle for the bereaved householder was not necessarily as advanced in age as the married man.
remained constant for long periods. That it would be inadvisable to assume too close a link between the composition of the household and the developmental cycle is emphasised by the results for three further sub-groups presented in Table 7:3. The first group includes a group of male householders recorded in the Easter Books of 1585, 1593 or 1594, who had been married during the previous five years; the second a group of men whose death was recorded within five years of that date. As one might expect, the newly married man had fewer adults in his household than average, although it is notable that most in this group had already begun to acquire servants. Whilst it should not be assumed that all the men in the second sample were advanced in years, the results in this instance suggest that the average household would expand with increasing age. However, the results for the third group provide a counter to the idea that household size was closely linked to the life-cycle.

The men in the last group can all be traced entering the city council within five years of enumeration in either 1585, 1593 and 1594, and as the age of taking junior office was generally between 35 and 45, would have presumably all been in mid career. By this stage it is reasonable to suppose that, whilst a few may have already sent their children into service, most would still have had dependent offspring. One might also assume, in the light of the suggestion that extra labour was sometimes taken on to replace sons and daughters as they left home, that they would have had fewer servants than average. Yet the reciprocal link between servants and children clearly did not apply in this particular case for all the subgroups in Tables 7:2 and 7:3 the officeholders had the highest servant density. They also had

4. It is interesting in the light of the earlier discussion on the frequency of remarriage, to note that all but five of the 96 men in this group were still married within five years of death.
slightly more kin than normal, a fact which challenges the idea that relatives were most likely to be taken in at the extremes of the marital-cycle. In Chapter II it was noted that there was a correlation between socio-economic status and mean adult density. Although the present sample is small and it is possible that some of the officers were older than normal it seems logical to attribute the large number of adults per household to the fact that these men were above average in terms of wealth. It is unfortunate that little attempt has been made so far to ascertain the effect of economic status upon mean household size. However, from the limited evidence available for Salisbury, it might be suggested that, in an urban environment at least, wealth was probably far more significant than age or marital status.

One of the main problems in any attempt to determine the characteristics of the average household using records from one parish, and moreover, from a fairly restricted period, is that it is difficult to ascertain how typical these results are. The years covered by the St. Thomas Easter Books were in many ways turbulent ones. The town was struggling to surmount a period of economic decline. It also faced several years of exceptional mortality. Although the evidence suggests that the population rapidly recovered from the latter, it is worth speculating whether, in the long term, demographic trends may not have had a pronounced effect on the composition of the household. It is, for instance, conceivable that a prolonged rise in the death rate or a general decline in the rate of remarriage would have increased the number of solitary householders in a parish and the number of people lodging kin. At the community level it is impossible to test objectively for the significance of demographic factors without records spanning a far longer period than they do in St. Thomas's. However if the results obtained for the Cambridge Group using computer simulation can be accepted, then it would appear that, with the possible exception of the bride's age
at marriage, the constraints imposed by demography upon household structure were only minimal and that, despite changes in mortality or in the type of community involved, the latter altered very little during the pre-census period.

The basic format of the household may have remained fairly constant over time, but attitudes towards the family and towards individual members within it did not. To test for the impact of political and religious change upon family life one needs to cover a far longer period than was feasible in this particular study. Nevertheless, it has been possible to discern a number of minor developments which are of interest when viewed in the context of the evolution of the effective nuclear family. Testamentary evidence, for instance, illustrates that by the seventeenth century the average willmaker showed far more concern for the future welfare of his immediate family than he had done a century earlier. Besides devoting less attention to his obsequies, he was less inclined to endow large numbers of friends or distant kin or to leave his children to the care of guardians. The seventeenth century testator was also more likely to stipulate how he wished the latter to be brought up or how his widow was to be cared for, and was more prepared to voice his opinions on how the "natural" mother or child should behave.

Although wills rarely reveal the degree of affection which existed between man and wife, many men were evidently confident in their wife's ability to administer their affairs. Indeed, by the end of our period the proportion of women entrusted with the executorship was slightly higher than it had been in the early sixteenth century. Even so, large numbers of

widows were unable to remain in their old home or to take over their spouse's workshop. It is always tempting to adopt a "Whiggish" approach and to look for signs of a progressive amelioration in the position of women. Yet it is possible that, as Salisbury's fortunes declined, the opportunities for women to trade or to hold property may actually have been diminished. Clearly far more research is needed in order to see how far the economic conditions in individual communities and at different periods affected the role of women and whether, in turn, this influenced the rate of remarriage and the number of "broken" and "hybrid" households within the community.

By the outbreak of the Civil War the conjugal unit was probably no more stable than it had been before the Reformation. Quite apart from the effect of high mortality the ambiguities of the law meant that it was comparatively easy to form a temporary union or to desert an incompatible partner. Yet social attitudes were evidently hardening against those who, by living apart or by cohabiting without the sanction of a public ceremony, offended against the basic tenets of marriage. As the moral welfare of the family became a matter of increasing public concern, the authorities also assumed a greater interest in its economic well being and began to devise schemes to reduce poverty and to improve the system of parish relief. To some extent these limited schemes helped to encourage the self-sufficiency of the domestic group and reduced the need to approach kinsmen and friends in order to obtain money or employment. Not, it should be emphasised, that by the mid-seventeenth century there were many signs of the private, self-contained unit which characterises the modern family. Ties with distant relatives may have weakened since 1500, yet contact with friends and neighbours was still a crucial aspect of daily life.
Having begun this conclusion with a statistical breakdown of the "standard" household we should now, set this model aside for, as Rosenberg pointed out,

"descriptions of past social structure based on aggregated data do not necessarily correspond to the reality perceived by individuals or groups living and working in that society." (6).

The typical late sixteenth century household was not a static unit composed of a fixed number of inmates. It was a fluid entity which was constantly expanding and contracting. One child was born, another was buried or left home. Servants moved away to seek fresh employment or to set up their own homes, others came to take their place. An elderly mother might dwell in the house for a year or two before she died. A more distant relative or a complete stranger was given houseroom for a couple of months. Any conclusions we reach about the size of the household or about its changing structure over time are immaterial if we forget that, besides altering in character from one stage of the life-cycle to the next, it also changed from year to year and sometimes even from month to month. Likewise any assumptions we make about the relationships between individual members of the household are of little value without an awareness of the multiplicity of contacts which bound them to the wider community. Indeed only when, as a result of industrialisation and an improvement in demographic conditions, the family became far more stable in character did its external ties diminish in significance and those within the domestic group became increasingly close-knit.

APPENDIX ONE

THE EASTER BOOKS OF ST. THOMAS, SALISBURY: 1574 to 1607
In order to facilitate the presentation of the annual parish accounts, Churchwardens normally made use of a number of rough ledgers in which they noted items such as burial receipts, wages, pew-rents, the offerings made at churchings and weddings and, in the case of the Easter Books and Quarter Books, certain mandatory rates. One of the earliest references to an Easter Book in Salisbury occurred in the St. Thomas's Churchwarden's Accounts for 1560-1 where there was an entry for,

"Tythes and offerings at E(a)st(e)r for the offering dayes, tythes of the hole paryshe at Ester and for the font taper and other duetyes as by a boke of particulars." (1).

From 1568 onwards the Easter Book appeared as a regular item in the accounts, the amount collected under this head varying between £30 and £35. In the 1630s it was replaced in the receipts by an item known as the "Church Rate". But the system itself probably remained unchanged for the Easter Book reappeared as a heading in the 1660s.

To determine exactly what the Easter collection included is difficult for, in common with the inhabitants of other parishes, the men and women in St. Thomas's were expected to contribute to a number of different funds each year. From the mid-sixteenth century many parishes introduced compulsory rates to help finance the maintenance of the church fabric. Items such as candles and the communion elements involved separate collections. Money also had to be raised for the wages of the clerk, the sexton and the priest. The priest's wages and the maintenance of the chancel were normally covered by the parson's tithes. These were traditionally collected by the priest or his agent, rather than by the Churchwardens. However, occasional references to the priest's dues in local accounts suggest that by the sixteenth century the levy may have become the responsibility of

the wardens instead.

The earliest reference to the Easter Book cited above suggests that a number of different items were included in the Easter Levy. It did not, however, cover the Holy Loaf and the Bread and Wine. The money for these elements may have been collected at the same time as the Easter offerings, yet it was always entered as a separate item in the annual accounts. \(^2\)

The Easter Books should not, it seems, be confused with the Token Books which existed in a number of other parishes although they clearly did have a link with the traditional Easter Communion. \(^3\)

To appreciate this link we need to consider the origins of the Easter Book in a little more detail. In the Churchwarden's Accounts dating from the first half of the sixteenth century the "Font Taper and Deacon's Wages" was a common item amongst the receipts. As the Easter Book appeared in the St. Thomas's records, the latter significantly disappeared, whilst in St. Edmund's it was replaced twenty years later by the "Half Pence for Easter dues". The Easter due was an obligatory levy for all those who were old enough to take communion. In 1596 it was ordered that "all persons who have not paid their Easter duties" were to be presented before the Sub-Dean, and Churchwarden's Presentments dating from the early seventeenth century often listed such offenders along with those who failed to take

2. A note in the account for 1582-3 mentioning 43s 4d for "bread and wine gatheride from the Kings heede at fisherton bridge vnto the blewe lyon", indicates that, like the Easter Collection the communion money was gathered on a house to house basis. (Ibid., p. 292).

3. The wardens in St. Edmunds may have used some form of Token Book for several of the 17th century accounts mention books of communicants. Tokens were certainly distributed each year. In 1626, for instance, it was ordered that, "Every person that will receive communion shall on some daye of the week before the communion day give notice to the clark of their purpose and he to deliver token to them and towards defraying charges of bread and wine every person at the time of their receaving shall pay a halfpenny to the churchwardens and then deliver back their token". (Ibid., p. 183). In St. Thomas's references to stamping tokens suggests that a similar system may also have operated there. Ibid., p. 286.
communion.* In St. Edmund's, as in a number of other parishes, the due was apparently fixed at a halfpenny. In St. Thomas's it may have been as much as 4d. Certainly by the second half of the seventeenth century it was expected that,

"Every person rated to the poor to pay for himself, wife and children, and apprentices that are fit to use the sacrament a groat a piece besides a convenient allowance for bread and wine. And all and eurie single person both housekeepers and covenant servants that inhabitt within this parish are to be rated for there Easter duties fower pence a piece". 5.

It has been suggested that only a portion of the money collected under the guise of the Font Taper would ever have been used to provide wax. The rest probably went towards the general fabric fund or towards the payment of wages.* The Easter dues may have had a similar dual purpose. This certainly seems to have been the case in St. Edmund's where, in the 1640s two separate books were compiled, "One to gather ye ministers Easter dues (and) one for ye ch(urch)warden to gather his dues". (7). In addition to the fixed levy paid by all communicants the Easter collection also included an additional rate which varied according to the individual circumstances and which was sometimes described as a "privy tithe". (8). In origin personal tithes

4. Ibid., p. 301.
5. Ibid., p. 337.
8. That this was in some way means tested is suggested by an order of 1630 suggesting that all communicants should be rated for casting a new bell, "only all those thate are under 8d in the Easter Book are to pay nothing". Ibid., p.314.
It has already been pointed out how the earlier reference to an Easter Book mentioned "tythes and offerings", whilst a number of later accounts referred to the Easter Book for "the pryvie tithes". Ibid., pp.292, 294 and 295.
were assessed on wages and the profits of trade and, like praedial and mixed tithes based on crops and livestock, were paid directly to the priest. However, the Easter tithe was clearly an integral part of the parish stock rather than a prerogative of the priest and, like the fixed due, was presumably used for the upkeep of the church and the payment of wages.

In order to understand how each individual rate was determined it is important to be aware of the accounting systems which operated elsewhere. The methods adopted in St. Edmund's were in many ways very different to those in the neighbouring parish. Yet the same basic forms of income can be readily discerned. The Easter dues or "Halfpence" generally amounted to 53s 4d a year, a total which implies a communicable population of about 1280. By the 1630s the "Halfpence" no longer occurred as a separate item amongst the receipts, although entries for various expenses indicate that it was still gathered independently. Separate totals were also given each year for the communion elements and the clerk's wages, whilst a sum ranging from £6 to £13 was collected under the heading of the "Quarter Book". The latter formed one of the largest individual sources of income and as such made an important contribution towards defraying the costs of repair and maintenance. Despite the fact that it was collected on a quarterly rather than an annual basis the quarterage appears, in many respects, to have been

9. Some form of collection was obviously taken for the rector of St. Thomas's although whether it was paid to him directly or was the responsibility of the churchwardens is uncertain. In 1648, for instance, 2s 6d was spent on "writing of the booke of the parishes names that pay contribution to the minister". Three years later a note referring to the collection of Mr. Conant's money suggests that it was gathered in similar fashion to the Easter dues and may even have been collected at the same time. 

10. This is similar to the mean number of adults recorded for the years 1585, 1593 and 1594 in St. Thomas's, namely 1271.

11. The Quarter Book was possibly in use in the early sixteenth century and certainly by the 1560s.
the equivalent of the privy tithe recorded in the Easter Books, for, in contrast to the Easter due, it obviously varied according to individual wealth. In 1650 for instance, it was agreed that, in order to repair the chancel and the tower, "there be ten rates to every Parishioner after the rate of his yearly payment in the Quarter Book." (12) Although the evidence is limited, it seems likely that both the quarterage and the Easter tithe were assessed according to the value of real estate. 13.

The evidence from a number of other Easter Books confirms that a system involving a fixed duty plus an assessment on property may have been fairly common. In St. Mary's Leicester, for instance, each householder paid 2d for himself and his wife (presumably the mandatory duty) 1d or 2d for his house; the same for a garden and varying amounts for orchards, fruit trees and cattle. 14. In St. Michael's in Coventry, where individual contributions were considerably higher than in St. Thomas's, houses, shops, stables, bakehouses and cattle were all rateable. 15. The annual rent paid on a house seems to have been the determining criteria in the latter, although only property held in addition to the dwelling house was 12. Ibid., p.221. Such extraordinary levies to finance particular works became increasingly common in both parishes during the sixteenth century.

13. In 1638-9 the Wardens from St. Edmund's craved relief for those who had not paid their quarterly dues including, significantly, one Mr. Tucker who "refuses for his tenement 2s". (Ibid., p.209). An assessment based on real estate would accord with the tithe act of 1559 which stated that whilst every person was "liable to pay for his part the tenth part of his clear gains", in London, Canterbury and several other towns the charge was to be based instead on the rent each tithe-payer paid for his house. A. G. Little, "Personal Tithes", English Historical Review, LX,1945, p. 69.


15. Coventry Record Office, Corporation Financial Records pre 1835, Rates St. Michael 9A & 9B. Although these are described simply as Rate Books a torn fragment on the second of the two volumes suggests that contemporaries may have known them as Easter Books. Their contents certainly fit this description.
specifically mentioned. Thus, whilst some parishioners were listed with several properties, others appeared with none at all. A similar principle operated in Christchurch, Bristol. As in St. Thomas's the majority of entries in the local Easter Books simply gave a total, rather than specifying each individual item of assessment. But in each book several men were noted paying on shops. These were evidently distinct from the tradesman's dwelling house and may even have been held by men from a different parish.

In addition to real estate, wages were another criteria for assessment. In both St. Mary's and St. Michael's it was often specified when a servant was "on wages". In the former, as in St. Thomas's, a number of servants and youths who still lived at home obviously paid their own duties, whilst others were either bracketed with the householder or the space for an amount was simply left blank. To explain this inconsistency it is appropriate to return to the order ratified by the St. Thomas parish vestry in 1663. Every householder was expected to pay a groat "for himself, wife and children and apprentices that are fit to use the sacrament", whilst single people "both householders and convenant servants", were to be "rated for the Easter duties fower pence a peece". Younger servants and apprentices who were rewarded simply with board and lodging would be paid for by the master of the house, but those who were self-sufficient and actually earnt a wage would apparently pay for themselves.

17. Little points out that by a long standing agreement the rectors of St. Stephen's in Bristol were allowed half the tithes of a man who dwelt in another parish but held houses or shops in the parish and carried on business there.(Little, op. cit., p.78).
18. Single Totals for the household were the norm in Coventry and in the later Christchurch records.
19. Statutory wage regulations often allocated a smaller wage or board and lodging only to servants under the ages of 16 or 18. This would be a valuable clue to the minimum age of the houseling population, but for the fact that the clerks were not always consistent. Thus whilst in some years a youth apparently paid for himself, in others no sum is mentioned.
A particularly good example of the operation of this system occurs in St. Ewens, Bristol where the Easter Books simply recorded the offerings due from "Servants and Youths" (20). Individual payments ranged from 2d to 6d. The former presumably representing the obligatory duty, was normally paid by the younger communicants. The latter must have included an additional element for those earning wages. In the few surviving lists the name of the head of the household was often given instead of that of the youths themselves, a fact that confirms that he was responsible for the tithes of his dependents. His own contribution, which varied between 8d and 13s 4d, was meanwhile listed in the annual Proctor's accounts under the heading for "the rate upon every householder towards the prestes wages."

The Easter Books which it has been possible to examine — and doubtless many similar account books must exist, albeit under different names — reveal that the methods of individual churchwardens were very flexible. Yet there are sufficient similarities to indicate that a levy based on a personal rate plus an element for wages and for various types of property must have been fairly widespread in towns. In a rural parish the profits from livestock and crops would also be included. Thus in the parish of Ryton in Durham, the Easter levy amounted to 2d for a single person, 3d for a couple, 1d each for children and servants, 1d for a plough and varying sums for poultry, wool and bees, whilst another tithe due on St. Mark's day included 21.


In most parishes the fixed personal due amounted to no more than a few pence, but the rate on property varied from one to the next. In Christchurch, for example, the former was 2d in 1588, whilst the highest contribution by a householder, namely the mayor, was 13s 4d. In Leicester it was unusual for a parishioner to pay more than 2s, yet in Coventry offerings of over £1 were fairly common. The upper limit in St. Thomas's was normally 6s 8d, although there are isolated examples of higher contributions. At the opposite extreme, meanwhile, some people could not even afford the fixed levy of 4d and rebates were common.

Having discussed the purpose of the Easter Books we need to consider how and when they were compiled. In common with Christchurch, St. Michael's and St. Mary's, the levy in St. Thomas's entailed a house to house collection. Individual households were not always listed in exactly the same order, the arrangement in the Chequers being particularly haphazard, yet the books are significantly alike to make it clear that the collectors followed a recognised circuit. This method of collection was common. In St. Edmund's for instance, it was agreed in 1603 that "the bread and wine for the communion shalbe gathered in three severall circuits", and the people presented for missing communion were significantly listed under streets. The collectors of the various sixteenth century lay-subsidies also appear to have followed a set pattern.

---

22. Annual variations in individual dues were only slight and presumably related to the number of "extra" members of the household the head would need to pay for.

23. In St. Ewens the youths' offerings may conceivably have been collected when they took communion, for the lists were divided between those paying on Palm Sunday, Easter Eve, Easter Day and Low Sunday.

24. In Fig 2:2 the streets are numbered according to the normal circuit.

25. Swayne, op.cit., p. 194. In Southwark the distribution of Communion Tokens was carried out on a similar basis, a number of rounds apparently being made during the Easter season until all the tokens were sold. I am grateful to Mr W. Ingram for this information.
Less certain is whether the collection was made at a fixed point in the year, quarterly as in St. Edmund's, or gradually over a long period. The levy for the Font Taper, one of the precursors of the Easter Book, had been gathered during Holy Week. A collection involving over a thousand people may well have started somewhat earlier, although even if this was the case, many delayed payment until long after the Easter Communion. Large sums were often outstanding at the time of the annual audit and certain parishioners repeatedly neglected their payments. In 1600–1 for instance, Edward Penruddock owed 30s "for his ch(ur)ch duties for three yere behinde and vnp(ai)d". The following year he was still two years in arrears.²⁶

The crucial problem in any attempt to date the Easter Books is in relating the street collection to the compilation of the record itself. Was the book prepared in advance and actually used by the collectors or transcribed at a later date from rough working copies.²⁷ The book of 1594 included no record of individual contributions, a fact which suggests that several copies were drawn up that year. But a number of other books appear to have been used to facilitate the collection, with crosses appended to indicate payment and marginal notes mentioning if a resident was "dead" or "gone".

Several of the Easter Books give a precise date, the month, when indicated, generally being March or April, that is shortly before Easter. Failing such explicit evidence, the name of the Churchwarden who supervised the book can be used to determine its date, although this in itself poses a problem.

²⁶ Ibid., p.303.

²⁷ Although one would expect a certain amount of information to be transferred from one book to the next, the variations in layout, spellings and sometimes, in Christian names, suggests that each clerk started afresh.
The Churchwarden's term of office normally ran from Easter to Easter, each man having a year as junior warden before assuming direct responsibility for the accounts. Thus, for every book there are two possible dates, the Easter when the Warden took senior office or the Easter of the year in which he presented his accounts. To adopt the latter presupposes a fairly rapid process in which the money was collected, the ledger drawn up and the accounts presented within the space of about a month. The latter allows for a gradual collection, possibly even by instalments, which would give ample time for a fair copy to be drawn up towards the end of the year.

The heading of the earliest known book, compiled by two men who were in office together between 1573 and 1574, gives credence to the second alternative. It states that the book was made,

"the 25th of March 1574 (Easter that year falling on April 11th) and was from 1573 to the day seased by ye masters of ye p(ari)she and gathered by us Peter Heyward and Thomas Eyre churchwardens".

Unfortunately none of the other headings are so explicit and even when a date was specified this does little to clarify the issue for sometimes the date of taking office was given and sometimes the date of the year of audit. However, if the heading cited really did refer to a collection lasting from Easter 1573 to March 1574 (and the issue is confused by the alteration of the historical year at this point in the calendar), external evidence suggests that at some stage after 1574 the system may have changed. We should certainly not expect so many arrears if the collection really did take a whole year.

28. The audit was normally soon after Easter.

The name of the current mayor, which is indicated in several books, provides a key to the solution for he began his office on 2nd November and would therefore only coincide with the chief warden for roughly half a year. Significantly this six month period normally covered the second of the two possible dates for each Easter Book, namely the Easter when the Warden presented his accounts. This method of dating is confirmed by looking at the marital status of various men referred to in the books. In the list compiled by Thomas Tichborne and Walter Belly, in office together between 1589 and 1590, John Bastard was recorded with a wife and John Slatter as a single man. We know that the former married on 4th February 1590, the latter on the 26th April that year. The record must therefore have been compiled between the two. The dates of two more books can be resolved by using the example of Henry Marketman, a householder who was widowed in January 1594 and remarried in February 1595. In an undated book compiled when Richard Godfrey was mayor (November 1593 to November 1594), Marketman appeared alone indicating that the collection was taken after January 1594. In the next book, drawn up whilst Augustine Abbot was senior warden and Thomas Grafton mayor, the year 1594-5, he is entered once again with a wife.

A number of similar samples confirm that the Easter Books should be dated according to the final year of the churchwarden's term. They suggest moreover, that the information recorded in each book was still relatively up to date and that the collection, the drawing up of the ledger and the audit must all have been roughly contemporaneous.

30. Ibid., No. 35.
31. Ibid., Nos. 48 & 41.
Whilst censuses of the entire population are rare, lists of communicants albeit in the guise of Easter Books or Token books, are more common. These lists have a part to play in demographic history and cannot simply be dismissed because they do not meet the criteria for a perfect census. As more of these sources are studied it is hoped that we shall develop a greater understanding of the rationale behind them and consequently, will be able to make meaningful comparisons which can be used to further the ongoing debate on household structure in the past.
## APPENDIX TWO: A: TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS IN ST. THOMAS'S, 1574 - 1607

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1574</th>
<th>1582</th>
<th>1585</th>
<th>1590</th>
<th>1592</th>
<th>1593</th>
<th>1594</th>
<th>1595</th>
<th>1596</th>
<th>1599</th>
<th>1601</th>
<th>1602</th>
<th>1603</th>
<th>1607</th>
<th>MEAN 1574-1603/7</th>
<th>MEAN 1585, 1593 &amp; 1594</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bower's Chequer</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatmeal Row</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher Row</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Row</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricket's Corner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Street</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. High Street</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>*20.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. High Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Gate</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Street</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Catherine St.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Catherine St.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Chequer</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lion Chequer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. New Street</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. New Street</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Churchyard</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the Churchyard</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>401</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>416.4</td>
<td>425.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX TWO: B: TOTAL ADULT INHABITANTS (UNCORRECTED), 1574 - 1607

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1574</th>
<th>1582</th>
<th>1585</th>
<th>1590</th>
<th>1592</th>
<th>1593</th>
<th>1594</th>
<th>1595</th>
<th>1596</th>
<th>1599</th>
<th>1601</th>
<th>1602</th>
<th>1603</th>
<th>1607</th>
<th>MEAN 1574</th>
<th>MEAN 1585,1593</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ditch</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bower's Chequer</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatmeal Row</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher Row</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Row</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricket's Corner</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Street</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>106.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. High Street</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. High Street</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Gate</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Fisherton St.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Street</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Catherine St.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Catherine St.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Hart Chequer</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Lion Chequer</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. New Street</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. New Street</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Churchyard</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the Churchyard</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>1269</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>1089.5</td>
<td>1270.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX THREE

EVIDENCE FROM ST. THOMAS'S FOR THE UNDER-REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS

Whilst it was suggested earlier that the Salisbury Baptismal Registers may have been unreliable, it is possible, for St. Thomas's at least, to make certain checks for under-registration by using a comparatively rare document, a Chrysom Book or register of churchings. Estimates for the birth-baptism shortfall are generally based on entries in burial registers. Between 1634 and 1648 in Rothwell, Yorkshire, for instance, the burial register included 135 "infants not baptised", as many as a tenth of the total registered baptisms. However, although premature death may have been one factor which lead to the under-registration of births, a comparison of the baptisms recorded in St. Thomas's with the names of the women who were churched in the parish suggests that negligence and non-conformity were also of significance.

A certain proportion of the population, including non-conformists and poorer people who were negligent about all forms of church attendance, would presumably have failed either to have their children baptised or to attend churching. It is also conceivable that a number of women would have been churched in one parish, whilst the child was christened in another, or that in other cases neither the mother nor the child would have survived. However, even though one cannot hope, by using the Chrysom Book, to pick up all the omissions, this method does indicate that estimates based on burial entries alone may be too low.


2. Under-registration is thought to be less of a problem in the sixteenth century than in later periods when the likelihood of dying unbaptised increased as the birth-baptism interval extended. That there may actually have been some attempt to hasten the baptism of a sickly child in Salisbury is suggested by the large number of infants christened and buried on the same day. R. Midi Berry, loc. cit.,p.456.
The St. Thomas Chrysom Book dates from 1569 to 1592. However, for this analysis I have concentrated on the 1580s. By then the precise date of each churching was given and the clerk noted if the child had died. The latter can also be inferred if nothing was paid for the chrisom, the cloth traditionally bound round the head of the newborn child at baptism. During this decade 825 children were recorded in the baptismal register, whilst 759 women were churched. 80 of the churchings cannot be linked with a christening, suggesting that the total number of births must have been at least 905. This means that a maximum of 91.2% of all known births resulted in baptism and 83.9% in a churching.

The total number of births can be extended by adding a further 36 children who were buried during the 1580s but cannot be linked with an entry in either the Baptism register or the Chrysom Book. Some may have been christened elsewhere, but if we accept 941 as a maxima this reduces the number of births leading to baptism to 87.7% and those leading to a churching to 80.7%.

Of the 80 cases where the mother was churched but there is no recorded baptism, 14 can be linked with a burial. In 20 more cases, although there was no entry in the burial register, the clerk noted that the child was dead in the Chrysom Book. Nearly half the omissions (42.5%) were therefore apparently caused by the sudden death of the child. This proportion should possibly be even higher for, as only 14 of the 34 cases of neonatal mortality noted in the Chrysom Book can be traced in the Burial register, it is clear that the latter was also incomplete. Yet it is significant that in each of the remaining 46 cases the mother paid for the cloth used during the christening service. If the child had already died there was no reason to include this entry. As there is no record
of a baptism in the other Salisbury parishes it seems logical to conclude that over half the apparent omissions may simply have been due to error or to neglect.

The degree of under-registration indicated by this method of analysis, between 9% and 13%, is higher than that obtained by the more conventional method of comparing baptismal and burial entries.\(^3\)

Whether there was an additional group of births which appeared in none of the three registers, and whether the parish registers were any less stringently kept between 1580 and 1589 than at other times, or in St. Thomas's than elsewhere, are of course moot points.\(^4\)

---

3. The latter indicates only an additional 36 births in St. Thomas's, just over 4% of the total.

4. It is possible that the degree of error may increase proportionately with the number of events to be recorded. This might explain the discrepancy between the average birth intervals noted in St. Thomas's and those in the smaller rural parishes of Terling and Colyton. Supra, p.147.
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